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But nothing’s lost. Or else: all is translation

And every bit of us is lost in it...

(Or found – …

James Merrill “Lost in translation”
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RESUMO

THE MARVELLOUS TRAVELS OF FERNANDO MENDEZ PINTO ACROSS THE LOW COUNTRIES: TRANSLATION, APPROPRIATION AND RECEIPTION

(AS MARAVILHOSAS VIAGENS DE FERNÃO MENDES PINTO PELOS PAÍSES BAIXOS: TRADUÇÃO, APROPRIAÇÃO E RECEPÇÃO)

PATRICIA REGINA ESTEVES DO COUTO

Em 1652, De wonderlyke reizen van Fernando Mendez Pinto die hij in eenëntwintig jaren deur Europa, Asia, en Afrika gedaan heeft, daar in hij dartien malen gevangen heeft geweest, en zeventien malen verkocht is (As maravilhosas viagens de Fernão Mendes Pinto, que ele fez durante vinte e um anos através da Europa, Ásia e África, em que foi treze vezes preso e dezassete vezes vendido), a tradução neerlandesa de Jan Hendrik Glazemaker (1620-1682) da obra de Fernão Mendes Pinto, Peregrinaçam (1614), foi publicada em Amsterdam por Jan Hendriksz and Jan Rieuwertsz, livreiros em Amsterdão. A tradução foi impressa por Pieter la Burgh. No ano seguinte, em 1653, seguiu-se uma segunda publicação.

Glazemaker foi um tradutor extremamente produtivo e heterodoxo, conhecido pelas suas traduções de Descartes e Spinoza. A fim de perceber as razões que levaram Glazemaker a traduzir a obra de Mendes Pinto e o modo como a traduziu, pois a tradução da obra de Mendes Pinto foi fortemente manipulada e abreviada, foi preciso situar primeiro o contexto em que o tradutor vivia e trabalhava.
No final do século dezasseis dá-se a revolta das Províncias Unidas contra o domínio espanhol. Depois da queda de Antuérpia, em 1585, nas mãos dos Castelhanos, as províncias do Norte bloqueiam a foz do rio Escalda, rio fundamental para o tráfico comercial daquela zona. Assim, por motivos económicos, religiosos, ou políticos dezenas de milhares de pessoas, oriundas do Sul, refugiam-se no Norte, onde Amsterdão se torna o principal centro económico europeu. Além disso, devido à tolerância que existia, a República das Províncias Unidas recebe também refugiados perseguidos de outros locais da Europa. Mesmo sendo a Igreja Reformada Holandesa a religião oficial do estado, outras religiões eram toleradas desde que os crentes não a praticassem de forma pública. A tolerância, no entanto, não era ilimitada, não era permitido pôr em questão os dogmas fundamentais da religião cristã.

Glazemaker nasce em Amsterdão em 1620, no século dezassete chamado século de ouro na cultura holandesa, numa cidade em forte expansão com uma classe média ascendente e com uma elevada taxa de literacia comparada com outros países na Europa. O seu nome “Glazemaker” (vidraceiro) indica que a sua profissão era a de vidraceiro mas cedo ele resolve tornar-se tradutor a tempo inteiro. Primeiro traduz apenas do francês, mas passados poucos anos resolve estudar latim para poder alargar o seu campo de trabalho. O texto fonte para a tradução de Mendes Pinto é a versão de 1645 da tradução francesa de Bernard Figuier *Les voyages advatvrevx de Fernand Mendez Pinto* publicada pela primeira vez em 1628, em Paris.

Nascido numa família Anabaptista, Glazemaker também participa activamente em encontros do movimento dos *Collegianten*, cristãos que se reuniam de forma espontânea, caracterizavam-se por uma grande tolerância religiosa e se mostravam extremamente críticos em relação às igrejas institucionalisadas. Provavelmente, através
destes conhecimentos, entra em contacto com um grupo de iluministas radicais do qual fazem parte os filósofos racionalistas Franciscus van den Enden, Adriaan Koerbagh e Benedictus de Spinoza. Também os livreiros Jan Rieuwertsz e Jan Hendriksz, bem como o tipógrafo Pieter la Burgh, estavam ligados a este grupo de livre-pensadores. Jan Rieuwertsz é também responsável pela publicação clandestina da obra de Espinoza.

Desde cedo, Glazemaker revela interessar-se pela tradução de livros heterodoxos e relacionados com a “Nova Filosofia” que representava uma perspectiva científica, secular e mecânica do mundo e que incluía o estudo das ciências naturais. Uma nova perspectiva que entra em conflito com a Bíblia e a filosofia aristotélica tradicional. O historiador Jonathan Israel situa a crise da consciência europeia na República das Províncias Unidas, entre os anos de 1650 e 1680.

Na primeira parte da dissertação, Glazemaker é contextualizado no seu meio cultural. A fim de conhecer o pensamento de Glazemaker e a sua opinião sobre tradução, foram analisadas algumas introduções de sua autoria a traduções suas, bem como a lista de obras que ele traduziu. Também se torna claro que Glazemaker não se limitava a traduzir o que lhe pediam mas é ele quem escolhe criteriosamente e sugera as suas fontes. Também não se esquiva a correr riscos: é o tradutor anónimo de Espinoza, escritor proscrito.

Glazemaker, em algumas das introduções às suas traduções, revela que o seu objectivo é tornar o saber acessível às pessoas comuns que não têm conhecimentos de latim ou francês. Por isso adopta uma linguagem clara e simples, isenta de estrangeirismos e traduz livros sobre filosofia, história antiga e moderna, política e relatos de viagens.
Na segunda parte, *Wonderlyke reizen* é analisado. É focada a estratégia adoptada por Glazemaker, as suas omissões e a manipulação do texto. A tradução de Mendes Pinto é importante porque revela a agenda religiosa e política do tradutor e torna clara a corrente clandestina de pensamento radical existente na República das Províncias Unidas. É igualmente focada a razão porque Glazemaker se interessou pela tradução de Mendes Pinto, pois a obra revela uma perspectiva crítica, totalmente diferente dos livros de viagens em voga na República, que divulgavam um ponto de vista protestante, patriótico e heróico, da política expansionista dos holandeses.

Na terceira parte, é apresentada a recepção da obra de Fernão Mendes Pinto nos Países Baixos. Aqui verificamos que a obra de Mendes Pinto, além de ter sido lido como um livro de aventuras, foi também interpretada por uma minoria radical como um texto desestabilizador, no século dezassete e nos primeiros trinta anos do século dezoito, para seguidamente cair no esquecimento. No século dezanove, com o interesse dos holandeses pelas suas colónias no Extremo Oriente, a obra de Mendes Pinto torna-se importante pelas informações sobre os povos que descreve, a sua história e geografia.

No século vinte o escritor holandês Jan Jacob Slauerhoff (1898-1936) inspira-se na obra de Mendes Pinto para os seus romances *Het verboden rijk* (O reino proibido, 1932) e *Het leven op aarde* (A vida na terra, 1934) que decorrem parcialmente ou totalmente na China. Mais recentemente Mendes Pinto figura como um dos dois protagonistas principais no romance *Het China van Gaspar* (A China de Gaspar, 1989) da escritora flamenga, Magda van den Akker.

**Palavras chave:** Estudos de Tradução – Iluminismo Radical – República Unida dos Países Baixos – Spinoza – Glazemaker – Fernão Mendes Pinto
ABSTRACT

THE MARVELLOUS TRAVELS OF FERNANDO MENDEZ PINTO ACROSS THE LOW COUNTRIES: TRANSLATION, APPROPRIATION AND RECEPTION

PATRICIA REGINA ESTEVES DO COUTO

In 1652, Wonderlyke reizen, the Dutch translation of Fernão Mendes Pinto’s Peregrinaçam (1614) by J. H. Glazemaker was published in Amsterdam.

Glazemaker was a very productive and unorthodox translator, known for his translations of Descartes and Spinoza. The aim of this dissertation is to explain why the translation of Mendes Pinto was severely manipulated and abridged by the translator.

The first part gives a contextualization of Glazemaker in his cultural environment. In order to have an insight on his views on translation and on his ideology, various forewords from some of his translations were analysed, as well as the list of books he chose to translate.

In the second part, Wonderlyke reizen is analysed. I focus on the strategy Glazemaker adopted, his omissions and his manipulation of the text. The translation of Mendes Pinto’s work is important because it reveals Glazemaker’s religious and political agenda. It throws a light upon the radical undercurrent of thought existent in the Dutch Republic.

Finally, in the third part, the reception of Mendes Pinto’s work in the Low Countries is presented.

Key words: Translation Studies – Radical Enlightenment – Dutch Republic – Spinoza – Glazemaker – Fernão Mendes Pinto
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TRANSLATIONS, QUOTATIONS AND CONVENTIONAL SIGNS

For my dissertation not only did I translate – and thus interpret – other people’s concepts about translation or text passages from Dutch into English, but I also had to translate Glazemaker’s own comments into modern English and provide a line-by-line translation of parts of his translation of Peregrinaçam. As I am presenting my dissertation at a Portuguese university I did not translate the Portuguese texts. Unless otherwise mentioned, all translations are mine.

The titles of books, passages taken from books and articles in Dutch are translated into English the first time they appear. In the addenda, the Dutch titles of Glazemaker’s translations are translated into English.

The Portuguese copy of Fernão Mendes Pinto’s work I used was Peregrinação de Fernão Mendez Pinto. (Edição facsimilada da edição de 1614) apresentação José Manuel Garcia, Maia: Castoliva Editora, 1995. Quotes or references from Peregrinaçam and Historia Oriental are immediately followed by chapter number in Arabic numerals, from Voyages Advantvrevx they are followed by Roman numerals, and from Wonderlyke reizen (Marvellous travels) by page number.

The translations by Glazemaker mentioned in my dissertation are numbered in square brackets according to Thijsen-Schoute’s chronological inventory included in her article “Jan Hendrik Glazemaker. De zeventiende eeuwse aartsvertaler.” (Jan Hendrik Glazemaker. The seventeenth-century arch-translator, 1967). They are listed in volume II, Addendum I.
In Glazemaker’s translations two types of font are often used. A different type of font is used for emphasis, foreign names, names of ships and direct speech, and is written in italics in my dissertation.

Whenever I could use modern English translations I based them on Rebecca Catz’s translation of *The travels of Mendes Pinto* (1989).

The (last) date of access of electronic sources is mentioned in the list of sources cited.

The illustrations included were taken from Glazemaker’s translation *Wonderlyke reizen* with permission from the National Library in The Hague.
ILLUSTRATIONS

Plate folio 112 of Wonderlyke reizen
Plate folio 10 of Wonderlyke reizen
Plate folio 224 of Wonderlyke reizen
Frontispiece of Wonderlyke reizen
Plate folio 190 of Wonderlyke reizen
Plate folio 132 of Wonderlyke reizen
Plate folio 28 of Wonderlyke reizen
### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>Ceremonies et Coutumes Religieuses de Tous les Peuples du Monde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dbnl</td>
<td>Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEA</td>
<td>Diccionario de la Real Academia Española</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM</td>
<td>Historic Macau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO</td>
<td>Historia Oriental de las Peregrinaciones de Fernão Mendes Pinto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVR</td>
<td>Het verboden rijk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Het leven op aarde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Naaukeurige beschryving der uitwendige godtsdienst-plichten, kerk-zeden en gewoontens van alle volkeren der waereldt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Peregrinaçam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVA</td>
<td>Universiteit van Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Les Voyages Advantvrevx de Fernand Mendez Pinto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>Vereenigde Oostindische Compagnie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNT</td>
<td>Woordenboek der Nederlandse Taal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR</td>
<td>De wonderlyke reizen van Fernando Mendez Pinto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dit had de gedaante van een man / die meer dan hondert voeten hoog is / ... had zijn beide handen in de mont gesteken / die zo groot / als een deur was / daar in men rijg van schrikkelijke tanden / en een zwarte tong zag / die heel verre tot de mont uitstak (WR 112).

(It had the shape of a man of more than a hundred feet high ...it had inserted both his hands into his mouth, which was as big as a door, inside of which we could see a row of horrible teeth and a black tongue that was stuck out very far.)
INTRODUCTION
This dissertation is about the Dutch translator Jan Hendrik Glazemaker (1620-1682) and his translation *De wonderlyke reizen van Fernando Mendez Pinto die hij in eenëntwintig jaren deur Europa, Asia, en Afrika gedaan heeft, daar in hij dartien malen gevangen heeft geweest, en zeventien malen verkocht is.* (The marvellous travels of Fernando Mendez Pinto that he made during twenty-one years through Europe, Asia and Africa, during which time he was imprisoned thirteen times and sold seventeen times). The translation was published in 1652 (reprint 1653) by Jan Hendriksz and Jan Rieuwertsz, booksellers in Amsterdam.

From the title, it becomes clear that it was a translation of *Peregrinaçam* by Fernão Mendes Pinto (c. 1510-1583) published in Lisbon in 1614. Glazemaker used as his source text the French translation by Bernard Figuier (Paris: 1620, 1645) *Les voyages advantvrevx de Fernand Mendez Pinto*, because he was not acquainted with the Portuguese language.

Only recently, with the establishment of Translation Studies as a formal discipline, has reflection on translation become a more generalised practice. Not long ago, translators and translations were usually ignored because translation was considered a secondary practice.

Glazemaker’s case is an important instance of the many complex issues raised by a translation. In this particular case, it became a means of propagating radical and subversive ideas by manipulating the source text, the French translation of Fernão Mendes Pinto’s *Peregrinaçam*, in order to serve specific ideological purposes.
This dissertation consists of three main parts. In order to understand the strategy Glazemaker adopted in his translation of Mendes Pinto, it is necessary to contextualise him both historically and geographically. Next, I analyse his translation of Mendes Pinto and finally, the reception of Mendes Pinto’s work in the Low Countries.

In Part I, sections 1 and 2, I contextualise the translator in his time and cultural environment. In order to do so, I had to understand who he was, his origins, and how he had been considered by other scholars (section 4). The importance of the network of his contacts proved to be essential for the understanding of his activity as a translator and is presented in section 3.

In section 5, based on the research done by Theo Hermans, I analyse the translation norms in the Dutch Republic, in particular of the two most representative poets and translators, Joost van den Vondel (1587-1679) and Constantijn Huygens (1596-1687). In order to understand Glazemaker’s perspective on translation and his own worldview, it is necessary to analyse the books he chose to translate, as can be seen in section 6. All the introductory texts that accompany the translations were here studied. Some of the forewords are signed by Glazemaker, some are written by other authors, and other texts are anonymous, but from their contents and their style it is clear that they come from the same translator. These paratexts give us an insight on Glazemaker’s views on translation, what the norms of translation during his time were and allows us to understand to what degree he challenged the traditional norms. In section 7, I explore the data that enabled me to confirm Glazemaker’s active participation in a clandestine network that aimed at the dissemination of radical thought.

In Part II, I present an analysis of Glazemaker’s translation of Mendes Pinto’s work. It begins with the presentation of Peregrinaçam in section 1, followed by an
account of other seventeenth-century translations of Mendes Pinto’s book in section 1.1. In order to contextualise Glazemaker’s translation I contrast it with Jornal ofte gedenckwaerdige beschrijvinghe van de Oost-Indische reyse (An account or memorable description of the voyage to the East Indies) written by Willem Ysbrantsz Bontekoe (1587-1657), which was the most popular travel account published in 1646, shortly before the publication of Wonderlyke reizen. In section 2, the paratext, the verbal and non-verbal material that accompanies the main text, of the book Wonderlyke reizen is presented and analysed. In section 3.1, I present some passages in which Glazemaker’s translation is confronted with his source text, the French translation by Figuier published in 1645, and with the original Portuguese version. In section 3.2, the different types of omissions by Glazemaker are studied and finally, in section 3.3 the reasons for the translation of Mendes Pinto’s text by Glazemaker are presented as well as a justification for his appropriation of Mendes Pinto’s text.

In Part III (sections 1.1 and 1.2), I give an account of the reception of Mendes Pinto’s work in the Low Countries during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In section 1.2, the reception of the highly unorthodox and controversial writer and journalist Jacob Campo Weyerman (1677-1747) is analysed and confronted with the reception of other authors, mostly writers of travel accounts. In section 1.2.2 the reception by other eighteenth-century writers is given and section 1.2.3 presents a conclusion on the reception of Mendes Pinto mostly by radical thinkers in the seventeenth century and the first half of the eighteenth century. In section 3.1 references to Mendes Pinto in books published in the Netherlands during the nineteenth century are analysed. With the advent of colonial studies and the exploration of the Dutch colonies, Peregrinaçam and its various translations are considered a valuable
source of information for the history, geography and customs of the native population in the Dutch East Indies. In section 3.2, the reception during the twentieth century is analysed, namely the slow recognition of Mendes Pinto as a literary writer and the importance of the second – unabridged – translation into Dutch in 1992 from a literary point of view. Section 4 analyses a different appropriation of Mendes Pinto that took place in the twentieth century: in section 4.1, I present an interpretation of two novels by the Dutch writer J. J. Slauerhoff (1898-1936) that I consider to have been inspired by passages of *Peregrinaçam*; where in section 4.2 I mention the novel by the Flemish author Magda van den Akker (1943-) in which Mendes Pinto features as one of the main characters. In section 5 my aim is to present a conclusion of Mendes Pinto’s reception during almost four centuries in the Low Countries by readers and writers coming from different backgrounds and with different purposes.

Finally, in the conclusion, I intend to demonstrate the translator Glazemaker’s importance as the disseminator of new philosophical, political and scientific knowledge among the common public. Through an analysis of the strategies he adopted in his translation of Mendes Pinto’s work, we become aware of how Glazemaker’s translation of this travel account fitted his ideological agenda as cultural and political mediator. The study of the reception of Mendes Pinto reveals that during some time his translation was considered unorthodox by a radical section of society. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries however, Mendes Pinto was appropriated for different reasons.

In order to understand Glazemaker’s choice of translation strategies, an essential source for me was Jonathan Israel’s *Radical Enlightenment* (2001), in which the author describes the development of radical thought and its dissemination in Europe. The
movement had its roots in the seventeenth-century Dutch Republic. Israel considers that Spinoza, supported by a circle of which Glazemaker was an essential member, had a pivotal role in the revolutionary process that shaped the egalitarian and democratic core values and ideas of the modern world.

Most of the partial studies on Glazemaker have only been published in recent years. This is not surprising, as translations and the impact they caused on the target culture have been overlooked for a long time. Yet, I was guided by C. L. Thijsse-Schoute’s shaping article on Glazemaker in which she lists all of his translations. This study was published in 1967,¹ several years before James Holmes’ presentation in 1972 of the seminal essay that marks the formal birth of the discipline of Translation Studies.² My list of translations made by Glazemaker, which is largely based on Thijsse-Schoute’s research, is included in the second volume (Addendum I).

For technical reasons and in order to facilitate consulting the Portuguese, French, Dutch and English versions of the longer passages that are analysed in Part II (section 3.1), I present them in A3 size pages, also included in the second volume (Addendum II).

A list of partial or unabridged translations of Mendes Pinto’s work that were published in the Low Countries is presented in volume II (Addendum III), as well as the most important publications that refer to Fernão Mendes Pinto published in the Low Countries from the year 1640 until roughly the year 2000 (Addendum IV).

I decided to write my dissertation in English because this is the academic lingua franca nowadays, however, the research for my dissertation could only be done by

---

1 The article was published posthumously in 1967, but had been ready in manuscript as early as 1951-1952 (Akkerman 1980:102).
2 The text was expanded and published in James Holmes “The name and nature of Translation Studies” Translated! (ed. Raymond van den Broeck), Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988, 67-80)
someone with a solid knowledge of the Dutch and Portuguese languages. I am aware that a profound knowledge of peripheral languages and cultures is a necessary condition if we do not want to obscure or distort indispensable parts of the historical reality.
Wy / dus gebonden en mishandelt / wierden in zegepraal deur de stat geleid / ... 
Want al de genen / ... die ons zagen voorbygaan / wierpen potten met pis en drek / 
en andere vuiligheden boven tot de veinsters uit / (WR 10).

(We, thus, tied and mistreated, were led in triumph through the city ... For all 
those who saw us passing by, threw out pots with urine and faeces, and other filth 
from above, even from the windows.)
PART I

JAN HENDRIK GLAZEMAKER
1 Socio-Historical Contextualization

Jan Hendrik Glazemaker, Mendes Pinto’s translator, lived in Amsterdam during the seventeenth century. This period is called the Golden Age in Dutch history and as such, it is associated with economic, scientific, cultural and artistic prosperity. It was also a period ridden by intense ideological conflict and marked by wars with other states.

The Republic was essentially an urban society. In the seventeenth century, Dutch towns became more and more autonomous and their population increased notably, particularly in the city of Amsterdam. With the decline of the city of Antwerp, Amsterdam emerges as the dominant centre in the Low Countries and as a major hub of European commerce. Amsterdam was a fast growing city in the seventeenth century and inhabited by an emerging middle-class composed of artisans, artists, shop owners, innkeepers, Calvinist ministers, lawyers, teachers, physicians, traders, etc. The city was governed by wealthy merchants, financiers and regents. A large part of its now famous canals was built during that period, offering employment to hundreds of workers.

For almost a century the city flourished with splendid buildings and warehouses alongside the canals belonging to regents and merchants, as well as the paintings of Rembrandt, Vermeer or Frans Hals. It was the age of scientists, like Christiaan Huygens and Anthonie van Leeuwenhoek, but the Republic also became a haven for philosophers such as Descartes and Spinoza.

Amsterdam welcomed refugees, as a significant number of immigrants had fled the Southern Provinces, dominated by King Philip II of Spain, for economic, political or religious reasons. Others had fled from religious persecution, particularly Jews from
Portugal, Huguenots from France, Socinians from Poland. Refugees from the Thirty Years’ War, also found a safe dwelling in the city or in the Republic.

The Golden Age of the Dutch Republic reminds us of the proverbial spirit of tolerance of the Dutch. Officially, the Republic was a Protestant state but only a minority belonged to the Calvinist Reformed Church, which was itself torn apart by internal controversies. The non-Calvinistic communities were accepted as long as they did not step outside the boundaries imposed by the authorities. Large groups of people lived in a state of unofficial tolerance unknown in the rest of Europe. They were granted freedom of conscience but not freedom of worship. Nevertheless, they managed to worship in clandestine accommodations to which the authorities usually turned a blind eye. Only those who undermined the foundations of Christianity could expect no clemency. Other factors that favoured tolerance was the decentralised nature of the Dutch Republic and its fragmented policies (Frijhoff 1999: 140).

Religious freedom was associated with economic prosperity, what mattered to the regents was social peace and stability. The political and economic weakness of the nobility favoured the growth of the bourgeoisie and their wealth. In terms of art and culture this meant that Dutch cultural output catered primarily to a middle-class audience. Literacy levels in the Republic were high compared to other countries, which consequently guaranteed a domestic publishing market of a size unparalleled to in Europe. A second reason for the flourishing of publishing houses was the fact that they could publish works that were forbidden elsewhere. Scholars and intellectuals also benefitted from the open-minded atmosphere that was inexistent in other places in Europe.
A characteristic of the Dutch people was their active involvement in society. Consequently, the Dutch, especially the middle groups of society, were eager to participate in discussions on all aspects of social life (Frijhoff 1999: 51).

It was in this emerging urban culture that Glazemaker was active. The translations he made were aimed at a middle-class public. In order to understand his way of thinking, acting and translating, I will first give a historic outline of the Dutch Republic and of Glazemaker’s circle of friends and collaborators in Amsterdam at the time.

1.1 Dutch Revolt against Spain

After Charles V’s abdication in 1556, his son Philip II (1527-1598), who had been raised in Spain and spoke neither Dutch nor French, became Lord of the Seventeen Provinces. During Philip’s reign, tensions flared in the Low Countries over heavy taxation, suppression of Protestantism by the Inquisition, and centralization efforts. The revolt was led by William the Silent, Prince of Orange (1533-1584). After the Beeldenstorm, the iconoclastic attacks, in 1566, Philip II appointed the Duke of Alba (1507-1582) Governor of the Low Countries. Although the formal end of the revolt against Spain only came in 1648 with the Peace Treaty in Münster, Westphalia, separation was a fact since 1579 with the signing of the Union of Atrecht by the Southern Provinces under the Spanish crown and its response two weeks later by the rebels in the Northern Provinces with the Union of Utrecht.

In 1585 Antwerp, the largest city and one of Europe’s most important cultural, economic and financial centres, fell into the hands of the Spanish troops. After the siege, the Dutch fleet remained on the river Scheldt, blocking the city’s access to the sea
and cutting it off from international trade. The fall of Antwerp and the closing of the Scheldt was an economic disaster for the once so flourishing port. The emigration of many highly qualified professional artisans, merchants, intellectuals and artists who fled to the north for economic, religious or social reasons was an enormous stimulus and marked the beginning of the Dutch Golden Age (Israel 1995: 328).

At the beginning of the seventeenth century a theological conflict, that almost led to a civil war, broke out within the Calvinist Church between a party of liberal Erasmians, led by Jacobus Arminius (1560-1609) who rejected the doctrine of Predestination, and Franciscus Gomarus (1563-1641) and their followers, respectively called Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants. Maurits of Nassau (1567-1625), the stadhouder\(^3\) and army leader, sided with the Gomarists, whereas Oldenbarneveldt (1547-1619), the raadspensionaris, Grand Pensionary,\(^4\) as well as the famous jurist, philosopher and poet, Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) supported the Arminians. The Synod of Dordrecht was held in 1618-1619 in order to settle this controversy of which the Arminians came out defeated. As a result, Johan van Oldenbarneveldt was beheaded and Hugo Grotius imprisoned. Although the most orthodox part came out victorious, they had to allow some religious freedom. During the long period of Protestant growth preceding the establishment of the Dutch state in 1648, several denominations gained a firm foothold. There was no question of one confession being strong enough to gain

---

\(^3\) The stadhouder was originally appointed by the monarch to represent him in his absence, to whom was delegated full authority. The Union of Utrecht used to designate the stadhouder as a mediator or arbiter in the event of internal conflict, but not as a sovereign lord. The designation implies that stadholdership was not a hereditary office. However, since William the Silent the stadhouders of Holland belonged to the House of Orange-Nassau.

\(^4\) Each province was headed by a pensionaris or state advocate, who was the head of the legislative body. Because of its size and importance the pensionaris of Holland bore the title of raadspensionaris. Although nominally the second most powerful Dutch official after the stadhouder, the raadspensionaris often wielded greater power and influence and was the political leader of the entire Dutch Republic when there was no stadhouder.
universal acceptance (Frijhoff 1999: 351). The religious debates, even those inspired by Cartesianism or Spinozism, were mostly attempts to educate and to achieve a basis for religious unity or concord.

The young Republic had a fragmented infrastructure with power concentrated on a local city level, with the regents, often wealthy merchants, who lived among their fellow citizens but over whom they did not hold hereditary right to rule (Hartman 2009: 18-19). This opened a debate – not limited to the political elite but one in which the bourgeoisie participated – on the capability for office-holding, especially in times of crisis.

After the death of Maurits in 1625, his brother Frederik Hendrik (1584-1647) became stadhouder. During the greater part of his administration, the alliance with France against Spain had been the pivot of his foreign policy. The Calvinists strongly opposed a peace treaty with Spain while the Arminians, Anabaptists and Catholics were in favour. In 1648 the Peace of Münster was signed.

Tensions between the orthodox Calvinists, supported by stadhouder Willem II (1626-1650), and the regents and powerful merchants of Amsterdam led to a constitutional crisis in 1650. That same year, Willem II made an unsuccessful attempt to take the city. He died shortly afterwards and the opposition did not wish another stadhouder. The year 1650 marked the beginning of the First Stadhouderless Era, also known as Ware Vrijheid (True Freedom) and marked the rise of a republican ideology

---

5 Willem II, Prince of Orange was the son of Frederik Hendrik.
in which the power of the church should be subordinate to that of the Staten-Generaal (Frijhoff 1999: 332). At this time the Dutch Golden Age reached its zenith.

During this period, raadpensionaris Johan de Witt (1625-1672) occupied the most important political office in the country. De Witt was a mathematician and supporter of the new sciences influenced by Descartes. He favoured religious freedom and prevented attempts to forbid the teaching of any philosophy other than Aristotle’s at Dutch universities. He was a republican backed by wealthy merchants who believed he could guarantee economic prosperity to Holland and thus to the Republic. As a republican he opposed the Orangisten, advocates of the monarchy in the form of a stadhouder. The Orangisten were supported by the Reformed Church.

The First Stadhouderless Era ended in 1672 when raadpensionaris, Johan de Witt and his brother were lynched by the mob - an act referred to by Spinoza as ultimi barbarorum - because of the flaring up of tensions between Orangisten and the Republican Party. After the death of Johan de Witt, William III (1650-1702) became stadhouder. The year of 1672 is known as Rampjaar (disaster year): apart from the lynching, the Republic was at war with England, France, Münster and Cologne.

---

6 After the abjuration of the king in 1581, the Staten-Generaal became the supreme authority in the Republic. In the Staten-Generaal the seven provinces were represented as well as the Generaliteitslanden (Generality Lands) those territories that were not included in the seven provinces.

7 They were called Orangisten because since William the Silent (1533-1584), the stadhouder of Holland was a member of the house of Orange-Nassau. The stadhouder of Holland was choosen also to represent the provinces of Zeeland and Utrecht. In fact, his position resembled that of a monarch.

8 William III, son of William II, became King of England, Scotland and Ireland in 1689 because of his marriage to his first cousin, Mary II of England.
2. FREETHINKERS IN THE UNITED PROVINCES

“Want in deze bloejenste geméne stataat en voortreffelijke Stad leven alle menfchen, van wat volk en gezindheit zy ook zijn, in een zeer grote eendracht;”

(For in this most blossoming common state and excellent city all people live, whatever their nation or religion, in great harmony.)

B. de Spinoza, De rechtzinnige theologant (The orthodox theologian) (p. 357), transl. J. Glazemaker.

2.1 THE REPUBLIC IN THE 1650S

At the end of the 1640s non-academic but intellectual Amsterdam became for the next decennia a hotbed for radical religious thought in which Jan Hendrik Glazemaker (1620-1682), the translator, Jan Rieuwertsz (c. 1617-1685), the publisher, and Pieter la Burgh (1630-1689), the printer of De wonderlyke reizen van Fernando Mendez Pinto (The marvellous travels of Fernando Mendez Pinto), took active part (Visser 1996: 16).

When the Republic was officially recognised in 1648 there was no religious majority, but the State was autonomous and did not let itself be regulated by the Church. Commercial interest and the fact that the Republic was actually composed by provinces

---

9 Or Glasemaker. In the seventeenth century names were often written in a variety of ways. Sometimes he is called Jan Hendriksz. Not to be confounded with Jan Hendriksz Boom, name of one of Rieuwertsz associates (or: Johannes Henricus Hendricksz, Jan Henricius, Joannes, working in Amsterdam from 1649 to 1674 at the Oude Huysstittende-steegh and later at the Singel) (bibliopolis.nl).
10 Also written: Jan, Joannes or Johan Rieverts, Riewerts, Riverius, Rivertz, Jan Riwerts (bibliopolis.nl). He was active from 1644 to 1685, first in the Dirk van Assensteeg, later in the Beurssteeg in Amsterdam.
11 We know Pieter La Burgh (also written: Pieter La Burg, La Burght or De La Burgh) was active in Amsterdam from 1645-1665 and was established at the Niesel (bibliopolis.nl).
without a centralised form of power favoured religious tolerance. However, the Calvinists were the only group allowed to worship openly.

By this time powerful new philosophical systems rooted in the scientific advances of the early seventeenth century generated the struggle between traditional theologically-sanctioned ideas and secular mechanistic conceptions. Conflicts were no longer between different faiths, but between faith itself and agnosticism. In the late 1650s, heliocentrism and its implications were vehemently disputed in popular as well as in learned publications. Developments already under way on a national level were spurred on by foreign brands of Sephardic Jews, Huguenots, German and Polish refugees from the Thirty Years War and philosophers like Descartes (1596-1650) and Locke (1632-1704), who all found a favourable climate for exile in the Republic. A new social class, composed of merchants, artisans and other professions who were interested in acquiring new knowledge, had emerged. As a result, there was a growing demand for books in the vernacular. Jonathan Israel situates the crisis of European thought in the period ranging from 1650 to 1680 and centres it particularly on Spinoza (1632-1677) and his circle in the Republic, more precisely in Amsterdam (Israel 2001: 3, 20).

2.2 RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY IN THE REPUBLIC

In order to understand Glazemaker’s options and the role Rieuwertsz and he played among the radical circle, we have to analyse the evolution of religious thought in the United Provinces.

In sixteenth-century Europe there were three groups of religious dissenters who had suffered heavy persecution and eventually found a safe haven in Holland: a) the
Anabaptists, who sought to restore the spiritual purity of primitive Christianity and proposed Millenarianism; b) the Radical Spiritualists who rejected external religious institutions, sacraments and ceremonies in favour of the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, or Inner Light, in the individual soul; and c) the Socinians who rejected the doctrine of the Trinity and the divinity of Christ (Fix 1987: 64-65).

In the United Provinces, these groups felt motivated by the Collegiant movement. The Collegiants had emerged from former Remonstrants, the followers of Arminius, who were defeated at the Synod of Dordrecht, and whose ministers were forbidden to preach. Although left without leaders, the Remonstrant congregations nevertheless decided to meet. The members would gather in colleges, hence their name Collegiants, and read the Bible, relying on the spontaneous testimony of anyone who felt moved by the Holy Spirit to speak. They were highly critical of the institutional Reformed Church and were ruled by extreme freedom of thought. Although they represented a small group, they were disproportionately prominent in the Dutch intellectual debate.¹²

In the 1640s Daniel van Breen (1594-1665), a former Remonstrant, and Adam Boreel (1603-1666), a Spiritualist, founded a college in Amsterdam. During that same period, the Mennonite preacher and physician Galenus de Haan (1622-1706) settled in Amsterdam where he was elected teacher of his congregation (1648-1706) and where he came into contact with Adam Boreel and Daniel van Breen. Some Mennonites, Dutch Anabaptists named after their leader Menno Simons (1496-1561), were the first to join Boreel and De Breen, due to some mutually shared ideas such as theological tolerance.¹³

¹² Many Collegiants moved in 1621 to Rijnsburg that became the center of the movement.
¹³ During the years of 1534 and 1535 a group of Anabaptists, some from the Netherlands had tried to establish a New Jerusalem in the German town of Münster. The attempt was cruelly suppressed and many
They had become disenchanted with the rigid, dogmatic structures in the more conservative groups. Some years later, with the great exodus of the Socinians from Poland, these also joined the Collegiant group. After 1650 Galenus de Haan became leader of the Amsterdam college. The conservative Mennonites, however, held fast to confession as necessary to salvation, whereas the followers of Galenus put all the weight on Christian living, tolerance and a free conscience. The conflict between the two factions was called the Lammerenkrijg (Battle of the Lambs), because they would gather beside the brewery “‘t Lam” (i.e., at the sign of the Lamb), and as the name was at the same time an allusion to the Mennonite commitment to peace. In Galenus de Haan’s opinion, God had withdrawn the Gifts of the Holy Spirit as a punishment for a Church that had become corrupt, and even that Luther and Calvin had failed to restore. Influenced by Anabaptist Millenarianism he believed the world was cut off from God’s inspiration, which meant that human beings must seek guidance inside themselves through reason. The Collegiants came to see reason as the source of metaphysical truth and the substitute for Revelation. Collegiant thought can be seen as a bridge between Reformation and the rationalism of the Radical Enlightenment, and thus, between a traditional religious worldview and a secular conception of reality (Fix 1987, 63-80).

14 From church documents, Visser identified some members who sided with Galenus: Jan Rieuwertsz, Pieter Arentsz, both publishers, Jan Hendriksz, by whom probably Glazemaker is meant, Pieter La Burgh, printer, Pieter Balling, translator and author of a small oeuvre of philosophical works (See Part I, section 3.3) and Anthony van Dale, Spinozist, author and physician at Haarlem (Visser 1996: 16; see Part I, section 7). Rieuwertsz and Arentsz often published together. Arentsz was a bookseller in Amsterdam from 1663-1688 (bibliopolis.nl.).

15 The more conservative fraction was known as the Zonists, as the building where they came together was known as De Zon (The Sun). The discord led to the separation between the Lamist and Zonist Mennonites in 1664.
3. Radical Circle in Amsterdam

Esse híc atheos, eosqve potissimum Cartesianos, ut van der Enden, Glasemaker etc: qvi et alios subinde edoceant, non qvidem profiteri eos Atheismum, loqvi crebrò de deo, sed per Deum nil aliud intelligere qvam totum hoc universum, ut latiùs patet ex scripto qvodam Belgico artificiosè nuper conscripto suppresso avthoris nomine.


(There are atheists here and they are principally Cartesians, like Van den Enden, Glasemaker etc.; and they also teach other people. They do not proclaim atheism. They often talk about God but under God they understand nothing else but this whole universe as it convincingly becomes clear from a certain Dutch writing which was recently artificially written while the name of the Author was suppressed.)

In the early 1660s, the Danish scholar Olaus Borch was the first to report that the “atheist” Franciscus van den Enden (1602-1674) frequented a Cartesian circle in Amsterdam in which Jan Rieuwertsz\(^\text{17}\) and Jan Hendrik Glazemaker were also active (Klever 1997: 133). This circle was composed by Spinoza’s friends and collaborators with whom, after his expulsion from the synagogue in 1656 or even before, Spinoza discussed his theories (Klever 1996: 17). After his move to Rijnsburg near Leiden in 1661, they kept in contact on a regular basis, as the philosopher’s circle came together to discuss ideas, translate, publish and finance his works.

Before the Revolt, the Netherlands already exhibited higher levels of literacy than in other parts of Europe, owing essentially to the high proportion of the population

---

\(^{16}\) Translation by Wim Klever (Klever 1996: 24)

\(^{17}\) Borch refers to Rieuwertsz in his diary twelve days later on 15 April 1662.

\(^{18}\) In the sixteenth and seventeenth century the word “atheist” was often used to refer to those who denied divine Providence, the divine authorship of the Scriptures.
dwelling in towns. With the triumph of the Reformed Church, the publication of the authorised version of the Bible in Dutch, the *Statenbijbel* (1636) and the importance of individual Bible reading and Bible study, literacy levels rose even higher (Israel 1995: 686). Adding to this was the fact that in the Republic, radical religious debate was fermenting. Dutch radicals were predominantly from an urban, often Amsterdam, middle-class background (Israel 2001: 33). The relative freedom of speech, the presence of persons that had suffered persecution in their homelands, the rise of a middle-class armed with curiosity and with access to books, and the intellectual crisis led to the construction of a new world-view.

The reading of Descartes’ philosophy by these freethinkers was soon radicalised, and the rejection of the supernatural and miraculous, of religious dogmas and the acceptance of Spinoza’s idea of an immanent God and thus, negation of an intervening God, eventually led to theories of tolerance, freedom, egalitarianism and democracy. Jonathan Israel traces the philosophical roots of these concepts as they emerge in a historical context amid conflict and controversy (Israel 2001). This small but extremely radical circle of amateur-*érudits* was actively engaged with the diffusion of popular Enlightenment. One of the means was by removing key areas of knowledge such as medicine, jurisprudence, science, philosophy and theology from the hands of closed elites who used arcane terminology and Latin to exclude others for their own profit (Israel 2001: 176).

Spinoza’s association with these radical men, most of whom were Collegiants and truly religious, is of utmost importance as they enabled the diffusion of his ideas and financed his publications. They had in common the fact that they were non-academic radical free-thinkers, actively and boldly engaged in spreading their own ideas.
and those of others amidst a middle class composed of merchants, doctors, artisans, shopkeepers, among others. To attain their objectives some wrote works of their own or anonymous pamphlets, others printed or published heterodox philosophical works. Still others translated controversial books or were modern lexicologists. They were engaged in emancipating the vernacular language that was the vehicle of clandestine heterodoxy. Publishing in the vernacular enabled a non-academic audience to have access to new ideas and form a critical mind. Rendering knowledge accessible to common people was only possible if books were written in an everyday language and in straightforward terms that could be understood by all. While we witness the waning of Latin, the vernacular flourishes, using a totally different style: clear, stripped of the pedantry and of academic terminology (Israel 2001: 61).

Before I focus on Glazemaker, I will present some members of this circle in chronological order as far as they are relevant in our contextualization of Glazemaker’s translation of Peregrinação.

3.1 FRANCISCUS VAN DEN ENDEN (1602-1674)

According to Klever, Spinoza attended Franciscus van den Enden’s Latin school from 1655 to 1657 after receiving a formal Jewish education (Klever 1991: 628). Other students who frequented his school and befriended Spinoza were Lodewijk Meijer and Johannes Bouwmeester. Van den Enden was an ex-Jesuit and an innovative thinker who taught his students the rudiments of Cartesianism and he was also an

---

19 There is no independent historical evidence to support this. It is almost certain Spinoza went to the Talmud Torah School until the age of thirteen or fourteen and it is usually accepted that he went to the Latin School in the mid-1660s (Ven 2011: 6, 8).
advocate of educational theatre. He was born in Antwerp and became a Jesuit, but after some time he was dismissed from the order. Klever speculates that the reason for his dismissal could be his Jansenist sympathies, a current the Jesuits fiercely opposed; he also suggests that Van den Enden was a pious Roman Catholic until 1657.\textsuperscript{20} We know he studied theology and medicine, and moved to Amsterdam where he started a type of gallery and bookshop in 1645. However, in 1652 he went bankrupt and started a Latin School, which was quite successful (Klever 1991: 617-8).

It has recently been discovered that Van den Enden is the author of the anonymous \textit{Vrije Politieke Stellingen} (Free political proposals, 1665) in which he pleads in favour of radical democracy. In 1662 he had published \textit{Kort Verhael van Nieuw-Nederland} (Brief account of New Netherland) without mentioning the author, publisher or place of publication, in which he proposes an ideal, utopian republic (Klever 1991: 613-631).\textsuperscript{21} The initiative for an “ideal” New Netherland settlement appears to have come from Pieter Cornelisz Plockhoy from Zierikzee. We know very little about Plockhoy, other than that he had frequented the Amsterdam Collegiants in the 1640s where he became acquainted with Galenus de Haan. Plockhoy was an ardent advocate of equality and religious toleration and aimed at creating a utopian “little commonwealth” separate from the rest of society, which he unsuccessfully proposed to Oliver Cromwell at the end of the 1650s. In 1662, Plockhoy agreed to go with twenty-four other colonists to New Netherland, where they would settle in Delaware.

In 1670, Van den Enden moved to Paris, where he again founded a Latin school. Finally, in 1673, he got involved in a conspiracy against Louis XIV. He was arrested,

\textsuperscript{20} Klever in an answer at \textit{Weblog over Spinoza, Spinozisme en Spinozana}, ed. Stan Verdult on 7 December 2010.

\textsuperscript{21} The book was probably published by Rieuwertsz or Arentsz.

Klever calls Van den Enden the mastermind of the circle around Spinoza. Van den Enden’s ideas have much in common with Spinoza’s, which led Klever to suggest he could very well have been Spinoza’s inspiration. He disseminated a scientific attitude and a naturalistic world-view among his younger friends, which became fruitful in so many of Spinoza’s works, but also in those of Balling, Jelles, Koerbagh, Meijer and Bouwmeester (Klever 1991: 627-631).

Van den Enden also focused on reforming education, promoting equality and enlightening the people, including women and girls. In his opinion, organised religion was a political device contrived to discipline and control the people through their ignorance and credulity (Israel 2001: 176).

### 3.2 Jan Rieuwertsz (1616/17-1687)

Jan Rieuwertsz, one of the most productive publishers, book dealers and bookbinders in Amsterdam, belonged to a Mennonite family. From 1644 until 1677 he owned a bookshop at the Dirck van Assensteeg (nowadays called the Dirk van Hasseltsteeg) and from 1678 until his death in the Beurssteeg (currently Beursstraat). On the sign-board of his shop was written “In ’t Martelaers boek” (In the book of martyrs), a reference to the martyrologia by the Mennonite Hans de Ries *Historie der martelaeren* (History of martyrs, Haarlem, 1615) and *Martelaers spiegel der werelose Christenen* (Martyrs’ mirror of the defenceless Christians, Haarlem, 1631) and thus an indication that this was an Anabaptist bookshop. From 1675 onwards, Rieuwertsz
became the official printer of the city of Amsterdam, an amazing appointment, as his heterodoxy was no secret. Yet, the fact that his prices were lower than those of the official printer, Johannes van Ravesteyn, could have been the reason for his replacement, as well as Rieuwertsz’s good connections with members of the Amsterdam regent class, such as Johannes Hudde (1628-1704), burgomaster and mathematician, or Coenraad van Beuningen (1622-1693), burgomaster, who were also friends or correspondents of Spinoza (Eeghen 1963: 77; Visser 1996: 13). He was the father of Jan Rieuwertsz (the Younger) who continued his father’s work until his death in 1701.

From 1644 until 1687, Rieuwertsz published more than 230 titles that carry his name (Visser 1996: 13). The number of pamphlets or books he published clandestinely remains unknown. Visser distinguishes two categories of books that were published by him. The first covers 10 till 15% of the total amount of his publications and consists in works about medicine, physics, mathematics, history and a remarkable number of travel books. The second and most important category consists in religious or philosophical books and pamphlets. The majority of his publications were written in Dutch, and on the whole his choice of publications reveals a non-conformist taste and sometimes a lot of courage (Visser 1996: 14). He published books by Spinoza, Descartes, Galenus de Haan, but also by the Flemish non-conformist mystic and millenarian Antoinette de Bourignon (1616-1680). The eclectic and sometimes contradictory choice of books he published shows he was an active and coherent supporter of the free word, as well as a shrewd businessman. His social network included Remonstrant, Anabaptist, Cartesian-Spinozian and Collegiant contacts.
Rieuwertsz became a prominent member of the congregation that was led by Galenus de Haan. These groups of religious freethinkers also usually gathered at private houses and one of their meeting places was at the bookshop owned by Jan Rieuwertsz (Visser 1996: 13-14).

Rieuwertz’s freethinking was no secret: Meinsma quotes three sources that mention his name. According to a sneering pamphlet, Sociniaense hooft-pijn (Socinean Headache, 1655), in the form of a dialogue between two allegorical characters representing Rieuwertz and Galenus de Haan, Rieuwertz was accused of having Socinian sympathies (and of making a profit with his publications). In another pamphlet, his bookshop was reputed to be a “school der spotters” (school of mockers). This led the Mennonite Caspar Luyken, father and grandfather of the famous engravers Jan and Caspar Luyken, to defend Rieuwertz and his circle publicly. A third document, referring to the Socinian translator Jan Knol (d. 1672), mentions that Knol “spews his venom every day” at “a certain Mennonist bookbinder at the Dirck van Assensteeg”, a place visited by many other Socinians (Meinsma 1896: 106-113).

Rieuwertz’s first publication in 1644 of Redenkavelingskonst (The art of debate) by the anti-Aristotelian Petrus Ramus (1515-1572) sets the tone for his later publications (Visser 1996: 14). He was the publisher of many heterodox, heretical or forbidden works. In order to mislead the authorities, he used several different aliases, false titles and fictitious printers’ names. Under the fictitious printer’s name of Henricus Künraht at Hamburg he published Spinoza’s Tractatus theologico-politicus anonymously (1669/70). After the philosopher’s death he immediately made available

---

22 In 1673 Rieuwertz published Spinoza’s Tractatus theologico-politicus in a second clandestine edition together with Lodewijk Meijer’s Philosophia Sacrae Scripturae interpres under three different fictitious titles and addresses: 1. Opera chirurgica omnia by Franciscus Henriquez de Villacorte,
all his works in a Latin as well as in a Dutch publication.\(^{23}\) He published other works of Spinoza’s friends, Pieter Balling (fl. 1647-1664), Lodewijk Meijer (1629-1681) and Adriaan Koerbagh (1632-1669) as well.

### 3.3 Jarig Jelles (c. 1620-83) and Pieter Balling (fl. 1647-1669)

Two other close Collegiant members, probably from Spinoza’s time in his father’s firm, were Jarig Jelles and Pieter Balling. Jelles was a merchant and writer of philosophical works, and he was also actively and financially involved in the editing project of Spinoza’s posthumous works. He wrote the introduction to his *Opera posthuma* and *Nagelate schriften*, the Dutch translation.

Pieter Balling was one of Spinoza’s oldest friends, he was a trader also and worked for Spanish factors and was acquainted with the Spanish language. He was the – anonymous – author of *Het licht op den kandelaar* (The light on the candlestick) (1662) in which the word “light” was used with deliberate ambiguity. It can denote a Spiritualist inner guidance ensuing from a mystical union with God, but the title can also refer to the light of pure reason (Israel 2001: 170-171, note 60). The book was published by Rieuwertsz and republished in 1684, after Balling’s death, but this time with the author’s name. In 1988 Klever reedited the work under the title “De Spinozistische prediking van Pieter Balling: Uitgave van “Het licht op den kandelaar” met biografische inleiding en commentaar.” (The Spinozistic preaching of Pieter

---

\(^{23}\) B. d. S. *Opera Posthuma* and *De nagelate schriften van B. d. S.* (1677).
Balling: Edition of “The Light on the candlestick” with a biographical introduction and commentary). Klever considers its contents as being close to Spinoza’s philosophy. Balling also translated into Dutch Spinoza’s *Renati Des Cartes principiorum philosophiae*.25

3.4 LODEWIJK MEIJER (1629-1681)

Rendering knowledge accessible to common people was what Lodewijk Meijer, physician, philologist and Latinist, and another prominent member of Spinoza’s circle, had in mind when he reedited and revised the *Nederlandtsche woorden-schat* (Dutch word treasure) (from 1654 onwards), a lexicographical work in which he manifested his radical and purist zeal (Israel 2001: 198). This lexicon had originally been edited by J. Hofman in 1650, but in 1669 it was renamed *L. Meijers woordenschat* (L. Meijer’s Lexicon). He wished to give meanings in plain Dutch to foreign, usually Latin or Latinised, terms. His aim was “om de Konsten en Wetenschappen der Landtgenooten in hunne moedertaale bekent te maken” (to make the arts and sciences known to his countrymen in their mother tongue) (Meijer 1669: “Voorreeden” (Preface)) and to explain technical terms in current usage. It was also meant as a practical tool to be used by purist translators, such as Glazemaker (Akkerman 1982: ix).

---

24 Information found on Stan Verdult *Weblog over Spinoza, Spinozisme en Spinozana* ed. Stan Verdult on 12, 13 and 14 Januari 2012.
25 The Latin edition is dated 1663, the Dutch translation *Renatus des Cartes beginzelen der wysbegeerte* was published a year later.
Another highly controversial book by Meijer was the anonymous *Philosophia Sacrae Scripturae interpres* (1666),\(^{26}\) which depicts a frontal attack on the compromise that had been reached at Dutch universities between philosophy and theology, and in which he declared reason as the only interpreter of the Bible.

Meijer was a founder of the dramatic and literary society *Nil Volentibus Arduum* in 1669, a Chamber of Rhetoric inspired by the *Académie Française*.\(^{27}\) Though more directed at the dramatic arts, the aspiration of the society was to systematically define and regulate the language, aiming at the purity, simplicity and perfection of the Dutch language. One of the ways in which they intended to raise Dutch theatre to a higher level was through translation and adaptation to Dutch settings and morals (Leemans 2010: 42).

### 3.5 Johannes Bouwmeester (1630-1680)

Johannes Bouwmeester was a physician, Latinist and, like Meijer, an active member of *Nil Volentibus Arduum*. He was a close friend of Spinoza who held him in high esteem. He had studied in Leiden where he befriended Koerbagh. He is said to have written some entries to Koerbagh’s *Bloemhof* (Flower garden) (Israel 2001: 198) and to have likewise been involved in Meijer’s *Philosophia Sacrae Scripturae interpres* (Steenbakkers 1994: 17). He rendered the twelfth-century Arabic pantheistic novel *Ḫayy ibn Yaẓān* by Ibn Tufail into Dutch, perhaps at Spinoza’s instigation (Israel 2001: 198). He is allegedly one of the editors of Spinoza’s *Opera Posthuma* and the

---

\(^{26}\) *De philosophie d'uytleghster der H. Schrifture* (philosophy, the interpreter of the Holy Scriptures), the Dutch translation was published a year later. Both books were clandestinely published by Rieuwertsz.

\(^{27}\) The Chambers of Rhetoric were amateur literary societies in the Low Countries during the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries that dedicated themselves to the writing of poetry and drama.

3.6 **ADRIAAN KOERBAGH (1632-1669)**

Adriaan Koerbagh, one of Spinoza’s other friends, published ‘t *Nieuw woorden-boek der regten* (New dictionary of law, 1664). Like Meijer, his aim was to make the sciences, in this case juridical sciences, accessible to a public that did not know Latin.

In 1668, probably with the help of his brother Johan, he wrote *Een Bloemhof van allerley lieflijkheid sonder verdriet. … Of een vertaaling en uytlegging van al de … vreemde bastaart-woorden.* (A flower garden with all kinds of loveliness without sorrow…. Or a translation and interpretation of all the ... foreign loanwords.) From the subtitle we can conclude it is a dictionary of loanwords. Under the cover up of its innocent title, the book explained foreign philosophical and theological terms from a rational and Socinian perspective, giving them allegedly real meanings and explaining how they had been used to mislead common people (Israel 2001: 191). Koerbagh demolishes such Christian notions as the Creator, the Trinity, the divinity of Jesus, heaven and hell, angels, devils and miracles. Instead, he presents a monistic world view in which Nature and God are identical. The *Bloemhof*, a catalogue of seventeenth-century heretical doctrines, was immediately confiscated by the authorities amid a general outcry of blasphemy and atheism (Israel 2001: 190). Shortly afterwards, Koerbagh tried to publish *Een ligt schijnende in duystere plaatsen*. (A light shining in

---

28 The place of publication is Amsterdam but the publisher is not mentioned. The book was published in English and Dutch under the title *Adriaan Koerbagh, A Light Shining in Dark Places, to Illuminate the Main Questions of Theology and Religion* ed. Michiel Wielema (Leiden: Brill, 2011).
dark places) in which he rejects the central mysteries of Christian faith within a Spinozistic framework. The book was not yet completely printed when he was betrayed. Adriaan Koerbagh was arrested and died in prison soon after that.

3.7 **BENEDICTUS DE SPINOZA (1632-1677)**

The youngest member of the group, Spinoza, soon became its centre. We do not know much about his life in Amsterdam. Apart from his works, there is his correspondence with foreign scholars and with his friends whom he had left behind in Amsterdam in 1661. According to Jonathan Israel, Spinoza – persuaded by his teacher Franciscus van den Enden – was caught up in the general intellectual turbulence precipitated by Cartesianism at the beginning of the 1650s or, more likely, in the late 1640s (Israel 2001, 168-9).

He was born in Amsterdam in 1632. His father, Michael d’Espinosa, was born in Vidigueira, Portugal but fled the country as a child. The family first settled in Nantes and in 1621 in Amsterdam. Spinoza’s mother, Michael’s second wife, Hanna Deborah, whose family had settled in Amsterdam in 1598, also came from Portugal. In Amsterdam his father was an active member of the Sephardic community and a merchant. The young Spinoza, whose first name was Bento in Portuguese or Baruch in Hebrew, almost certainly went to the *Talmud Torah* School where he learned Hebrew until the age of thirteen or fourteen (Ven 2011: 6). He very likely entered the family business after his formal Jewish education. After his father’s death in 1654, Baruch took over the firm, but two years later the Amsterdam *Mahamad*, the board of directors of the Sephardic congregation, officially banned Spinoza. The exact reasons for his
expulsion from the Portuguese community remain unclear. In the mid-1650s, he probably attended Van den Enden’s Latin School, though there is no independent historical evidence of his formal education (Ven 2011: 6, 8)\(^{29}\) and it is said that he frequented Cartesian “circles” (Ven 2011: 10). At Van den Enden’s house he was probably influenced by his tutor and his freethinking visitors’ belief in a secular, tolerant and democratic state (Nadler 2005: 148-9). What is certain is that he learned Latin, the language in which he will express his philosophy. The change in scope of his intellectual horizon is reflected in his name: from now on he calls himself “Benedictus”.

Spinoza’s reputation as an original thinker begins to spread after his expulsion from the Sephardic congregation (Ven 2011: 12). According to Israel, before 1656, the year Spinoza was banished from the synagogue, he had written a long treatise in Spanish (now lost) in which he denied that the Jewish Scriptures were a divine Revelation, thoughts that he must have developed long before his ban. In it he denied the soul’s immortality, divine Providence and a God who rewards or punishes (Israel 2001, 173). The unfinished *Tractatus de intellectus emendatione* is believed to be his first work.\(^{30}\) The *Korte verhandeling van god de mensch en deszelvs welstand* (Short treatise on god, man and his well-being), discovered in 1851, is held to be the Dutch translation of a Latin text that was lost. Both texts were presumably written in the years 1657-1659, while still in Amsterdam. Although Spinoza cannot be considered a Christian, he belonged to a circle of Collegiant friends that were liberal, freethinking Christians from different religious traditions. It is not known when he began to frequent

\(^{29}\) According to recent investigations, Spinoza studied at the University of Leiden during his years in Voorburg. (Wim Klever’s commentary on the recently published *The Vatican manuscript of Spinoza’s Ethica* by Leen Spruit and Pina Totaro (Weblog over Spinoza, Spinozisme en Spinozana ed. Stan Verdult on 21 September 2011).

\(^{30}\) The *Tractatus de intellectus emendatione* was published in his *Opera posthuma* in 1677.
these Collegiant meetings. During his whole life, even when he was living in Rijnsburg (1661-1663), Voorburg (1663-1669/70) or The Hague (1669/70-1677), he remained in contact with his circle of collaborators in Amsterdam and discussed his ideas with them.

His motto *caute* refers to his cautiousness as he was aware of the risk he ran if his writings were published under his name, all the more understandable given his family history. His signet ring was engraved with the Latin word, together with a rose and his initials. It was a reference to the phrase *sub rosa* to denote secrecy, but it is also a reference to his name “Espinosa” which is close to the Portuguese word “espinhosa”,

translated as “thorny” or “difficult” and thus warning the reader to beware of his writings, as they are considered heretic and complex.

Caution is something Spinoza will have his whole life. In 1670, when he is aware that the Dutch translation by Glazemaker of his *Tractatus theologico-politicus* is ready to be published, he asks his friend Jarig Jelles to abort the publication as it would endanger his collaborators and himself. In fact, during his lifetime only two works are published under his name, *Renati des Cartes principia philosophiae* together with *Cogitata metaphysica* by Rieuwertsz in 1663, and the *Tractatus theologico-politicus*, which, forbidden by the authorities, was clandestinely published in 1670. The title page fictitiously declares Hamburg as the place of publication and Künraht as the name of the publisher, when actually it was Rieuwertsz who was responsible.

Spinoza states that God is not distinct from his Creation, but immanent and identified with the Universe. *Deus sive Natura*, God or Nature is a neutral force, the totality of all that is. There can only be one substance, independent in itself. This neutral and amoral force that is God or Nature has no objective, no goal. God’s Providence is

---

31 Female form of the adjective ‘espinhoso’.
nothing but Nature’s order. All things happen in accordance with Nature’s law and order, thus the supernatural is denied by Spinoza, as in Nature nothing can happen that contravenes her own universal laws. In this system there are no miracles nor demons or angels, no original sin, there is no reward or punishment, no Heaven or Hell. According to Spinoza, miracles that had believably or allegedly occurred had natural causes, which at the time men were unable to grasp.

In Spinoza’s opinion, a free man lives in accordance to the principles of reason alone. Thus, he advocates freedom of thought and expression. The best type of governance is the democratic republic where one can be consulted and can participate in decision making (to some degree) through debate or voting (Israel 2001: 260). Freedom of thought and expression are only possible if the state is not subordinated to the authority of the church.
4. Jan Hendrik Glazemaker (1620-1682)

Although Glazemaker was a professional translator, the texts he selected to translate are closely related to his personal convictions. As a translator, Glazemaker depended on his publishers. Glazemaker usually translated for Jan Rieuwertsz, who often worked in association with other publishers and booksellers, such as Jan Hendriksz Boom\(^{32}\) and Pieter Arentsz, all notorious for their blasphemous publications. I found more than forty works in which Glazemaker cooperated with these book professionals, either individually or in group. Rieuwertsz, Arentsz, Boom and the printer Pieter la Burgh,\(^{33}\) who also worked with them, were all part of a network composed by Mennonite, Collegiant, Cartesian and Spinozist radicals (Visser 1996: 14, 16). Their radicalism consisted of the fact that they rejected the church and its dogmas; they were fascinated with the progress of the natural sciences and discussed these topics freely in groups that were religiously tolerant. Thus, they were advocates of freedom of opinion and expression.

4.1 Fortune

Though we do not know much of his life, Glazemaker’s work has been the object of some studies. Ellerbroek (1958), who refers to him, acknowledges that the impact of the translator’s work on the target culture should be studied. He is aware that Glazemaker was very productive and that his translations are characterised by their

---

\(^{32}\) Like Rieuwertsz, Boom also published forbidden books under a false name: Henricus Dendrinus (Schaap 1978: 32).

\(^{33}\) La Burgh printed the forbidden Socinian New Testament by Jeremias Felbinger (1660) and Socinian works by Daniël Zwicker (1662) (Schaap 1978: 34-35).
critical aspect, and as such, he considers him a precursor of the eighteenth century in which sharp criticism in different forms flourished (Ellerbroek 1958: 662). Some years earlier, Van Praag had dedicated an article on Glazemaker’s translation of Du Bosc (1935) [1]. In 1967, Thijsse-Schoute’s exhaustive study of Glazemaker was published. Before this, Boas had written an article on Glazemaker’s Seneca translation, suggesting that Spinoza might have become acquainted with Seneca, and the Stoic philosophers, thanks to Glazemaker’s translation of Alle de brieven, (1658) [16], while Meinsma argues that Spinoza could have been introduced to Descartes’ philosophy through Glazemaker’s translation published in 1659 [31] (Boas 1919: 16-17; Meinsma 1896: 220n). Both based their suppositions on Spinoza’s library (Musschenga 2009: 62-63, 32).


34 Only more recently, scholars such as Margaret Jacob, Silvia Berti, Wim Klever, Piet Steenbakkers, M. Wielema, Wijnand Mijnhardt, Wiep van Bunge and, last but not least, Jonathan Israel have confirmed the presence of a current of critical thinkers in Dutch society from the 1640s onwards.

35 I have utilized the enumeration adopted in the list composed by Thijsse-Schoute (1967: 226-261).
(Translations of Spinoza) subtitled (in English): *Based on texts by the Dutch philosopher Baruch Spinoza. From Tractatus theologico-politicus*, transl. Hendriksz Glazemaker, 1693. In a time in which English is the new *lingua franca*, the explicit indication of this translator’s name, together with Spinoza’s, is remarkable: in the cantata we actually hear Glazemaker.\(^{36}\)

Glazemaker was a very productive translator as he translated almost seventy different works. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries his prolificacy was only surpassed by the Frenchman Gabriel Chappuys (c.1550 - c. 1611) (Burke 2005: 11).

Thijssen-Schoute listed sixty-eight translations by Glazemaker, twenty-seven of which had been published by Rieuwertsz.\(^{37}\) The inventory collated by Thijssen-Schoute shows that Glazemaker’s main interest in philosophy and theology was very eclectic. Besides Descartes and Spinoza, he translated stoic philosophers like Seneca, the Younger [16], [28], [35], and Epictetus [29], thinkers not sanctioned by ecclesiastical authorities, and other non-Christian writers like Plutarch [36], Livy [4] or Curtius Rufus [37]. He also translated the Quran [30] from the French, a feat not always without risk (Hamilton 2004: 93, 101, 111). The fact that he usually translated authors who were forbidden or not approved by the establishment implies that most of his translations introduced ground-breaking perspectives. His other interest was in the newly discovered

\(^{36}\) First performed in the Netherlands in 2004 (*Weblog over Spinoza, Spinozisme en Spinozana* ed. Stan Verdult on 22 October 2011). The cantata can be heard at You Tube: http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=qdiqlo4cBV8#! accessed on 23 October 2011. Other Dutch translations are *Een rechtsinnige theologant* (anon. translation, An orthodox theologian, 1694); *Godgeleerd-staatkundig vertoog* (Theological-political remonstrance) by Willem Meijer (1895); *Theologisch-politiek tractaat* (Theological-political treatise) by Fokke Akkerman (1997) and *Defintie van het Christendom: Spinoza’s Tractatus theologico-politicus retransformed and explained* (Definition of Christianity: Spinoza’s Tractatus theologico-politicus retranslated and explained, 1999), republished in 2000 under the title *Theologische-politieke verhandeling* (Theological-political treatise) by Wim Klever.

\(^{37}\) The last translation *De rechtzinnige theologant* was published anonymously by J. Rieuwertsz, the Younger. (c. 1651-1723).
regions and their peoples. Apart from Mendes Pinto [13], Marco Polo and Hayton of Armenia [39] he translated several contemporary travel writers.

Lacking among Glazemaker’s translations are poetry, plays and other works of high literary standards. Akkerman once classified his translation of the Iliad [17], [27] under the head of adventure and romantic stories given the dry manner in which he translated Homer (Akkerman 1984: 23-4). 38

Fokke Akkerman divides his translations into several groups:

1) Rational philosophy: Descartes [20], [21], [22], [23], [24], [25], [31], [32], [33], [34], [67] and Spinoza [60], [68];

2) Ethical or semi-religious works: J. du Bosc [1], J. Puget de la Serre [44], Montaigne [57], Erasmus [10], [38], Seneca [16], [28], [35], Epictetus [29], Marcus Aurelius [29], Plutarchus [36] and L. Lessius [11], [64];

3) Religious works: the Quran [30], D. Blondel [9], I. d’Huisseau [55] and Robert Barclay [65];

4) Works on political theory: John Barclay [2], [61] De la Haye [47], Lipsius [26] and M. Z. Boxhorn [45];

5) Travel literature: V. le Blanc [15], Marco Polo [39], Pietro della Valle [40], Augustin de Beaulieu [46]; J. de Bourges [48], J.-B. Tavernier [63], A. Kircher [43], A. Olearius [49], J. J. Saar [53], V. Evertsz [52] and A. Herport [51];

6) History: C. Rufius [37], Livy [4], H. Cardanus [5], N. Coëffeteau [6], [41], L. van Aitzema [14], G. Bentivoglio [58], a work on the war in Crete [54], 39 P. Moreau [12] and C. Malingré et al. [8];

39 By “a work on the war in Crete” an anonymous book by Giovanni B. Rostagno (1671) is meant.
7) Literary works: Homer [17], [27], *Toonneel der wereltsche veranderingen* (Scenes of worldly changes) by several authors [3], [7], Mme de Villedieu [56] and H. d’Urfé [59]. Finally, there are two books difficult to categorise, a phrase-book [19] and a book on blood transfusion [42] (Akkerman 2003: 333-4).

Missing in this inventory assembled by Akkerman are Mendes Pinto [13], Jean Puget de la Serre [18], P. Rycat [50], Mouchemberg’s continuation of J. Barclay’s *D’Argenis* [62] and Clauberg’s book on Descartes [66]. Not mentioned in either of Akkerman’s or in Thijsen-Schoute’s list, is the literal crib translation of Jean de Rotrou’s *Laure persécutée*, dated from the beginning of his career in 1645 [69], for the actor and translator Adam Karelz van Germez (Molhuysen 1921: 201; Hermans 1996a: 21).

Glazemaker is generally considered a reliable translator and the importance of his work has never been denied. Thijsen-Schoute calls him the seventeenth-century arch-translator (Thijsen-Schoute 1967: 206). Smit is of opinion that he is a remarkably faithful translator, but Van Praag denotes that Glazemaker sometimes introduced changes out of religious or other motives (Smit 1975: 586; Van Praag 1935: 94; Akkerman 1982: xiii).

---

40 Curiously, another phrasebook by the same authors except for Glazemaker was included in the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* by a decree dated July 4, 1661: Garnier *Dialogues en cinq langues* (Spanish, Italian, Latin, French and German).

41 The last two titles were probably included under Barclay and Descartes.

42 G. Kalff, Winkel, Overdiep, Es and Overdiep, K. ter Laan, M. Buisman and P. Kroone ascribed an English translation of John Lylie to Glazemaker (Kalff. 1895: 119; Winkel 1924: 301; Overdiep 1944: 70; Es 1948: 212; Laan 1952: n. pag.; Buisman 1960: n. pag.; Bork 1985: 224). The abbreviation “J. G.” on the title page probably meant J. Grindal who translated other works from the English (Lindo 1896: 103; Enenkel 1998: 76). Another work translated by Grindal was also ascribed to Glazemaker (Winkel 1924: 325). In an anonymous article, Glazemaker is mentioned as one of the translators of English poetry or prose (C.d.V. “Hoe zijn anglicismen te beschouwen?” *De Nieuwe Taalgids* 1914: 127). In Thijsen-Schoute’s list of translations by Glazemaker there is no mention of translations from the English language (Thijsen-Schoute 1967). Schoneveld’s research into the identity of the translator J.G., excludes the possibility of Glazemaker (Schoneveld 1979).
De Nave complains about the quality of Glazemaker’s translation of the Flemish humanist and classical scholar Justus Lipsius [26] (1547-1606), and does not always consider him reliable (Nave 1970: 110-111). Hamilton, considering his enormous production and the haste in which he must have worked, wonders how deep his sympathies ran for the works he translated (Hamilton 2004: 115). Akkerman remarks that Glazemaker attaches importance to technical terminology, creating in this way a language that fits academic purposes. He tends to bring the reader to the source-text and mentions his literalness as he adds, or summarises much less than most translators of his time.43 One of his main characteristics are doublets, he translates a word twice either because the Dutch expressions are not totally equivalent or because he wants to stress it. Another characteristic is his desire for a comprehensive translation. This means that he sometimes resorts to source texts in different languages, for example Latin and French, so that his text is as close as possible to the writer’s intention. Nevertheless, he tends to translate the longest version. Akkerman considers him a purist as he tries to avoid Latin or French expressions. He also identifies errors due to hasty translating, but overall, he considers him a faithful, easy to read, fluent translator not preoccupied with stylistic refinement.44 However, he is aware he lacks a theoretical framework that enables him to describe his way of translating (Akkerman 1982: xiv, xi, xii). Drion prefers his easy to read prose translations of the Iliad [17] and [27] to Karel van Mander’s translation in poetry (1611) (Drion 1988: 277).

43 An idea stressed by De Bom’s analysis of Glazemaker’s translation of Lipsius [26] as he observes that unlike the French translation, Glazemaker’s is unabridged and without additions and very close to the original. (De Bom 2008: 220-221).
44 Variations between De nagelate schriften [60] and the Opera posthuma reveal that the two texts do not correspond as a source text does to a target text. Glazemaker is believed to have had access to another Latin manuscript (Akkerman 2005; Mignini 2005).
PATRICIA REGINA ESTEVES DO COUTO

Even in his own time, J. H. Glazemaker was known for his translations. The poet and playwright Jan Vos (1612-1667), who was also a glazemaker (glazier), was called in an ode by his publisher, J. Lescaille: “Een Glazemaker, die niet dan zijn moeders tael / En kan”, (a Glazier who does not know but his mother tongue) (Vos 1662: 10) or “Glazemaker … die geen taal dan Neêrlants verstont” (Glazier who understood no other language other than Dutch). As ordinary seventeenth-century glaziers were not polyglots, the comment can only refer to J. H. Glazemaker (Vos 1662: r).45 While Jan Vos prided himself on knowing no other language other than his mother tongue, J. Lescaille probably had in mind the translator who in 1649 very likely caused him some loss with the publication of Néroos lof (The praise of Nero) [5].46

Jan Hendrik Glazemaker is assumed to be the translator of Spinoza’s Tractatus theologico-politicus [68] due to the apparent evidence from Vervolg van ’t leven van Philopater (Sequel to Philopater’s life), the second part of a Spinozistic novel, published in 1697 and attributed to J. Duijkerius, in which it is mentioned that Glazemaker translated Spinoza’s text into Dutch (Duijkerius 1991: 195-6).47 Akkerman’s analysis of the translation confirms his authorship as he too ascribes it to Glazemaker (Akkerman 1995: 112-119).

In 1705, J. Colerus (1647-1707), Spinoza’s biographer, refers to Glazemaker mentioning the same novel by Duijkerius (Colerus 1880: 46). J.-M. Lucas (1646-1697), another biographer,48 compares him to the French translator Perrot d’Ablancourt (Lucas

---

45 In a laudatory poem, Lescaille wrote: “Hy licht he huis door glas, de weerelt door zijn dicht. / Hy spreekt geen taal dan Duits” (He illuminates the house through glass, the world through poetry. / He speaks no other language than Dutch) (Vos 1662: 3r, 10).
46 See Part I, section 6.4.1.
47 The first part Het leven van Philopater (Philopater’s life) had been published in 1691.
48 Johannes Nicolaus Colerus or Köhler (1647-1707) was a Lutheran preacher, who lived in The Hague, in the house were Spinoza had lived in the years 1670 and 1671. Lucas was a French refugee living in Holland and had personally known Spinoza.
1735: 47), a comparison Meinsma echoes adding that he is “een man wiens verdiensten voor de beschaving nog te weinig zijn gewaardeerd” (a man whose cultural merits are still underestimated) (Meinsma 1896: 451). 49 Outside the Netherlands, Christian Gottlieb Jöcher included Glazemaker in his Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon (Jöcher 1750: col. 1016).

Meinsma also quotes from annotations taken by Gottlieb Stolle (1673-1744) while travelling through Holland in 1703-1704 where he interviewed several people about Spinoza and in which Glazemaker is referred to as one of his friends (Meinsma 1896: Bijlage V, p. 6).

More recently, his name has been mentioned by prestigious international researchers belonging to different areas, like the historian Jonathan Israel, who calls him a skilful translator (Israel 2001: 170, 305). Glazemaker is equally mentioned by the philosopher Stephen Nadler, or the cultural historian Peter Burke (Nadler 2005: 378-379; Burke 2005: 11, 15, 18). Generally speaking, his translations were considered very important for the emancipation of the Dutch language (Thijssen-Schoute 1967: 206). 50

Who was then this man who abandoned his craft as a glazemaker in a fast growing city to become a translator of controversial and even forbidden works, and who put his personal freedom at risk?

49 Meinsma refers to Glazemaker and his activities as a translator several times (Meinsma 1896: 220, 336-7, 444-5, 450).
50 A short passage of Glazemaker’s translation of Principia philosophiae: Of beginselen der wijsbegeerte (Principia philosophiae: or philosophical principles) by Descartes, (1657) appears as an exercise for students of sixteenth and seventeenth century Dutch (Korne 1987: 105/106).
4.2 Life

Jan Hendrik Glazemaker, born in Amsterdam in 1620, was the stepson of a glazier, hence his name. His parents and his stepfather were Mennonites. His father died shortly after his son’s birth. Almost eight years after her first marriage, celebrated on 25 August 1618, his mother married Wijbrant Reijndersz on 4 January 1626. His stepfather was an active member of the Mennonite congregation led by Galenus de Haan at “Het Lam”; he even published in 1663 an exhortation in favour of Galenus (Thijssen-Schoute 1967: 207-210).  

Jan Hendrik was baptised on 3 March 1652 at “Het Lam”. He married Cathalyntie Cardinaels, member of a prominent Anabaptist family, who also belonged to the same congregation, on 18 June 1651. At the time his occupation was that of “glaesemaeker” and in later years when Jan Hendrik was a professional translator, “Glazemaker” had become his name, no longer referring to his former occupation.

His father-in-law, Sijbrandt Cardinael, a Mennonite mathematician and land surveyor, had a school, which Cathalyntie’s sister, Levijntje, continued after his death. He had taught at the Nederduytsche Academie (Dutch Academy), a Chamber of Rhetoric, an institution that offered higher education in the vernacular to common people. Cardinael had a personal relationship with Descartes though he was an advocate of traditional philosophy. His other daughter, Tanneke, married Isaac de Vreede who

---

51 For the controversy between the Lamists and the Zonists, see Part I, section 2.2.
52 I thank Frank Mertens for this information (Weblog over Spinoza, Spinozisme en Spinozana ed. Stan Verdult on 23 November 2011).
53 It is interesting to note that in 1645 Adam Karesz van Germez uses italics when he refers to Glazemaker’s name “Ian Hendrikzoon” and a regular font when he refers to his occupation “Glaezemaker”.

50
sided fervently with the more conservative current in the Lammerenkrijg. Glazemaker himself had one daughter who did not marry. The family lived on the Brouwersgracht (Thijssen-Schoute 1967: 212-216).

In 1643, his first translations from the French were published with success, which probably contributed to his decision to become a professional translator in the early 50s (Keyser 1982, xiv). Glazemaker decided to study Latin so he could broaden his activities.\(^\text{54}\) His first Latin translation, Romainsche historien van Titus Livius, was published in 1646 [4]. From 1656 on, he translated Descartes. He continues until today to be the only one to translate the French philosopher’s complete oeuvre into Dutch.

Apart from French and Latin, Glazemaker also translated from the German, Italian and Spanish according to the title pages of his translations.\(^\text{55}\)

Glazemaker’s first and foremost interest is philosophy, as he himself admits “een zonderllinge neiging tot deze wetenschap hebbende” (possessing a special tendency to this science) (“Voorreden van de oversetter” (Preface by the translator) Clauberg, Nadere uitbreiding (Further development, 1683) [66]. By philosophy is meant the “New Philosophy” which represented a scientific, secular and mechanistic view of the world, thus it included the study of the natural sciences. It represented a new system in which theology and Church authority were subordinated to concepts rooted in

\(^{54}\) It is unknown where or how he learned Latin.

\(^{55}\) The translation from the Italian is Guido Bentivoglio’s Historie der Nederlantsche oorlogen (History of the Dutch wars), Amsterdam: Rieuwertsz, 1674 [58]. The translations from German are: Adam Olearius’s De beschryving der reizen van Georg Andriesz (The description of the travels of Georg Andriesz) [49] and De beschryving der reizen van Volkert Evertsz naar Oostindien (The description of the travels of Volkert Evertsz to the East Indies) [52]; Albrecht Herport’s De beschryving der Oostindische reizen van Albrecht Herport van Bern (The description of the East Indian travels by Albrecht Herport from Bern) [51]. They were published in Amsterdam, in 1670 by J. Rieuwertz and Pieter Arentsz, as well as his translation from the German of Johan Saar’s De reisbeschryving van Johan Jacobsz Saar naar Oostindien (The description of the voyage to the East Indies by Johan Jacobsz Saar, 1671) [53]. On the title page of his translation Verhael van de Nederlandsche vreede handeling (History of the Dutch peace treaty, 1653) [14] by Lieuwe van Aitzema is mentioned that “tot gherief van den lezer alle de stucken voor dezen in Fransch, Latijn, als Spaensch ghedruckt, in Duystsch vertaelt” (for the reader’s comfort all pieces printed in French, Latin or Spanish were translated into Dutch) [14].
mathematically grounded philosophical reason (Israel 2001: 14). From this perspective, the inclusion of a work on blood transfusion fits into Glazemaker’s philosophical interests. Descartes had been influenced by William Harvey’s (1578-1657) theory of blood circulation published in *De moto cordis* (1628), which conflicted with the medical culture based on Galen (129-200). According to Harvey, organic entities act by virtue of powers that are inherent in them and not mysteriously imposed from the outside. Descartes considered the human body as a machine with mechanical functions. Spinoza also occupied himself with the study of medicine and his close circle of friends included physicians such as Bouwmeester and Meijer.

From the very beginning, even before his first translations of Descartes (1656-1661), Glazemaker reveals a preference for heterodox works. His translations questioned traditional learning and challenged confessional religions in a way that could cause him problems with the authorities, which explains the anonymous translation and publication of Spinoza’s *De nagelate schriften* (1677) [60] and *De rechtzinnige theologant* (1693) [68].

Apart from being a translator, he collected books, and Jöcher even mentions that he owned a “schöne Bibliothec” (Jöcher 1750: col. 1016). In his later years, Glazemaker seems to have also been a book trader as he acquired books for others (Elsevier 1890: 58, 27, 28, 41).

---

56 The book was composed of articles that had been published in the *Journal des Scavans* from 1666 until 1668.
57 Recent investigation shows that Spinoza studied anatomy in Leiden (cf. Wim Klever’s commentary on the recently published *The Vatican Manuscript of Spinoza’s Ethica* by Leen Spruit and Pina Totaro on *Weblog over Spinoza, Spinozisme en Spinozana* ed. Stan Verdult on 21 September 2011).
5. TRANSLATIONAL NORMS IN THE SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY REPUBLIC

The diverse and sometimes contradicting opinions about Glazemaker’s translations reflect the opaque, unstable and plurivocal nature of translation, and the difficulty in investigating the practice and discourse of translation in a distant time and thus distant culture. When discussing translations of the past, it is very difficult not to project onto past practices the concept of translation and its norms that are prevalent in our present time and culture (Hermans 1996b, 1997, 1998). Gideon Toury writes:

Translation activities should rather be regarded as having cultural significance. Consequently, “translatorship” amounts first and foremost to being able to play a social role, i.e., to fulfill a function allotted by a community – to the activity, its practitioners and/or their products – in a way which is deemed appropriate in its own terms of reference. The acquisition of a set of norms for determining the suitability of that kind of behavior, and for maneuvering between all the factors which may constrain it, is therefore a prerequisite for becoming a translator within a cultural environment (Toury 1995: 53).

According to Toury, norm-governed type of behaviour applies to all kinds of translations and in principle, the claim is also valid for every society and historical period (Toury 1995: 57-58). From the researcher’s point of view, norms are a category for descriptive analysis of translational phenomena.

Thus, and in order to better understand Glazemaker’s mode of translating, the first problem we have to consider is what were the norms in his time, in other words, how was translation viewed and how did translators consider their practice in the seventeenth century. As these norms are not directly observable, they have to be reconstructed from actual texts or from various kinds of statements on translational practice (Toury 1995: 65). Theo Hermans selected liminary texts on translation
published in the Low Countries from 1550 to 1670 (Hermans 1996a). The passages focus on the problems translators faced while translating the main texts that accompany them. It is usually not a reflection on translation in general but a personal testimony (Hermans 1996a: 18). Hermans published his research in various articles and focused mainly on literary texts (Hermans 1985a, 1985b, 1987, 1991, 1996a, 1997, 1998). The forewords, warnings, poems and letters compiled by Hermans shed a light on the translator’s responses to existing expectations and pressures. Translating according to the prevailing norms amounts to translating in a way that was considered “correct”. Norms presuppose choices, decisions and selections made by the translator, and they can show us the paths chosen by the translator against the background of alternatives that were not preferred (Hermans 1998).

Of the thirty-five liminary texts that Hermans collected, nine were introductions to translations of writers from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the remaining twenty-six accompanied translations of the Ancients or of biblical texts. The motivation for translating was inspired according to the author’s prestige or religious reasons. Hermans enumerates political, utilitarian or authoritative reasons as well. During that period, young poets considered translation as a useful stylistic exercise. (Hermans 1996a). If Hermans’ study is a representative sample of what was common practice at that time, then Glazemaker’s case is atypical because he translated the works of fifty-nine contemporary writers. Glazemaker’s motivation was to educate his readers: he wanted to offer recent facts, modern knowledge, the “New Philosophy” or reveal the

---

58 The translations analysed by Hermans were published from 1550 to 1670.
edifying qualities of “pagan” writers. In the case of translating modern historiographers and Spinoza, Glazemaker had a political motivation.

In Hermans’ anthology, the literalist principle is very strong in biblical texts. Because there were many poets among the Ancient writers, the translators become aware of the constraints imposed by rhyme and metre.

In the seventeenth century, the principle of word-for-word translation, that had its origin in Antiquity, was rapidly waning. It survived in biblical translation (except in the Lutheran), in philological translations that had a specific pedagogical intent, and as prose cribs that would be put to rhyme afterwards (Hermans 1991). The ideal of the literal translation had been reiterated by Saint Jerome in his “Letter to Pammachius” (c. 395), written in self-defence as he had been accused of having delivered a fraudulent product and thus, of having acted in bad faith. Jerome was expected to deliver an ad verbum translation, but proposed an alternative mode, that of translating ad sensum. Throughout centuries, the idea of translating without intervening in the sense, was the rule because an interpreting translator created room for misinterpretation and distortion, in short, he could be accused of betraying the readers’ trust (Hermans 1997).

During the sixteenth century, however, a shift had taken place. The two major translators in the Low Countries, Cornelis van Ghistele (1510/11-1573), from Antwerp, and Dirk Volckersz Coornhert (1522-1590), born in Amsterdam, translated in the rhetorical or naturalising manner in order to fit the prevailing literary conventions in the recipient culture. Van Ghistele’s translation of the Aeneid (1554-6) and Coornert’s translation of the first half of the Odyssey (1561) proved a success among a well-to-do culturally progressive public. Both were members of Rederijkerskamers and did not

59 His translation of Stoic philosophers such as Seneca, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius is explained by a revival of Stoic ideas.
favour a literal translation (Hermans 1991 §3, 4). The example set by Van Ghistele and Coornhert was followed by other translators such as Karel van Mander (1548-1606) who had prepared his translation of the first half of the *Iliad* in the early 1580s (Smit 1975: 275; Hermans 1996c: E). However, the publication of Van Mander’s translation in the rhetorical manner in 1611, some thirty years later, was felt to be an anachronism because by then a more literal mode of translating was predominant.

From the 1620s on, the two most prestigious and influential translators, the outstanding poets Constantijn Huygens (1596-1687) and Joost van den Vondel (1587-1679), started adhering to the literalist tradition although they became less constrained over the time. As the vernacular culture established itself and became more assertive, and the awareness of the idiomatic nature of the Dutch language grew, Huygens’ and Vondel’s position becomes more flexible in later years. Vondel gradually accepts the possibility of a middle course, though Huygens is more reluctant in abandoning the literalist principle (Hermans 1991: §7). In the light of Vondel’s evolution, his literalist prose rendering of Virgil’s *Aeneid* (Book II) in 1646 remains intriguing. In that same year Vondel published his unabridged translation of the *Aeneid*. The reason he gives for returning to a stricter conception was that the demands of rhyme and metre made it impossible not to add or omit in relation to the source-text (Hermans 1985: §9). A translation in prose was thus closer to the meaning expressed in the original text.  

Vondel revealed a respectful veneration towards the authority of the Ancients. He considered the original text superior to the translation, which he saw as a derivative product and described himself as a choirboy with an untrained voice (Hermans 1985: §4). Huygens, known for his extraordinary linguistic gift, also considered the translation

---

60 Nine years later Vondel retranslated the second book of the *Aeneid* but this time in verse.
inferior to the original. He held a critical view of his own achievements and was sceptical about the possibility of translating adequately (Hermans 1987: §8).

Keeping in mind that although Vondel and Huygens were poets, and that Glazemaker does not reveal literary preoccupations, I want to analyse the choices made by Glazemaker that other studies have omitted. Glazemaker’s own remarks, expressed in forewords, will be taken into account. Only on a few occasions does he comment on his mode of translation in the forewords that accompanied his translations: instead, he preferred to state his reasons why he recommended the book to the public. For Glazemaker, it was more important to justify why he had translated the work, rather than how he had done it. Both attitudes will be analysed as they are both governed by norms. The way how he translates and the reason why he proposes a translation give us a glimpse of his own standpoint and ideology.

Although usually unsigned, some of the liminary texts leave no doubt about the identity of the writer because he identifies himself as the translator of the work. In addition, they are usually short and concise, and often end with the words “Vaar wel”, (Farewell). Rarely do we find laudatory poems, privileges or dedications in the works Glazemaker translated. His translations are a challenge for his readers, Glazemaker wishes his “verstandige” (wise) readers to form a critical opinion (“Aan de lezer” (To the reader) Onderwys tot de ware godgeleertheid (Compendium for arriving at true theology, 1651 [10]). The writers he translated were either not sanctioned or at least considered unorthodox by the uneasy authorities.

61 Glazemaker is not the only one in ending with a word of parting, Montaigne, translated by him, ends his foreword with the words “A Dieu”, so did Jean Puget de la Serre. Glazemaker however does not refer to God as he prefers ‘vaarwel’ instead of the other Dutch word ‘adieu’. 
6. J. H. Glazemaker, Radical Translator

6.1 Democratic-Oriented Translating

In his own forewords, Glazemaker always reveals himself as an admirer of the author he has translated and is convinced of the significance of the work he is presenting. The liminary texts from his own authorship introduce books about philosophy, including natural sciences, history or politics, and travels. The contents of his translations are often radically new or deal with scientific – and therefore also new – matters. Like other translators in the seventeenth century, he is aware that translating involves finding a balance between the literalist principle and a more reader friendly interpretative mode:

Wat de vertaling aangaat, ik zal in weinig woorden daar af zeggen, dat ik den Schrijver in onze taal niets doe spreken, ’t welk hy niet in de zijne gezegt heeft, en dat, zo ik hem niet van woort tot woort gevolgt heb, dit alleenlijk geschied is om beter verstaan te worden, en om niet aan de Lezer een Werk, dat ten hoogsten aangenaam is, op een onaangename wijze te vertonen (“Voorreeden”62 Rycaut, Verhaal van de tegenwoordige staat van het Turksche Kaizerryk (History of the present state of the Turkish Kingdom), 1670 [50]).

(Concerning the translation, in a few words I will say, that I do not let the writer speak in our language what he did not say in his and if I did not follow him word by word, this only happened in order to be better understood and not to offer the reader a work which is highly agreeable, in a disagreeable way.)

Though the Dutch translators closely follow the literalist tradition, contrary to their French and English colleagues, Glazemaker justifies his more naturalizing mode of translation. He is aware of the grammatical, idiomatic and stylistic differences between

62 Other forms of spelling used by Glazemaker in his translations are “voorreden” or “voor-reden”. He also uses different spellings in “leezer” and “lezer”.

58
languages, and that it is possible to accurately convey the sense. Thus, he reveals to be a domesticating translator. A literal translation would be ambiguous and not enjoyable to read.

In “Aan de Lezer” of his Erasmus’ translation (1651) [10] Glazemaker informs the reader what his aspirations are:

Wat de stijl van de redenen, en de vertaling aangaat, wy zullen niets daar af reppen, maar 't oordeel daar af aan u, verstandige lezer, bevelen, en ons onderzusschen vernoegt houden zo wy, onder menschen een menschelijke taal die van yder verstaan kan worden, gebruiken (“Aan de lezer” Erasmus, Onderwys tot de ware godgeleertheit, 1651 [10]).

(Concerning the style of the discourses and the translation, we will not make any mention of it but leave the verdict to you, wise reader, and in the meantime we do not wish but that we among humans, use a human language that can be understood by each one of us.)

Glazemaker wishes his translations to be understood by everybody and not only by a learned elite, as had been the case in the sixteenth century (Hermans 1991: 153). It becomes clear that his target audience is composed of readers, who are relatively uneducated but who do not shun learning, to whom he is offering access to sources normally unavailable to them. His aim “op dat onze Nederlanders, geen kennis van andere talen hebbende” (so that our Dutchmen, without knowledge of other languages) (“Aan de lezer” Seneca. Alle de brieven, 1654 [16]) gain access to his translations is stressed several times in his forewords.63 His above stated aim “van yder verstaan …

---

63 “by de genen, die alleenlijk kennis van de Nederlandsche taal hebben” (by those who have knowledge of the Dutch language only) (“Aan de lezer” Eerste deel der zedige werken van … Seneka, (First part of the moral works of … Seneca), 1658 [28]); “op dat degenen, die in andere talen onkundig zijn” (in order that those who do not know other languages) (“Aan de lezer” Zedige gedachten van Marcus Aurelius, (Moral meditations of Marcus Aurelius), 1658 [29]) and “en haar ook aan de Nederlanders, de welke onkundig in de Latijnsche taal zijn, deelachtig te maken” (and to be as well partaken by the Dutchmen, ignorant of the Latin language) (“Voorreden van de oversetter” Clauberg, J. Nadere uitbreiding wagens
worden” (that can be understood by each) implies that the translator has to resort to a common language which is simple, clear and straightforward in opposition to the rhetorical language loaded with loanwords in vogue in the sixteenth century.

The emancipation of the vernacular had started in the second half of the sixteenth century and had reached a certain consolidation around the 1650s (Wal 1995: 101). We become aware of the evolution the Dutch language had undergone in Glazemaker’s “Waarschuwing” of the translation he decided to make of Livy (Romainsche historien (Roman history), 1646 [4]). According to Glazemaker, he was asked to rewrite an earlier Dutch Livy translation that had been made by a “Brabander” (Brabantine) and based on another translation made by a “Hoogduytscher” (German).64

Glazemaker’s criticism is directed at the “Brabander”, a person either from the duchy of Brabant that consisted of the present-day Belgian province of (South-)Brabant and Antwerp, and the Dutch province of (North-)Brabant, or simply from the Southern-Netherlands (WNT). This “Brabander” is the anonymous translator who used a German source. The foreword of the first translation into Dutch (1541) by the Flemish publisher and bookseller Jan Gymnick is considered the first written statement that publicized Dutch as a language equal, if not superior, to other tongues (Sonnemans 1999: 16). The attempt to create a purified and unified Dutch language and establish a Dutch cultural

---

64 Glazemaker refers to De Romeynsche historien ende gheschiedenissen (Roman histories, 1614). Thijssen-Schoute refers to Geerebaert’s Lijst van de gedrukte Nederl. vertalingen der Oude Grieksche en Latijnsche schrijvers (List of printed Dutch translations of the Ancient Greek and Latin writers, 1924) which informs us that the 1614 translation was based on an anonymous translation Titus Livius dat is de Roemsche historie oft gesten (Titus Livius, that is the History or Heroic Deeds of Rome) published in Antwerp in 1541. Sonnemans and Besamusca also refer the same translation from the German commissioned by the bookseller and printer from Antwerp, Jan Gymnick and which was later reedited by the translator Maarten Everaert, also from southern origin. Geerebaert and Sonnemans refer to a 1541 translation which was reedited and corrected by “M. E.” in 1597. Hermans mentions M. Everaert but the date he refers to is 1607. (Thijssen-Schoute 1967: 230; Sonnemans 1999: 123; Hermans 1996: 114).
and linguistic identity had been a major concern since the Revolt (1568-1648) against
the Spanish dominion. The first attempts to develop a general language took place
primarily in the Southern Netherlands. At the time when Antwerp was the major home
of printmaking and publishing houses, the printers of the city aspired that the dialect of
Brabant would gain ascendancy. Due to major political changes, the centre shifted from
Flanders to Holland, especially after 1585.65 Under the influence of prominent
immigrants from the south, the vernacular underwent a great evolution in the north. In
the 1630s, the Staten-Generaal decided to order the translation of the Bible from the
original Hebrew and Greek languages into Dutch. In 1637, the authorised version, the
Statenbijbel, was published after representatives of the different provinces had approved
the translation; which meant that the language, mainly based on the dialects of Brabant
and Holland, had to be generally accepted. In the Northern Netherlands several
grammars and dictionaries were published66 while Simon Stevin’s (1548-1620)
technical and mathematical terms, and Hugo Grotius’ juridical vocabulary had been

Thus, by the 1640s, the language of the former Livy translation had become
unacceptable in Glazemaker’s purist eyes and would not satisfy a public with greater
demands in the area of contemporary language and style (Frijhoff 1999: 549).67
Glazemaker is known for using a discourse purified of foreign loanwords directed at the

65 See Part I, section 1.1.
66 Namely A. L. Kók’s Ont-werp der Neder-duitsche letterkonst (Outline for the Dutch letters)
Amsterdam: Johannes Troost, 1649; Petrus Leupenius’s Aanmerkingen op de Nederduitsche taale
(Comments on the Dutch language), Amsterdam: Hendryk Donker, 1653. Before this Christiaen van
Heule had published two grammars (Wal 1995: 65). Hofman’s Nederlandtsche woorden-schat (Dutch
thesaurus) had been published in 1650.
67 In the introduction to his imitatio of Terence (1617) Bredero (1585-1618) who was also from
Amsterdam had a similar reaction lashing out against the Brabantine translator of Terence whose name he
does not mention but was Van Ghistele (1555). The translation by Van Ghistele had been done in the
rhetorical mode but Bredero also criticizes the use of loanwords (Hermans 1996a: 89-90).
common reader who was not acquainted with Latin or French (Ellerbroek 1958: 663; Thijssen-Schoute 1967: 207; Akkerman 1981: ix; 1984: 24-25; De Bom 2008: 223) This idea is stressed by Van Praag who observes that, even for scholarly loanwords that would easily be understood by an erudite public, Glazemaker creates Dutch equivalents (Van Praag 1935: 95). Throughout his career as a translator, his zeal, inspired by Van den Enden’s ideas, by Meijer’s and Koerbagh’s lexica and by Nil Volentibus Arduum’s agenda, aimed at a democratic oriented purism. These men were aware that linguistic purism was a form of defending the common reader from another form of discourse that was ideologically more dominant, but that he did not control. Thus, Glazemaker’s translations are a form of empowerment of a rising middle class. He offered (new) translations of works that had formerly been destined for an academic audience, an elite, to a middle-class public. Thus, he contributed to a social shift that extended the discussion on philosophical, political and scientific issues from universities to coffeehouses and bookshops. In fact, at the end of the seventeenth century, after the publication of two translations of Spinoza’s Tractatus theologico-politicus, one of which was by Glazemaker (1693) [68], and the Philopater novels (1691-1697), public intellectual debates proceeded almost entirely in Dutch (Wielema 2004: 82)

Though the use of a purified vernacular in all his translations reveals Glazemaker’s radical zeal, what was most important for him was the reproduction of a text that was scientifically justified. Therefore, characteristic of his method was the inclusion of technical terms in Latin or French in the margins, while he used a Dutch term in the text (Thijssen-Schoute 1967: 238; Akkerman 1982: xiii). This process also

68 Duijkerius use of loanwords and Latin inspired grammatical constructions can be interpreted as a parody of the theological jargon. Some mistranslations in Glazemaker’s translation of Spinoza’s Opera Posthuma are corrected by Duijkerius in his novel (Maréchal 1991: 28).
favoured the incorporation of the neologisms used in the text (Wal 1995: 58). Another trait are the doublets, a device he was fond of (Ellerbroek 1958: 663; Van Praag 1982: xi).

All this implies that Glazemaker’s style was not too varied, as sentence structures were simple and easy to read. Since he had become a professional translator at the beginning of the 1650s, he translates in a fast tempo as we can verify from his intense production. Simplicity of style makes his, as well as his public’s task, easier. He creates a language that is clear and to the point, it is close to everyday language expunged from foreign loanwords.

He has a good global understanding of the text and his translations gain in clarity (Akkerman 1982: x). Sometimes, however, Glazemaker tends to interpret or add something for clarification (Smit 1975: 592).

For Glazemaker, language was an instrument; the translator is above all a propagator of ideas: thus, the question of whether or not an adequate translation is possible, is not the point. Glazemaker is never sceptic:

\[
i k \ldots \text{dit kostelijk werk de waereld in een duits kleed, vertoonde. \ldots Want men heeft by ouds een yder in sijn eigen taal geschreeven, en alles bekend gemaakt, soo dat het de reden en billijkheid vereischt dat dit Latiynsche kint, 't welk slechts een ander kleet aangedaan is, met een jonstig oog aangezien zal worden} \ldots \text{ (“Voorreden van den oversetter” (Preface by the translator) Clauberg, \textit{Nadere uitbreiding wegens Renati Cartesii bedenkingen van d’eerste wijsbegeerte} (Further development on account of René Descartes’ meditations on first philosophy) 1683 [66]).}
\]

(I … showed the world this precious work in a Dutch gown … For traditionally each one wrote in his own language, and published everything, thus reason and fairness demand that this Latin child, that was merely dressed in another gown, will be regarded with favourable eyes.)
A “kostelijk” (precious) work possesses an immutable and universal essence that can be represented in any language, the translator merely dons it with his language, thus naturalizing it. This attitude is probably related to the fact that, with the exception of his prose translation of the *Iliad*, Glazemaker did not render into Dutch texts of high literary value in which form and content are a whole, a fundamental characteristic of which Vondel and Huygens were aware. While Vondel and Huygens considered the original text as being superior, Glazemaker reveals himself as a culturally self-conscious translator. Although language is considered a mere tool, he is proud of his mother tongue, which is not inferior to Latin. Glazemaker is above all a translator of ideas. The motivations for his work are the edifying characteristics of the original work or the dissemination of knowledge: philosophical, political, cultural or scientific. His ideological commitment explains why the opposition between the original and its derivative in another language is not deemed by Glazemaker as a discredit in the case of the translation. Translating was considered essential for the enlightenment of the common people, which was ultimately his aim.

6.2 CAPTURING THE “ZIN”

In 1654, Glazemaker admits that while he rendered Seneca from the Latin, he also used other translations in French in order to catch the “zin” (sense) of the writer as accurately as possible (“Aan de lezer” Seneca. *Alle de brieven*, 1654 [16]). Thijssen-Schoute observes that he used the Latin publication as well as the French translation of Descartes’ *Principia Philosophiae* for his 1657 translation [25] (Thijssen-Schoute 1967: 240). On other occasions, Glazemaker confesses that he needed the help of “enige
anderen” (some others) (“Aan de lezer” Cardano, G. *Neroos Lof*, 1649 [5]), or of specialists: a friend “niet onkundig in de Wiskunstige dingen” (not ignorant of Mathematical things) (“Voorreeden aan de lezer” Descartes, R. *Discours de la Méthode*, 1659 [31]); or a Dutchman who corrected or filled some lacunae related with musical notions he was unfamiliar with as he acknowledges:

Doch om mij zelf geen onëige lof toe t’eigenen, zo heb ik, onkundig in deze kunst, de Lezer hier te verwittigen dat ik in de vertaling van dit stuk, gelijk ook in verscheide andere dingen, grote hulp en onderstant van zeker Heer, niet onervaren in dusdanige zaken, en diens naam ik om verscheide reden verzwijg, heb genoten, dewijl hij de moeite heeft gedaan van mijn vertaling tegen ’t Latijn over te zien, de plaatsen, van mij open gelaten, te vullen, en de misstellingen, hier en daar begaan, te verbeteren; over ’t welk ik ten hoogsten dank aan hem verplicht ben, gelijk ook de genen, die deze vertaling tot nut zou konnen strekken (“De vertaalder aan de lezer” (The translator to the reader) Descartes, R. *Musicae Compendium*, 1661 [33]).

(But in order not to appropriate myself of praise that suits me not, thus I, ignorant in this art, must inform the reader here that in the translation of this part, as in several others, I received and enjoyed great help and support of a certain gentleman, not inexperienced in these matters, and whose name for several reasons I conceal, as he took the trouble to revise my translation confronting it with the Latin, filled the spaces left in blank by me and corrected the errors committed here and there; so that I owe him the greatest gratitude, as do those to whom this translation may be useful.)

The excerpt shows his ethics as a translator, for he does not wish to earn credits he does not deserve, but admits he needed help and shows his gratitude. It also reveals his constant concern with the most adequate translation which is also observable in the several reprints of his translations of Descartes’ work where we can verify that he introduced slight changes as he continued to polish and work on his former translations (Thijssen-Schoute 1967: 240).
A similar assumption was made by Smit, who in his analysis of Glazemaker’s translation of Homer [17], [27] observes that he did not copy a mistake that appeared in the Latin version he used. This means he must have consulted other translations too, namely from the French (Smit 1975: 586). The Dutch title *De Iliaden*, in the plural, points in the same direction as several French translations of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are entitled *Les Iliades d’Homère* (Smit 1975: 584).

The process of consulting more than one source text is a practice he employs regarding some of his translations, especially of Descartes.
6.3 “Feminist” Translations

Glazemaker’s allegedly first translation was published when he was twenty-three or twenty-four years old. He does not mention the source of *De deugdelyke vrou* (1643) but we know that it is a translation of *L’honneste femme* (1632) parts I and II by the Franciscan monk Jacques du Bosc (d. 1660) (Van Praag 1935: 92), described as a philosopher, feminist and libertine, as well. The book was meant to be a French Catholic role model for women. Du Bosc sets out a standard of Christian behaviour based on a morality dictated both by natural and revealed law. In his opinion, the world had much to learn from the pagan and Judaic traditions which had helped to shape it (Fitzgerald 1996: 12, 109).

The first edition of the French original dated from 1632 was flawed because the printer could not read the manuscript correctly, and therefore, the author was not identified. It contained an “Epistre” to Madame de Courbalet signed with the initials “D.P.”. In 1633 the author reissued his work and acknowledges his authorship by signing: DV BOSCQ at the end of the “Epistre”, but once again his name is not mentioned on the title page (Fitzgerald 1996: 112). Later editions were enlarged with a second and third part in 1634 and 1635, respectively. The latter part was more theological, which the author justifies as counterbalancing the many examples in the

---

69 Two translations were published in 1643, the year in which we find the first translations by Glazemaker. We do not know which book was published first *De deugdelyke vrou* [1] or *D’Argenis* by Barclay [2].

70 Jacques Du Bosc is mentioned in the *Dictionnaire* (1697: vol I, 619) by the controversial philosopher and Huguenot refugee Pierre Bayle (1647-1706). It is difficult to identify Bayle’s point of view as his articles are provided with footnotes in which arguments for and against are presented. The notes on Du Bosc’s anti-jansenism are more elaborate than the description under the entry. See Part III, section 1.2.2.
first two parts taken from pagan writers, especially Seneca and Plutarch, that could have
given the impression that a woman can be virtuous without being Christian (qtd. in Van
Praag 1935: 93). But the suspicion created by the inclusion of writers not sanctioned by
the rigorist faction of the Church must have pleased Glazemaker, for he does not
translate the third part.

The young Glazemaker dedicated the first volume of *De deugdelyke vrou* to
fifty-eight “Amsterdammer fyne zusjes” (nice young ladies from Amsterdam) with a
laudatory poem for the “virtuous young lady M. K.. In the list of the fifty-eight girls we
find well-known Mennonite names. The second volume is dedicated to “fyne zusjes”
from Haarlem, again with a poem, this time in honor of Miss E. Brouwers (Thijssen-
Schoute 1967: 226). The word “zus”, of which “zusje” is the diminutive, could be used
to address a girl in a caressing way, but with the adjective “fyn” it was mostly used to
refer to Mennonite women (*WNT*). What was meant as a Catholic manual for feminine
behaviour became a model for women, especially Mennonite women. Du Bosc’s project
had some common grounds with Glazemaker’s idea of popular Enlightenment. The first
chapter of *L’honneste femme* is an apologia for reading (Bosc 1639: 1), especially
philosophy, history and poetry (Bosc 1639: 1-50).

The anonymous “Voor-reden” is an abridged form of the French “Preface”. In
both introductions Du Bosc is never identified but referred to as “l’Auteur de ce Livre”
or “de Maker van dit Boek”. Due to its success by 1643, the year Glazemaker’s
translation was published, there had been at least eight reprints of *L’honneste femme* in
French and an English translation. The book’s success and the signature at the end of
the “Epistre” make it very hard to believe that Glazemaker ignored the author’s identity.
The suggestion offered by Van Praag, that the name of the author might have been
omitted so as to make the translation appealing to non-Catholics, becomes very plausible (Van Praag 1935: 92).

From some of Glazemaker’s other translations we may also infer an interest in emancipating his female readership. In the foreword of his Livy translation (1646) [4] we notice again that his audience includes women as he explicitly mentions them. In line with this is his translation Verhaal van ’t leven en de voorvallen van Henriette Sylvie de Molière (History of the life and adventures of Henriette Sylvie de Molière, 1672) [56], an unconventional but successful novel by one of the first female writers, Madame de Villedieu (born Desjardins, c. 1640–1683) Mémoires de la vie d’Henriette-Sylvie de Molière (1672-1674). The novel consists of six parts, however, in 1672 only the first four had been anonymously published. In this novel truth and fiction are inextricably blended as it is the first French work of fiction to bear the title Mémoires. It is a work that defies categorisation as it can be labelled a pseudo-autobiography, a picaresque or an epistolary novel about the adventures of a heroine who challenges social conventions governing female conduct as she fights her economic and amorous battles. The novel does not end with the marriage of the heroine, but with her retiring from the world after a marriage that went wrong. (Kuizenga 2004: 10-13).

The transition from Latin to the vernacular, and from the academic debate to discussions in salons resulted in the possibility women had in taking part in events like these (Leemans 2002: 261). The emancipation of women was one of the radical thinkers’ aims. Van den Enden undeniably includes women and girls under the “common people” he wants to enlighten (Israel 2001: 176). For Van den Enden this was not a mere theoretical question: Meinsma cites Colerus and Gotlieb Stolle saying

---

71 Though Van den Enden excluded women from participation in decision-making and voting (Klever 1997: 43).
that Van den Enden’s daughter Clara taught Latin and Music at her father’s school from a very young age (Meinsma 1896: 140). We find that Glazemaker’s sister-in-law, Levijntje, taught at her father’s school, a family enterprise which she probably led after his death (Thijssen-Schoute 1967: 214), as did the widows of publishers such as Jan Hendriksz Boom or Pieter Arentsz.

Van Praag also wondered if some changes in Glazemaker’s text were inspired by religious motives but these suppositions remained inconclusive. Some saints are entitled “heilige” (saint) as in the source-text, but in other cases Glazemaker omits the title (Van Praag 1935: 94). In turn, Akkerman, who admires Glazemaker for his literalness, notices that he translates twice Spinoza’s axiom “Deus sive natura” as “God” and twice as “God, of [van] de natuur” (God or nature) (Spinoza, B. Nagelate schriften (1677: 192 [60]). Akkerman also noted that he inaccurately translates Descartes’ notion “Deus aut natura” (either God or nature) as “God” just like the French translator Claude Picot (Akkerman 1982: xi). Did Glazemaker consider this notion of God too heterodox? What is the reason for his lack of consistency in his translation of Spinoza? Was it carelessness or was he afraid to translate it every time as “God or nature”? In other words, was it a real slip of the pen or did he try not to emphasise the concept that could call the attention of the authorities? Should there be any problems, the busy translator could always justify his “blasphemy” with other occurrences in which he had “censored” the sacrilegious axiom. In the case of the Catholic saints, these inconsistencies seem to be a subtle way of manipulating the reader by not overemphasizing the concept of saint. Other changes are subtle but confirm his tendency to lead the reader away from the Catholic inspired text, as “La Vierge” becomes “Deze Maagt” (This Virgin). He does translate references to Catholic rituals,
although references to superstition are systematically changed: “Comme chaque Astre a son influence” becomes “Gelijk yder star haar glans [heeft]” (Like every star has its brilliance) (Van Praag 1935: 94).

The modifications can only be spotted when the French and Dutch texts are put side by side, but this could only be done after identifying the source-text. The fact that he did not identify the work is remarkable, for only in very few cases did he omit the author’s name. The apparently slight interventions in the text itself are insidious and in consonance with his ideological agenda that will become more apparent in the introductions to his later translations, as well as, in the translations themselves.

We may conclude that in 1643, when Glazemaker translated De deugdelyke vrouw, he was already an advocate of rationalism, fighting superstition, and in favour of access to knowledge for women and girls, as his translation was targeting a Mennonite, especially female, audience. For Glazemaker, the concept of equality included the emancipation of women.

6.4 “PAGAN” TRANSLATIONS

By “pagan” translations I mean the twelve translations Glazemaker made of Greek and Roman writers – mostly philosophers – or of classical antiquity. With the exception of the two translations of Homer, all other books have an introduction written

---

72 The name of the author is sometimes omitted as a matter of precaution, which is the case of his translations of Spinoza. The volumes of Toonneel der wereltsche veranderingen (Scenes of worldly changes) [3], [7] and Het treurtoonneel (Tragedy) [8] only mention “uyt verscheyde schryvers” (from various writers) and not their names.
by Glazemaker. The legitimation usually given for translating these works were the edifying qualities of wisdom and virtue that could be found in the Ancients although they were not yet Christianised.

6.4.1 Romainsche Historien van Titus Livius (1646) [4]

We find Glazemaker’s longest reflection on how a translator ought to proceed in his supposedly first Latin translation of Livy’s Romainsche historien van Titus Livius [4] published in 1646. From his “Aan de lezer” and following “Waarschuwing” (Warning) it becomes clear that the publisher, J. J. Schipper, who was a translator as well, wanted to reprint an earlier translation of De Romeijnsche historien ende geschiedenissen, beschreven door Titum Livium (The Roman History described by Livy) published in Amsterdam under several booksellers’ names in 1614.

While preparing the text for publication, Glazemaker changed his own plans and his publisher’s plans:

Wat d’eerste achttien of negentien bladen aangaan, wy hebben daar in het oude exemplaar, gelijk ’t hier voor dezen gedrukt is, gevolgt, doch echter veel verandert, verschafft, en, naar ons oordeel, verbetert: maar dewijl wy, al voortgaande, bevonden dat dit werk te zeer mishandelt was, zo hebben wy d’Auteur zelf, voor zo veel ’t overige aangaat, van nieus vertaalt, tot meer voldoening van de Lezer, die, de nuttigheit hier af smakende, en dit in dank afneemende, gelieven zal zich hier meê te vernoegen, en te wachten tot dat wy, zo God ons ’t leven spaart, iets heerlijker, alreê in onz gemoed begrepen, na

73 The remaining ten books are Glazemaker’s translation of Livy, Cardanus, Coeffeteau (2X), Seneca (3X), Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius, Plutarch and Curtius Rufus.
eenig verloop van tijd, aan den dag brengen74 (“Aan de Lezer” Romainsche historien van Titus Livius [4]).

(In relation to the first eighteen or nineteen folios, we followed the old copy like it was printed before, however, we changed, polished and, in our opinion, amended a lot; but as we were thus proceeding, we found this work too mistreated. With regard to the rest, we translated the author anew, for readers’ greater satisfaction, who savoring the usefulness from it, and being grateful, will have to contend with this until we, may God let us live, shall publish after some time, something more delightful that we already have in mind.)

Schipper had apparently already started printing the first folios. Glazemaker’s change of ideas must have caused him some loss. As far as we know, this was the last publication in which both worked together (Keyser 1982: xv-xvi).

Though this probably was Glazemaker’s first translation from Latin and unlike many other commentaries by translators in which the modesty topos is traditional, we notice in Glazemaker’s tone some pride in his recently acquired knowledge and also contempt for his predecessor.75 Not only does he criticise what he considered lack of linguistic or stylistic skill, but also the elimination of a part of the source text without informing the reader of this.

In the following “Waarschuwing, om ’t onderscheijt tusschen d’oude oversetting van Titus Livius Histori in ’t Neêrduits, en deze na te speuren” (Warning in order to distinguish the difference between the ancient translation into Dutch of Livy’s History and this one) – the long title clarifies that this is Glazemaker’s justification for his decision of a new translation – his tone becomes more indignant and it becomes clear that the problem is not merely linguistic or stylistic:

74 In fact in 1649 a second part of his Romainsche historien is published [6]. This time translated by Glazemaker from the French and written by Nicolas Coeffeteau.
75 Though Glazemaker’s name is not mentioned it is generally accepted that he was the translator (Geerebaert 1924: 132).
Die enige lust tot lezen heeft, of begeerig is, om goede boeken te vergaren, zal altijd trachten, om die, zoo 't mooglijk zy, volkomen te hebben, en zulke, daer eenig blad, of woorden, in gebreeken, zoo haten, dat hy liever voor de volkomen meer guldens, dan voor de gebrekkelijke, stuyvers wil geven. Wat nu d’oude overzetting van Livius Histori belangt, 't gebrek daer van is, naer 't Latijns, met enige woorden of geen blad te helpen, maar nauwelijk met hondert bladen. De zonde van de jammerlijke mishandeling daer van, is eerst door de Hoogduytscher begaen, en van de Neerduytscher, 'k vertrou een Brabander, gevolgt, die licht geen andere taal dan Hoogduyts, om Livius t’ overzetten, kon. Deze is, in zijn zonde, noch zo verwaant geweest, dat hy in plaats van 't gene, dat hy van Livius eygen schrijven daer uitsmeet, enige Fabulen en redenen voegde, die aan 't werk niet kleven, ja zomtijts in steê van Heydens, als de Romainen toen waren, Kristelijk zijn. Wy zelve zo jammerlijke mishandeling niet vermoedende, vernoegden ons eerst met de stijl te verbeteren, en d’ongevoegelijke redenen, die van Livius zelf niet geschreven zijn, daer uit te schrappen, gelijk gy, van voren af tot Foli 75, daer onze oogen eerst ter deegen geopent wierden, na kont speuren, en met een hoedanig 't gebrek daer zy; dat ons toen d’oude verduytste t’eenemaal als onwaerdig, dee verwerpen. Van hier af hebt gy Livius eygen schriften, zo volkomen als zy zijn, op nieu vertaalt. (...) Maer 't docht ons beter 't Latijn te volgen; mits men niet behoort te bedriegen, en 't niet past dat men 't geen, dat de Schrijver zelf van 't zijne verlooren heeft, met gissingen of ingevoegde redenen, zonder zulx aen te duyden, poogt goed te maken (“Waarschuwing” Romainsche historien van Titus Livius [4]).76

(Those who feel the desire to read or are avid of collecting good books will always try, if possible, to own a perfect work, and hate it if any sheets or words are missing, so that he will prefer to spend guilders on perfection than pennies on faultiness. Regarding the old translation of Livy’s history, the shortcomings in relation to the Latin, cannot be restored with a few words or a page; hardly with a

---

76 As a matter of fact on page 75, in the middle of Book 1, we suddenly find another comment by the translator, stressing again: Merkt Wy hebben ons dus verre met de Titus Livius, gelyk zy in 't Neêrduyts is, beholpen, behalven dat wy hem (gelijk de Lezer ongetwijffelt gewaar kan worden) verschaat en op beter stijl hebben gestalt; doch wy, bevindende dat hier 't verhaal van 16 of 17 Iaren gebraak, daar af niet, of weinig gerept werd, hebben dit volgende uyt d’eige Titus Livius van nieus daer by gevoegt (Romainsche historien 75 [4]). (Notice Until now we had to make do with Livy, as it was written in Dutch, except that we (as the Reader no doubt has noticed) have polished and improved the style, though as we found that the story lacked 16 or 17 years, about which nothing or hardly anything is mentioned, we added the following new part of our own Livy.).
hundred pages. The sin of the wretched bad treatment was first committed by the German and was followed by the Dutchman, I believe a Brabantine, who was clearly not able to translate Livy from any language other than German. This man was in his sin so arrogant that he threw out Livy’s own writings adding some fables and epistles that do not go well with the work, and which sometimes are in fact Christian instead of pagan, like the Romans were at that time. We ourselves, not suspecting this wretched abuse, were content at first with correcting the style and taking out the inadequate epistles that were not written by Livy, as you can verify from the beginning till page 75, where our eyes were first properly opened and such a shortcoming made us definitively reject the old Dutch version as unworthy. From there on, you have Livy’s own writings, as perfect as they are, translated anew. (…) But we thought it better to follow the Latin, for one should not deceive and it is not becoming that one patches up with conjectures and inserted discourses without indicating what was lost from the writer.)

From Glazemaker’s point of view, the unjustified omissions and especially the inclusion of Christian writings in a pagan history are not a mere anachronism or old-fashioned custom but an appropriation from a biased perspective. The choice of words used in his “Waarschuwing” referring to his predecessor’s options: “zonde” (sin) (2X); “verwaandheid” (arrogance); “bedriegen” (deceive); “jammerlijke mishandeling” (wretched abuse) (2X); “gebrek” (including derivations) (fault or deficiency) (3X); “onwaerdig” (unworthy), do not merely condemn the quality of the translation but form a moral and ethical judgment of the translator. They contrast with the word “volkomen” which means “perfect” or “complete” (3X). The “gissingen” (conjectures) of the former translator that cannot be proven but are his interpretations and “ingevoegde redenen” (inserted discourses) are, in Glazemaker’s eyes, manipulations because they are only detectable by someone who compares the target text with its source, as he had done. From Glazemaker’s perspective, the insertion of a Christian point of view was insidious because it was unsuspected by the reader. By not justifying his actions, the former translator took advantage of his public’s credulity. In his Christian fervor, he defrauded
the readers, misleading them. Further on in the text, Glazemaker calls his predecessor an arrogant “brodder” (botcher) because he did not justify which text belonged to whom, he accuses him of leaving out important events of Roman history and condemns him because he inserted conjectures and discourses. Glazemaker’s reaction can be associated with Van den Enden’s conviction in the sense that organised religion was used to control people’s ignorance. In his “Aan de lezer” Glazemaker gives a short typology of the intended readers. According to this typology, Glazemaker addresses himself again to a female audience, among others. He explains that the reader who reads Livy’s book will find examples of virtuous, as well as cruel men and women, and can learn from their behaviour. In addition the reader can also find a long list of remarkable Romans given by the translator. Glazemaker’s perspective is one of universal ethic regardless of religion, sex or culture.

According to Glazemaker, “Livius eygen schriften” (Livy’s own writings) start on the page where his own translation begins. What is implicit is the assertion that until that moment we did not have “Livius eygen schriften”, but the former translator’s deceitful words and insertions that travestied and Christianised the pagan writer.

Though in the paratexts of this translation Glazemaker is highly visible, the expression “Livius eygen schriften” reveals that, in his opinion, the honest translator does not intervene in the interpretation of the translation, a quality that was associated with the literal translator, as a moral compensation for disappearing behind the words so that the reader is given full interpretative freedom. (Hermans 1997). However, what is at stake in Glazemaker’s case is the translator’s integrity and reliability: his moral character is linked with his skill as a translator. Honesty is the ethical quality a

77 Typologies of intended readers were not uncommon. The typology in “Voorreeden aan de lezer” in Wonderlyke Reizen was taken from the French translation of 1645.
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Translator must show if he wants to convince the readers that he can be trusted. In Glazemaker’s opinion, the ethical qualities no longer refer to a literalist principle of translating in which the aim of the translator is not to interpret. Glazemaker is convinced that translating does not consist in the mere linguistic transference from one language to another. Thus, for the reader there is no other solution than to trust the translator’s ethical options and that can only be done when both share the same convictions (Hermans 2001). For Glazemaker truthfulness means that the translator must adopt a rational, scientific approach to his task. Yet and in spite of Glazemaker’s indignation, we saw that he, too, manipulated his translation of *De deugdelyke vrou* [1]: from the paratexts in the front matter it became clear that the translation was undoubtedly aimed at a female Mennonite public.\(^{78}\)

In fact, the tone had already been set in the “Aan de lezer” of the translation of Livy [4], which begins with the words: “Polybius, dat gaau vernuft, en die ervare staatkundige” (Polybius, that precious genius, and experienced politician) in which Glazemaker invokes the Greek historian Polybius (c. 200 – c. 118 BC). The humanist and philologist Justus Lipsius (1547-1606) had written a scientific commentary *De Militia* (1595) on part of the *Historiae* of Polybius.\(^{79}\) Lipsius considered Polybius a trustworthy source and stressed his conviction that the knowledge of classical historians could illuminate Lipsius’ own age. He usually identified his source texts carefully either in the main text or in the margin (Landtsheer 2001: 101-122). Glazemaker’s concern in identifying his source texts was probably inspired by Lipsius who was of great

---

\(^{78}\) For the concept of “paratext” see Part II, section 2.1.

\(^{79}\) Ironically the book dedicated to the Spanish Crown Prince, the future Philips III, by Lipsius turned out of enormous importance for another Prince, Maurits of Nassau, commander-in-chief of the North Netherlands who owed his military success against the Spanish largely to Polybius’s strategy.
importance for him. In 1657 he translated his *Monita et exempla politica* (1605) [26], and his Seneca and Epictetus translations [16], [28], [29] and [35] respect Lipsius’ indications concerning the order in which the chapters are presented.

In the “Aan de lezer” Glazemaker laments that parts of Livy’s source text were lost. He decided to resort to the popular French historiographer and philosopher Scipio Dupleix (1569-1661) so as to complete the missing chapters in Livy’s text and informs the reader what was written by each historiographer. In his “Waarschuwing”, Glazemaker once mentions again that he resorted to Dupleix and that he excluded texts by Lucius Annaeus Florus (c. 70-c. 140), which had been included in the 1614 translation. It is not clear why Glazemaker replaced Florus with a more modern writer, perhaps he considered Florus’ style bombastic and knew that the text contained factual errors. Glazemaker’s language is clear and to the point and his attitude is that of a modern scholar: objective and unprejudiced.

---

80 The preoccupation of identifying the authors of his source texts we find again in the “Bericht aan de Lezer” (Word to the reader) of his translation of Quintus Curtius in 1663 [37] in which he makes sure to distinguish what was written by Curtius and what was added by J. Freinshemius (1608-1660) the German historiographer known for his supplements to Rufus and Livy.

81 The reader is informed again at the end of Book 1 by the translator: Merkt Hier gebreekt het tweede Boek van *Titus Livius*, of zijn tweede Decade, die geheel verloren is, en daar af wy weinig bescheit konden krijgen, schoon daar gewichtige en gedenkwaerdige oorlogen in beschreven waren, (…) Doch wy hebben, om, zo veel in ons is, de Lezer te vernoegen, ‘t geen, dat hier gebreekt, uit de Romainsche Historie van de vermaarde Historieschrijver, M. Scipio du Pleix, bygevoegd, die dit gebrek, uit verscheide Schrijvers, met grote vlijt, gevult heeft (Romainsche historien, 102 [4]). (Notice Here lacks the second Book by Livy, or his second Decade, which was completely lost and of which we thus acquired few information, though important and memorable wars were described in it, (…) However, in order to please the reader to our best ability, we have inserted what is missing here taken from the Roman History by the famous historywriter M. Scipio du Pleix, who with great zeal filled this flaw recurring to various writers.)
6.4.2 *Neroos lof* by Gerolamo Cardano (1649) [5]

Three years later, in the “Aan de lezer” of *Neroos lof*, Glazemaker finds it necessary to explain again his omissions, this time justified by social decorum:

Voorts, wat de vertaling aangaat, ik heb my zo naau, als ’t my mogelijk was, aan ’t Latijn gehouden, geen verandering daar in gebracht, en ook niets uitgelaten, dan enige ontuchtige dingen, die zo snood zijn, dat zy onbekent behoren te blijven, en van geen eerbare oren, zonder de grootste beschaamtheid, gehoort konnen worden. Indien gy ergens iets vind, dat niet zodanig is, als ’t behoort, zo zal ik in een gemene zaak geen andere, dan gemene, ontschuldiging bybrengen. Vaar wel (“Aan de lezer” Cardano, *Neroos Lof* [5]).

Furthermore, concerning the translation, I kept myself as close as possible to the Latin, I did not change nor omit, except for some indecencies, that are so pernicious, that they ought to stay unknown and can not be heard by virtuous ears without the greatest shamefulness. In case you find something somewhere that is not according to what it should be, I will allege in a general case no other than general excuse, Farewell.)

The sections that were expunged by Glazemaker deal with sexual excesses committed by Nero and other emperors (Poel 2005: 294-296).

Again in the case of this translation, Glazemaker adopts a controversial point of view. The subtitle reads: *Daar in de Kaizer Nero, met ernstige en staatkundige redenen, voor de beste vorst geroemt word* (In which Emperor Nero is acclaimed, for serious and political reasons, as the best sovereign). The book is clearly an apologia of the Roman emperor Nero by the Italian physician, mathematician and philosopher, Gerolamo
Cardano (1501-1576) who took a stand against the prevailing opinion that Nero was the worst of Caesars.

In the “Aan de lezer”, Glazemaker justifies the title *Neroos lof*, probably considered as a paradox in the eyes of his public, by explaining that although Nero persecuted Christians and committed many atrocities – after all he was considered the epitome of wickedness – there were “ernstige en staatkundige redenen” (serious and political reasons) for this emperor to be considered the best by Cardano, and these reasons should be known. Thus, he urges his public to compare this emperor with others who perhaps are not so “goed en deuchdelijk” (good and virtuous) as was generally assumed. Glazemaker considers Nero to be a good sovereign. It is Glazemaker’s aim to emancipate his public by offering a translation into the vernacular of a work with a different perspective on Nero. He expects his public to be unprejudiced, open-minded and curious.

There are different interpretations of Gerolamo Cardano’s (1501-1576) paradoxical encomium. Partly due to his bad reputation – he was condemned as a charlatan and freethinker – his work on Nero was often dismissed as a mock encomium in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. More recently, other interpretations are offered, like Glazemaker did, and it is considered a serious rehabilitation of Nero (Poel 2005: 284-5).

6.4.3 THE ANCIENT PHILOSOPHERS

Glazemaker translated Seneca [16], [28] and [35], Epictetus [29], Marcus Aurelius [29] and Plutarch [36]. I found strong evidence to ascribe the unsigned
paratexts texts to Glazemaker. In the introductory texts he stresses that though they were not Christian philosophers they can certainly compete with them (the case of Seneca, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius). Furthermore, he calls our attention to Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius’ saintliness, and Plutarch’s erudition in all the sciences.

In the “Aan de lezer” of Seneca’s letters to Lucilius Junior (Alle de brieven, 1654 [16]), Glazemaker begins with an apology of the Roman philosopher whom he considers highly despite his paganism, stating that Seneca returned victoriously from his struggle against wrong:

In voegen dat hy [Seneca], verwinner weêrkeerende, een heerlijke zegepraal daar over verdient, tot grote laster van veel Christenen, die hoewel een beter voorganger hebbende, zich echter voor hem moeten schamen (“Aan de lezer” Seneca, Alle de brieven, 1654 [16]).

(With the result that he [Seneca], returning as a vanquisher, deserves a wonderful triumph to the disgrace of many Christians, who though they have a better predecessor, must feel ashamed of him.)

The sentence is cryptic and obscure. Does Glazemaker mean that Christ did not return victorious because He was crucified and thus lost His battle on earth? In what sense does Glazemaker think Christ was better than Seneca despite the fact that His followers, the Christians, had to feel ashamed of Him? The sentence reveals that Glazemaker does not see Christ as a redeemer or God’s son. The comparison with Seneca turns Christ into a human being, which is a dangerous statement and, therefore, covered in enigmatic phrasing.

In 1658, in the “Aan de lezer” of Marcus Aurelius’ Zedige gedachten (Moral meditations) [29] we find a similar mode of thinking but this time slightly less obscure:

Daar in hy [Marcus Aurelius] betoont wat de Natuur, door Reden beleid, teweegbrengen kan, aan ons, die Christenen willen wezen, en die zo veel beter
behoren te zijn, als wy een treffelijker Voorbeeld en Leermeester, namelijk Christus, hebben, een prikkel, om hem niet alleenlijk gelijk te worden, maar ook t’overtreffen, gegeven (“Aan de lezer” Aurelius, Zedige gedachten van M. Aurelius Antonius [29])

(In which he [Marcus Aurelius] demonstrates what Nature, guided by Reason, can cause, to us, who wish to be Christians, and who should be so much better, as we have a more outstanding Model and Master, namely Christ, a given incentive not only to imitate but also to emulate.)

It becomes clear that the predecessor not named in the foreword of Seneca’s Letters [16] is Christ, and again He is not seen as divine, but as an outstanding human being. If He were divine than it would be impossible for man to equal or even excel God’s son. Another keyword in the foreword to Marcus Aurelius [29] is “Reden” (reason): a life according to nature means living according to reason, as it is reason that elevates men above the beasts and enables them to lead a virtuous life.

The passages shed some light on Glazemaker’s anti-Trinitarian rationalistic ideas. The reason the second passage is not as obscure as the first, probably has to do with the fact that Marcus Aurelius’ meditations were not published separately, but at the end of the discourses of Epictetus and the Tablet of Cebes [29]. This means that the “Aan de lezer” does not appear at the very beginning of the book but is “hidden” after page 532.82

---

82 From the title page it becomes clear that the Moral meditations of Marcus Aurelius were intended to be published together with Epictetus’ work as it reads: Epictetus Redenen, door Arrianus, zijn toehoorder, vergaderd; met des zelfs handboek, en onderwijzingen. Cebes Tafereel; en zedige gedachten van M. Aurelius Antonius, Kaiser van Romen. Nooit voor dezelfs zodanig gedrukt. Alles door J. H. Glazemaker vertaalt. (Epictetus’ discourses, brought together by Arrian, his listener, with his *Encheiridion* and teachings. The Tablet of Cebes; and moral meditations of Marcus Aurelius, emperor of Rome. Never before printed as such. All translated by J. H. Glazemaker). I found five copies in Dutch libraries, one in Yale University Library and three on Google books and they all included Marcus Aurelius’ meditations. Though these begin with a new pagination and there is no catchword for the binder at the bottom of the page of the *Tablet of Cebes*, I did not find a copy that only consisted of Marcus Aurelius meditations.
6.4.4 The Iliad (1654, 1658) [17], [27]

In 1654 a prose translation of the second part of Homer’s Iliad was published [17], the first part followed in 1658 [27] and it was only then that the name of Glazemaker appeared as the translator. No explanation was given for this reversed order, but the fact that there had been a translation of the first part of Homer’s Iliad by Karel van Mander must have been the reason for Glazemaker having begun his work with the second part (Smit 1975: 583)\textsuperscript{83}. By translating into prose, Glazemaker followed a trend that had its recent origin in Vondel. In fact, the poet’s 1646 translation in prose of Virgil’s Aeneid was immediately copied by others and within twelve years, five great epic poems were translated: Aeneid, Odyssey, Iliad, Orlando Furioso and Jerusalem Delivered.

Glazemaker, who did not know Greek, used an interpretatio latina ad verbum for his two prose translations. The resort to an intermediate translation in another language was an accepted practice, and he could have used the French translations that were also available and easier for him. He wished to come as close as possible to the writer’s words for he must have known the Latin source-oriented renderings to be nearer to the Greek than the more interpretative French versions. Another reason why Glazemaker wished to follow the source-text as close as possible, even in the case of an intermediate translation, is the fact that he used for his second translation in 1658 a newly published Latin version Homeri Ilias & Odyssea (…) Cum Latina versione accuratissima that he must have considered better than the Homeri Opera omnia, Cum interpret. lat. ad. verbum (…) he had used before (Smit 1975: 586-7). Smit thinks that

\textsuperscript{83} The title on Van Mander’s translation is: De eerste 12. boecken, vande Illyadas (The first twelve books of the Iliad) Haerlem: Adriaen Rooman, 1611.
Glazemaker follows the text he is translating closely but does not sacrifice linguistic correctness and purity to literalness. He therefore concludes that Glazemaker wished to present a scientifically reliable text to his public, unlike the 1651 translation of the *Odyssey* (Smit 1975: 574).\(^\text{84}\)

The second part, which was published first in 1654 [17], has no liminary texts, but the first part published ten years later [27] possesses a “Inhout der Iliaden van Homerus” (Contents of the Iliad) and “Homerus leven, uit Herodutos Halikarnasseus getrokken” (Life of Homer drawn from Herodotus of Halicarnassus). No paratext by Glazemaker was added, contrary to his other translations of ancient writers or classical history. The fact that the *Iliad* was a fictional work must have counted in his decision because it seems that, first of all, Glazemaker wanted to edify and instruct his readers.

### 6.5 Religious Translations

Glazemaker shows his heterodoxy in the choice of his four translations on religious themes: *Mahomets Alkoran*, the translation of the Quran [30], a translation of a book by the irenic theologian David Blondel [9], another of the Cartesian-inspired theologian Isaac d’Huisseau who sought to find a common foundation for all Christian beliefs [55], and the last translation is of Robert Barclay’s defense of Quakerism [65].

The only book in which we can find a paratext by Glazemaker is in his translation of the Quran. The introduction to Blondel’s text is in the form of a letter by the author. The other two books do not possess any liminary texts.

---

\(^{84}\) *De dooling van Ulisses* (The odyssey of Ulysses), Amsterdam: Gerrit van Goedesberg. The translation was made by “G.V.S.”. The translator has not yet been identified.
6.5.1 MAHOMETS ALKORAN (1658) [30]

Glazemaker translated the Quran from the French translation by André Du Ryer (c. 1580-1660) who was a French diplomat and Orientalist. Du Ryer’s translation of the Quran *L’Alcoran de Mahomet. Translaté d’arabe en français par le sieur Du Ryer* (Paris: Antoine de Sommaville, 1647) was the first translation into a European vernacular made directly from the Arabic (Hamilton 2004: 91). It was republished in Paris in 1649 and judging from the number of French editions in Holland it became a huge success (Hamilton 2004: 108). The French version was soon translated into other languages: English (1649), Dutch, German (1688, from the Dutch version) and Russian (1716).

The Dutch title of Glazemaker’s translation reads: *Mahomets Alkoran, door de Heer Du Ryer uit d’Arabische in de Fransche taal gestelt; beneffens een tweevoudige beschryving van Mahomets leven; en een verhaal van des zelfs Reis ten Hemel, gelijk ook zijn samenspraak met de Jood Abdias.* (Muhammad’s Quran, set from the Arabic into the French language by Mr. Du Ryer; besides a twofold description of Muhammad’s life; and a history of his voyage to heaven, as well as his dialogue with Obadiah, the Jew). Thus, Glazemaker’s translation is different from Du Ryer’s because the two biographies, Muhammad’s ascension and the dialogue with the prophet Obadiah, were not included in the French version. *Mahomets Alkoran*, Glazemaker’s translation, begins with a “Voorreeden” and “Kort begrip” (Brief understanding).

---

85 This was not the first translation in Dutch. In 1641 an anonymous translation *De Arabische Alkoran* (The Arabic Quran) had been published in Hamburg and was based on the German translation by Solomon Schweiger which was a translation of the Latin translation from 1143.

86 The so-called *Book of a thousand questions* first published by Bibliander (1543) (Hamilton 2003: 116).
translations of the introductory texts “Au lecteur” and “Sommaire de la religion des Turcs”, generally believed to be by Du Ryer.\textsuperscript{87} Between the translation of the Quran and the texts added by Glazemaker there is an anonymous “Aan de lezer”.

The first biography of Muhammad included in \textit{Mahomets Alkoran} is written by the Coptic Christian historian, the Egyptian Ibn Al’Amid or George Elmacin (c. 1205-1273), and was drawn from his \textit{History of the Saracens} written in Arabic. Part of this history had been published in Arabic and Latin in Leiden in 1625. Glazemaker used the Latin version translated by the Dutch Orientalist Thomas van Erpe (1584-1625). The second biography was written by Christians as well, as can be inferred from the title: “Mahomets leven; uit verscheide Christe schrijvers getrokken” (Muhammad’s life; drawn from several Christian writers). The biography included a compilation of hostile descriptions by Rodrigo Jiménez (1170-1247) archbishop of Toledo, the Austrian humanist Joannes Cuspinianus (1473-1529), and the French Blaise de Vigenère (1523-1596) and Scipion Dupleix (Hamilton 2004: 115-6). According to Hamilton, the Dutch publication displayed an effort to place the work in a reliable and scholarly setting; Hamilton also argues that only in Holland did the Dutch translation fall into the hands of a public connected with the Enlightenment, contrary to the English and German translations. These affirmations seem to contradict an earlier statement in which Hamilton declares that the translation by Glazemaker was an elegant piece of prose intended for a public more interested in literature than in the study of the Islam (Hamilton 2004: 115-6).

The tone of the “Voorreeden” and the “Kort begrip” both translated from the French, is ambiguous. In the very first sentence Islam is ridiculed and scorned:

\textsuperscript{87} The “Au lectuer” and “Sommaire de la religion dés Turcs” are not signed but generally ascribed to Du Ryer.
Dit boek is een lang gesprek van God, van d’Engelen, en van Mahomet, ’t welk van deze valsche Profeet plompelijk genoegh bedacht is (“Voorreeden” Mahomets Alkoran [30]).

Or in French:

Ce Livre est une longue conference de Dieu, des Anges, & de Mahomet, que ce faux Prophete à inventée assez grossierement (“Au lecteur” L’Alcoran de Mahomet).

But angels are not unfamiliar to Christians either. When one takes into consideration Glazemaker’s ideas about the supernatural, the reference to angels, the ascensions to heaven and other fables, these create a distance with the reader and serve as a foil for the denial of miracles and the supernatural whether in Islam or in the Christian Church.

In the introductory text, in French as well as in Dutch, it is said that the Quran contains “fabelen”/“fables” that have been interpreted by scholarly Muslims but their explanation is “belachelijk”/“ridicule” because they state that the Quran was written on a table in Heaven and that Gabriel, the angel, took a copy to Muhammad who could not read nor write. The introduction ends with a warning that knowledge contained in the Quran is “verachtenswaerdig”/“mesprisable” (“Voorreeden”; “Au lecteur”). The hostile tone was probably a precaution because publishing the Quran in a vernacular language could involve certain dangers. It was most likely also the reason why Du Ryer claimed to have acted at the service of the French missionary movement. On the other hand, Du Ryer’s appointment as ambassador to the sultan and his access to Quranic commentaries imply the confidence of learned Muslims (Hamilton 2004: 94-6). Du Ryer is an ambiguous writer for after the “Au lecteur” his tone becomes less negative in the “Sommaire”.

87
The warning at the end of the “Voorreeden” and “Au lecteur” seems like a strange recommendation because the very beginning of the next part “Kort begrip” or “Sommaire de la religion des Turcs” begins with an assertion saying that the “Turken”/“Turcs” believe in a God who is almost the same as the God of the Christians:

De Turken geloven in een enig God, in een enig persoon, Schepper van hemel, en van aarde, Vergelder der goeden, en Straffer der quaden; die het Paradys geschapen heeft om de vromen te vergelden; en de hel voor d’uiterste straf der misdaden (“Kort begrip” Mahomet Alkoran [30]).

Les Turcs croyent un seul Dieu en une seule Personne, Createur du Ciel & de la Terre, Remunerateur des bons, & punisseur des mechans, qui a creé le Paradis pour recompenser les gens des bien, & l’Enfer pour la derniere punition des crimes (“Sommaire de la religion des Turcs” L’Alcoran de Mahomet).

The Unitarian affirmation “in een enig persoon” (in one person) must have pleased Glazemaker and Rieuwertsz as it fits into their Socinian sympathies. Further on we read:

Zy geloven niet dat Jesus Christus God, noch Gods Zoon is, en geloven ook niet in de heilige Drieëenheit (“Kort begrip” Mahomet Alkoran [30]).

Ils ne croyent pas que Iesus-Christ soit Dieu, ny Fils de Dieu ny ne croyent pas en la Sainte Trinité (“Sommaire de la religion des Turcs” L’Alcoran de Mahomet).

As Socinian writings were absolutely forbidden in the Republic this was an indirect way to propagate anti-Trinitarian ideas.

While in the first introductory text Islam was seen in a negative way, in the second text, the tone is different, more objective and even favourable. Muslim convents are presented as models and it is stressed that Muslims are obliged to give money to the poor. Du Ryer, however, was accused of not being very familiar with Islam because of
some unfortunate statements in his “Sommaire de la religion des Turcs” as he tries to translate Islamic concepts into Christian terms (Hamilton 2004: 94).

The Dutch translation of Du Ryer’s *L’Alcoran de Mahomet* ends on page 692, the next new page begins with an unsigned “Aan de lezer” ending with the words “vaar wel” but clearly written by Glazemaker. In this introduction to the second part of the book, Glazemaker explains that he thought it convenient to include some information on Muhammad, the author or “ontfanger” (receptor) of the text “vermits zy voorgeeven dat dit boek van de hemel gekomen is” (since they declare that this book came from heaven). Aware that friends and foes have written about Muhammad and that these accounts differ depending on each writer’s perspective, Glazemaker decided to include two biographies, one written by Elmacinus, whom he – mistakenly – takes for a Muslim and another biography from which he selected writings by Christian authors that he organised in chronological order. He is conscious that each writer gives a contradictory interpretation, but the conflicting accounts will allow the reader to form his own critical opinion. Glazemaker himself is not objective, as he mentions the “sporeloze dingen” (baseless things) Mahomet saw on his voyage to Jerusalem and to heaven. Similar to Du Ryer’s case, Glazemaker’s ambiguous and even hostile tone towards Islam may have been a way of safeguarding himself and the publisher from the authorities. However, Glazemaker is not afraid to offer his readers the translation of a proscribed book. We know he was not an advocate of Islam, but a radical thinker and as such he believed in freedom of thought and religion. According to Glazemaker, the reader should be able to form his own opinion and, therefore, he must have access to all kinds of information. Other creeds should be studied without prejudice. Nevertheless, this does not mean that
Glazemaker did not wish to challenge received doctrines, whatever faith they belonged to.

It was not an uncommon practice to bind together several different texts. Taking into account that the text “Aan de lezer” introduces the second part of the book and starts a new pagination, one is allowed to conclude that the addition of these texts was decided afterwards. Glazemaker was thus able to conveniently hide his unsigned opinion in the middle of the book: a practice done by the translator that was not new as we already observed in his Marcus Aurelius translation [29], published in the same year and with the same bookseller.

6.6 Travel Accounts

Besides philosophy and modern and ancient history, Glazemaker revealed an interest in travel accounts or descriptions of exotic countries (mostly in the Middle and Far East). He translated Mendes Pinto [13], Vincent le Blanc [15], Marco Polo (including Hayton of Armenia) [39], Pietro della Valle [40], Kircher [43], Beaulieu [46], Bourges [48], Olearius [49], [52], Herport [51], Saar [53] and Tavernier [63]. He also translated Pierre Moreau’s account about the fights between the Portuguese and the Dutch in Brazil, in which a description of the country and its inhabitants is given. Rycaut [50] and Rostagno [54] also describe in an indirect way distant regions.

The anonymous “Voorreden aan de Leezer” in *Markus Paulus Venetus Reisen en Beschryving der oostersche lantschappen* (The travels of Marco Polo from Venice and description of eastern regions, 1666) [39] is an apology of Marco Polo who was long considered an untruthful source. In the introduction it is stated that Marco Polo
made some mistakes, but on the whole, he is worth being read for some of the phenomena described turned out to be true after all. The same idea is already present in the title: “daar in hy naaukeurigelijk ... beschrift” (in which he accurately describes ...).

The introduction deals with the importance of travel accounts, citing ancient and modern voyagers, for example: Strabo (64/63 BCE-c. 23 CE), Álvaro Semedo (1585-1652), Martinus Martini (1614-1661), Van Linschoten (1653-1611) or François Caron (1600-1673). The abundant reference to ancient and modern travel writers or accounts of exotic regions reveals the anonymous author’s preference for uncanonical sources. Travel writers do not wish to confirm traditional writings, they seek to give accurate descriptions of what they witnessed. The “Voorreden”, and thus the book, begins with a long and cryptical paragraph, while the rest of the introduction was written in a clear, fluent language:

De gene die tot de studien geneegen zijn, kunnen zeer zwaarlijk eenigen lof, den oprechten loon van hunnen arbeyt, verkrijgen. Want d’oude wetenschappen heeft den yver onzer eerste Christenen te niet gedaan, overzulks en is daar van niet veel overig ‘t gene kan naar gevolgt worden; en van ‘t gene ons noch is gebleven, zijn de Theologie, Historien, Rechten, Medecijnen, Philosophie, tot zulken verachtinge gekomen, en die wetenschappen zo zeer vervallen, dat men de voornaamste oude Autheuren, die ons niet en zijn ontnomen, niet wel en kan verstaan, ik late staan naarvolgen in hun wonderlijke en uytnemende wijsheyt, waar door de resterende fraayste wetenschappen, met een grooten hoop ontijdige en onnutte geschillen zijn verdonkert en versmacht; daar toe hebben d’oude Godtsgeleerde, Origenes, Hieronymus, Augustinus, &c. zo veel, en zo wel geschreven, dat zy aan hunne nakomelingen niet gelaten en hebben, als den tydt om hun schriften wel te doorzien; ‘t zelfde mach met redenen ook gezegt worden van de oude Historischrijvers, die hunnen tyt en de manieren, alsdoen gebruykelijk, voegende by hun verstant en grooten arbeyt, vele treffelijke tekenen van de oude wijsheyt ons hebben naargelaten, ‘t gene nu onmogelijk zoude zijn om te konnen volbrengen; Gemerkt aan ons niet alleen en gebreekt
dien yver tot de wetenschappen, en ‘t groot verstant, maar ook de maniere van
die tijden, wanneer men gewoon was de geschiedennissen in Jaarboeken te
beschrijven, en van wegen de Hooge Overigheyt te bewaren; maar alzo die
gewoonte al ten tijden van den Historischrijver Dion Cassius is onderbleven, en
hy hem in zijne boeken daar over beklaagt, zo en is ‘t niet vreemt, dat men sedert
dien tijd weynige oprechte en goede Historien heeft gevonden, behalvens dat de
Monarchen en Koningen, zelfs aan hun Hovelingen ‘t geheym der zaken niet en
openbaren; het eenig dat’er noch overig is, zijn de verre-gelegen reysen, die
eenige personen hebben gedaan in landen, aan de Oude niet bekent, en waar van
de beschryvinge, en van ‘t genezy hebben gezien, hunnen naam heeft verbreydt
(“Voorreden aan de leezer” Polo, Markus Paulus Venetus Reisen [39]).

(Those who are inclined to study, scarcely obtain some glory, the honest merit
for their effort. Because the zeal of our first Christians largely destroyed the
ancient sciences, therefore, not much was left that can be imitated; that what
remained: Theology, History, Law, Medicine, Philosophy, was so disdained and
these sciences became so decayed, that we cannot understand well the most
important ancient authors of whom we were not deprived of, let alone imitate
them in their marvellous and excellent wisdom. Consequently the remaining and
most beautiful sciences were overshadowed and suffocated by a great number of
untimely and useless conflicts; furthermore, the old Doctors of the Church:
Origen, Jerome, Augustine, etc. wrote so much and so well that their descendants
spent the whole time studying their writings; the same can be said of the ancient
historians, who left us many outstanding proof of their ancient wisdom and their
epoch and manners, that were customary at that time, together with their reason
and great effort, which in the present would be impossible to improve;
considering that not only that scientific zeal and great intelligence is lacking us as
well as the traditions of those times when they had the custom of writing history
in yearbooks and keep them on account of the high authorities; but as this habit
already in Cassius Dio’s time was overturned, and he laments himself about it in
his books, it is not strange that since that time few honest and good histories were
found, except that the Monarchs and Kings do not reveal even to their courtiers
the secrets of their doings; the only thing that rests are the faraway travels that
some persons made in countries, not known to the Ancients, the descriptions of
what they have witnessed have spread their name.)
I have tried to translate the first paragraph of the “Voorreeden” in a less twisted style. In the writer’s opinion, early Christian zeal against paganism was the cause of the destruction of the ancient sciences and philosophy in favour of traditional sciences or scholastic Aristotelianism. According to the text, the Ancient culture that was transmitted to us was so corroded that it became impossible to understand the Ancient writers in their context. The statement is reminiscent of a similar attitude taken by Glazemaker in his Livy translation of 1646 [4] when he criticised the “Christian” deformation and the inclusion of missing passages by Lucius Annaeus Florus.

In another of his translations of Descartes, Glazemaker does not shun an outspoken critique of Aristotle’s authority:

en wie is er voor desen grooten man [Descartes] geweest, die beter, en verstandiger heeft geredenkavelt. Wat heeft doch Aristoteles, de Meester van Alexander de Groot gedaan: die mede niet anders trachte te doen, dan de Schriften op te koopen, die van betere gedachten waren als de zijne, en daar het merg uitgetrokken hebbende, liet hyse door het alverslindende vuur verbranden, vercierende alsoo zijn Schriften met ander mans veeren. Alsoo pronken vele Ezels-verstanden, met de geleertheid van anderen, en dat niet van oudts, maar zelfs ten huidigen dage (“Voor-reden” Descartes, R. Brieven (Letters), 1661 [32]).

(and who existed before this great man [Descartes], who has spoken better and more intelligently. Though what did Aristotle, Alexander’s mentor, do, besides try to acquire the writings, which contained better thoughts than his, and having drawn all the marrow from them, have them burned by the fire that devours everything, adorning thus his writings with borrowed plumes. Thus, many ass-wits parade with the erudition of others, and not only in ancient times, but even today.)

Was this attack inspired by Porphyry’s Life of Pythagoras in which Aristotle is accused of plagiarising Pythagoras whose writings have not survived (Grant 1857: 66n; Kofsky 2000: 260n)? It is a remarkable critique by a man who admires the Classics and
it gives us a more nuanced picture of his evaluation of the Ancient writers. Glazemaker criticises Aristotelian scholasticism but he favoured other Greek philosophers whom he translated. Aristotelian scholasticism or the reconciliation of Christian philosophy with classical philosophy, especially that of Aristotle, had been under attack since the fifteenth century. Thus, Glazemaker prefers the Stoic philosophers, as they identified God with the totality of universe and stressed the importance of reason in order to attain knowledge, ideas that were considered heretic.

In the “Voorreden aan de leezer” of *Markus Paulus Venetus Reisen*, the writer adds that the zealous Christian thinkers have obscured the “remainder” with their useless conflicts that were unproductive because the discussions were held under the control of royal, ecclesiastical and academic authorities that dominated the political, philosophical and scientific discourse. By “remainder” Glazemaker refers to the ancient sciences and philosophies which were not entirely destroyed, namely the Stoic philosophers, in opposition to Aristotelian scholasticism. The reference made to the Church Fathers and more recent historians must be read ironically because the author says that they wrote so well that nothing was left to be discussed or improved, implying that their writings were dogmatic and unproductive. It also includes a veiled critique on sovereigns who give no justification of their actions, excluding even their inner circle from their decisions.

“Kerkelijke schrijvers” (ecclesiastical writers) are also targeted, namely in Glazemaker’s “Bericht aan de lezer” (Word to the reader) of the *Romainsche historien* (Roman history) by Coeffeteau (1666) [41]:

die, de kerkelijke zaken ten breetsten uitmeetende, weinig geloof verdienen, vermits zy, van waangeloof ingenomen, veel beuzelingen verhalen, en daar
benefits zich zo eenzijdig betonen, dat men weinig vertrouwen op hun verhaal kan hebben (“Bericht aan de lezer” Coeffeteau, N. Romainsche historien [41]).

(who exaggerating ecclesiastical matters to the utmost extent, deserve little credit, for being assailed by superstition, they narrate many trifles, and also reveal themselves so biased that one can have little reliance on their story.)

Glazemaker is careful enough not to identify these “kerkelijke Schrijvers” but they can range from Church Fathers to any other ecclesiastical authority.

Returning to the “Voorreden” of Markus Paulus Venetus Reisen, the author informs that there is only one novelty: the travel accounts speak of the newly discovered regions, unknown to the ancient writers but also to those writing according to traditional belief and authority. They are sources for the study of nature in its various dimensions. Travel accounts escaped the control of the authorities, they described what their authors had witnessed. What they had seen challenged the beliefs of Western’s sacred history and political thought and could not be reconciled with biblical authority. The intricacies of the East were especially connected with the intricacies of radical thought (Weststeijn 2007: 538). Describing new people, their customs, beliefs, history, language and political organization was the only way to get around the censorship imposed by the authorities, and to acquaint an eager and curious public with unsanctioned new perspectives.

It is not surprising that the “Voorreden” ends with the question of the chronology of the world, another hot topic at that moment:

… hun Historien zijn zo oudt, dat Mendoza getuygt, dat Zy hun Geschiedenissen brengen van over de negentig duyzent jaren, welk getal Martinus Martini, in zijn eerste deel der Chineesche Historien noch al verre te boven gaat, en seyt dat Zy wyder rekenen als d’Egiptenaars, of Chaldeen, en zeer vast op hun Jaarboeken blijven staan. Wat daar van is of niet, dat staat vast, dat hun Historien beginnen 2952. jaar voor Christus geboorte, als by de voorsz Martinus Martini te zien is;
en hun Tale, volgens Alvaro Semedo, is oudt over de 3700 jaren, zonder eenige
veranderinge (“Voorreden aan de lezer” Polo, Markus Paulus Venetus Reisen
[39]).

(… their History is so old, that Mendoza testifies that their histories go back
more than ninety thousand years, a number which Martino Martini surpasses
considerably in the first part of his Chinese History by stating that they date
further back than the Egyptians, or Chaldeans, and stick to their Yearbooks. Be
that as it may, what is certain is that their History starts 2952 years before
Christ’s birth, as one can observe in the aforementioned Martino Martini; and
their language, according to Alvaro Semedo, is more than 3700 years old,
without having suffered any changes.)

The last quotation alludes to an ongoing debate about the biblical account of
world history. In 1655, Prae Adamitae by Isaac La Peyrère had been published
anonymously in Amsterdam. It was an alternative to the biblical account of world
history and stated that “pre-Adamites”, humans who had not been touched by original
sin or the Flood, had populated the world before Adam. La Peyrère concluded that the
Bible dealt only with Jewish history and was only of local historical value.

Even Catholic missionaries could no longer ignore Chinese historiography. In
1584 the Spanish Augustinian Juan de Mendoza dated the first Chinese monarch from
2550 or 2600 BCE (Kley: 1971: 362). In 1658, the Italian Jesuit Martino Martini (1614-
1661) informed that Chinese history began in 2952 BCE, six centuries before the Flood
according to the Vulgate (2350 BCE), in which all the people on earth except Noah and
his family were drowned and after which no archaeological monuments survived.88 The
Portuguese Jesuit Álvaro Semedo’s (1586-1658) estimate of the antiquity of the Chinese
language did not fit biblical accounts either. Chronologists found it more and more
impossible to operate within the constraints of the Bible. Especially since in Chinese

88 Martini shifted to the chronology of the Septuagint, which stated the Flood had occured in 3617 BCE.
historiography there was no indication of a universal flood. Martini was certain that “outermost Asia was inhabited before the deluge” (Kley 1971: 363). From a radical perspective this meant that the Bible could not be interpreted literally and this information – consciously or not, as the authors were mostly Catholic missionaries – turned out to be an attempt to undermine biblical authority. Isaac Vossius (1618-1689) philologist, libertine atheist and a friend of Spinoza’s, preferred the Chinese annals over traditional biblical chronology. From the end of the 1650s throughout the next decennium, Vossius’ discussion with the Leiden professor of philosophy Georg Hornius (1620-1670) kept the minds engaged over how to reconcile the Chinese annals with biblical authority and Christian sacred history. Notably, it is during this period that most of Glazemaker’s translations of travel accounts in the East are published.

Another ongoing search was for the origin of language. The origin of the diverse languages was long believed to be monogenetic: according to the Bible, the diversity of languages was a consequence of the erecting of the Tower of Babel, having the Hebraic language been the first language, a divine language, given by God to Adam (Eco 1996: 82-83, 88). La Peyrère’s pre-Adamite theory and the findings on the antiquity of Chinese culture and language conflicted with these traditional ideas (Eco 1996: 95). Due to its antiquity and to its ideograms, that permitted communication between different Asian languages, it was thought that Chinese could even be very close to the lost primitive language.

The same year *Markus Paulus Venetus Reisen* was published, another travel account translated by Glazemaker was published. The unsigned “Aan de leser” of this
account by Pietro della Valle [40] is undoubtedly written by the translator. In it is stated that travelling to distant new regions brings “kennis, ... van veel heilsame dingen, de welken in onz lant onbekent zijn” (knowledge, ... of many beneficial things, that are unknown in our country), and great developments in science are visible by observing “de zeden en handelingen der volken, die de vreemde landen bewonen” (the manners and activities of the peoples, who inhabit foreign countries). By science we should understand geography, physics, history, philosophy. Though not explicitly mentioned by Glazemaker, knowledge gained from observation and verification in distant places and cultures proved to be more pertinent than preconceived ideas. Traveller accounts allowed the readers to move from the field of geographical discovery into philosophical discovery, a shift that was dreaded by authorities, the Church and conservative philosophers. A reference is made to the debate between those who favoured travelling and its consequences, and:

Anderen ... die voor wijze Staatkundigen gehouden willen zijn, hebben zeer strengelijk aan hun burgers, en voornamelijk aan de jonge lieden, verboden lange reizen buiten hun lant te doen, om dat zy vreesden dat zy door de handel en ommegang met de vreemdelingen eerder nieuwe gebreken, dan nieuwe deuchden zouden verkrijgen (“Aan de leser” Valle, P. della, De volkome beschrijving der voortreffelijcke reizen (The complete description of the outstanding travels), 1666 [40]).

(Others ... who want to be taken for wise politicians, have strictly forbidden their citizens, especially younger people, to make long travels outside their own countries, because they feared that through the trade and contact with strangers, they would acquire more new vices than new virtues.)

Some politicians considered travelling as morally corrupting. Glazemaker continues by affirming that he does not want to judge in an important issue such as the

89 The author mentions that he intends to translate Della Valle's complete work soon.
advantages and disadvantages of travelling. But, by qualifying politicians “who want to be taken for wise” the reader knows that they want to be taken for what they are not: wise. Indirectly and without apparently taking sides, Glazemaker has to legitimate this translation (and his other translations of travel accounts). He most certainly favours travelling, a necessary condition for the existence of travel accounts. Glazemaker explains that Della Valle’s annotations enable the readers to become familiar with useful and beneficial knowledge encountered in distant regions without running the dangers the traveller experienced, thus answering those whose argument against travelling was the danger it involved. Travel accounts allowed the reader to stay comfortably at home.

Glazemaker avoids clarifying or discussing the corrupting aspect of travelling. Instead, the author’s accurateness and truthfulness are constantly stressed and these are the qualities that place Della Valle above any criticism: what he has observed and described with precision is authentic. The reader can trust Della Valle because Glazemaker praises the author/traveller’s moral qualities, his honesty, accurateness and generosity. Glazemaker is sure that those who condemn travelling will not criticise the publication of the truthful and precise descriptions of all remarkable circumstances Della Valle observed in person. What matters is the truthfulness of experience which is more important than the dogmas and beliefs until now held. It is an indirect form to legitimise travelling, and as a result, legitimating Glazemaker’s translation.

The opinions expressed in the precautiously unsigned “Voorreden”, in *Markus Paulus Venetus Reisen* [39] compared to those expressed in other liminary texts by Glazemaker make me ascribe to him this anonymous “Voorreden”. Apart from the first obscure paragraph the style resembles his manner. However, the contents of this
paragraph are very close to ideas expressed by Glazemaker on other occasions. His preference for new sources, in which the existence of China’s civilization could be used as an argument against traditional thinking, is shown once more with his translation of *China illustrata* [43] by the German Jesuit Athanasius Kircher (c. 1601-1680) in 1668. In this piece, Japanese Buddhism, Indian Brahmanism and Confucianism are described (Weststeijn 2007: 552).

Rieuwertsz, the publisher, is usually presented as an unorthodox thinker, willing to take risks but also as a cunning publisher eager to make some profit. The latter explains his interest in publishing travel accounts for they were financially lucrative, and they satisfied the readers’ curiosity for breathtaking and exciting adventures. However, there was a second reason, usually overlooked, that had more to do with Glazemaker’s and his own ideological agenda, as the accounts also described natural and man made phenomena that challenged conventional ideas. There is no doubt that philosophers such as Spinoza, Leibniz or Locke were particularly fascinated with Chinese philosophy.

6.7 TRANSLATIONS ON CONTEMPORARY HISTORY AND POLITICS

Glazemaker’s aim as a translator is to grant the Dutch bourgeoisie access to works that until then could only be read by an elite that knew Latin or French. From his first translation *De deugdelyke vrouw* on, he was a supporter of egalitarianism and emancipation. His translations of several works on ancient, as well as contemporary
history, confirm this tendency.\(^{90}\) In his opinion, the reading public can learn from past events and from the actions perpetrated by politicians and sovereigns, whatever their religion, because they serve as a mirror to us.

There are five translations that specifically deal with politics. These are works by Lipsius [26], Boxhorn [45], De la Haye [47]\(^{91}\) and Spinoza [60], [68].

The study by De Bom focuses on Glazemaker’s translation of *Monita et exempla politica* (1605) by Justus Lipsius (1547-1606) entitled *Staatkundige vermaningen en voorbeelden* (1657) [26]. It is meant as a mirror for princes (De Bom 2008: 210-226).\(^{92}\) While Lipsius’ book was written as a piece of advice for a monarch, it is remarkable that it is no mere theoretical contemplation, but a practical manual for rulers, filled with historical cases, a real political schooling. Quite unlike Lipsius, who dedicated the book to Archduke Albert VII (1559-1621) sovereign of the Southern Netherlands, Glazemaker considered Lipsius’ work useful to his common readers whom he considered should be involved in contemporary politics.

In 1669, *Disquisitiones politicae, of Overwegingen van staat en bestiering* (Disquisitiones politicae or considerations on state and governance) [45] by M. Z. van

---

\(^{90}\) On contemporary history Glazemaker translated: *Het treurtoonneel der doorluchtige mannen* (Tragedy of the outstanding men of our century) [8], Pierre Moreau’s account on the conflict between Portuguese and Dutch in Brazil [12] and Aitzema’s history of the Dutch peace treaty in 1648 [14]. I have dealt with Glazemaker’s translation of Ancient history in Part I, section 6.4.

\(^{91}\) On De la Haye’s book or translation, I did not find any information except that he had been a French ambassador to the Doge. The French original was published in 1668 under the title *La politique civile et militaire des Venetiens* (Paris: Charles de Sercy), the book was translated into English as *The Policy and Government of the Venetians* (London: John Starkey, 1671). De Bom mentions an earlier edition in French published in Cologne, 1666 (De Bom 2008: 215).

\(^{92}\) Glazemaker was familiar with Lipsius’ work. His translations of Seneca [16], [28] and Epictetus [29] had introductions by Lipsius. During his life Lipsius travelled to Italy where he began his philological study of Seneca and was appointed secretary to Cardinal Granvelle. He finished his major edition of Seneca’s philosophical writings in 1605. It was his aim to present a didactic edition. He returned to the North and lectured at the Calvinist university of Leiden and in Jena and spent some time in Vienna at Maximillian’s court. Due to the bitter controversies that arose from the publication of his *Politica*, Lipsius decided to return to the Catholic Southern Low Countries where he re-embraced the Catholic faith and lectured in Leuven where he died.
Boxhorn was presented. Boxhorn’s book is not a mere theoretical treatise; it is illustrated with many concrete examples of cases and is thus more comprehensible. Boxhorn (1612-1653) was a Dutch classicist who wrote several books on (contemporary) Dutch history too. Regarding statesmanship, Boxhorn claims that in the case of political capability, ancestry is of less importance than virtue. The far-reaching consequence of this claim was that in theory everyone could have access to office (Hartman 2009: 12).

Glazemaker makes it clear in his introduction to the *Disquisitiones politicae* that his translation is not aimed only at rulers, but is to be read by all citizens, as all are directly or indirectly involved in government (De Bom 2008: 216-217). He reveals quite a democratic conception of government and believes it should not be carried out by one ruler but by a group, which in turn is controlled by the general public. Using nautical metaphors for the government of the ship of state Glazemaker says:

*De bezondere en onbeampte lieden hebben mijns oordeels, ook geen reden om zich buiten de kennis en wetenschap van deze Staatsbestiering te houden, en zich daar van uit te sluiten, dewijl hen, in ’t gemeen schip zijnde vry staat, ja hun plicht is, om, gelijk men zegt, een oog in ’t zeil te houden (“Voorreeden” Boxhorn, M. Z., *Disquisitiones politicae* [45]).

(According to my judgement, the persons who exercise a function or those who do not, have no reason to maintain themselves secluded from the knowledge and science of government, and to exclude themselves from them, because those who are embarked on the joint ship are free, yes, it is their duty, as we say, to keep one’s weather eye open.)

If Boxhorn’s message was that everyone could have access to public office then Glazemaker’s translation into the vernacular is in fact an effort to transmit this message to the general public.
Glazemaker’s most radical political translations are of Spinoza. The *Tractatus politicus* or *Staatkundige verhandeling* (Political treatise) included in the anonymous *De nagelate schriften* was published in 1677 immediately after Spinoza’s death. However, the *Tractatus politicus* was left unfinished, Spinoza had only written the chapters on monarchy and aristocracy when he died (Nadler 2011: 196).

Only in 1693, after Glazemaker and Rieuwertsz’s deaths, the *Tractatus theologico-politicus* was published anonymously as *De rechtzinnige theologant*. It had probably been translated more than twenty years earlier, because there is evidence of it in a letter by Spinoza to Jarig Jelles, dated 17 February 1671. In this letter, the philosopher urges Jelles to prevent the Dutch translation of his *Tractatus theologico-politicus* from being published. Though the long introduction was written by Jarig Jelles, Glazemaker, the translator, would not have risked his own freedom if he did not agree on the importance of this book’s publication in Dutch. Glazemaker is assumed to be the translator of the *Tractatus theologico-politicus* given the evidence in *Vervolg van ’t leven van Philopater*. It was a book “forged in hell” as Willem Blijenbergh wrote in 1674 while referring to the *Tractatus theologico-politicus* (Nadler 2005: 376). Written at the end of the 1660s, in a time of political upheaval in the Republic, Spinoza favoured a true separation of church and state, and ranks the democratic republic above monarchy and aristocracy as the best type of governance. In a democracy, liberty is

---

93 Glazemaker probably used older translations or passages by Bouwmeester or Simon de Vries for his translation of *De nagelate schriften*. It is likely that he was assisted by others (Thijssen-Schoute 1967: 253).


95 In fact, in 1674 the *Tractatus theologico-politicus* was forbidden (Thijssen-Schoute 1967: 260).

enhanced in that one is consulted, and can participate through debate, whatever one’s social status may be (Israel 2001: 260).
7. GLAZEMAKER’S ROLE IN THE RADICAL NETWORK

We have already mentioned that it was Glazemaker who decided which sources he would use for his *Romainsche historien van Titus Livius* [4]. It became clear from this case that he was not a submissive translator who limited his work to the text he was asked to translate. Jan Jacobsz Schipper, the publisher, must have suffered some loss when Glazemaker decided to make a whole new translation.

When Glazemaker translated Seneca and Epictetus, published in 1654 [16], 1658 [28], [29] and 1661 [35], he followed the order of the texts proposed by Justus Lipsius in his standard Latin editions. Lipsius’ didactical aim was to provide a new edition not only reliable philologically, but especially an edition that would be easy to read for his public: a concise introduction and clear notes instead of an outpouring of philological material for specialists. Glazemaker extends the readership of Lipsius’ general but Latin reading public, to the common public. In his translation of Boxhorn, Glazemaker decided to restructure the examples given in the source text (De Bom 2008: 216).

From the above it becomes clear that Glazemaker, having in mind his public, often carefully determined which edition was to be his source text. It is evident that this choice was also made in accordance with or at the suggestion of the publisher, who had to finance the project. Visser found a letter, dated 1 April 1672, written by Rieuwertsz to Anthony van Dale (1638-1708), Collegiant, Spinozist and one of the leading medical men in Haarlem, from which it becomes clear that Glazemaker was the editor of an anonymous pamphlet:97

97 It is no coincidence that it was in this period that Glazemaker translated three political works: by Boxhorn, De la Haye and Spinoza. The end of the 1660s and beginning of the 1670s were politically
'tis zulks dat Ik en Pieter Arents onderhanden hebben 'tgeen gepasseert is ontrent de triple Alliantie en Jan Hendriks glazemaker heeft dit uit Aitsema daar het hier en daar staat in ordre uitgetrokken en een werk van gemaakt dat malkander volght … maar alzo Aitsema niet langer als tot het jaar 1668 schrijft … zo kan glazemaker niet wel een aaneenknoping maken tot deze tijd toe om het werk als een Historie uit te geven … alzo ghij met Abraham Casteleijn groot vrient zijt die heeft light iets dat ons kon dienen. (Visser 1996: 16)

(the project Pieter Arents and I have in our hands is about what happened at the Triple Alliantie, and Jan Hendriks Glazemaker has already extracted materials here and there from Aitsema, has organized them and composed a work in a logical sequence … but as Aitsema does not go beyond the year 1668 … Glazemaker cannot connect it to the present time in order to publish the work as a history … as you are a good friend of Abraham Casteleijn’s, he might have something that could be useful to us.)

According to this letter, Glazemaker was engaged in the edition of a political pamphlet on the recent events in the Republic. The purpose of the letter is to ask if Van Dale can contact his friend Abraham Casteleijn, founder of Weeckelijcke Courante van Europa (Weekly Journal of Europe), in order to obtain material for Pieter Arentsz and him, the other publisher’s project. From the letter it becomes clear that Glazemaker was working on a pamphlet about the events that dealt with the Triple Alliantie (1668) and its consequences.  

98 He had used Aitzema as a source, but Aitzema’s Historie of verhael turbulent times in the Republic. The Stadhouderless era, or Ware Vrijheid, ended in 1672 with the assassination of Johan de Witt. See also Part I, section 1.1.

98 Louis XIV of France wanted to expand his empire to the Southern Netherlands under Spanish domination. Thus, in 1667 the French troops enter the Southern Netherlands. The Triple Alliantie was an armed coalition between the Republic, England and Sweden, formed to mediate between France and Spain. Raadpensionaris De Witt wanted to avoid a conflict with France but the different views as how to deal with France and Spain developed into a serious tension between De Witt and the city of Amsterdam because an alliance with Spain would be more convenient for Dutch merchants, as most of them were settled in Amsterdam (Israel 1995: 780-781). In June 1672 the French march into the Republic marking the beginning of the Franco-Dutch War (1672-1678). De Witt is blamed for this failure and he and his brother were (falsily) accused by the Orangists, who opposed De Witt's republican regime, of plotting William III’s death. At the same time, William was appointed stadhouder. De Witt and his brother were lynched by the mob. The events mark the end of the First Stadtholderless Period, or period of Ware Vrijheid. See Part I, 1.1.
van saken van staet en oorlogh (History or story of the affairs of state and war) ends in 1669 and Glazemaker wanted to include more recent information. Aitzema was not a new source for Glazemaker because in 1653 he had already translated another work by Aitzema: *Verhael van de Nederlandsche vreede handeling* (History of the Dutch peace treaty) [14]. Like most of Glazemaker’s sources, Lieuwe Aitzema (1600-1669) was controversial. He was a Dutch historian, diplomat, libertine and spy, who had lived for many years in the towns of the Hanseatic League and had access to confidential documents. His *Herstelde leeuw* (Restored lion) had been banned by the States of Holland owing to the sensitive information it contained (Frijhoff 1999: 277-278). He was also rumoured to be an “atheist” (Israel 2006a: 165). His books on the recent history of the Republic reveal a critical perspective. Aitzema used an enormous amount of source material and presented different points of view. His books also contained an account of the current public debate on issues such as the best form of government, the relationship between church and state – in Aitzema’s opinion the state had sovereignty over the church – and whether or not to opt for peace with Spain. Unlike most historians and politicians, he considered the Dutch Revolt against the Spanish dominion a terrible civil war, a struggle for power in which religion was used to achieve political objectives. He did not share the common Dutch opinion that considered the Revolt a religious war or a struggle for independence. Aitzema wondered if a Christian could wage war and he revealed to be very tolerant, especially regarding the Catholics (Plaat 2003: 255-258).

Glazemaker’s pamphlet was published anonymously in 1673 with the title: *Verhael van Staet-saken, vertonende d’oprechtingh van de Triple Alliantie* (History of state affairs, explaining the formation of the Triple Alliance) (Visser 1996: 57). This
means that we know of at least one work for which Glazemaker was responsible as editor or perhaps author, and which he did not merely translate. The political contents of the work apparently justified the anonymous character of the pamphlet.

The fact that Glazemaker was actively involved in the publication and distribution of radical ideas is upheld in an article written by Klever. One of the arguments Klever uses to try to identify the anonymous addressee of Spinoza’s “Letter 84” is the above-mentioned correspondence between Rieuwertsz and Antony van Dale. 99 Rieuwertsz’s words to Van Dale shed a light on Glazemaker’s role in his publishing enterprise, especially if we are aware that Rieuwertsz did not know Latin, which makes Klever affirm that “he [Glazemaker] must always have been involved in planning activities, the negotiations with authors and the preparation of manuscripts for the press” (Klever 2007: 29, underlining by Klever).

The editors used the letter by Spinoza to preface the unfinished *Tractatus politicus* which he had started to write in 1675 and which was published by Rieuwertsz immediately after the philosopher’s death in 1677. 100 The short letter originally written in Latin also appeared in Glazemaker’s translation of the *Tractatus politicus* under the title *Staatkundige verhandeling*. The letter, which is not dated, is determined by Klever to be from around 1675 (Klever 2007: 28-30).

The form of address in Spinoza’s letter, “amice dilecte”, as well as the style indicate that it was directed at an intimate friend with whom the philosopher must have been on equal footing for quite some time and who was familiar with Spinoza’s recent

---


100 The *Tractatus politicus* was included in the *Opera posthuma*. 
activities. We know that Glazemaker had been a longtime friend of the philosopher. After his father’s death, Jan Rieuwertsz, the Younger was interviewed by a German traveller, Gotlieb Stolle, who wanted to collect information on Spinoza. He told Stolle that the persons with whom Spinoza chiefly associated with in Amsterdam after his expulsion from the synagogue in 1656 were his father, Van den Enden, Glazemaker, Jarig Jelles and Pieter Balling (Meinsma 1896: Bijlage 5, p.6; Israel 2001: 170).  

The already cited Danish traveller Olaus Borch mentions in the early 1660s that Van den Enden, together with Glazemaker and Rieuwertsz were members of a group that discussed philosophy and collaborated with Spinoza. These men, as Borch says, understood by God nothing else than the whole universe. From Borch’s notes we may conclude that these men were very close to Spinoza’s ideas.

But apart from their relation between author and translator, Spinoza and Glazemaker shared other common interests that might have brought them together earlier. We know Spinoza possessed Glazemaker’s translation of Seneca’s letters Alle de brieven, 1654 [16], and that he was influenced by the Stoic philosophers. It is likely that he had acquired the book before or at the time of his excommunication in 1656, at the time of his acquaintance with Van den Enden (Boas 1919: 16-17). Meinsma suggests that Spinoza’s knowledge of Descartes could stem from Glazemaker’s translations from 1657 onwards (Meinsma 1896: 220, note 5).  

It is not unlikely that Spinoza frequented Rieuwertsz’s bookshop in order to participate in the discussions on Descartes’ philosophy.

---

101 In 1675, the year Klever dates the letter, Van den Enden and Balling had already died, and Rieuwertsz did not know Latin. It means that they could not be the addressees of the letter.

The other common interest between Glazemaker and Spinoza was the latter’s lens-grinding. As a glazier, Glazemaker was familiar with the techniques of glass making, the different kinds of glass, the instruments needed and where to find them. Apart from this, Glazemaker had translated Descartes’ *La dioptrique* in 1659 [31]. Gullan-Whur speculates that Glazemaker very likely advised Spinoza because in 1661 the philosopher was observed “to occupy himself with the constructions of telescopes and microscopes” (Ghullan-Whur 2000: 114).

Revisiting “Letter 84”, in it Spinoza mentions that he is busy with a new treatise about every kind of political system and its mechanisms. He had already finished the first six chapters, each of which he summarises in a few words, and then mentions his next chapter. Unfortunately, Spinoza died before he could finish the *Tractatus politicus*. Referring to this enterprise, Spinoza writes in his letter:

… if I were not engaged in a certain matter which I believe to be more important, and which I think will be more to your liking, namely, in composing a Political Treatise, which I began some time ago at your suggestion.103

If Klever is correct in identifying the recipient as being Glazemaker, than we are dealing with a freethinker who was very close to Spinoza. This idea is strengthened by the impression we get from Glazemaker through the heterodox opinions expressed in the forewords of his translations. The letter reveals that both men discussed radical philosophical matters together and that the addressee of the letter had spurred Spinoza to write a political treatise. It also reveals that the treatise would be of the recipient’s liking. The always cautious Spinoza considered his “amice dilecte” a trustworthy and intelligent interlocutor.

103 Translation by Klever (2007: 30). The original text reads: “non praetermitterem, nisi in quadem re essem occupatus, quam utiliorem judico, quaque tibi, ut credo, magis arridebit, nempe in Tractatu Politico concinnando, quem ante aliquod tempus, te auctore,”
From what we have analysed, it is clear that Glazemaker was not a compliant translator but a dynamic freethinking intellectual, whose translations – the choice of his sources, composition of the publications and manner of translating – corresponded to his philosophical and political views. He is a translator because he feels the urge to disseminate new ideas. His cultural project had a strong political and ideological dimension. These new ideas, their essence, can be transmitted in any language. This attitude permits him to break away from the dominance of a stricter conception of translating in the Dutch seventeenth century: the literalist tradition. Though he rarely speaks about his translations, the translational process that takes place between the source and target text does not provoke a feeling of loss in him, the process of translating is never put into question.

Related to his ideological agenda is the fact that Glazemaker translates in a purist manner. It is his mission to transmit information to his fellow citizens, common people without knowledge of Latin or French. Therefore, he must find Dutch equivalents for Latin or French expressions his readers were not familiar with. Glazemaker is part of a period in which the vernacular language and culture have become more self-confident and assertive, pertaining to an urban class of artisans, teachers, shopkeepers, merchants and manufacturers in ascension. Behind the scenes, Glazemaker was an essential joint in the radical network. Within three decades he had evolved from a devout Anabaptist into a radical freethinker.
Two boys and a Portuguese immediately entered the water in order to grab a barrel that had been thrown at them from the ship. But before they had grabbed it, they were swallowed up by three crocodiles; we did not see anything of their bodies other than the blood that tainted the water.
PART II

WONDERLYKE REIZEN
1. Fernão Mendes Pinto’s *Peregrinaçam*

In 1614 a book was published in Lisbon with the following text on its frontispiece:

*Peregrinaçam*

**DE FERNAM MENDEZ PINTO.**

*EM QVE DA CONTA DE MUYTAS E MUYTO estranhas cousas que vio & ouuiu no reyno da China, no da Tartaria, no de Sornau, que vulgarmente se chama Sião, no do Calaminnhan, no de Pegu, no de Martauão, & em outros muytos reynos & senhories das partes Orientais, de que nestas nossas do Occidente ha muyto pouca ou nenhüa noticia.*

*E TAMBEM DA CONTA DE MUYTOS CASOS PARTICULARES que acontecerão assi a elle como a outras muytas pessoas. E no fim della trata brevemente de algüas cousas, & da morte do Santo Padre mestre Francisco Xauier, vnica luz & resplandor daquellas partes do Oriente, & Reytor nellas vniuersal da Companhia de Iesus.*

Escríta pelo mesmo Fernão Mendez Pinto.

*Dirigido à Catholica Real Magestade del Rey dom Felippe o III. deste nome nosso Senhor.*

*Com licença do Santo Offício, Ordinário, & Paço.*


The book, a folio in 8s format, consists of 226 chapters divided over 303 pages, folia recto and verso, counting 606 pages.\(^{104}\) The folio size indicates that this was an

\(^{104}\) The book was printed as a folio (two leaves per full sheet), but bound in gatherings of eight leaves each (Information retrieved on 24 January 2012 from *Wikipedia* on “Book size”).
expensive book and aimed at a public who could afford it. The author of this book, Fernão Mendes Pinto, had died more than thirty years earlier in 1583. He was born in a poor family, in Montemor-o-Velho c. 1510. In 1537 he set sail from Lisbon to the East to seek his fortune, only to return in 1558. He befriended Saint Francis Xavier,\(^{105}\) to whom he lent money to build the first Christian church in Japan (Catz 1983: 132, note 2, doc. 1.), and for a short time he joined the Society of Jesus but was dispensed from the order on his own request.

The aim of the Portuguese expansion politics was economic as well as religious, and the voyages to new regions were seen as crusades. Missionaries were sent together along with soldiers and merchants with the task of converting the gentiles.

A short time after Mendes Pinto’s separation from the Society of Jesus he returned to Portugal. He was already famous in Western Europe as the author of a letter that had been published by the Society in 1555.\(^{106}\) Back in Portugal, where he was refused a reward by the royal court, he settled near Almada, got married and had at least two daughters. In 1569 he started to write the account of his voyages in the Orient. The years during which he wrote down his account were years of political turbulence in Portugal, culminating in 1580 with Philip II of Spain claiming the Portuguese crown after the death of King Sebastian in North Africa during his failed crusade against Islam. Mendes Pinto’s century was a period of religious intolerance. In 1492 the Alhambra decree ordered the expulsion of all Jews and Muslims from Spain who did not convert to Christianity. Five years later, Jews were expelled from Portugal too.

\(^{105}\) Francis Xavier is a Catholic saint. He was born in Xavier (Navarra) in 1506 and, together with Ignatius of Loyola, founded the Society of Jesus. He was appointed by Dom João III of Portugal to take charge as an Apostolic Nuncio in the East Indies. His missionary work took him to India, China, Japan and other areas in Asia that had not been visited by Christian missionaries before. He died in China in 1542.

\(^{106}\) Apart from his book, Mendes Pinto is the author of two letters written in the Orient that were published during his life (Catz 1983: 38-45, 59-65).
among them many refugees from Spain. In 1536 Dom João III formally established the
Inquisition in Portugal, which was expanded to Goa in 1560. Its main target was the
persecution of *conversos* or New Christians. It was also the period of the Counter-
Reformation.

Mendes Pinto died in 1583 and Francisco de Andrade, the royal chronicler, was
assigned the task of preparing Mendes Pinto’s manuscript for publication. We do not
know why it was published more than thirty years after the author’s death nor to what
degree the manuscript suffered manipulations. After the first edition of *Peregrinação* in
1614, the book was reprinted in Portugal in 1678.

Before the *editio princeps*, manuscripts of *Peregrinação*, as well as, drafts of
Mendes Pinto’s interview to Giovanni Maffei in 1582 had already circulated in Europe
and were incorporated by other authors writing about the Orient, especially the parts
dealing with Saint Francis Xavier (Oliveira 2003: 1330-31; 2010: 271-297; Catz 1983:
doc. 22).\(^{107}\) Laborinho mentions the existence of a Latin manuscript of *Peregrinação*
(Laborinho 2007: 100-106). During the seventeenth century, the book was translated
into Spanish, French, Dutch, English and German. When Glazemaker and Rieuwertsz
decided to translate the book, *Peregrinação* was already famous due to the success of
the Spanish and French translations.

*Peregrinação* is the story of an anonymous first person narrator, who travels
throughout the East, including the Persian Gulf, India, Indochina, Malacca, Sumatra,
China and Japan, where he suffers many tribulations, hardships, imprisonments and
shipwrecks. The narrator’s character adopts different personae: he appears as a prisoner,

\(^{107}\) In *Peregrinação* data and descriptions were taken from many other texts and most probably oral
information was incorporated as well. Two of Mendes Pinto’s most important sources were Gaspar da
Cruz and João de Barros. Most of what he wrote was the author’s imagination and his first hand
slave, servant, pirate, shipwrecked, beggar, soldier, sailor and envoy. Although he embarks seeking material fortune at whatever cost, it is also a spiritual journey. However, the world of overseas commerce turns out to be one of violence and treason. Fate is capricious and one moment the ship is heavily loaded with (mostly stolen) treasures, while the next moment the narrator is almost starving to death. The reader is left with the impression that Mendes Pinto comes back penniless but certainly a more experienced man than when he departed, his ideals being spiritual. Accordingly, the title of his book refers to the Christian idea of worldly life as a pilgrimage and as a path of gradual purification to the afterlife of the blessed in heaven. The episodes in which Mendes Pinto’s persona accompanies Saint Frances Xavier at the end of the book counterbalance those at the beginning in which he served the Portuguese corsair Antonio de Faria.

The book is a vivid description of what Mendes Pinto and other Portuguese travellers witnessed in the East. The adventures the first person narrator describes are a compilation of what Mendes Pinto or other Portuguese adventurers experienced. It is a book for all tastes thanks to its enormous variety. The reader can obtain information and knowledge on geography, history, religion, architecture, warfare, trade, politics, and different mores and habits transmitted in subtle layers over the course of the book in which fact and fiction are ingeniously interwoven. Peregrinaçam is in part a historical work, but also a satire and a critique of Portuguese expansionist politics. It reveals the ambivalent behaviour of the Portuguese colonisers. In his text, Mendes Pinto has the others, mainly Asians, say what he wanted to criticise but was not allowed to reveal.

The book attracted the readers’ attention, it was an exciting story and it described experiences and phenomena that were wonderful, that were never heard of or
seen before. The author soon became contested on the veracity of his work. Even in the early twentieth century his work was still mainly analysed on the grounds of incongruities and “errors” (Alves 2010: 12-15). From the 1940s onwards, the positivist historiographical reading declined and gave rise to more literary interpretations. The narrator, Mendes Pinto, was seen as an anti-hero, a pícaro (Saraiva 1958, 1961), Peregrinaçam was interpreted as a satire, an anti-crusade condemning Portuguese soldiers and missionaries (Catz 1981). After the 1980s, different schools of literary interpretation have emerged followed by the appearance of diverse historiographical views. Peregrinaçam was important for the information it contained for Asian studies. The highlight was the publication of the richly annotated English translation by Rebecca Catz in 1989 (Alves 2010 vol. I: 12-14). In 1991 a French translation by Robert Viale was published, followed by a Dutch translation by Arie Pos in 1992. In 1999 a Chinese translation by Jin Guo Ping was published. Presently, the avalanche of information transmitted by Pinto is being analysed by specialists from different fields and different backgrounds (Alves 2010 vol. I: 17). The book continues to baffle readers and scholars: in October 2005 an international seminar on Fernão Mendes Pinto took place at the Arrábida Monastery, resulting in the edition of the restored Portuguese text, notes, indexes and studies directed by J. Santos Alves and published in 2010.

---

108 Not mentioned are the translations before 1989. For Portuguese editions, translations and adaptations see Laborinho (2007).
1.1 Other Seventeenth Century-Translations of Peregrinação

In 1620 Historia Oriental de las peregrinaciones de Fernan Mendez Pinto, the Spanish translation by Francisco de Herrera Maldonado, was published in Madrid by Tomas Junta. It was reprinted five times in 1620, 1627, 1645, 1664 and 1666. Like the Portuguese original text, the 1620 publication was in folio in 8s format and had 226 chapters. The book consists of 481 pages.

Herrera Maldonado, the Spanish translator, was a canon at the Igreja Real de Arbas in León and had lived for some time in Évora. He wrote religious poetry, a compendium on the history of China, a eulogy on the Toledos of Catilla and a hagiography of Bernardino of Obregón, founder of an order of monks. Apart from Mendes Pinto, he translated two other representative authors: the Italian humanist Jacopo Sannazaro and the Greek Lucian. In his forewords he is an advocate of translating according to the sense rather than translating word for word (Aguilar 2002: 1701-2). Menendez Pelayo, the Spanish scholar and literary critic, did not admire Herrera Maldonado’s translation of Lucian calling it “fea infidelisima” in a quip to the “belles infidèles” translation in vogue in seventeenth-century France and England. Menendez Pelayo mentions that Herrera Maldonado had added reflections, paragraphs and whole pages of his own authority (cited in Rendón 2010: 110, n. 17).

In Herrera Maldonado’s time, however, his Historia Oriental de las peregrinaciones de Fernan Mendez Pinto was highly successful. It is preceded by a

\[109\] According to Laborinho, on the frontispiece is mentioned the year 1627 and in the colophon 1628 (Laborinho 2006: Vol. II, lxxiii).
lengthy “Apología en favor de Fernán Menéndez Pinto, y desta Historia Oriental.” In the “Apología” Herrera Maldonado defends the veracity of Fernão Mendes Pinto’s account but complains about Francisco de Andrade, the Portuguese editor. He criticised Andrade for not “correcting” Pinto’s mistakes or incongruities, nor did the Portuguese editor conform the author’s style to the prevailing rhetorical standards. Herrera Maldonado mentions he had access to a manuscript of Mendes Pinto’s text and regretted that Andrade had limited his interventions to the division into chapters and the addition of chapter titles. Herrera Maldonado informs the reader that he felt “siendo forçoso vestir de contentos, y sentencias esta escritura de que estaua mendicante” (“Apología” xii). This means that he did not limit his work to mere rhetorical embellishments, but that his appropriation was also an ideological appropriation. Thus, Herrera Maldonado justifies himself for he cannot translate Pinto according to the literalist principle, but feels obliged to translate in a style that corresponds to the dominant poetical canon and catholic ideology:

   Herrera ejerció una labor similar a la de un corrector de estilo, modificó la estructura de los párrafos y cambió expresiones del autor para dar al texto un carácter más elaborado que, de alguna manera, permite una lectura más fluida. En ocasiones, introduce sentencias moralizantes o datos históricos y, cuando se percata, corrige errores presentes en el original. En la mayoría de los casos cambia la primera persona, que el narrador/autor (o alguien por él) usa para titular los capítulos, por la tercera persona del autor, aunque la mantiene en el contenido, y resta así importancia al sentido de relato autobiográfico (Rendón 2010: 111)

The moralizing aspect in his translation corresponds to the moral code of the official ideology of his age and country. This becomes clear from some of the

---

110 The mistakes mostly refer to Mendes Pinto’s somewhat haphazard chronology, measures, quotations from foreign languages and toponomy.
paratextual elements present in the translation, such as the licence, the several approbations in the name of the Church and the privilege by the King and the dedication to worldly or ecclesiastical powers. Every writer or translator in Portugal and Spain was aware of the presence of the Inquisition, and had to write in accordance with traditional Christian beliefs. This had far reaching consequences as, under the influence of the Inquisition, Portugal and Spain become isolated from the secularization of philosophical and scientifical thought.

The French translation by Bernard Figuier was published in 1628, and reprinted once again in 1645. Both books were publications in quarto format and consisted of 226 chapters. The publication of 1645 consisted of 1193 pages. The quarto format indicates the size of a leaf in terms of the size of the original sheet. The book was printed on a sheet of paper folded twice. The quarto format comes next to a folio volume in which the leaf is folded once and represents the largest and costliest sort of regular books. Next to the quarto format comes the less expensive octavo format. It consists of a sheet of paper on which sixteen pages of text were printed, which were then folded three times to produce eight leaves. Thus, the quarto format was used for books that were aimed at a public that could afford a more expensive book.

111 The first edition is dedicated to Don Duarte, Marques de Flechilla and the second to Manuel Severin de Faria.
112 In 1982 an intralingual translation of Herrera Maldonado was published in Madrid with the title: Las peregrinaciones. Según la traducción del Licenciado Francisco Herrera Maldonado, canónigo de la Santa Iglesia Real de Arbas, publicada en 1620, revisada y completada por José Agustín Mahieu. Mahieu was an Argentinian critic, historicist and cineast who was exiled in Spain from 1978. In the foreword he justifies that he based his translation on the text by Herrera Maldonado and the Portuguese original as the Spanish translator and Francisco de Andrade had had access to Fernão Mendes's manuscript. Mahieu's revision includes pontuation and modernization of the spelling as well as the inclusion of notes to help the reader with archaic expressions and geographical and historical data. He calls our attention to the fact that Herrera Maldonado felt obliged to embellish the original text and to add concepts and sentences. Mahieu corroborates his claim with a passage taken from chapter 83 that is thrice as long in the Spanish translation. Curiously he does not comment upon the two passages (Mahieu 1982: xxxvii).
Figuier’s translation was reprinted in 1645. The translator, of whom no other translations or works are known, is presented as a “Gentil-homme Portugais”. Catz suggests that it is “quite possibly that he was a Portuguese, living in France, that his name was probably Bernardo Figueiro” (Catz 1988: 76). Nevertheless, his work, about which he says that it was “fiddelement tradvits de Portugais”, was influenced by the Spanish translation as we can conclude from his “Deffence apologetique” that was taken from the Spanish publication. Catz mentions that Figuier copied some of the mistakes made by Herrera Maldonado (Catz 1988: 76). So, it is no wonder that we find some influence of the Spanish translator in Wonderlyke Reizen, although Glazemaker, who used the French translation as his source text, was probably unaware of this. As an illustration of Herrera Maldonado’s indirect influence on Glazemaker’s translation, in the first chapter we find Glazemaker’s expression “met reden” (with reason), the translation of “auec raison” that stems from “con razón”, an insertion by Herrera. At the end of the chapter the reader is left with the impression that the Mestre de Santiago in some way helped finance the narrator’s voyage to India, as is suggested by the “con su favour” of the Spanish translation which became “de sa faueur” in French and “met zijn jonst” (with his favour) in Dutch.

From my analysis of some passages we can observe that the French translator sometimes based his translation on Herrera Maldonado. Like the Spanish translator, Figuier follows the dominant canon. The French translation displays the King’s privilege and was dedicated to Cardinal Richelieu, who was held responsible for the establishment of the Académie Française in 1635. The purpose of the Académie was the emancipation and purification of the French language and the enhancement of French literature. The latter was done through the translation of the Ancients. The strict
norms of the Académie corresponded to a linguistic, aesthetic and moral code of behaviour. This resulted in adapting the translation to the target culture and language by omitting expressions or passages that offended good taste, and by adding improvements or rhetorical embellishments. What is added in this free approach involves a process of domestication in which the foreign text is imprinted with values specific to the receiving culture (Venuti 2008: 39-40).

One year after the publication of Wonderlyke reizen in the Republic, the English translation, The voyages and adventures of Fernand Mendez Pinto by H. C. (Henry Cogan) Gent was printed in London by F. Macock, for Henry Cripps and Lodewick Lloyd. The book was in quarto format and it was reprinted in 1663 and 1693. It consists of 326 pages and eighty-one chapters. Like the Dutch translation, it omitted the episodes about Saint Francis Xavier and Father Belchior Barreto. Apart from these similarities the Dutch and English translations are quite different. The inclusion by H. C. Gent of “An apologetic defence of Fernand Mendez Pinto his history” suggests that his source was the Spanish translation and/or the 1628 French translation. The name “Fernand Mendez Pinto” appears exactly the same in the French translation, while in Spanish “Fernan Mendez Pinto” is used. The English title seems to have also been inspired by the French: Voyages advantvrevx de Fernand Mendez Pinto became The voyages and adventures of Fernand Mendez Pinto.

---

113 The Jesuit Belchior Nunes Barreto (1519-1571) was the first missionary who ventured entering China and accompanied Francis Xavier in the Orient.
114 For example, the chapters of the Chinese bride and at the ilha dos ladroês were omitted by Gent but not by Glazemaker (P 47, 53-54).
115 The “Deffence apologeticque”, translation of the Spanish “Apologia”, was not published in the second French reprint of 1645. See Part II, section 2.1.3.
Finally, the German translation entitled Wunderliche und merckwürdige Reisen Fernandi Mendez Pinto appeared in 1671.\textsuperscript{116} The translator is never mentioned. The book was published in Amsterdam by “Henrich und Dieter Boom” or Hendrik and Dirk Boom, the sons of Jan HendrikSZ Boom, RieuwertSz’s associate in the publication of Wonderlyke reizen, and like RieuwertSz and Glazemaker, an active member of the radical network occupied with the propagation of dissenting thought. The book was decorated with the same frontispiece and two copper plates from Wonderlyke reizen. It consists of 392 pages. The translation is clearly based on Glazemaker’s and also consists of 63 chapters. The “An den Leser!” mentions that the translation was based on the Dutch and French translations. The title is slightly different though: the adjective “merckwürdige” (worthy to remember, strange or odd) was added on the title page but not on the frontispiece or at the top of the first chapter, nor at the headings of the pages. It means that the adjective was added when the text was ready to be published, probably to make the book more appealing.

As in the case of the Dutch translation, the German is only preceded by an unsigned “An den Leser!” which is a partial adaptation of the Dutch “Voorreeden aan de lezer”.\textsuperscript{117}

At the end of the introduction the German translator admits he intends to translate Della Valle should the public show interest. Della Valle had also been translated by Glazemaker and published by the widow of Jan HendrikSZ Boom [40].\textsuperscript{118}

\textsuperscript{116} Marília dos Santos Lopes mentions that the translation was published by three different publishers (Lopes 2010: 263, n. 18).

\textsuperscript{117} The Dutch “Voorreeden aan de lezer” was in its turn partially based on the French “Adressement au Lecteur” by Bernard Figuier that was added in the reprint of 1645.

\textsuperscript{118} The only German translation of Della Valle I found was published in Geneva by Widerhold in 1674: Reiß-Beschreibung in unterschiedliche Theile der Welt. On the title page is mentioned that the translation was made from the original text. The translator is not mentioned.
1.2 Dutch Travel Accounts in the 1640s: Mendes Pinto versus Bontekoe

Wonderlyke reizen, the translation by Glazemaker of the French translation by Bernard Figuier of Peregrinaçam, was published in 1652, shortly after the publication of a series of highly popular travel accounts in the Dutch Republic. Between 1644 and 1646 a collection of travel accounts had been published under the title Begin en voortgang vande Verenigde Nederlandse Geoctroyeerde Oost-Indische Compagnie (Start and progress of the Chartered East Indian Company of the United Netherlands).


on the Abrolhos of Frederick Houtman, at a latitude of 28½ degrees South of the Equinoctial line. Sailed under the worthy Francoys Pelsert. Containing the shipwreck, as well as the atrocious murders, among the rescued crew and passengers on the Island Batavia’s Church-yard, along with the punishment of the criminals. Occurred in the years 1628 and 1629).

The last two books are sensational travelogues about terrible events. What is remarkable is the fact that, even before the narrative starts, both books tell a story in which Bontekoe and Pelsaert emerge as true Christian heroes, right from the title or laudatory poems. Nonetheless, the most terrible events they suffered were provoked by their own crew’s impiety. In Bontekoe’s case, his ship exploded as a consequence of negligence while a sailor was pouring brandy, and in Pelsaert’s, there was a shipwreck followed by a terrible mutiny among the Dutch during which more than a hundred people were killed.

Of these books, Bontekoe’s account was the most successful. The text, which is not very long, narrates an explosion on board, a shipwreck, the hardships Bontekoe suffered during his maritime voyage and the many risks he faced. Illustrated and written in a simple language, the book was the most popular piece of prose during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Before 1800, it had been published over sixty times (Bork 1985) and had been translated into English and German. It inspired J. Fabricius to write De scheepsjongens van Bontekoe (Bontekoe’s cabin boys) (1923), a children’s book read by many generations, and which inspired a successful film with the same title (2007).

Bontekoe and Pelsaert’s books were published several years after the facts had taken place, unlike the travel accounts by other Dutch Asian travellers, such as Van
Linschoten or Van Neck that were published immediately after their return home in the 1590s. The lack of urgency means that the Dutch had sufficient information for their commercial activities in the Far East. The aim of the publication of Bontekoe’s and Pelsaert’s accounts was different. It helped in the construction of a national identity serving political, economic and religious ends (Barend-van Haaf ten 1998: 289). These publications in the 1640s had in common that they presented the official, heroic point of view of Dutch Protestant colonial politics. The foreword, as was the case with the majority of these publications, clearly expresses its moralizing, edifying purpose. The god-fearing author is praised for his courage, noble-mindedness and religious devotion, and it was due to God and his firm belief in Him that he was rewarded with a safe return home.

An attentive reader acquainted with Bontekoe’s Journael and Glazemaker’s translation Wonderlyke Reizen cannot avoid associating both accounts, as in both narratives a first person narrator describes a dangerous sea voyage to the Far East. In Bontekoe there is always a severe moral judgment being transmitted by the narrator, who is incapable of self-criticism. On the other hand, Wonderlyke reizen is characterised by a highly inconsistent protagonist, as well as by various other conflicting voices.

119 Since the end of the fifteenth century, the Dutch contested Spain and Portugal’s claim over their commercial monopoly. But it was necessary to find the sea route to India that Vasco da Gama had discovered in 1498. Accordingly, all kind of information was being gathered. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, two books about the East had been published but little useful information could be obtained from them: Calcoen (Calicut) (1504) and Die Reyse van Lissebone (The voyage from Lisbon) (1508), printed by Jan van Doesborch (the latter is a reprint of Calcoen). In the 1590s Cornelis and Frederik Houtman were send to Lisbon to spy but were imprisoned by the Portuguese authorities. Important were the contacts between Portuguese seafarers and cartographers like the Flemish Ortelius (1527-98) appointed geographer to Philip II, or the Dutch Lucas Waghenaer (1533/34-1606) who had been a seafaring pilot himself. With the help of Dirck Gerritz Pomp, who had travelled also in the East (1568-1588), Waghenaer published the sea rutter Thresoor der Zeevaert (Treasure of sea navigation) in 1592. However the publication of Jan Huyghen van Linschoten’s Itinerario (1596) enabled the Dutch passage to India as it was a veritable merchants’ manual of routes, commodities and conditions in the East Indies (Pos 1997, 35). As a result, between 1595 and 1601 the Dutch freighted 15 expeditions to the Far East and founded the Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie (VOC, United East Asia Company) in 1602.
While the Dutch captain presents himself to us as honourable and devout, possessing all the virtues of a classical Christian hero, Pinto’s *persona* calls himself “o pobre de my”, an anti-hero who is not spurred by patriotism, totally bereft of idealism, floating at the mercy of the waves, serving whoever is his master, whatever his origin or religion. He needs all his cunning in order to survive, even if this means lying, stealing, assaulting or killing. His perspective is ambiguous, forcing the reader into reflection.

Pinto’s *Peregrinaçam* belongs to a tradition of rogue literature that started in Spain, but that was not unknown in the Netherlands. For example, we recall the success caused by Bredero’s play *De Spaanse Brabander* (The Spanish Brabantine, 1617) based on *Lazarillo de Tormes*. The structure of the picaresque novel enables the author to express what was not allowed to be said in other ways. In Mendes Pinto’s case, it meant questioning expansionist policies, the barbaric acts of piracy, the forced conversion to Catholicism, and European supremacy. In the fictional world of *Peregrinaçam* there is actually a dialogue between several voices representing different opinions, something that would have been impossible in the real world of that time. While describing a utopian China, the narrator offers an alternative for his own society from which he was forced to flee when he was about ten or twelve years old (P 1, WR 2). Unlike Portugal, China was a country in which religious tolerance was a fact. Mendes Pinto presents us with a picture of other people from different religions, some of them sincere, others corrupt, to demonstrate that moral behaviour is more important than the fulfilling of rituals, thus suggesting a universal concept of god. In Bontekoe, on the other hand,

---

120 “pobre de my” is once translated into French as “moy chetif que i’estois” in the first chapter and not translated by Glazemaker.

121 The reasons why Mendes Pinto was forced to leave the household of the noblewoman he was serving are not known. Some speculate that he could be running away from the plague that affected Lisbon in 1522-1523 (Münch-Miranda 2010: Fernão Mendes Pinto and the Peregrinação, Notes, Vol. 3, 29).
the reader receives only one perspective. The situations described in both books are frequently similar, as both protagonists are confronted with the Other. The Dutch do not reveal much interest in the natives, since they hardly ever abandon the shore. The local inhabitants are presented as inferior:

Wy saghen dit Volck met verwonderingh aen / wy gaven haer Wijn te drincken / uyt een silveren Schael / zy waren soo wijs niet dat zy daer te degen uyt konden drincken / maer staken het hooft of aengesicht in de Schael / en droncken ghelijck de Beesten uyt een emmer drincken; En toen zy de Wijn in ’t lijf hadden tierden zy haer of zy geck waren.

Dit Volck was gantsch naeckt / uytgezeydt dat zy een kleetjen om de middel hadden / voor de schamelheyt / waren geelachtigh-swart van couleur.

(…) Wy en konden aen haer geen teycken van kennisse Godts of Godts-dienst bespeuren / maer hadden aen sommighe plaetsen buytens huys Ossen-hoofden op staken opgerecht daer voor zy (zoo wy bemercken konden) neder vielen en aenbaden / schenen heel vreemt te wezen en zonder gevoel van den waren God (Jovrnael 8).

(We observed these people in amazement gave them wine to drink from a silver bowl they lacked the discernment of how one could drink appropriately from it but they put their head or face in the bowl and drank like the beasts drink from a bucket. And when they felt the wine in their bodies they behaved like mad.

These people were completely naked except from having a small cloth around their waist for decency they were of a yellowish black colour.

(…) We were incapable to detect any knowledge of God or religion in them but they had erected in some places outside skulls of ox stuck on poles in front of which (thus we noticed) they kneeled down and worshipped they seemed to be very strange and without the notion of the true God.)

The narrator in Bontekoe’s account compares the natives to animals: they are heathens, almost naked and do not possess any control over themselves. Bontekoe is not really interested in trying to know more about them; we are merely informed of the colour of their skin and on another occasion, they are called “wilden” (savages)
They have no voice in his account and are only seen from the perspective of the morally and civilizationally superior Dutch narrator. His description contrasts with the one we find in the merchant’s farce in Peregrinaçam (P 223; VA CCXXII; WR 275-276) in which the Portuguese are represented as a barbarian people who eat with their dirty hands. In Peregrinaçam the various non-European characters criticise the Portuguese for their manners, greed, corruption, hypocrisy, faked religiousness and arrogance, and are implicitly represented as equal or even superior to the Portuguese.

Both texts also describe the terrible occasions in which the travellers are almost starving to death. In Peregrinaçam the narrator tells us, without adding any moralising commentary, that they were so famished they ate the body of a dead native (P 33, 180; VA XXXIII, 179; WR 43, 243). Bontekoe, in his turn, tells us how he had to negotiate with the crew three days in order to postpone the killing of the youngest member so as to eat him. This proved to be unnecessary because before the deadline was met they viewed land and nobody had to be executed. Bontekoe considers that God decided to intervene thanks to his religious devotion (Jovrnael 38).

The similarity between Antonio de Faria, one of the main characters in Peregrinaçam, and Bontekoe, the first person narrator, attracts our special attention. In Peregrinaçam we meet Antonio de Faria, one of the narrator’s patrons. At first, Faria seems a pious, just and courageous leader, but it soon becomes clear that he is a violent and immoral pirate. His greed leads him to cheat, plunder, rape, kill and to desecrate tombs and altars. The region where Faria causes havoc, the South China Sea, also features in Bontekoe’s Jovrnael. The actions of the Dutch captain do not differ much from Faria’s. The Dutch being stronger than the Chinese owing to their firearms, lie,
plunder, burn down villages, attack the local inhabitants, sell them and take whatever they can lay their hands on (Jovrnael 30-41).

Another similar event is the attack on a Chinese junk, during one of the many Dutch raids. Bontekoe summarises it in three lines; his Christian perspective restrains him from the graphic description of the assault and impedes him from justifying the assault and to explaining what exactly happened to twenty or twenty-five of the remaining Chinese while the rest of the prisoners were used as slaves and sold in Batavia:

In onze wegh ontmoeten wy noch en Chinesche Jonck / kostelijck geladen / eenighe duyzenden waerdigh / die na de Manieljes wilde; Namen hem / hadde wel 250. zielen in / nam het Volck meest over op ontrent 20. a 25. man na (Jovrnael 40).

(On our way we met another richly laden Chinese junk / worth a few thousand / that wanted to sail to Manila; we took it / it had some 250 souls on board / we took most of the people except for some 20 to 25 men.)

Mendes Pinto, on the other hand, describes the attack on a Chinese junk in great detail though he does not judge his protagonists, he leaves it to the reader to draw any conclusions. (P 47; VA XLVII; WR 62-64)

At one point we are told how the lost, famished Portuguese are saved by a fish falling from the sky out of the claws of a red kite flying over them, that ends up falling near Antonio de Faria (P 54; VA LIV; WR 71). In Bontekoe’s Jovrnael we find a similar episode when Bontekoe and his men are almost starving, and flying fish suddenly land in their boat (Jovrnael 14). It is an important episode in the Jovrnael

122 The fish falling out of the sky into Faria’s boat can be interpreted as a symbol for Christ when we remind that the Greek word for fish Ichthys is an acronym for Iēsous Christos, Theou Yios, Sūtēr: Jesus Christ, God’s Son, Savior. Faria’s reaction strengthens this interpretation because he immediately falls onto his knees and deeply touched, prays to Christ.
because it is illustrated with an engraving in which we observe winged fish falling into the boats of the Dutch. The episode in Bontekoe can be interpreted as a parallel of the manna from heaven, the biblical miracle that occurred while Moses and his people were in the desert, as described in Exodus 16. Bontekoe establishes an analogy between the narrator or his alter ego and Moses. However, in light of the similarity between the episode in Bontekoe and in Wonderlyke reizen, the Dutch reader will be induced to interpret the similar Faria episode as a parody of the miracle manna from heaven. This is especially the case if we consider Glazemaker’s brief comment in the margin that reads: “wonderlijke spyzing” (miraculous feeding). Instead of Moses leading the elected people, we have Faria leading a gang of corsairs, looking for the Isle of Calempluy, where he hopes to find treasures. Glazemaker’s brief manipulation in the margin will spur the Dutch reader, familiar with the Bible, to establish a parallel between Faria and Moses, but also between Faria, Moses and Bontekoe. Both Faria and Bontekoe find themselves in an identical situation, in the same region and their actions are not so different, as both are violent and greedy.

Curiously, in both texts the men rapidly forget they were once starving: some time later they need to throw the surplus of their ransacking overboard as their ships are too heavily loaded with their loot, and in both cases, rice was chosen (Jovrnael 35; P 55; VA LV; WR 74).

Bontekoe’s identification with the prophet is emphasised a little further on when the lost, desperate captain prays on top of a mountain and is able to see the Strait of Sunda – the Promised Land he was looking for – after a large cloud had passed (Jovrnael 22-23). Just like Moses in Exodus, he is guided and saved by God who appears to him disguised as a cloud. The identification of the Dutch with the elected
people is a recurrent theme in Dutch literature of the seventeenth century. The Dutch Revolt against the Spanish king is often presented as being analogous to the struggle of the Hebrews commanded by Moses against the Pharaoh. Bontekoe and his men’s odyssey symbolises the pilgrimage of a people purified through their battle against the sea and the Spanish tyrant, and therefore, chosen (Schama 1988: 103-33). From Bontekoe’s Promised Land, however, neither milk nor honey flow, but rather gold and spices. Like Faria, Bontekoe is a leader looking for profit, at whatever cost.

The reader who confronts both narratives becomes aware that Bontekoe’s narrative reveals another dimension: the captain, whom the reader associates with the prophet Moses, is not very different after all from the pirate Antonio de Faria. Whereas Pinto does not comment on Faria’s death, leaving the reader to interpret the sinking of his overloaded ship as a just punishment for his greed and sin (P 79; VA LXXVIII; WR 97), Bontekoe explains his own safe return as a divine reward.

The parody on Moses/Faria in Peregrinaçam, as interpreted by Glazemaker, is even more malicious if we take into account Glazemaker’s context as described in Part I.123 Men like Spinoza, Koerbagh and Meijer denied miracles and the supernatural. In Spinoza’s opinion, the success of the crossing of the Red Sea by the Hebrews, so as to escape the Pharaoh’s army, was not due to a miracle but to intense winds that blew all night long, a fact not mentioned in the Bible, according to Spinoza, in order to heighten the wondrous effect. By giving a scientific explanation to this miracle, Spinoza intends to demonstrate that there was no divine intervention and that God elected no people either. Spinoza considered that Moses had not written the Pentateuch, an idea also expressed by Adriaen Koerbagh in his Bloemhof (Israel 2001: 62-63).

---

123 See Part I, section 3.
I do not want to say that Spinoza had already reached these conclusions at the time of Glazemaker’s translation, but Glazemaker’s interpretation of the Faria episode could have been insinuated by the discussion around the Red Sea episode. It suggests that the debate on the divine authorship of the Bible and the rejection of the supernatural was taking place among radical thinkers in Amsterdam, a group with which Spinoza was acquainted. The episode of the Hebrews crossing the Red Sea described in the Exodus is one of the miracles that Spinoza explains from a rational point of view in his *Tractatus theologico-politicus* (*TTP* ch. VI, section 82-83). In the same work he denies that Moses could have written the Pentateuch (*TTP* ch. VIII).

We may conclude that one of the reasons that led Glazemaker to translate *Peregrinaçam* was Fernão Mendes Pinto’s critical vision of the expansion politics and of the religious sincerity of the Portuguese explorers, a critical vision regarding religiousness that could not be found in the Dutch travel journals published in the 1640s. The parodic aspects of Fernão Mendes Pinto’s work helped to demystify the devout, moralizing journals about the colonial enterprise.

124 See Part I, section 3.
125 In the same chapter, Spinoza refers to Ibn Ezra as the first writer who denied the authorship by Moses.
2. **Wonderlyke Reizen**

*Wonderlyke reizen*, the shortened form of the title of Jan Hendrik Glazemaker’s translation of Fernão Mendes Pinto’s *Peregrinaçam*, was published in Amsterdam in 1652 by Jan Rieuwertsz and Jan Hendriksz Boom. A reprint followed a year later.

2.1 **Paratext of Wonderlyke Reizen**

The concept of “paratext” as used by G. Genette (1997: 1-15) refers to all material, verbal or non-verbal, that accompanies the main text. These elements form a frame that moulds the reception and interpretation of the main text.

2.1.1 **Colophon, Format, Pages and Illustrations**

According to the colophon at the end, Pieter La Burgh, established in the Niezel, printed the book.

Whereas the Portuguese, Spanish and French versions of Fernão Mendes Pinto’s book were published in folio format, *Wonderlyke reizen* appeared in octavo, in gatherings of four leaves. The Portuguese copy consists of 303 pages, the first Spanish publication of 481 pages, the French 1628 version of 1193 pages, the second publication from 1645 of 1020 pages, while the Dutch publication has only 280 pages. As it is an octavo format, the size is smaller than the other publications, it is 19,3x14cm.\(^\text{126}\) The octavo format was easy transportable and often used for a larger public.

\(^{126}\) The size of the Portuguese book is 26,4x18,7cm, the Spanish 28,4x20,2 and the French is 22,7x16,7.
Only by counting the number of words of each version can we know more accurately how much was added or omitted by each translator. Nevertheless, I want to try to make a rough estimate. The Portuguese publication consists of 303 folia recto and verso, or 606 pages, each page consists of two columns, each with forty lines and each line has approximately seven words. The result is c. 339,360 words. I used the Spanish translation, published in 1660, which consists of 452 pages (the forework and “Tabla” at the end were not included), each page has two columns with fifty-nine lines and each line has seven words. The Spanish translation has c. 373,352 words. The French translation from 1645, which I believe was Glazemaker’s source text, consists of 1020 pages with thirty-seven lines. Each line has approximately eleven words. The French translation consists of c. 415,140 words. This means Figuier added around 75,000 words if compared to the original text, and he added more than 40,000 words compared to Herrera Maldonado, who added more than 33,000 words. The Dutch translation consists of 280 pages with forty-eight lines of roughly twelve words. The Dutch translation has c. 161,280 words, which means that it has approximately 178,000 words less than the Portuguese text and more than 250,000 words less than Glazemaker’s source text, the French translation. Thus, we may conclude that the text by Glazemaker was heavily abridged.

Apart from the illustrated frontispiece in the Dutch translation, there are seven illustrations made from copper plates that complement the written text. Especially in the case of travel accounts, these stimulated the reader’s imagination. From the octavo format and the illustrations, we can infer that this was a publication intended for a large market, the Dutch middle class. The small size of the book made it cheaper and easy to

---

127 The different reprints do not suggest that the Spanish translation was modified.
The illustrations, however, made the publication costlier for the bookseller but it became more attractive for the public. Thus, the inclusion of the illustrations was used as a strategy to sell more copies. Besides, the bookseller could always reuse the illustrations or sell them to another bookseller. In fact, three of them appear once more in the German translation.\(^\text{128}\)

*Wonderlyke reizen* is the first illustrated publication of Fernão Mendes Pinto’s text. The pictures reveal the difficulty of representing a reality never seen or dreamt of before. The illustrator tries to represent the marvellous, unbelievable, exotic aspect of a new, unknown world. This new world is conceived of in images and forms that belong to the European tradition. Thus, the public is confronted with similar European, or even Dutch buildings, streets and vegetation, or with “Oriental” sovereigns who resemble Western monarchs sitting on their thrones. Even the sculptures remind us of Western sculptures. Only by the way they dress can we distinguish the Portuguese – who look more like Dutch merchants – from the native inhabitants who are represented wearing turbans and robes, but they are not dressed like the people in the Orient. In order to give his plates an exotic touch, the engraver had to resort to turbans, elephants and tapestries. These were more Arab-Indian inspired elements with which he was familiar. On the illustration on page 13 of volume I of this dissertation, we recognise the caciz Moulana as he wears a half moon on his hat (*WR* plate folio 10). Other illustrations focus on the horrifying aspect, for instance, a shipwreck or corpses lying on the ground.

\(^{128}\) See Part II, section 1.1.
2.1.2 Chapters, Summaries and Marginalia

The chapter division of Wonderlyke reizen is completely different, as there are only 63 chapters instead of the 226 in the Portuguese, Spanish and French versions. In the original text and the Spanish and French translations, all chapters begin with a very short summary. This was an established practice, thus, it is no surprise that Glazemaker also added a summary at the beginning of each of his chapters. However, his summaries are not based on the translation of Figuier’s summaries, but are texts written by Glazemaker himself. Through these summaries and the marginalia, which he also added, Glazemaker influences the reader’s interpretation of the text. The marginalia are often very short repetitions of what was mentioned in the summary before, or simply short phrases with the aim of calling the reader’s attention to certain aspects of the story and controlling his interpretation.

The summary of chapter 20 in the Dutch translation reads:


(Antonio arrives at a place, which he plunders. He masters a pirate who attacks him. He arrives at Liampoo, where he is splendidly received. Strange sermon by a parish priest. Antonio departs on a voyage to the isle of Calempluy and observes many strange things during his travels.)

The summary corresponds to the introduction of chapters 66 to 73 of Peregrinaçam. In his translation, Glazemaker summarises chapters 67 and 68 in a few
lines, of chapter 69 he only translates the sermon and of chapter 70 he only summarises the ending. Chapters 71, 72 and 73 are translated in an abridged form.

In Portuguese and French the summaries read:

Chapter 66: Do mais que Antonio de Faria passou até chegar às portas de Liampoo.

Suite de la navigation d’Antonio de Faria, iusque à son arriuée au port de Liampoo (VA LXV).

Chapter 67: Do que fez Antonio de Faria chegando às portas de Liampoo, & das nouas que ahy teue do que passaua no reyno da China.

De ce qu’ Antonio de Faria fist à son arriuée aux ports de Liampoo, & des nouuelles qu’il eust en ce lieu de ce qui passoit dans le Royaume de la Chine (VA LXVI).

Chapter 68: Do recebimento que os portugueses fizerão a Antonio de Faria na pouoação de Liampoo.

De la reception que les Portugais firent à Antonio de Faria en la ville de Liampoo (VA LXIII).

Chapter 69: De que maneyra Antonio de Faria foy leuado à Igreja, & do q passou nella até a Missa ser acabada.

De quelle façon Antonio de Faria fut mené à l’Eglise, & de ce qui s’y passa iusqu’à ce que la Messe fust acheuée (VA LXVIII).

Chapter 70: Do banquete que neste dia se deu a Antonio de Faria & a seus companheiros.

Du manifique banquet que les Portugais de Liampoo firent à Antonio de Faria, & à ses compagnons (VA LXIX).129

Chapter 71: Como Antonio de Faria se partio de Liampoo em busca da ilha de Calempluy.

129 In bold in the Portuguese text are the expressions Figuier did not translate, and in bold in the French text are the expressions Figuier added.
Comme Antonio de Faria partit de Liampoo, pour s’en aller chercher l’Isle de Calempluy (VA LXX).

Chapter 72: Do mais que Antonio de Faria passou até chegar ao rio de Patebenão, & da determinação que ahy tomou acerca da sua viagem.

Continuation de ce qui arriua à Antonio de Faria, iusqu’à ce qu’il eust gagné la riuire de Paatebenam, & de la resolution qu’il y prist touchant son voyage (VA LXXI).

Chapter 73: Do que Antonio de Faria passou até chegar à serra de Gangitanou, & da disforme gente com que ahy fallou.

De ce qui aduint a Antonio de Faria, iusques à son arriuée en la montagne Gangitanou, & de la deformité des hommes aus quels il parla (VA LXXII).

The Portuguese and French summaries are characterised by their objective style, as can be seen by some of the geographical information that is given and by how nearly no adjectives are used. In fact, they hardly reveal anything about the contents of the chapter. The reader of the Dutch translation, however, does not doubt Antonio de Faria’s evilness: the prefix “uit” in the word “uitplondert” implies that Faria plunders the place until there is nothing left. The fact is stressed in the margin of the first five lines of chapter 20 where we can read: “Antonio plondert een Vlek” (Antonio plunders a place). The Portuguese or French summaries do not mention the actions Antonio de Faria committed; in the French summary everything seems going as planned with the expression “Suitte de la nauigation”.

The first sentence in the Dutch summary contrasts with the third describing Faria’s reception in Liampoo as “splendid”. Without having read the contents of the chapter, the reader infers that the people of Liampoo receive a raider as if he were a hero. The sensation that something quite unusual is going on in this chapter is stressed by the reference to a “strange sermon”. Glazemaker calls his readers’ attention again to
the sermon in the margin, “Zeldzame Predikate van een Pastoor” (Strange sermon by a parish priest, WR 86).

In the summaries, Figuier translates the Portuguese text almost literally. This is amazing, as we have previously seen that he augmented his translation by almost a fourth when compared to the original text. Only in the summary of chapter 70 (VA LXIX) does Figuier add the adjective “manifique” to describe the banquet.130

We find another example of Glazemaker’s manipulation in the summary of chapter 49 that corresponds to chapters 159 to 161 in Peregrinaçam:


(Exquisite accommodation. Celebration of the memory of all the dead. Splendid market. Image of the idol Tinagogo, and of other idols. Description of the procession of these heathens. Terrible sacrifice of human beings. Excessive superstition about the robbing of the ashes of the dead. Strange sacrifices with weighing scales, for the forgiveness of sins. The image of Tinagogo and the excessive superstition about it. Strange caves inhabited by various orders of hermits.)

Chapter 159: Do sitio & fabrica deste pagode de Tinagogoogoo, & do grande concurso de gente que a elle vem.

De la situation & du bastiment de ce Pagode de Tinagoogoo, ensemble du grand nombre de gens qui s’y rendent (VA CLX) (sic).131

---

130 The Portuguese and French summaries of the last chapter mention deformed people, information that is not given by Glazemaker in his summary.

131 The chapter numbering in the French translation (1645) is incorrect and confusing.
Chapter 160: Da grande & sumptuosa procissão que se faz neste pagode & dos sacrificios que se fazem nella.

De la grande & somptueuse Procession qui se faict en ce Pagode, & de ses sacrifices (VA CLIX).

Chapter 161: De húas penitentes que vimos em cima na serra deste pagode, & da vida que fazem.

De certains Hermites ou Poenitens que nous vismes sur la montagne de ce Pagode, & de leur façon de viure (VA CLX).

The chapters deal with the strange religious rituals among the heathens and bloody self-sacrifices in Tinagoogoo. The Portuguese and French summaries do not judge the rituals or the people that are involved in them. Though adjectives are rarely used, in this case the adjective “grande” in Portuguese, “grand(e)” in French (2X), and the word “sumptuosa” “somptueuse” are applied. The Portuguese and French summaries consist of 51 or 56 words respectively, while the Dutch summary consists of 68 words. This is very unusual because Glazemaker tends to summarise and abridge his translation.

Glazemaker uses words with a negative connotation, such as “idol” and “heathen”. The extremely cruel aspect of what is narrated in the chapter is implied by the “terrible sacrifices of human beings”. Glazemaker calls the reader’s attention twice to the “excessive superstition” when in the text irrational beliefs are never judged as such, they are merely described. The Dutch translator prepares his reader, who must create the necessary distance to the text, in order to be critical. The reader should interpret the text from a rational perspective. In the margins, the distancing effect is provoked by short commentaries that repeat what was mentioned in the summary, or by other notes that were added, for example: “Vreemd waangeloof” (strange superstition or heresy, WR 214), “Sporeloos waangeloof” (excessive superstition or heresy, WR 215),
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“Beuzelachtig waangeloof” (deceitful superstition or heresy, WR 217) and “Sporeloze heiligheid” (excessive saintliness, WR 218). The last note is interesting because saintliness can never be excessive from a believer’s point of view.

In other summaries or marginalia, we repeatedly find expressions such as “fabel” (fantastic story), “beuzelachtig” or “waangeloof”. We may conclude that Glazemaker makes his own opinion clear in these paratexts. Glazemaker is careful not to use loanwords, such as “superstitie”, which could be more difficult for his readers, who were unfamiliar with French or Latin. Instead, he prefers to use “waangeloof” a compound noun composed of “waan” which means “not real”, “hallucinatory” and “geloof” which signifies “belief”. For the same reason he uses “sporeloos” meaning “excessive” or “having completely lost track” instead of “extreem”.

On other occasions Glazemaker adds a short commentary in the margin using the adjective “treffelijk(e)” (excellent) when Chinese characters criticise the Portuguese. For example, the hermit of Calempluy’s speech is qualified as “Treffelijke redenen” (excellent discourse) or “Treffelijke antwoort” (excellent answer) (P 76, 77; VA LXXV, LXXVI; WR 94, 95). The words of an old Chinese man about God’s mercy and the world’s evilness are qualified as “Treffelijke redenen van een Chinees” (excellent discourse of a Chinese, P 81; VA LXXX; WR 99).

132 See Part I, 6.1.
Frontispiece of De wonderlyke reizen van Fernando Mendez Pinto, 1652.
2.1.3 FRONTISPICE AND TITLE PAGE

The title on the frontispiece reads as follows:

DE WONDERLYKE

REIZEN

van

FERNANDO MENDEZ PINTO

die hij in eenëntwintig jaren deur EUROPA,

ASIA, en AFRIKA gedaan heeft, daar in hij
dartien malen gevangen heeft ge-
weest, en zeventien malen verkocht is.

Door J. H. GLAZEMAKER vertaalt,
en met cierlyke kopere platen verciert.

t’AMSTERDAM,

Voor Ian Hendriksz en Ian Rieuwertsz.

Boekverkopers. 1652.

(The marvellous travels of Fernando Mendez Pinto that he made during twenty-one years through Europe, Asia and Africa, during which time he was imprisoned thirteen times and sold seventeen times. Translated by J. H. Glazemaker, and embellished with elegant copper plates. In Amsterdam, for Ian Hendriksz and Ian Rieuwertsz, Booksellers. 1652).

Above the title, in the middle of the page, we see a naked woman, representing the goddess Fortuna – with one foot on a small sphere and a banner in her risen hands. She represents life’s capriciousness. At her right hand side we see an elegantly dressed woman looking ahead with a laurel wreath on her head, necklaces around her neck, a
laurel bough in one hand and a big brimful cornucopia in her other arm. In the background, on the calm sea, a vessel steers with its sails intact and wind filled. On Fortuna’s left side we observe an indigently clad man with a big empty horn in his arm, turned upside down. The man is looking over his shoulder. Behind him the sea is stormy and clouded, and the half shipwrecked vessel is fighting against the rampant waves. In the air many objects are flying, it looks as if they came out of the banner. On the right side of Fortuna we see a crown, a sceptre, coins, a purse, a fan, goblets and a winged flute, objects associated with wealth, glory and power. On the left side, we observe chains, a broom, a bell, different types of crutches and wooden clappers, objects associated with disgrace, captivity, illness and death: bells and rattles were carried by lepers to warn people of their approach. These objects and the crutches were associated with leprosy, impurity, exclusion and poverty. The illustration reveals that the life of a European traveller in the Far East was one in which wealth or poverty came and went with the tides.

How different are the frontispieces of two of the most popular Dutch travel accounts from the same period. In Bontekoe’s *Journael* we observe a merchant on the left side, and on the other side, a man with a piece of paper in his hand, wearing a turban and a long loose fitting robe with sleeves and a waist belt. He is clearly an Asian native, his unusual way of dressing indicates different habits and religion. In the middle we can observe a kind of emblem, on top the weapon of the city of Hoorn – where Bontekoe came from and where the book was printed – bearing a unicorn which represents combativeness and courage, and at the same time a wordplay on the Dutch word for unicorn, “eenhoorn”. In the emblem we notice an imposing vessel with the Dutch flag
on a calm sea, with the VOC insignia underneath, seeing as the work was dedicated to the VOC directors. Behind the merchant we notice a necklace on the ground, cases ready to be embarked, and Dutch merchants and soldiers. Behind the Asian man, we see other natives, some dressed like the man in the foreground, some nearly naked, a box, a big jar with a cover, and some plants or fruits. The illustration symbolises commerce as something noble; apart from the half naked natives in the background, both men appear dignified. The picture suggests that trade is done in a conciliatory way as there are no signs of plundering, looting and violence described in the book. A similar message is conveyed in Pelsaert’s account. The frontispieces of Bontekoe’s and Pelsaert’s books reveal the peaceful side of the colonial enterprise.

Resuming my analysis of Wonderlyke reizen, on the title page we read:

DE WONDERLYKE REIZEN

Van

FERNANDO MENDEZ PINTO;

Die hy in de tyt van eenëntwintig Jaren in Europa, Asia en Afrika, in de Koninkrijken en Landen van Abissyna, China, Iapon, Tartarien, Siam, Calaminham, Pegu, Martabane, Bengale, Brama, Ormus, Batas, Queda, Aru, Pan, Ainan, Calempluy, Cochinchina, en byna ontellijke andere Landen en plaatsen gedaan heeft.

Daar in

hy beschrijft de schrikkelijke noden en gevarelijkheden / die hy ter Zee en te Lant uitgestaan heeft / en verhaalt dat hy dartien malen gevangen heeft geweest / en zeventien malen verkocht is / en veel schipbreuken geleden heeft.

---

133 The Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie (United East Indies Company), or VOC, was formed in the Netherlands in 1602 with the aim of sending ships to East Asia to buy pepper, cinnamon and other spices and trade them on European markets.

134 Inside the Ongeluckige voyagie the plates illustrate the violence the shipwrecked passengers suffered from the hands of the mutineers. In the case of Bontekoe’s Journael the illustrations do not show the violence the Dutch practised over the native population.
Met een nauwkeurige Beschrijving van de wonderen en vreemdheden van die Landen, de Wetten, zeden en gewoonten van die Volken, en de grote Macht en Heirkrachten der Inwoonders.

(The marvellous travels of Fernando Mendez Pinto that he made during twenty-one years through Europe, Asia and Africa, through the kingdoms and countries of Abyssinia, China, Japan, Tartaria, Siam, Calaminham, Pegu, Martabane, Bengal, Brama, Ormus, Batan Islands, Qeda, Aru, Pan, Ainan, Calempluy, Cauchinchina and almost innumerable other countries and places.

In which he describes the terrible needs and perils he suffered at sea and over land and reports that he had been imprisoned thirteen times and was sold seventeen times and suffered many shipwrecks.

With an accurate description of the marvels and curiosities of those countries, the laws, mores and manners of those peoples and the great power and armed forces of the inhabitants.)

On the title page, the information regarding the translator, publishers, publishing place and year are the same as on the frontispiece.

Whereas the frontispieces of the Portuguese, Spanish and French versions mention that the book includes a biography of Saint Francis Xavier, in the Dutch translation this part is completely ignored.

Glazemaker never mentions his source text. We have already seen that in some cases Glazemaker would use more than one source text. In 1652 the Dutch translator could have had at his disposal several source texts such as the Portuguese publication dated from 1614 and the Spanish translations by Herrera Maldonado from 1620 (reprinted in the same year), 1627 and 1645. There were two French publications, the first one dated from 1628 and the second one from 1645. We know Glazemaker did not translate from the Portuguese: although, he was acquainted with the Spanish language because he translated some texts from the Spanish for his translation of Aitzema in 1653.
My analysis in Part II, 2.1.3 and 3 will show that Glazemaker only used the French translation, from 1645.

The title of the French translation reads:

Les Voyages Advantvrevx de Fernand Mendez Pinto fidellement tradvits de Portugais en François par le Sieur Bernard Figvier Gentil-homme Portugais et dediez a Monseigneur le Cardinal de Richelieu. Le contenu de la presente histoire se verra à la page suivante. À Paris. Chez Mathurin Henavlt, rue Clopin, deuant le petit Nauarre: & à sa boutique en la Coor de Palais, à costé de la Chapelle sainct Miche, proche de la fontaine. MDCXXVIII. Avec Privilege du Roy.135

The last four sentences were omitted in the publication from 1645 as the publisher was different. Instead we read: A Paris, Chez Arnovld Cotinet, ruë des Carmes, proche la Mazure et Chez Jean Roger, ruë des Amandiers, deuans les Grassins, à la Verité Royale. MDCXLV.

Judging from the title, the French translator translated directly from the Portuguese. He did not opt for the literal translation of the title Peregrinaçam but instead, he preferred Voyages Advantvrevx obliterating the religious connotation conveyed in the word “peregrinação”.136 This is an interesting fact when we take into consideration that Figuier dedicated his translation to Cardinal Richelieu.

A similar thing happens in the first and last chapter in which Figuier translated the word “peregrinaçam” into “voyage(s)” and consequently, Glazemake translated the French word into “reizen” (travels). The first and last chapter form a framework containing the remaining two hundred and twenty-four chapters in which Mendes Pinto describes what he calls his “peregrinaçam” referring not only to his travels in the East,
but also using his travels as a metaphor for man’s life and strife on earth. The word “peregrinaçam” or derivatives are used several times throughout the book but most of the time Figuier translates them as “voyage(s)” or derivatives. As a result, Glazemaker used the words related to “reizen”. Only twice Glazemaker used “als Pellegrims” “comme en pelerinage” (WR 91, 101; VA LXXV, LXXXI).

Glazemaker preferred to translate “advantvrevx” by “wonderlyke” and not by “avontuurlijk” (adventurous). In the seventeenth century “wonderlyk” meant “marvellous”, “wonderful”, “supernatural” or “miraculous”. The description given in the WNT is of something that is alienating, divergent from common reality to such a degree that one tends not to believe one’s eyes or ears (WNT). Greenblatt mentions that “wonder” was the quintessential human response to what Descartes called a “first encounter” and consequently, the word “wonder” became a component of the discourse of discovery. It refers to the instinctive recognition of difference (Greenblatt 1991: 20). Thus, Glazemaker opted for a term that denotes a “decisive emotional and intellectual experience felt in the presence of radical difference” (Greenblatt 1991: 14). What is stressed in the Dutch title is the secular, incredible, sensational and radically different aspect of the contents of Pinto’s account.

The indication on the Dutch title page that this book is the description of hardships rather than the less appealing “chose estranges & prodigieuses par luy veuës & ouyes” translation of “muyto estranhas cousas que vio e ouuio” reveals the intention

---

137 In some cases the word appeared in a passage that was not translated by Glazemaker.
138 Figuier unlike Herrera Maldonado did not delete the religious connotation although the title stresses the Historia oriental putting it in the first place. Figuier translated “romaria” (P 74) or “romagem” (P 136) as “pelerinage” (VA LXXXIII, CXXXV). In these passages “romaria”, “pelerinage” was not translated into Dutch. The word “pelerinage” translation of “romagem”, “peregrinaçam” or “peregrinos” (P 76, 162, 111; VA LXXV, 161; 110) is translated by Glazemaker once as “Pelgrimagie” and twice as “bedevaart” (synonym of “pelgrimage”) (WR 93, 219, 150).
to stimulate the Dutch reader who, by this time, was eager for thrilling travel narratives. The format of the book, the illustrations and the title page seem to target the common reader who knew neither Latin nor French, but was curious and probably familiar with Captain Bontekoe’s highly popular account; this reader had also certainly heard about the tragedy on the Batavia as described by Pelsaert. However, it is necessary to stress that the content of Mendes Pinto’s book in Glazemaker’s translation is quite different from popular Dutch travel accounts about the East. Wonderlyke reizen is about a Portuguese traveller who in the very title admits that he has been sold seventeen times as a slave and imprisoned. He is presented as a Portuguese who had suffered numerous humiliations at the hands of people that were usually represented as inferior, which was something new.

2.1.4 “VOORREEDEN AAN DE LEZER” (PREFACE TO THE READER)

The foreword to Wonderlyke Reizen calls our attention because it is different from other forewords at that time, though similar to most of Glazemaker’s forewords in his translations. Apart from the “Voorreeden aan de lezer” there are no other paratexts. The “Voorreeden” is not signed and it lacks the edifying solemn tone that was usual. The author is not presented as a model hero, nor is he the object of praise poems as in the Dutch travelogues mentioned above. Devoid from traditional sentimentality and devotion, the “Voorreeden” is ironic in tone. Especially striking is the fact that God simply is not mentioned even once. Mendes Pinto is presented as a Portuguese traveller with a profound knowledge of the Orient, its inhabitants and their customs – almost as if
he were a kind of modern ethnographer. He is not represented as a god-fearing Christian, as is usually the case in Dutch travel accounts of that time, and his religious beliefs are not even mentioned.

The Dutch foreword is a partial translation of the French “Advertissement au lecteur”, but unlike the French, it begins with a Dutch quote saying that it is pleasant to watch the rain fall down while standing under a roof. The idea of a detached observation is emphasised in the next sentence through an explicit reference to the Roman poet Lucretius’ (c. 98-54 BCE) *De Rerum Natura* (Book II 1-13) about the metaphor of the spectator who witnesses from a safe distance a battle between two armies or a shipwreck.

'It is pleasant to watch the rain fall when we are standing under a roof, goes the Dutch adage. It’s agreeable, says Lucretius, to watch two armies in shining armour and full battle array attack each other when we are not in peril, or to watch from the shore ships in the wild sea being tossed by the tempestuous waves putting the sailors in extreme danger, not because we draw pleasure from other people’s distress or danger but because the idea that we ourselves are
spared from these evils causes us pleasure. It is not less agreeable when, in wonder and astonishment, we hear and read about the marvellous events that happened to others on their voyages over land and by sea and we are at the same time affected by terror and by joy; by terror because by listening and reading we are moved about the dangers of others who often perish in the event and by joy because although we had the delight of being acquainted with their perils we did not partake in them.)

The sea journey and the possibility of shipwreck are traditional metaphors for life and its difficulties. In this case, the spectator is the reader who observes the unfolding of Pinto’s sea voyage and the several shipwrecks he suffered, but also who witnesses his life and struggle for survival. Seafaring was also seen as a transgression of natural boundaries exposing men to disaster, a fate to which man is condemned in the words of the old man from Restelo in Camões’ Os Lusíadas (IV, 94-104) who warns the seafarers before they leave. His advice against their sailing out is meant as a warning against human ambition that knows no limits.

However, taking risks is indispensable to realise human aspirations, one of which is knowledge. The study of the natural sciences implied transgressing the borders determined by traditional religious thought. The sea voyages were proof of the heliocentric system and thus, a major contribution in the revolutionary change of thought. The written testimonies of travellers in the newly discovered regions confronted the Europeans with other forms of society, customs, zoology, botany, languages and faiths, thus undermining the traditional assurance about religious truths. The discoveries disclosed new realities that violated fundamental beliefs. As we will see, Glazemaker – inspired by his heterodox ideas – also transgresses boundaries in his translation by deliberately manipulating the text.
The proem to Lucretius’ book II praises the Epicurean practice of *ataraxia*, that recommends a life of modest and easily satisfied appetites, and warns against lofty ambitions, in the present case, it involves riches from newly discovered territories, and the disquiet these inevitably provoke. *Ataraxia* implied a lucid state, a mind free from all worries and dogmatic beliefs. This idea of detached, unbiased observation was similar to the ideals of commitment to non-violence, tolerance and rationalism that were very appealing to the Mennonite or Collegiant group with their rational religiousness, of which Glazemaker was part.

But the reference to Lucretius reveals another indirect allusion. The content of Lucretius’ philosophical poem closely mirrors what he found in the works of the Greek philosopher Epicurus. The main purpose of Lucretius’ poem was to free men’s minds of superstition and fear of death. Throughout the poem he consistently attacks supernatural explanations of natural phenomena and argues that the world must be understood as an entirely natural phenomenon. Nature consists of atoms moving in an infinite universe of which the human being is part. As body and soul consist of atoms, they must, like every atomic compound, be destined for eventual dissolution. Hence, there was no afterlife, no reward nor punishment but simply non-existence after death.

The Roman Epicurean thinker and poet was considered to be an irreverent source because of his supposed atheism. Epicurean rationalism and materialism were perceived as threatening and blasphemous. Consequently, the use of quotations by such an author acted as a concealed form of intellectual dissidence and a way of spreading views opposed to prevailing theological orthodoxies. This was not only the case in the Dutch Republic, but also in other parts of Europe and went back to a libertine philosophical current that had flourished in sixteenth century Italy (Israel 2001: 46-49).
Considering the philosophical debate going on in the Republic between the “old” and “new” natural philosophy, the reference to Lucretius is quite intentional and an indirect warning from Glazemaker to the reader.¹³⁹

The “Voorreeden” proceeds with the presentation of the author:

Onder een groot getal der gener, die, met overmatige kommer en arbeid, en met het uitterste gevaar van hun leven, byna onëndijdige wegen te lant en ter zee bereist, byna onëndijdige lantschappen bezocht, en ’t aanmerkenswaerdig, dat hen daar ontmoet is, naaukeuriglyk aangetekent en beschreven hebben, is niet een van de minste deze Portugees, Fernando Mendez Pinto, die wy hier aan u vertonen, en, zo ik vertrou, niet onaangenaam aan u zal wezen, dewijl hy in de tijt van eenëntwintig jaren, die hy ter zee en te lant gereist heeft, in Europa, Asia, Afrika, doch voornamelijk in Asia, ontellige noden en gevaarligheden heeft uitgestaan, en, gelijk hy zelf zegt, dartien malen gevangen heeft geweest, en zeventien malen verkocht is; behalven noch de gevaarligheden en schipbrekingen, die hy op zee heeft geleden, van de welken hy deurgaans met enige weinigen, afgekomen is.

Wat zijn Reizen aangaat, die strekken zich wijt en breet uit, niet alleenlijk ter zee, maar ook te lant, niet alleenlijk in Europa, ’t welk genoeg bekent is, maar ook in Afrika, daar hy in ’t Lant der Abissynen heeft geweest, doch voornamelijk in Asia, ’t welk hy als deurkropen heeft, als in de Koninkrijken van China, Japon, Tartarien, Siam, Calaminham, Pegu, Martabane, Bengale, Brama, Ormus, Batas, Queda, Aru, Pan, Ainon, Calempleuy, Cauchinchina en veel andere landen, van de welken hy de gelegenheden der plaatsen, de vreemdigheden, die daar te zien zijn, ’t waangeloof dezer Heidenen, en de zeden en gewoonten van deze Volken, gelijk hy die zelf gezien heeft, heel naerstiglijk, en zodanig beschrijft, dat zy vermaak aan alle, ja ook aan de walgende Lezers zullen veroorzaken (WR “Voorreeden”).

(Among a large number of those who with excessive trouble and toil and utmost danger for their lives, have travelled the almost infinite roads over land and by

¹³⁹ In the “An der Leser” of the German translation Lucretius is twice mentioned in a similar context. In both cases the state of quietness is one given by God: “nicht das man sich an anderer Schaden zubelustigen / sondern der von Gott vertriebenen Ruhe zu erfreuen hat” and “in deiner dir von Gott vergönten Ruhe”. Was “God” added in order to outwit authorities?
sea, visited the almost uncountable landscapes and noted down and described with precision what remarkable things they found there, not the least [important] is Fernando Mendez Pinto whom I show you here and as I trust you will not find disagreeable, while he travelled in a period of twenty-one years over land and by sea through Europe, Asia, Africa, but mainly through Asia, during which time he suffered uncountable necessities and dangers, and as he says himself he had been imprisoned thirteen times and sold seventeen times, apart from the dangers and shipwrecks he suffered at sea of which he survived usually with very few others.

Regarding his travels, these stretch far and wide not only by sea but also on land, not only in Europe, which is sufficiently known, but also in Africa as he has been in the land of the Abyssinians but most of all Asia, as he crawled through the Kingdoms of China, Japan, Tartaria, Siam, Calaminham, Pegu, Martabane, Bengal, Brama, Ormus, Batan Islands, Queda, Aru, Pan, Ainan, Calempluy, Cauchinchina and many other countries of which he describes the places, the peculiarities that can be seen there, the superstitions of these heathen, and the morals and customs of these peoples, exactly as he observed them, very carefully and in such a way that they will cause delight to all, yes, even to the disgusted readers.)

Fernão Mendes Pinto is not presented as a model Christian crusader among the infidels, but as an objective modern ethnographer who wrote down with precision everything he observed or verified. Verification is the privileged way of obtaining knowledge. Empirical evidence as a result of the writer’s unbiased observation is stronger than preconceived ideas. Consequently, neither he nor the peoples he described are morally judged.

Starting a new paragraph, the “Voorreeden” then follows part of the French foreword of the second publication (1645), in which the translation of Mendes Pinto’s work is legitimised and in which is explained in an ironic tone that the book is aimed at all kinds of readers:

---

140 The new paragraph in the “Voorreeden” is marked by a wider space between the last word of the sentence and the first word of the next sentence.
Want de droefgeestigen zullen zonder twijfels stoffe van vermaak in de vreemde waangelovigheden der Heidenen vinden, de statigen treffelijke grontreegels voor hun burgerlijke bestiering, de geleerden verwondering in de verscheidenheid der gevoelens van veel verschillende volken, de bedrukten verquikking in d’aanschouwing der zwarigheden en tegenspoeden van ’t leven, de wijzen scherpzinnigheden van geest in ’t geen, dat de zeden en gewoonten dezer Volken betreft, de rampspoedig voorbeelden, om zich met de rampen van anderen te vertroosten, de geltzuchtigen schatten en rijkdommen in overvloed, en de stoutmoedigen stoute aanslagen, en dappere krijgshelden, (WR “Voorreeden”)

The paragraph is the translation of:

Car ici les melancholiques trouveront sans doute, des suiets de raillerie dans les superstitions des Gentils; les plus serieux des maximes remarquables en leur gouuernement politique: les doctes de l’admiration en diuersité des sectes & des opinions de plusieurs nations differentes, les affligez du contentem en la consideration des disgraces & des prosperitez de la vie; les sages des subtilitez d’esprit, en ce qui regarde les coustumes de ces peuples d’Asie; les mal-heureux des exemples pour se consoler eux-mesmes par les infortunes d’autrui; les auaricieux des richesses en abondance, & les grands courages des suiets d’entreprise & de guerre (VA “Advertissement”).

It is a book for all tastes thanks to the enormous variety of information it offers and the thrilling adventures recorded by the author.

Without starting a new sentence the Dutch text, cited above, which had been translated from the French “Advertissement” adds:

dewijl hy niet alleenlijk ’t geen verhaalt, ’t welk hem overgekomen is, maar ook gehele Historien van die landen, en opkomsten en ondergangen van Koninkrijken, voor en in zijn tijt gebeurt.

Ik weet wel dat enigen zwaarhoofdig zullen zijn, voornamelijk in ’t geloven van zodanige dingen, die de zwakheit van hun begrip, uit onkunde spruitende, overtreffen, als in de grootheid der landen, steden en plaatsen, in d’uitsteekentheit der Gebouwen, en schrikkelijke beelden, en in ’t groot en byna ongelooffelijk getal der schepen, inwoonders en krijgslieden. Maar zeker, degenen, die oude
Historien, en de genen, die de stant en gelegenheden van die landen zelf bezichtigt, of uit het lezen der boeken verstaan hebben, zullen dit niet ongeloofelijk achten, te meer dewijl men (om uit veel voorbeelden een by te brengen) geschreven vind dat de Chinezen (’t welk doch een flaamooedig Volk is) geduriglijk ten minste tien hondert duizent mannen, alleenlijk tot bezetting van hun steden, in de wapenen houden. Wijders, wat de grootheid der steden aangaat, wy hebben hier af een varsche getuignis in zeker geschrift, onlangs uitgekomen, van de grote brant in de stat Patane, die nergens na de grootste in die landen is, daar in verhaalt word dat de brant zich drie en een half mijlen in de stat uitspreid heeft, zonder echter haar geheel te noemen; in voegen dat men naar ’t deel van de grootheid van ’t geheel gissen kan (WR “Voorreeden”).

(for he does not narrate only what happened to him, but also the complete history of those countries, and the rise and decline of kingdoms that occurred before and during his time.

I am aware that some people will be pessimistic, especially in believing the kind of things that due to their ignorance surpass the frailty of their understanding, like the magnitude of the countries, cities and villages, the excellence of the buildings and terrible sculptures and the great and almost unbelievable quantity of ships, inhabitants and warriors. But no doubt those who are acquainted with those ancient Histories and those who have visited the state and location of the countries or those who know from the reading of books, will not consider it unbelievable, especially because one finds it written that the Chinese (who certainly are a cowardly people) keep at least one million men constantly armed and stationed merely in their cities. Furthermore, concerning the enormity of their cities, we have here a fresh testimony in certain writing, recently published, about the great fire in the city of Patane, far from being among the biggest in those countries, in which it is narrated that the fire spread over three and a half miles throughout the city, without considering it totally, from this one can guess the magnitude of the whole.)

The Dutch introduction focuses on the information concerning the history of the countries Mendes Pinto visited and the incredible things he saw. The fire in Patane, for instance, is referred to in several sources since the Dutch had a trading post there. But the issue here is the credibility of the text. Even before the Portuguese text was
published, the discussion was centred on what was “true” and what was not (Laborinho 2006: 20). Herrera Maldonado’s “Apologia en favor de Fernan Mendez Pinto, y desta Historia Oriental” that appeared in all four Spanish publications of 1620 (2), 1627 and 1645 reveals the need of a justification of Mendes Pinto’s reliability. The “Apologia” was followed by the “Catalogo de los Avtores qve han escrito de las Indias Orientales, Iapon, y China, y de sus situaciones, navegaciones, y conquistas” an extensive list of works by other highly regarded authors who had also written about the Orient. In the “Apologia” other travel writers are cited who corroborate some of Pinto’s affirmations. The French publication from 1628 has a “Deffence apologétique de l’Histoire Orientale de Fernand Mendez Pinto” inspired by Herrera Maldonado’s “Apologia”. In the second publication from 1645 the “Deffence” is, however, omitted and replaced by Figuier’s “Advertissement av Lectevr”. The “Advertissement” is actually a “deffence” of the translator and seems to be motivated by some of the critique he had received. In the first part of the “Advertissement”, Figuier justifies himself by stating that his translation took him seven to eight years to accomplish, during which he read many other accounts on the Orient in order to adequately express Mendes Pinto’s thoughts.141 Even so, he admits some mistakes were made and therefore, he decided to add an erratum in this second edition. He also explains that proper names and toponimical names are untranslatable. The “Advertissement” goes on to legitimizing the translation by focusing on the types of readers it is intended for, as we have already seen. At the end, Figuier says that he hopes to have pleased his readers. Thus, in the French translation of 1645, presumably Glazemaker’s source text, there is no defence or praise to Mendes Pinto.142

141 As Figuier’s translation was published in 1628, this means that he started to work on it soon after the Spanish translation had become available in 1620.
142 In both publications there was a royal privilege and dedicatory to Cardinal Richelieu.
Did the French translator or printer forget to include the “Deffence” or did Figuier want to distance himself from the Portuguese writer, as a result of the criticism he had received? What exactly did this critique consist of? The third edition in 1830 bears both introductory texts but by then Figuier had long been dead.

The Dutch foreword legitimises Pinto’s reliability through: a) the presentation of the author’s respectability, experience and accurateness; b) confirmation by testimonies of people who had travelled in those regions; c) confirmation by providing other written sources by respected authors.

At the end of the “Voorreeden” the French foreword is again cited:

Ik zeg dan tot besluit, dat ik niet twijffel of ’t verhaal dezer wonderlijke Reizen en voorvallen zal al degenen vernoegen, die de moeite, van dat te lezen, gelieven te doen, uitgezondert d’onwetenden, die misschien daar in niets naar hun smaak zullen vinden. Want, gelijk Seneca heel wel zegt, zodanige sporeloze Geesten hebben dit met de zotheid gemeen, dat zy zonder onderscheit alle dingen verachten, en daar af walgen, zonder te weten waarom (WR “Voorreeden”).

En vn mot, ie ne doute point que ces Relations ne continent tous ceux qui prendront la peine de les lire, horsmis les ignorans, qui possible n’y trouveront rien à leur goust. Car, comme dit fort bien Seneque, tells esprits extrauagans ont cela de comun auec la folie, de blasmer indifferemnt toutes choses, & s’en degouster sans sçauoir pourquoy (VA “Advertissement”).

Thus, Glazemaker confirms the French translator by saying that the book is not aimed at the ignorant, for ignorance is the origin of contempt. Seneca is cited for whom knowledge is a source of truth. Though the reference to Seneca was taken from the French “Advertissement”, we can state that Seneca is one of Glazemaker’s preferred writers: two years later, the first of Glazemaker’s three Seneca’s translations was published.
Glazemaker’s translation follows the French text closely, “ces Relations” is transformed in “‘t verhaal dezer wonderlijke Reizen en voorvallen” (the story of these marvellous travels and events), a phrase that sounds more attractive to the prospective reader.

In the Dutch foreword we do not find the traditional grave, devote or paternalist attitude. The tone is appealing; sometimes we sense a hint of irony, the idea is to publicise this book as something different, which in fact it is.

The book, unlike the Portuguese, Spanish or French publications, was not dedicated to anyone, which means that the publication was printed at Rieuwertsz’ own expense and risk.143

Having in mind that books at that time did not have a cover text, the client had to browse through the title page and foreword so as to understand what the book was about. Not only did Glazemaker write an appealing introduction, but he also included clues in it that were enough to warn the heedful reader that the following text was unorthodox.

143 Most of Glazemaker’s translations for Rieuwertsz were published without patronage.
3. Glazemaker’s Mode of Translating

3.1 Selection and Presentation of Several Passages

In order to understand how Glazemaker translates Figuier’s text some passages were chosen for examination. It proved to be necessary to confront the original text with the French and Dutch translations, and to provide a translation of Glazemaker’s text into English. The seven longer passages that will be analysed were included in Volume II, Addendum II (Passages A-G). In the case of these longer passages, and in order to facilitate the comparison between the different versions, I present them in four columns. In the first column is the original text and in bold are the parts Figuier did not translate, which is rare, as he usually did not omit anything, quite the contrary, he often augmented his text. In the second column we can find the French translation and here the words in bold correspond to the text that was added by Figuier. Underlined in the French translation are the passages Glazemaker did not translate. In the third column we find Glazemaker’s translation, in bold are the additions/changes made by him. The column on the right consists of a (as far as possible) literal translation in English of Glazemaker’s words.

Passage A was taken from the beginning of the book, passage B from the episode about Antonio de Faria, passage C from the episode about the religious rituals at Tinagoogoo, and passage D from the end of Wonderlyke Reizen, will be analysed. The choice of passages A, B, C and D was made at random in order to demonstrate that Glazemaker’s manipulations of the text are constantly applied. All other shorter and

144 The words and phrases in bold or underlined correspond roughly to what was added and omitted. Sometimes the translator decided to give the sentence another turn or change it slightly.
longer examples (passages E, F and G) analysed in this dissertation were chosen for their religious implications, their extreme omissions, and deviant ideas.\textsuperscript{145}

3.1.1 PASSAGE A: ARRIVAL AT THE CITY OF MOCAA

The first passage for analysis is the end of Chapter 5 of \textit{Peregrinaçam} (Passage A).

From the number of words we can infer that Figuier wrote in this part of chapter 5 a text twice as long as the Portuguese one. The Portuguese passage consists of 269 words, The French of 545 and the Dutch of 423. Glazemaker omitted approximately one fifth of the French text in this example. The original version is by far the shortest.

Mendes Pinto’s prose is characterised by its simplicity and the writer resorts to a straightforward oral style that is in accordance with the narrator’s naïveté. The French translator transforms Mendes Pinto’s oral style into a more elaborate one that is in conformity with literary conventions of the time. Bernard Figuier reveals a tendency to underline by adding “tout” as an adjective or adverb on several occasions, or by using a comparative “moindre”, “plus aagez” or “plus grand”, or adverbs like “plein” and “seulement”. There is a propensity to hyperbolism as he adds other adjectives such as “grosse”, “obscure”, or expressions like “excez de colere”. The exaggerations and additions have a stylistic purpose but also serve to stress the victimization of the Portuguese: “qu’il venoit de gaigner sur nous”, “tous enchainsez que nous estions, & persecutez des vns & des autres”, “Ayans este tourmentez de cette sorte” “ainsi

\textsuperscript{145} This includes the examples taken from the summaries at the beginning of each chapter and the marginalia in Part II, 2.1.2.
garottez”. Expressions like “Cét imposteur s’en alloit par la Ville sur vn Char de Triomphe”, “transportez d’vn excez de colere”, “A quoy les incitoit principalement la meschanceté du Cacis, qui leur faisoit accroire” are free interpretations that place the Caciz bluntly in a negative light. Whereas Mendes Pinto is subtle and leaves the reader wondering, Figuier emphasises and exaggerates: “grosse chaine”, or the more graphic “couuert de playes” instead of “tão ferido”. The “carro” becomes a “Char de Triomphe”, decorated with a “tapisserie” and in his description of the treatment the inhabitants gave the Portuguese he adds the word “balcons”, more noises and more dirt. Instead of a simple “praya” Soleymão Dragut is awaited at “l’embouchoure du port”.

Figuier seems to fear his readers will not understand the text and explains the term “Maulana” or the expressions “viera da casa do seu Mafoma”, “falleceo com mostras de muyto bom Christão” and adds at what time of the day and how often the meagre portion was distributed among the captives “qui nous estoit distribuée le matin pour toute le reste de la iournée”.

The longest addition is the justification for the people’s acting out of envy against each other as they mistreat the Portuguese. It has its origin in the Spanish translation where it was first added by Herrera Maldonado (in bold) and translated afterwards by Figuier:

> y desprecio del nombre Christiano, que como su Sâto les predicaua, que ganauan perdones, ninguno queria dexar de merecer en penitencias, que tampoco les costauan, gastando el día en estas estaciones. Y a casi el Sol puesto (HO 5).

The problem lies in the word “estaciones” or “Stations” in French, which has several meanings in both languages. Herrera Maldonado compared the passage of the Portuguese captives crossing through the city, during which they were physically
harassed and beaten by the people, to Christ’s Passion. The mistreatments by the native people were a form of obtaining indulgency, like the Catholics do when they pray their stations of the Cross, which consist in of a certain number of *Pater Noster* and Hail Marys, usually on Good Friday, the day Christ’s Passion is celebrated. Either Glazemaker was not familiar with the Catholic ritual because he translates “employans ... le iour en pareilles Stations” as “de dag in gelijke delen verdeelden” (divided the day in equal parts) and he does not mention the Dutch word “statie”, or else he did not want to refer to this Catholic ritual. If Glazemaker was aware of a certain parallelism, he did not want to stress the comparison between the narrator and Christ.

There are other additions made by Herrera Maldonado that were included by Figuier: “dignidad de Supremo Sacerdote” became “principale dignité Sacerdotale”, “aherrojados” “enchaisnez” and “para todo el dia mañana nos traian” “distribuée le matin pour tout ... la journée”.

When looking at Glazemaker’s translation we notice that he tends to omit what he considers irrelevant: *tous* les habitans, *grandes* benedictions, qu’il faut que i’aduouë, jamais, ainsi, trempez *dans l’eau*. In doing so, the Dutch text actually comes closer to the original, as many of Glazemaker’s omissions were additions made by Figuier, who tended to be over explicit or to emphasise, as demonstrated above. Glazemaker’s additions are more stylistically motivated tautologies like “lof en eer”, “pis en drek” or the alliteration “diep en duister”. An example of his skill as a translator is the repetition of the sounds [s] and [ŋ] in “toejuighingen met gezang en snarenspel vermengd”. Here he deleted “cris” and “plusieurs sortes”, the awkward “Musiques ... de voix” became “gezang” while “instruments” were reduced to “snarenspel” leaving out other types of

---

146 We must not forget that only the Calvinists were allowed to worship openly. See Part I, 1.
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instruments. The noises in Glazemaker’s text are associated with the atmosphere of triumphant reception for the victory of the Turkish Suleiman Dragut over the Portuguese, while in the French translation they possess a menacing character suggested by “cris” “plusieures sortes de Musiques” and “bruit”. Glazemaker translated the French “Temple” not with the Dutch word “tempel” but “kerk”, probably influenced by Meijer’s *Woordenschat* in which “tempel” is considered a loanword and “kerk” the correct Dutch equivalent (Meijer 1669: 318). The word “dietsmaakte”, currently out of use, meant “to explain” or “to deceive a person” (*WNT*). Whereas the Portuguese neutral word “dizia” was translated by Figuier as “faisoit accroire”, implying that the Caciz not only said something but had to convince his listeners, the Dutch expression is ironic as from the Caciz’s point of view he explained they would gain an indulgence. The reader is free to interpret that in reality the Caciz was deceiving his public and was thus an impostor.

It is worthy to observe that Glazemaker did not mention that the Portuguese were comforted or encouraged by the bishop’s repentance on his death-bed of a true Christian. His repentance demonstrates the strength of his convictions and serves as an inspiration for the Portuguese. Glazemaker’s omission could have been inspired by the debate on the immortality of the soul, one of the dogmas under attack by some radical thinkers.

---

147 Etymologically “tempel” [1271-72] stems from the Latin *templum* and “kerk” from the Greek *kūrikōn* [777, copy end of 11th cent.] (*Etymologisch Woordenboek van het Nederlands, Online Etymology Dictionary*, http://www.etymonline.com/index.php). The revised *Woordenschat* was published in 1654, two years after *Wonderlyke reizen*. It is possible that Meijer discussed his linguistic ideas with Glazemaker.
3.1.2 PASSAGE B: ANTONIO DE FARIA

The next example is taken from the episode about Antonio de Faria in chapter 50 (Passage B).

Quite unlike his common practice, Figuier did not add much in this passage. As usual, he stresses the evilness of the Muslims in favour of the Portuguese. Apart from adding “maudite” and “blasphemes” Figuier omits “mà” referring to the Portuguese.

The French translator was again influenced by the Spanish translation. Where Herrera Maldonado adds to the name Coja Acem “el corsario”, Figuier chooses to omit his name and simply calls him “Corsaire”. Some of Figuier’s additions are almost literal translations from the Spanish: “que es la Isla de los Cocos” becomes “qui est l’île des Cocos”, “Capitan” “Capitaine”, “de su maldita seta” “de la maudite secte”, “ansi llamam ellos al infierno” “nom qu’ils donnent à l’Enfer” and “con otras blasfemias” “par d’autres blasphèmes”. The additions go even further by explaining what Mendes Pinto does not explain, or stressing the negative side of the adversaries of the Portuguese, which Mendes Pinto does not do either. Instead, the interpretation of these two enemies assaulting each other in the name of God is left to the reader.

In the second passage Glazemaker summarises more than in the first, the 531 words in the French text are reduced to 233 in Dutch. What is completely excluded in Dutch is the explanation that God can turn bad events into favourable conditions, thus justifying Faria’s decision to attack not only Coja Acem, but all other pirates in his way. Faria justifies the violent raid he is planning by calling it an act of justice in the name of his god, when actually he wants to justify his own unchristian vengeance and greed. A few lines further down, the arrival of Hinimilau, a Chinese corsair, is presented by the narrator in the Portuguese and French texts as evidence of divine will. Once again,
Glazemaker omits the reference to this divine intervention and the Chinese corsair’s recent conversion to the Muslim faith, as well as his shouting and boasting that his god owed him a place in heaven for having killed so many Portuguese. The Dutch text does not mention the favourable conditions with which God rewarded the Portuguese so that they were able to assault those who venerated another God, nor does Glazemaker translate Hinimidau’s arrival as a divine act. God is not seen as an intervenient power that rewards the good and punishes the bad. Besides, who are the good and who are the bad? This is a very critical description of the Portuguese conduct by Mendes Pinto. In the Dutch text it is only stated that the Chinese corsair slandered against the Christians. Glazemaker considered Faria and Hinimidau as illustrations of religious intolerance and violence, and they also figure as such in Mendes Pinto’s text. Glazemaker omits their vile actions. Both pirates commit brutal crimes each in the name of his own God. Whereas the Spanish and French translator tend to present the non-Christian enemies of the Portuguese in a bad light, and place the Portuguese in a more favourable context, Glazemaker deletes illustrations of religious intolerance and violence. While confronting the Dutch text with the French and Spanish texts and with the original Portuguese text, I became aware that in the case of the Spanish and the French translations it was not a mere rhetorical embellishment but often an ideological appropriation in accordance with Christian beliefs.

We know Glazemaker belonged to a religious minority that supported non-violence and latitudinarianism and lived according to ethical principles.148 He also ommitted references to the divine will, which makes us wonder if his interests at the time already favoured an immanent concept of god instead of a transcendent and

148 See Part I,2.
anthropomorphic concept. This hypothesis is confirmed by the reference to the philosopher Lucretius in the “Voorreeden”.

The other omission in this paragraph is the date, it was September 8th, the day of the nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary. In fact, dates are details that are usually not translated by Glazemaker, as are references to saints.

Glazemaker summarises the episode when the prisoners on board of the pirate’s ship shout to God for mercy and as a result are recognised by Faria and his men as being fellow-Christians whom they decide to set free. The only direct speech in Glazemaker’s version belongs to Faria who orders:

\[
\text{Dat yder zich strijvaerdig maak. Wy moeten zien hoe’t hier gelegen is. Ik vertrou dat dit de hont, Coja Acem, is, aan de welk wy ons zullen wreken (WR 67).}
\]

(Let each one prepare himself for combat. We have to see what is going on here. I suspect that this is the dog, Coja Acem, on whom we will revenge ourselves.)

The Dutch translation is more concise and more direct than the Portuguese and French texts:

\[
e\text{a senhores \& irmaõs meus, não aja ahy companheyro que não se faça prestes, porq nòs, co nome de Christo auemos de saber o que isto he, porque a mim me dà na vontade que he este o perro de Coja Acem, \& quiç a que nos pagara oje bem nossas fazendas (P 50).}
\]

Messieurs, \textit{leur dit-il}, qu’il n’y ait aucun qui ne se tienne prest, pource que moyennant la Grace de Dieu \textit{ie me promets} que nous ñçaurons \textit{bien-tost} d’où vient \textit{tout} cecy. Car ie m’imagine que c’est ce chien de Coja Acem, \& possible qu’il nous pourra bien payer aujourd’hui nos marchandises (VA L).

In bold are Figuier’s additions in the French text and his omissions in the Portuguese text. Figuier did not translate “irmaõs meus” nor “companheyro”. Once more, Figuier adheres to the Spanish text in which the direct speech was transformed
into indirect speech and the expressions omitted. Consequently, in the Spanish and French text Faria appears to be more distant from his men and the narrator. By now, Antonio de Faria’s darker side is becoming clearer and clearer. The distance created by omitting the expressions “irmãos meus” and “companheiro” shield the Portuguese and especially the narrator from the (contaminating) evil Antonio de Faria represents.

In Glazemaker’s text, the vocative and the double negative are omitted. Instead of a metaphor about the possibility of reimbursing today their lost goods, the text simply mentions that they will take revenge. Glazemaker’s text is more straightforward, there is no doubt that revenge will be violent because he prefers the expression “strjitvaerdig maken” (to prepare for combat) instead of “gereedmaken” (to prepare). The most noteworthy omission is the fact that Faria is acting in God’s name. Actually, each time Antonio de Faria calls upon God, Jesus Christ or the divine justice these invocations are omitted by Glazemaker. With the exception of Faria’s fatal shipwreck in a storm, when the narrator, sailing on another vessel, hears some men on Faria’s ship shout: “Heer, barmhartige God” (Lord, merciful God) (WR 97) translation of “Senhor Deos misericordia” (P 79), “Seigneur Dieu misericorde” (VA LXXVIII), but the reader is not sure who exactly is calling upon God. The other occasion is again a reference to God’s mercy when Faria and his men are nearly starving and he comforts them by saying that “nosso Senhor he infinitamente misericordioso” (P 54), “nostre Dieu est infiniment misericordieux” (VA LIV) translated as “Maar God is barmhartig” (but God is merciful, WR 72), omitting “nostre” and “infiniment”.

---

149 The Spanish translation reads: “y al fin dixo, hablando con todos nosotros, que no huuiesse ninguno, que con animo varonil no apercibiesse sus armas, porque determinaua saber el autor de aquella descortesia, porque le auia dado ai alma, que era el Cosario, en cuya demanda andauamos, y que ansi le acometiessemos en el nombre de Christo, porque á lo que pensaua era ya llegada la hora en que ponia en nuestras manos el Cielo la satisfacion de tantos agrauios por aquel aleue recibidos” (HO 50).
Yet, whenever Faria’s enemies evoke God this is generally included. Such is the case of the old hermit’s discourse in chapters 76 and 77, or when the Chinese boy in chapter 55 mentions “por amor do teu Deos” “pour l’amour de ton Dieu” (VA LV) Glazemaker omits “ton” and translates “om God’s wil” (for the sake of God) (WR 72). On both occasions the reader is confronted with two non-Christian characters who ethically serve as a foil for Faria and his men.

By omitting Faria’s invocation of God, Glazemaker creates a more secular text. Another reason is the fact that Glazemaker’s intended public is composed of Protestants and Catholics. Thus, by taking out Catholic references, he transforms the text to make it more neutral and acceptable by both groups.

In the episode about Antonio de Faria, most of the narrator’s expressions referring to the will of God are usually excluded, as can be seen with “prouue a nosso Senhor”, “prouue a Deos”, “quiz nosso Senhor”, “nosso Senhor nos deu”, and “com a ajuda de nosso Senhor” which are generally translated as “il pleut à Dieu” (there are several different spellings in the French text), “il pleut a Nostre Seigneur”, “Dieu nous fist la grace”, “l’ayde de Dieu”, and “grace de Dieu”. At the end of chapter 50 “prouue a nosso Senhor”, “il pleust à Dieu de nous estre si fauorable” (VA L) was, however, translated as “God was … zo jonstig aan ons” (God was so favourable to us) (WR 67) and in chapter 53 Antonio de Faria escaped death owing to “prouue a Deos”, “grace de Dieu” (VA LIII), in Dutch “God’s genade” (WR 70). In the same chapter in which an argument over the booty broke out among the soldiers while they were staying at the rightly called “Eilant der Dieven” “ilha dos ladroës”, a terrible storm broke out, and

150 The name refers to a little archipelago a few miles to the southwest of the island Lantao and was a safehaven for pirates (Salmon 2010: Fernão Mendes Pinto and the Peregrinação, Notes, Vol. 3, 2010: 96).
the narrator and his companions prayed for “misericordia de nosso Senhor ... mas como, por nossos peccados, não eramos merecedores de nos elle fazer esta merce, ordenou a sua diuina justiça” (P 53). The expression is translated as “onze toevlucht tot Gods barmhartigheid alleen namen. Maar dewijl wy / uit oorzaak van onze zonden / Gods barmhartigheid niet verdienden / zo liet hy toe (WR 70)” (we resorted solely to God’s mercy. But because of our sins we did not deserve God’s mercy, He permitted). In French the passage reads, “la misericorde de Dieu, que nous reclamions tous à nostre aide, aué des cris & des larmes continuelles. Mais d’autant que pour nos pechez nous ne meritions que Dieu nous fit cette grace, sa Diuine Iustice ordonna” (VA LIII). The prayer itself and the fact that it was not answered was translated because it reflects the narrator’s self-criticism and repentance as he was conscious he did not deserve God’s mercy. By now, no reader and not even the narrator doubt the immorality of the Portuguese group. Though aware of God’s punishment in the form of a tempest in which the few who manage to survive loose everything, even their clothes, Antonio de Faria convinces his men that God will reward them with much more than what they had just lost. In fact, in the next chapter their miraculous rescue in the form of flying fish and other animals is narrated. Glazemaker does not describe their rescue as a supernatural intervention but, as we saw before, the incident with the flying fish can be interpreted as a parody of the Prophet Moses and Captain Bontekoe.151

On two occasions the Portuguese expression “quiz nosso Senhor” “il pleu à Dieu (VA LVI) and “Dieu permist” (VA LXI), was translated as “tot ons geluk” (to our good luck) (WR 74, 81). In these cases, Glazemaker intentionally changed the divine will into a stroke of luck as an intervening God is usually absent from the Dutch translation. It

---

151 See Part II, section 1.2.
reminds us of Van Praag’s observation, in which he mentions that Glazemaker changed the text in *De deugdelyke vrou* regarding superstition (Praag 1935: 94).  

Another remarkable characteristic is Glazemaker’s omission of the possessive pronoun when referring to God in the examples mentioned above, “nostre Dieu est infiniment misericordieux” (VA LIV) or “pour l’amour de ton Dieu” (VA LV). Glazemaker reveals to have a universal concept of God. The idea is strengthened by the translation of the evocation of God by the Chinese hermit and boy who are not Christians, but who are more honourable than Faria and his men.

### 3.1.3 Passage C: Tinagoogoo

The third example was taken from chapter 160 in which Mendes Pinto describes the impressive procession and bloody scenes of self-sacrifice in Tinagoogoo (Passage C).

Though this passage is located near the end of Glazemaker’s translation in which he reveals a growing tendency to summarise, this description was less abridged. It represents a shocking custom that appeals to the readers’ curiosity and was one of the reasons for publishing the book as we saw in the “Voorreeden”. Glazemaker only leaves out small details that he considers irrelevant: “à deux bouts”, “tout du … alloient”, “fort haut”, “ou mesme … ordre”, “pour cet effect”, etc. He omits that they were given food “pour l’honneur de Dieu”. We have verified that there is a tendency to ignore God as an intervening or venerable force.

---

152 See Part I, section 6.3.
The longest omission is the commentary declaring that despite their good deeds, these people were not Christians. By emphasizing that they were not Christians, the Portuguese, Spanish and French texts imply that the lack of Baptism and belief was detrimental for the quality of these deeds. The French and Spanish translations explain that these acts were more appropriate to Christians than to pagans: “il s’y fairoit tant de bonnes oeuvres, & si propres aux Chrestiens plustost qu’aux Gentils,” (VA CLIX) or “mas proprias por cierto de Christianos que de infieles” (HO 160). Once again, the French translator followed the Spanish version and felt the need to stress the fact that these people were not Christians.

In Glazemaker’s opinion, good deeds are good no matter who performs them. By omitting the division between those who had been baptised and those who had not, he hints at human equality, regardless of their faith, stressing the universal values in different religions and righteousness.

3.1.4 PASSAGE D: THE SAD DEATH OF THE KING OF SIAM

When Glazemaker approaches the end of the translation, he seems to be in a hurry. For example, in chapter 183 of Peregrinaçam, in the last part of the Dutch translation, because the episode about Francis Xavier was left out, the narrator wishes to prove the high merits of a gentile king by using three examples, but in Dutch only one is given (Passage D).

The most remarkable change by Figuier is the modification of “o milhor Rei Gentio” into “meilleur Roy que celuy-cy ny parmy ces Payens”, emphasising the
people’s paganism instead of the King’s, who owned qualities many Christian rulers lacked.

Glazemaker only translates the phrase “l’infortuné Roy rendit l’esprit en la presence de la pluspart des Seigneurs de son Royaume”\(^\text{153}\) and sums up the rest of the paragraph, merely mentioning that the king was meritorious and gives one example instead of three.

The exact moment of the King’s passing away is omitted, as he usually did not translate details, which is one of Glazemaker’s features. Other omissions include the reactions of the ruler’s subjects, the many qualities the King possessed and emphasis on the fact that they were pagans. We notice that Glazemaker had a tendency to abridge, therefore, usually leaving out what he considered irrelevant or uninteresting.

The examples given reveal that Glazemaker’s style is clear, to the point, easy to read and deprived of the baroque ornaments in vogue in France. He avoids loanwords and prefers a purified vernacular language. His style reveals the new tendency among radical intellectuals.

### 3.2 Different Types of Abridgement

Glazemaker’s most evident omission was the episode on Saint Francis Xavier, but he left out other episodes, summarised some and skipped details. On the whole, one can define three main tendencies: a) a tendency to summarise; b) the omission of episodes; c) the exclusion of passages that I will call “pious” omissions.

\(^\text{153}\) Glazemaker translated “pluspart” by “voornaamste” which means “most important”.
3.2.1 TENDENCY TO SUMMARISE

In general we can state that Glazemaker often reduced dialogues to a few lines in indirect speech; the same goes for the letters which he often translates based on a global understanding. For instance, in chapter 31 of *Peregrinaçam* Glazemaker does not translate the letter from the King of Jantana to the King of Achem, nor his answer (*WR* 39). Nevertheless, he does not omit Fernão Gil Porcalho’s speech – though it is slightly shortened – in which he admits having committed acts of cannibalism (*P* 33; *VA* XXXIII; *WR* 43). Glazemaker does not leave out the sensational aspect of Porcalho’s story, nor does he overlook the fact that a Christian committed this sin.

When looking at the two-part sermon against tyranny in chapter 168, we verify that the first part, which is a eulogy of the dead Rolim written in direct speech, is summarised in a few lines; while the second (Passage E), in indirect speech, is less abridged. Glazemaker probably considered that eulogies were traditionally held at funerals and therefore an irrelevant detail. On the other hand, the second part in which the King, moved to tears, manifests himself in favour of the rights and justice of his people, was an unusual act worthy to be mentioned. Thus, Glazemaker decided not to condense it as much as he did in the first part.

The last part of the sentence Figuier translated in a different way than what was originally stated in the Portuguese text. It reveals that the French translator interpreted the Burmese king’s speech as a moral lesson and it implies that the narrator and his fellow Christians did not live according to true Christian values. The last part of the sentence in French is, however, omitted by Glazemaker. In the original text the Portuguese were left bewildered by this Gentile’s speech but no reason is given for their
perplexity.\textsuperscript{154} In Glazemaker’s text there is no indication of “Chrestiens” or “Gentio”. We have already seen that the translator valued a life in accordance to one’s own spirituality and honest moral values, and not tied to dogmas. Organised churches were considered hopelessly corrupt. In Pinto’s Peregrinaçam we find examples of a slightly different thought: righteousness or corruption can be found everywhere, regardless of religion or nation; there are the cacizes of Mecca that have to be bribed (\textit{P} 6; \textit{VA} VI; \textit{WR} 11) or the vicar of Liampoo, Esteuão Nogueyra, who resembles more an investor than a priest (\textit{P}: 69; \textit{VA} LXVIII; \textit{WR}: 86). At the other end, we find the Chinese hermits living in seclusion in a form of asceticism, renouncing worldly concerns and pleasures (\textit{P} 76-77; \textit{VA} LXXVI-LXXVII; \textit{WR} 93-95).

The events referring to Diogo Soarez, Gonçallo Pacheco or Christouão Sarmento in chapters 192, 195 and 196 of the Portuguese text but almost at the closing stages of Glazemaker’s translation are summarised in a few lines (\textit{WR} 260-61), without even mentioning the names of the last two men. Though at the beginning of his work Glazemaker follows his source text more accurately than at the end, in the last quarter of his translation he reveals a growing tendency to summarise. The closer the text reaches its conclusion, the more frequent and more extensive the omissions become, and so is the propensity to summarise. The Dutch translation omits the episode about Francis

\textsuperscript{154} It seems that Figuier’s choice was influenced by the Spanish translation: “otras protestas hizo muy santas, y loables, dignas por cierto de cualquier peto Christiano” (\textit{HO} 168). The bewilderment that Mendes Pinto does not comment but has to be interpreted by the reader seems to have left the two translators also somehow bewildered. Their interpretation does not permit the reader to wonder why the Portuguese felt so baffled. They were confused because the promises made by this pagan sovereign were righteous and morally correct but they were not used to hear this kind of speech from a king. It is an indirect criticism of Christian monarchs who did not make such promises nor acted correspondingly. The French translation comes closer to the original as the monarch could serve as a model for Christians. To Herrera Maldonado the pagan king was worthy of a Christian while what is meant was the opposite: The men were bewildered because no Christian king was so righteous as this king.
Xavier, which means that the end comes immediately after chapter 202 of the Portuguese text.

The reader gets the impression that the translator is in a hurry to finish his task. We know that by this time Glazemaker had already become a professional translator. Was the reason why he worked so fast because he had to guarantee a certain income? Or was it also because he was being pressed to translate other books that were more urgent? Did his publisher judge the book too voluminous? In fact, in the years that were to come, Glazemaker revealed an intense production as a translator.

3.2.2 OMISSION OF DETAILS

Glazemaker tends to leave out details he probably considered irrelevant for the progress of narrative, such as dates for example. Right from the very first chapter he does not mention that the narrator was in Lisbon at the time of Dom Manuel’s death, on December 13th 1521, the day dedicated to Saint Lucy, nor does he mention the period in which Dom João III took shelter in Sesimbra. In the second chapter, he once more excludes dates: in the first sentence “Aos onze dias do mês de Março do Anno de mil & quinhentos & trinta & sete”, “Ce fût en l’année 1537. & le vnziéme iour de Mars,” which contradicts the date mentioned a little further “a cinco de Setembro do mesmo anno de 1538”, “le 5. de Septembre, en la mesme année 1538.”. It is possible Glazemaker decided to omit the dates because he considered them irrelevant and because the chronology is confusing.

He often omits phonetic transcriptions, such as in chapters 96, 127, 160, 167 or 199 for example:
a q todo o côcurso da gente fez tamanhas mostras de alegria q batêdo as palmas a modo de quem dâ graças dezião cô bramidos terriueis, exirau opatuu, louuado sejas Senhor (P 199).

tous ceux de l’assemblée frappant des mains, donnerent de grandes demonstrations d’allegrasse, e s’escrierent par maniere d’action de graces, Exir ao opatuu, Loüé soyez vous Seigneur (VA CXCVIII).

riep de gehele vergadering / als tot dankbewijs / met grote blijchap uit: Gelooft zy gy, Heer (WR 265).

(the whole assembly cried with great joy, in gratefulness: Praised be Thou, Lord.)

The same happens to the inventory of products (Passage F). Glazemaker does not include the enumeration of all the products they bought – sulphur, cannonballs, weapons, etc. – from which an attentive reader concludes that they were preparing themselves for combat, although it is not explicitly mentioned; instead, he prefers to add “om tegen onze vyant te strijden” (in order to fight against our enemy, WR 77). In doing so, this passage is almost one third shorter when compared to the original.

3.2.3 “PIOUS” OMISSIONS

It has been observed that the translations of Peregrinaçam in Protestant countries were affected by political circumstances. Catz mentions the omission of “pious Catholic phrases or references” (1989: xxix). It may be questioned whether these are in fact omissions that have purposely been done in order to avoid problems with the Protestant authorities. The Republic was known for its tolerance and during the second half of the seventeenth century there were only two main grounds for banning philosophical books: those that reflected an anti-Trinitarian perspective or those that were considered atheistic (Israel 1995: 915). We have already seen that Rieuwertsz and
Glazemaker were not afraid of publishing unorthodox books that were likely to cause problems with the authorities.

### 3.2.3.1 Christ

Taking up again Catz’s comment on the elimination of Catholic references in translations, published in Protestant countries, makes us wonder how one could justify the exclusion of the name of Jesus or Christ or Jesus Christ? With the exception of five occasions, Glazemaker avoids mentioning the name of God’s son. The first omission occurs in chapter 10 during a sea battle and after having killed six Portuguese, the Turkish shout to thank Muhammad. In reaction, the Portuguese admiral cries out:

> Ah senhores & Christaõs, ja que estes caês chamão pelo diabo que seja com elles, chamamos nos por Iesu Christo que seja com nosco (P 10).

> Mes compagnons d’armes, leur dit-il, puisque ces chiens appellent le Diable à leur ayde, prions tous le Sainct Nom de Iesus-Christ, qu’il soit à la nostre (VA X).

The admiral’s cry was deleted; nevertheless, the Dutch text mentions the Turkish thanking their prophet but not the admiral’s comment. In a Protestant country the admiral’s reaction would be considered as being natural, we can find similar reactions in Dutch travelogues of the time because the expression he used could be uttered by both a Catholic and a Protestant.

It would take us too long to list all the omissions of “Jesus” or “Christ” as they are more than twenty. On two occasions, Glazemaker substituted the French “Iesus-Christ” by “God”.

---

155 On two occasions, Glazemaker substituted the French “Iesus-Christ” by “God”.

183
treze” is translated into French as “l’année de Nostre Seigneur Iesus Christ 1013.” (VA XCV) and into Dutch as “duizentendartiende jaar … van Christus” (WR 121). It is a reference to a Christian calendar rather than to Christ himself. In chapter 116 the name of Christ is referred to twice. It was necessary to maintain the name as it is part of the dialogue in which the narrator recognises a fellow Christian, Vasco Calvo. We will shortly see why Glazemaker did not omit this episode.156

The two other references I found occur in chapters 145 and 146 (VA CXLIV-CXLV). The first comes out of the mouth of the “pathetic little King” who identifies himself as a Christian. In the second case, we find an identical situation when the narrator arrives at a village with sixty-four women and children who also identify themselves in this way.

In order to interpret the exclusion of the name of “Christ” by Glazemaker we will have to analyse other omissions and contextualise them.

3.2.3.2 SAINTS, DEMONS AND PRAYERS

It is remarkable that the reference to saints is usually avoided. Days dedicated to saints are omitted, and as we have already seen, dates are also generally not mentioned. We can interpret Glazemaker’s omissions of evocations of the name of saints, for example “nossa Senhora de Nazarè”, “Nostre Dame de Nazareth” (P 63; VA LXII), “santa Caterina”, “saincte Catherine” (P 43; VA XLIII) or “Saõ Lazaro”, “S. Lazare” (P 98; VA XCVII), or references to the calendar of saints “festa do Arcanjo São Miguel”, “iour que l’on celebre la feste de S. Michel” (P 54; VA LIV) or “vespera de São

156 See Part II, 3.2.3.3.
Bertolameu", “la veille de Sainct Barthelemy” (P 155; VA CLIV) not to be in accordance to Protestant standards. This seems to be confirmed by the omission, in chapter 48 of Portuguese and French texts, of: “Ladainha”, “Letanie” and of the promise the Portuguese made to “nossa Senhora do outeyro de Malaca”, “Nostre-Dame du Mont, qui est à Malaca”, or the evocation of the “Virgem nossa Senhora”, “la Vierge” (P 202; VA CCI). More proof can be found in the translation of:

Raynha do Ceo, porem elles não dizem isto pela que o he verdadeyramente, que he a Virgem Maria nossa Senhora (P 110).

Royne du Ciel, que les miserable tiennent sans comparaison au mesme rang que nous pouuons tenir la Vierge Marie (VA CIX).

*Koningin des Hemels* (...) die zy in eenzelve staat stellen / als de Roomsgezinden de maagt Maria (WR 146).

(Queen of Heaven, (...) to whom they give the same status as the Roman Catholics give to the Virgin Mary.)

While in the Portuguese text she actually is the “Virgem Maria nossa Senhora”, in the French translation her status is compared to our “Vierge Marie” and in the Dutch text she is the Catholics’ “maagt Maria”. A certain distance is created when the Roman Catholics are presented in the Dutch text. In doing so, the reader becomes aware that there is no difference between the Virgin Mary and the Chinese Queen of Heaven in status, as both religions have similar aspects. Accordingly, “miserables” is omitted some lines further down because there is no reason in only calling the Chinese “miserables” for believing in a Queen of Heaven.

In chapter 191, we find that the scene between Diogo Soarez and the old father is shortened (Passage G). Omitted by Glazemaker is the discourse of the old father begging Diogo Soarez for his daughter’s freedom in which is referred the dogma of the Immaculate Conception:
peçote senhor por reuerencia do grande Deos que adoras, concebido no ventre da Virgem sem macula de peccado algum, como confesso & creyo segundo o que delle tenho sabido & ouuido, que me não tomes minha filha ... em quãto viuer,

ie te supplie pour l’amour & le respect du grand Dieu que tu adores, qui a esté conceu sans tache d’aucun peché dans le ventre de la Vierge, comme ie le confesse & le croy selon ce que i’en ay sceu, & que i’en ay ouy dire, que tu ne m’enleus point ma fille ... que ie viuray.

Instead, in Glazemaker’s text we just read, “dee ootmoedige gebeden tot verlossing van zijn Dochter” (performed humble prayers for the salvation of his daughter) and no mention is made of God nor of the immaculate conception of Christ by the Virgin. Glazemaker avoids the mentioning of Christ’s name because the divinity of Christ was a dogma of the church that was being questioned by the circle Glazemaker belonged to. This is once more emphasised by the fact that although Glazemaker translates two short speeches by Diogo Soarez, the first one is, however, translated with a slight difference: the expression “nunca Deos queira” “À Dieu ne plaise”, a reference to the will of God as a justification for his foul act, was suppressed.

The name of the Virgin Mary also is frequently avoided, especially since many prayers are not translated. Nonetheless, her name is not always excluded. When the narrator arrives at a village with Christians, they welcome him with:

Christão, Christão, Iesu, Iesu santa Maria, & algůs dezião Padre nosso que estãs nos Ceos santificado seja o teu nome, sem mais outra cousa (P 146).

Chrestien, Chrestien, Iesus, Iesus, sainte Marie, & quelques-vns Pater noster, & ainsi du reste (VA CXLV).

“Christen, Christen, Jesus, Jesus, heilige Maria” (WR 192).

In the case of Glazemaker, the indication that some prayed the Pater Noster is omitted. The only reason I can find for eliminating this prayer that is common to
Protestants as well as Catholics is to make the text shorter. The rest of the sentence was not deleted. Like the episodes with Vasco Calvo (P 116; VA CXV; WR 155-156), the “pathetic little King” (P 145; VA CXLIV; WR 191) and the sixty-four women and children (P 146; VACXLV; WR 192), these characters identified themselves as being fellow Christians by revealing signs or demonstrating evidence of their Christianity.

Avoiding references to saints could be explained as a stratagem used by Glazemaker so as not to over identify the narrator and his companions with the Catholic Church, and to present them thus in a more neutral way with whom many readers could identify with or with whom they could compare the Dutch travellers in the Far East.

There is a tendency in Glazemaker to omit references to the devil, demon or related expressions, like “diabolic”. Of the nearly forty references I found, more than half were omitted. Nevertheless, as many pagan rituals are described, the expressions occur regularly and are almost unavoidable, especially in chapters 160 and 161, in which we find the description of the procession at the pagoda of Tinagoogoo.

On the whole, Glazemaker either omits prayers or they are referred to but their content is mostly left out and the same happens to many Catholic rituals. Upon observing the episode about Antonio de Faria we verify that:

- In chapter 54 when Antonio de Faria and his men are almost starving to death, he prays: “Senhor Iesu Christo, eterno Filho de Deos, … acabemos como fieis”, “Seigneur Iesus-Christ, Eternel Fils de Dieu, … nous te soyons à iamais fideles” (VA LIV), Glazemaker condenses this episode – the prayer and the procession that follows –

---

157 In this passage, it seems that even Figuier decided to do so.
in one single sentence: “Wy gingen derwaarts / met uitstorting van tranen en gebeden” (We walked away shedding tears and saying prayers, WR 71).158

– In chapter 57 Antonio de Faria’s prayer and the men’s answer “Senhor Iesu Christo … estes pobres companheiros” “Seigneur Iesus-Christ … nos pauures miserables compagnons” (VA LVI) is completely excluded;

– In chapter 61 the paragraph containing Antonio de Faria’s prayer as well as the men’s answer “Senhor Iesu Christo … de dor & tristeza”, “Seigneur … de douleur & de tristesse;” (VA LX) is translated as “en hem droeve tranen en gebeden dee uitstorten” (and made him [Antonio de Faria] shed sad tears and say prayers, WR 80-81);

– In chapter 69 the Catholic ritual performed by the priest and six young acolytes dressed up as angels in front of the statue of nossa Senhora da Conceição beginning with “Despois q o tumulto foy calado”, “ce tumulte finy” (VA LXVIII) until the end of the chapter is entirely omitted, except for the sermon by Esteuão Nogueyra and the laughter in the church that had previously occurred.

With the exception of the last case, in which we have acolytes dressed up as angels kneeling in front of a statue, and the first in which a procession is mentioned, the other two occasions in which prayers are omitted can not be explained as a sort of censorship of Catholic rituals in order to please Protestant authorities as Protestants also pray. I believe Glazemaker omitted the prayers because he does not believe in an intervening God and thus, there is no need for prayer. By omitting a Catholic ritual, he also turns the text more neutral and acceptable by Catholic and Protestant readers.

158 A little further in the text: “zagen wy ook een Hert / dat terstont gedoot was” (we saw a deer that had just been killed, WR 71). Divine will is not mentioned because Figuier translated: “le bon-heur voulut que nous vismes vn Cerf fraisement escorgé” while the Portuguese text says: “nos deparou nosso Senhor hũ veado degolado” (P 54; VA LIV).
On the other hand, in chapter 55 the references to God by the Chinese child are not deleted, nor are his gestures and plead:

mas pondo os olhos no Céu, com as mãos aleuanta das disse chorando, bendita seja senhor a tua paciência, que sofreu ater na terra gente que faleu tão bem de ti, & vse tão pouco da tua ley como estes miseraeus & cegos, que cuydáo que furtar & pregar te pode satisfazer como aos principes tyrannos que reynão na terra (P 55). (59 words)

les yeux eleuez au Ciel, & les mains iointes il dit en pleurant, Beniste soit, Seigneur, ta puissance, qui permet qu'il y ait sur terre des gens, qui parlent si bien de toy, & qui observent si peu ta luy, comme ces miserable aueugles, qui croyent que voler & prescher soient des choses qui te puissent satisfaire, comme des Princes Tyrans qui viuient sur terre (VA LV). (65 words)

hy / met gevouwe handen d’ogen ten hemel heffende / zeide: Heer, gezegent zy uw macht,319 die toelaat dat ‘er op aarde lieden zijn, die zo wel van u spreken, en zo weinig uw wet onderhouden, gelijk deze rampzalige blinden, die geloven dat roven en preken twee dingen zijn, die u vonnen vernoegen, gelijk de dwingelandige Vorsten, die op aarde leven (WR 73). (59 words)

(he / with folded hands raising his eyes to the sky / said: Lord, blessed be your might, that allows there be people on earth who speak so well of you, and observe so little of your divine Law, like these wretched blind, who believe that robbing and preaching are two things, that can satisfy you, like the tyrannical sovereigns, that live on earth.)

Glazemaker translated the text almost literally: the Chinese child seems even more impressive as Glazemaker took out “en pleurant”. He introduced the word “twee” (two) to make the sentence stylistically more fluent. Though the boy does not belong to the Christian Church, his discourse reflects an appropriate criticism and an ethical standpoint more in conformity with those expressed by the eclectic radical thinkers in Amsterdam who abhorred the institutionalised Church and tyranny.

---

319 Glazemaker’s “macht” “puissance” is the (mis)translation of the Portuguese “paciencia” by Figuier.
Sometimes Glazemaker does not omit but he makes subtle changes to some parts. For instance, in chapter 12 when the Portuguese text refers to the Turkish enemy with “pelo desejo que todos tinhão de se verem com estes inimigos da nossa santa Fè” “pour l’extrême désir qu’auoient tous les nostres de s’en aller combatre les ennemis de nostre Foy” (VA XII)\textsuperscript{160} this is rendered as “zij machtig op de Turken verbitterd waren” (they were very furious with the Turks, WR 18). In the Dutch sentence there is no reference to “tous les nostres” or “ennemis de nostre Foy”. Both parts are referred to in the third person and no mention to faith is made; the war between the Turks and the Portuguese is not seen as a religious war, but at stake are commercial interest and hegemony.

Glazemaker’s omissions are not always consistent and remind us of Van Praag’s inconclusiveness about the titles of saints in Glazemaker’s translation De deugdelyke vrou [1] (Van Praag 1935: 94). Akkerman also mentions that Glazemaker’s translation of “God” is not always consistent.\textsuperscript{161} It is a fact that most of the time these inconsistencies are associated with issues and rituals related to Catholicism or Christianity in general.

\textbf{3.2.3.3 Sante Kroos}

Most of the time Glazemaker avoids translating references to the Holy Cross, the most important religious symbol of Christ and Christianity. I found forty-one occurrences of the word “cross” in the French translation, twenty-eight of which occur

\textsuperscript{160} In the French sentence “sancta” was not translated.
\textsuperscript{161} See Part I, section 6.3.
in the episodes about Francis Xavier, Inez de Leiria (P 91; VA XC) and Mateus Escandel (P 96; VA XCV) that were deleted by Glazemaker. I here want to consider the remaining thirteen instances in the French text and the way they were translated by Glazemaker.

Glazemaker translated the references to the Holy Cross only if they figure in the text as objects and not as symbols of Christian doctrine:

– Crosses on banners: “hûa grande bandeyra de Cruz”, “vne Croix dans la banniere” (P 56; VA LV) became “een kruis in ’t vaandel” (a cross in the banner) (WR 74) and “hûa bandeyra de Cruz”, “vne banniere … où estoit peincte vne Croix” (P 146; VA CXLV) became “een Vaandel … daar in een kruis geschildert was” (a banner … in which a cross had been painted, WR 192);

– The “Cruz de prata”, “croix d’argent”, “zilver kruis” (silver cross) mentioned when Vasco Calvo shows the narrator a cross in order to let him know he is not an attacker (P 116; VA CXV; WR 156).

– In the same chapter when Calvo cries out, after having been recognised by the narrator as a fellow Christian:

Bemdito & louuado seja o dulcissimo nome de nosso Senhor Jesu Christo, pois a cabo de tanto tempo & em tamanho desterro permitio verê meus olhos homem Christão, que professasse a ley de meu Deos posto na Cruz (P 116).

Benist & loüé soit le doux nom de nostre Seigneur Iesu-Christ, puis qu’apres vn si long-temps & en vn si grand exil, il m’a fait la grace de voir vn homme Chrestien, qui fait profesion de la ley de mon Dieu mis en croix (VA CXV).

Gezegent en gelooft zy de naam van onze Heer Jesus Christus, dewijl hy na zo lang een tijt, en in zo lang een ballingschap, een Christen mensch voor my doet verschijnen (WR 156).

(Blessed and praised be the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, as he after such a long time, and such a long exile, makes appear in front of me a Christian.)
In this speech the only omission by Glazemaker is the reference to the crucified God at the end of the sentence.

Further ahead in the text, at Calvo’s house, the preparations at the hidden altar and the prayers said by his converted Chinese wife and children (over two hundred words in the original text) are not translated by Glazemaker:

a qual acabada, se leuantou sua molher com muyta cortesia, & como tinha por costume dar Christammente graças a Deos em segredo, por algum receyo que tinha dos Gentios ou de parentes honrados que tinha na terra, tirou hûa chaue que trazia no braço, & abrio hûa portinha de hum oratorio muyto bem concertado, onde estaua hum altar com hûa Cruz de prata, & dous castiçaes & hûa alampada do mesmo, & pondose ella & os filhos todos quatro em joelhos com as maõs aleuantadas disseraõ estas palauras pelo Portuguez, & bem pronùciado. … confessarem a aua ley com palauras tão santas. Acabado isto tudo, por serem ja mais de três horas depois da meya noite, nos tornamos para a nossa pousada, tão espantados do que viramos quanto da mesma cousa se pode entender que era razão (P 116).

Apres le soupper sa femme se leua de table aucuc beaucoup de courtoisie, & comme c’estoit sa coutume, elle se mit à rendre grâces à Dieu en vraye Chrestienne, bien qu’elle le fit secrettement pour la peur qu’elle auoit de ses Gentils, & de ses parens qui estoient du pays & personnes de qualité. Pour cet effect ayant pris vne clef qu’elle portoit d’ordinaire à son bras, elle en ouurit la porte d’vn Oratoire où il y auoit vn autel aucuc vne Croix d’argent, ensemble deux chandeliers, & vne lampe de mesme; puis elle et ses enfans s’estant mis tous quatre à genoux aucuc les mains leuées au Ciel, se mirent à dire ces paroles en Portugais, qu’ils prononcerent distinctement: … cœfessoient ainsi sa loy aucuc des paroles si saintes. Ces choses acheuées, pour ce qu’il estoit desia plus de trois heures aprës la minuit, nous nous en retournâmes à nostre giste, extremement estonnez de ce que nous venions de voir, comme d’vne chose qui auec beaucoup de raison nous pouuoit donner de l’admiration (VA 115).

Na dat de maaltijt gedaan was / stont de vrou met grote heusheit op / en / volgens haar gewoonte / dankte God / als een ware Christelijke vrou / doch in ’t heimelijk / uit vrees van deze Heidenen /en van haar magen / die Lieden van
Staat waren. Toen dit gedaan was / keerden wy weer / vermits het alreeds drie uren na middernacht was / naar onze herberg / en waren grotelijks verwondert van ’t geen / dat wy gehoord en gezien hadden (WR 156).

(After they finished their meal the woman got up with great politeness and according to her custom thanked God like a true Christian woman although in secret, fearing of these pagans and her relatives who were members of State. When this was done we returned to our inn as it was already three hours after midnight and we were highly astonished by what we had heard and seen.)

No mention is made of the altar with the cross, neither of the contents of the prayer in which Calvo’s Chinese wife, kneeling before “vossa Cruz”, “vostre Croix” professes her belief in the Holy Trinity “tres pessoas & hum só Deos”, “trois personnes & vn seul Dieu” and the Church of Rome.

Glazemaker, who usually excluded episodes about converts, did not omit this meeting with a Portuguese Christian who professed his religion in secret. Vasco Calvo, whom Mendes Pinto’s persona mistakes for a thief, is after all a good and generous man who invites the Portuguese men for a meal at his humble house in the company of his Chinese family. The reader becomes aware that Vasco Calvo and his Chinese wife live as true Christians which is presented as analogous to a life according to universal moral principles; the narrator, on the other hand, has been a corsair at Antonio de Faria’s command, sentenced to one year of hard labour by the Chinese and will soon help the Tartars in their violent attacks and board a Chinese pirate junk (P 132). Glazemaker, however, did not translate the prayers in which the Holy Trinity is evoked, nor the description of the oratory with the cross and candles in front of which the woman and her four children kneeled and prayed to the “Verdadeyro Deos”, “Vray Dieu”.

– Another occasion in which a reference to the Holy Cross is deleted by Glazemaker occurs when in the French text “sahião bêzêdo” is translated as “faire le
signe de la Croix” (P 25; VA XXV). The same happened with the battle cry in which Antonio de Faria invokes “Christo nosso Senhor posto na Cruz”, “Seigneur Iesvs-Christ mis en Croix” (P 59; VA LVIII), as well as Faria’s prayer in which the cross is referred to in chapter 61 (VA LX).

– After his scandalous behaviour, Diogo Soarez is summoned by the Chircaa, the Burmese officer of justice, to appear before the king. Glazemaker briefly summarised chapter 192, after Soarez’s refusal to accompany the Chircaa, the latter calls upon his people to stone Soarez to death. In a few lines we are informed how Soarez’s servants and slaves, and himself were killed and his house ransacked. Also Diogo Soarez’s prayer to Christ whose “precioso sangue que por mim derramaste na Cruz”, translated by Figuier as “precieux sang, que vous auez respendu pour moy en la Croix”, was also excluded.

– In chapter 164 when the grepo, a Burmese monk, tells the Portuguese about the creation myth of his religion, Gaspar de Meirelez, impressed by the similarities with the Genesis, further interrogates the grepo, but Glazemaker stops the translation of the passage at the moment Meirelez asks him if there had been a man on earth who had died on a cross. The Burmese monk’s answer was not translated either. The grepo explained that there had in fact been someone called Ioaõ who had preached that God had become man and had been crucified to save humankind. Ioaõ was persecuted and was brought to death. In the Portuguese, Spanish and French texts, but not in the Dutch translation, Gaspar Meirelez answered that everything this Ioaõ had preached was true after which both thanked God.

This omission becomes even more remarkable if compared to chapter 48 in which Faria and his men ask two Moors about their religious beliefs. The two men
answered that they believed in “hum só Deos todo podoroso”, “qu’vn seul Dieu Tout-puissant” (VA XLVIII), “niet meer dan een enige almachtige God” (only one almighty God, WR 65) the Creator of everything in which there is no imperfection in contrast to human beings who often sinned. When they were asked if God had ever come to earth in human shape they answered:

não, porque não podia auer cousa q obrigasse a tamanho extremino, porque pela excelencia da natureza diuina estaua liure de nossas miserias, & muyto esquecido de cubiçar tisouros da terra, porq tudo era pouquidade na presença de seu resplandor (P 48).

non, par ce qu’il n’y pouuoit auoir chose qui le pût obliger à vne si grande extrémité, à cause que par l’excellence de la nature Diuine il estoit desliuré de nos miseres, & fort esloigné dês thresors de la terre, & ce que tout estoit chose trop basse en la presence de sa splendeur (VA XLVIII).

neen, om dat er niets kon zijn, dat hem tot zo groot een uitterste kon verplichten, vermits hy door de voortreffelijkheid van de goddelijke natuur van onze elenden verlost, en vreemt van de schatten der aarde was (WR 65).

(no, because there was nothing that could compel him to such a great extreme, because he was free by the perfection of the divine nature from our miseries and alien to the treasures of earth.)

Glazemaker usually deleted references to Trinitarianism and the Holy Cross, however, he does not omit these words here because it suited his convictions: one of the Antitrinitarian arguments was precisely that God could not be crucified and brought to death as He is immortal.

– Another occasion in which a reference to the son of God was deleted occurs in chapter 111 in which the last sentence – mentioning that the narrator and his group are preparing to visit a temple reserved for nuns – was condensed by Glazemaker:

E destes desatinos & outros muytos a este modo nos contarão tantos, que he muyto para pasmar, mas muyto mais para chorar, ver com quão claras &
manifestas mentiras traz o demonio tão enganados a homens por outra parte tão entendidos, sem poderem atinar com a trilha desta nossa santa verdade que o filho de Deos veyo notificar ao mundo, porem o segredo disto elle so o sabe (P 111).

Ces Chinois nous estourdiren tellement de ces bourdes & autres semblables, qu’il faut que i’aduouë qu’il y a du suiet de se pasmer, & encore plus de pleurer, si l’on considere combien euidens & manifestes sont les mensonges pour abuser ces hommes en matiere de Religion, bien que d’ailleurs ils ne manquent pas d’esprit, sans qu’il soit possible qu’ils se donnent la cognoissance de nostre Sainte verité que le fils de Dieu nous vint manifes ter au monde, mais c’est vn secret incognu à tout autre qu’à sa Maiesté diviine (VA CX).

The long sentence in French became in Dutch:

Wy waren over deze beuzelingen der Chinezen, die anders wijs genoech zijn / verwondert / en gingen uit deze plaats / daar wy al deze wonderingen zagen naar een andere kerk van Nonnen (WR 150).

(We were astonished over this nonsense of the Chinese, who otherwise are wise enough, and went from this place where we saw all these marvels to another church for nuns.)

In the last paragraph of chapter 165 a peculiar custom is described that was simply erased in the Dutch text. The people of Timplão usually make the sign of the cross when they sneeze and say:

Quiay doo sam rorpy, que quer dizer, o Deos da verdad he tres & hum. Pelo que parece, como já atras fica dito, que teue esta gente algūa noticia da nossa ley Euangelica que he somente a verdadeyra (P 165).

*Quiay doo sam rorpy, c’est à dire Le Dieu de la verité est trois & un; par où l’on peut voir, comme i’ay desia dit, que ces peuples ont eu la cognoissance de la vraye Religion & de la Loy Euangelique (VA CLXIV).*

Even when other people, non-Christian, refer to a “ley verdadeyra do Deos ... que cō sua morte dera vida a todos os homēs”, “la vraye amitié de la loy de Dieu, ... qui
par sa mort auoit donné la vie à tous les hommes” (P 39; VA XXXIX) the mentioning of this “true faith” and the salvation of man through God’s death is simply omitted.

The last reference to the cross I have not analysed yet is an insidious form of manipulation by Glazemaker. The translation of a ship’s name “santa Cruz” in Portuguese and “saincte Croix” in French (P 12) became in Dutch “Sante Kroos” instead of “Sante Kruis” or “Heilig Kruis” (WR 18). The translation seems absurd, because there is no saint with that name.162 Phonetically, however, the sound “kroos” is immediately associated with “kruis” (“cruce” in Middle Dutch) and it was a corruption of the name of several places or islands in South America and the Pacific Ocean called “Santa Cruz”. But the sound “Sante Kroos” can also be associated with “santenkraam” which was a derisive expression used to refer to images of saints and other religious paraphernalia (WNT).

We know that Socinian, anti-Trinitarian, doctrines had influenced the Collegiant movement in Amsterdam in the 1640s to such extent that the States of Holland prohibited these gatherings in 1653 (Israel 1995: 911). For the Socinians total harmony between Scriptures and ratio implied a rejection of everything of which no confirmation could be found in the Bible and which was not in keeping with human reason (Frijhoff 1999: 412). This rational view of religious matters brought them close to the Mennonites and Collegiants. The Socinians rejected the Trinity doctrine and the deity of Christ and his Resurrection. If the Father and the Son were one, then God the Father had died on the cross. However, by definition God is immortal. Nevertheless, they emphasised the humanity of Christ and the divinity of his mission and invoked his name

162 Only in the thirteenth century “crois” or “croix” (cross) was used in names in Flanders (WNT). The sound “oi” could be a variant of “oo” in Dutch. The word “kroos” has several meanings, such as “duckweed” or “bowels of animals” or “interest” (sum of money), among others (WNT).
in prayer. Against this background it becomes very plausible that what apparently looks like a slip of the pen by Glazemaker is in fact a parody of the Holy Cross. The omissions of the Cross, Jesus Christ and the Holy Trinity then reinforce this idea. Glazemaker and Rieuwertsz did not want to curb Protestant authorities and censorship. On the contrary, they wanted to deceive them and tried to adjust the translation of Mendes Pinto’s *Peregrinação* to the forbidden ideas that were being discussed at that time among a restricted group.163

### 3.2.4 OMISSION OF EPISODES

Up to this point, I have discussed the features of Glazemaker’s translation that I relate to his radical convictions and religious revolutionary views. What follows is an enumeration of the most extensive and significant episodes that Glazemaker excludes from his translation when compared with the Portuguese original and the French translation. What follows is an attempt of systematization of what Glazemaker has excluded in order to then analyse the ideological implications.

1. In chapter 20 the narrator gives all the information about the regions he visited and where he explains that the failure of the three former expeditions was an act of God;

2. From chapter 67 to 70 the description of Antonio de Faria’s triumphant reception in Liampaoo. Except for Esteuão Nogueyra’s short sermon during Mass, these chapters are extremely summarised (one page in WR 86/7);

---

163 On page 191 of *Wonderlyke reizen* I found a suspicious printing error: “Mijne Heren Portugese, die ware nen (sic) zijf” translation of the French: “Seigneurs Portugais, qui estes vrays Chrestiens” (VA CXLIV). “nen” has no significance in Dutch. Did the printer, Pieter La Burg, leave out the two first syllables “Christe” on purpose? He did include “Christelijk geloof” (Christian faith) two lines further.
3. In chapter 91 the meeting with Inez de Leiria, daughter of Tomé Pirez. Her father had been sent on a diplomatic mission to Peking, but he had been taken prisoner and tortured. Nevertheless, he converted many Chinese to the Catholic faith;

4. In chapter 96 the episode about Mateus Escandel, Christian missionary, who had been stoned to death by Chinese bonzes. The chapter contains the explanation for the miracle that occurred after his death and the divine punishment in the form of earthquakes that was brought down over those who had persecuted the converts, and the renaming of the city;

5. In chapter 134 the episode about the introduction of firearms in Japan by the Portuguese and the accident the Nautaquim’s son suffered when the harquebus went off in chapters 136 and 137;

6. In chapter 162 the meeting with a Portuguese woman whom the narrator and his companions try to convince to embrace her old faith again and join the apostle Saint Thomas. She swears she will but does not keep her promise;

7. In chapter 176 the encounter with a Portuguese Buddhist monk who only escapes execution due to his origins. He returns to his former belief and goes back to Malacca, which is explained as a divine intervention;

8. The elimination of the chapters 202 to 220, dealing with Saint Francis Xavier. Some of Glazemaker’s omissions seem to correspond to his radical ideology. This is the case with items 1, 4 and 7 mentioned above where the Portuguese text explains the occurrences due to divine intervention. The omission seems to indicate that the translator was influenced by ideas that were formulated later by Koerbagh in his *Bloemhof* (1668) or by Spinoza in his *Tractatus theologico-politicus* (1670), as part of his philosophical system and translated anonymously by Glazemaker under the ironic
title *De rechtzinnige theologant* (The orthodox theologian). These ideas were already present in Spinoza’s *Korte verhandeling* (Short treatise [68]). It also reminds us of Lucretius’ gods who do not reward nor punish humans and his scorn of superstition. They all deny the supernatural, miracles and divine will or justification.

In item 4 a miracle and an earthquake are described. Earthquakes were usually interpreted as divine punishments, as what happens in this chapter (*P 96*). According to his convictions, Glazemaker decided to eliminate explanations based on divine interference. He does not want to translate descriptions or episodes that involve divine reward or punishment in the form of miracles or natural disasters. He wants to avoid a supernatural explanation for what he considers is irrational in the light of new scientific evidence. This way, he does not feed the belief of a divine purpose behind supernatural phenomena and opposes the excess of superstition that was still practiced, like witch-hunting or beliefs in the forces of the devil. These superstitions, especially the latter, continued to proliferate among an ignorant crowd because they were not unequivocally condemned by the religious authorities who saw these popular superstitions as a useful means to strengthen and maintain the common people’s respect for an omnipotent, severe, intervening and punishing God (Stipriaan 2002: 230-32). In Mendes Pinto’s text there is no voice that doubts what is said about these miracles. The narrator presents himself as naive and simpleminded, a stratagem that permits him to be ironic and which enables the reader to interpret the different layers of meaning. Glazemaker’s source text, however, was the French translation, which in part smothered Mendes Pinto’s naïveté.

---

164 Israel situates the composition of the *Korte Verhandeling* around 1658, Mignini in 1661-62 (Israel 2001: 806; Mignini cited by Klever 1996: 25)  
165 We also verify Glazemaker’s own ideological evolution as in 1646 he still mentioned the will of God in the “Aan de Lezer” of his translation of Livy (4).
Items 3, 4, 6 and 7 mention converts or conversion. As we have seen, religious affiliation was not important in Collegiant circles, but moral behaviour was essential. A principal characteristic of Collegiants was their religious tolerance; therefore, conversion is not a relevant issue and the allusion of the Catholic faith as the only true one does not make sense. Accordingly, the following episode from chapter 9 was deleted: Gonçalo Vaz talking about their attack on a Turkish galley “porque Deos nosso Senhor por quem pelejauamos, nos ajudaria contra aquelles inimigos da sua santa Fé” “que Dieu pour qui nous combations, nous seroit à tous secourable contre ces ennemis de sa saincte Foy” (VA IX) was omitted. The same happened in the first paragraph of chapter 108 when the narrator is in Peking and expresses his hope that God might give the Portuguese the power to convert the inhabitants to “a verdade da nossa Fé Catholica”, “la verité de nostre saincte Foy Catholique” (VA CVII), as well as in chapter 143 when the narrator comments that it would be a service to God if He intervened in the conquest of the isle of Lequios, because its inhabitants would be converted for the glory and propagation of “sua santa fé Catholica”, “de sa saincte foy Catholique” (VA CXLII).

Item 2 deals with the description of Antonio de Faria’s arrival at Liampoo, which is condensed into a few lines. Glazemaker did not omit Faria’s discomfort at the exaggerated praise, nor the sermon in direct speech. What is remarkable is the fact that the sermon was not reduced into indirect discourse. Did Glazemaker find the description of the reception, the festivities, and the festive meal uninteresting? Was he afraid his readers would not be aware of the irony? He did not fail to notice the satire of the

---

166 The Portuguese “hũa empresa de tanto seruiço de nosso Senhor” was translated by Herrera Maldonado as “de tanto seruicio de Dios” while Figuier interpreted “Senhor” not as referring to God but as to the king: “si grand seruice pour nostre Roy” (VA CXLII). The text was omitted by Glazemaker.
corrupt preacher who, thanks to Faria’s buccaneering, had recovered his seven thousand cruzados.

Item 5 is about firearms; it mentions the introduction of the harquebus in Japan, the accident it provoked, and the importance of firearms in the conquest of new colonies and the subjugation of the native people. In chapter 134 the narrator, naïve as always, does not see anything wrong in the huge amount of firearms manufactured in Japan thanks to the Portuguese. The alert reader becomes aware of their real effect in chapter 143, when the narrator mentions that the domination of the isle of Lequios is easy, considering the inhabitants’ lack of firearms. The Mennonites were pacifists and did not use firearms.

The omissions described in items 1 to 7 can be divided into three different categories. The first one consists of a great number of descriptions of miracles or of other supernatural phenomena that were eliminated. Glazemaker excludes them as they were interpreted in the book as divine rewards or punishment.167

Secondly, the episodes about converts and conversion are excluded. Conversion does not make sense in the eyes of those who actively favour religious and philosophical tolerance, hence the erasure.

Concerning the third type of omission, the use of firearms, there is a certain link between the fact that as a Mennonite, Glazemaker was a militant pacifist and against the use – even if symbolic – of weapons and these exclusions. He was aware that the success of colonisation was largely due to the firearms the Europeans possessed.

The longest omission is without doubt item 8 that deals with the whole part dedicated to Francis Xavier, and seems to have been imposed by other reasons than

167 We have already seen that Van Praag noticed that Glazemaker changed the text in De deugdelyke vrou [1] regarding superstition (Praag 1935: 94). See Part I, section 6.3.
mere haste. The deliberate elimination of the episode concerning the Portuguese saint could have been inspired by many reasons: lack of time, the wish not to emphasise the catholic aspect of the book, and the desire to make the book less bulky and thus, less expensive. But when analysed in the context of the other passages that were omitted mentioned before, I came to a different conclusion. This episode fits in all the three categories mentioned above: Francis Xavier performs miracles, he is a missionary and a crusader, thus it is his duty to convert the native population even if this involves the use of violence and the aid of arms. Also, on several occasions, faith in the most important dogmas of the Catholic Church is declared. They are the dogmas of the Holy Trinity, the Holy Cross and Christ as the Son of God (e.g. ch. 203, 204, 211, 212 and 215 of Peregrinaçam). These were the dogmas that Glazemaker’s group questioned and criticised.

From the beginning of chapter 202 to chapter 220, a large part of chapter 221 and the beginning of the next chapter, all references to Francis Xavier have been carefully deleted. In the Portuguese and French texts he is referred to several times at the end of chapter 224 or chapter 225, as well as in other parts of the book. In fact, there is not a single allusion to Francis Xavier or to Father Belchior, neither on the frontispiece nor in Glazemaker’s text. Researchers consider this omission due to historical circumstances that affected the work of Protestant translators (Catz 1989: xxviii; Teensma 1992: xxvi; Pos 1992: vi; Reck 1997: 33) without verifying what exactly had been left out and why.\textsuperscript{168} Their argument implies that they consider Peregrinaçam a book that propagates a Catholic point of view when actually it is very

\textsuperscript{168} In fact in the English and the German translation the episode on Francis Xavier was also erased. My study of Glazemaker’s translation does not include the English translation published a year after the Dutch. The German translation was based on Glazemaker’s hence the omission. See Part II, section 1.1.
critical of the Catholic Church. This seems to be in contradiction with Catz’s and Pos’ interpretation of *Peregrinação* as a satire, and with Teensma’s suggestion that Mendes Pinto might be a *cristão-novo* and thus, very critical of Catholicism. What is more, in the case of the Dutch translation, omissions in order to curb the Protestant authorities would be a contradiction as in Glazemaker’s eyes Pinto’s book is a pamphlet in favour of religious tolerance. Considering Glazemaker and Rieuwertsz’s participation in the debate of radical ideas such as freedom of thought, opinion and religion, and their role in the dissemination of heterodox ideas through clandestine book distribution, this was certainly one of the main reasons for its translation.

### 3.3 Appropriation and Reason for Translating *Peregrinação*

In *Wonderlyke reizen* Glazemaker consciously adopted a different strategy than in his other translations. Usually considered a reliable translator of Descartes and Spinoza, whose works he translated in the following years, in *Wonderlyke reizen* Glazemaker transgressed the norms and boundaries of his time in order to give voice to ideas that were forbidden to be expressed. He cannot be viewed as a “faithful” translator of Fernão Mendes Pinto as he consciously omits and manipulates the original text on nearly every page. The divinity of Christ, the Trinity, the immortality of the soul, the divine authorship of the Scriptures and the divine providence were dogmas that were not permitted to be questioned in the religious context of the Republic. Adriaan Koerbagh’s imprisonment and death in 1669 proved that those who ventured to cross these limits entered a dangerous territory. Koerbagh’s death in prison was the reason for

---

169 See Part I, section 4.1.
Spinoza to abort the publication of the *Tractatus theologico-politicus* in the vernacular language. Therefore, Glazemaker does not explicitly question Christian dogmas. Only by comparing with his source text are we aware of what was omitted in the Dutch translation. The common reader did not know to what extent the text had been manipulated. Through his manipulation, Glazemaker offered his public a travelogue that was in many aspects different, and it did not feed the readers with traditionally held religious beliefs, dogmas and comments; instead it offered a more rationalist perspective. The reader of a travelogue was mentally prepared to become acquainted with another world view so he would accept an outlook in which these dogmas were not emphasised or were nearly absent. Mendes Pinto described incredible novelties and adventures, but in Glazemaker’s version these were never considered supernatural and no miracles are described or referred to. Religious conversion was not an important issue for neither Glazemaker nor his radical friends, but it was actually one of the main justifications of Portuguese expansion politics. By omitting the chapters on Francis Xavier, the book lacks the religious pendant that counterbalances the worldly episode of Antonio de Faria. With Faria, the first person narrator embarked on a voyage of piracy, violence and greed; with Francis Xavier the voyage is a spiritual one, as its aims are not material riches but the propagation of Christianity. In *Wonderlyke reizen* the episode with Antonio de Faria is one of the narrator’s many adventures. After Faria’s disappearance the narrator continues his travels in the Far East, gets lost, suffers storms and shipwrecks, participates in attacks and almost starves to death, reminding us of Bontekoe’s narrator. But unlike Bontekoe, Mendes Pinto’s *alter ego* travels on foot throughout the Chinese mainland, he meets different peoples, some of whom are honourable while others are cruel, and witnesses in utter amazement and admiration
marvellous cities, strange habits, terrible religious customs and countries with different political systems. One of the reasons for Glazemaker’s translation was Fernão Mendes Pinto’s receptive attitude towards other ways of thinking, other customs, his openness to the Other.

*Peregrinação*, like many other travel books of that period, offers a large body of information about a world that was unknown to most people at the time. Mendes Pinto describes different forms of political organization, people that practise religious toleration, developed societies without revealed religions; cultures with a different history that ignores the classics, Christ or Muhammad. The description of a utopian China was a form of dealing with a radically different form of organization that otherwise would not have been accepted by the authorities nor by the readers. It was one of the first steps in establishing a new world view.

The new material Mendes Pinto’s book offered on natural phenomena and on customs, beliefs, morals, political organization, history, languages, zoology and botany contradicted established knowledge based on classical learning and the Bible and had an unsettling and relativizing effect on the European reader. A different place often implied a different religion, mores and political organization (Hazard 1961: 15-36). Thus, mapping out a whole new world had disturbing implications for traditional knowledge, which was precisely what radicals like Glazemaker wanted to unsettle. The knowledge he wanted to disseminate was the kind that provoked a transformation in people’s thoughts, by arriving at new concepts about political organisation, secularisation, religious tolerance and freedom of thought and even about the religious, scientific, and “common sense” foundations of these concepts. Glazemaker did not erase Mendes Pinto’s descriptions of a Chinese utopia, where sovereigns and judges can be righteous.
The description of this prosperous society, well-ordered from a political, judicial, social and religious point of view is in part a construction by Mendes Pinto.

We have seen how Glazemaker revealed some of his radical ideas in his forewords, manner of translating and choice of translations of heterodox books. The translation of travel accounts should be viewed from the same perspective. It was his aim to offer all kinds of new information and knowledge in an unsuspicious manner to a public that did not have access to books written in foreign languages.

Glazemaker’s omissions become more remarkable if we compare them to what he does not leave out, such as the passages in which we are confronted by characters, whether Portuguese or Asian, who profess their faith in an honest and sincere manner, nor does he do away with the clergy’s hypocrisy, no matter what religion they belong to, as they are only concerned with their own interests and gain, therefore, taking advantage of people’s ignorance and resulting superstition. Some of the ideas Mendes Pinto states here come very close to those professed by the group of freethinkers Glazemaker was part of. They criticised established churches for being corrupt and decayed, stressing the individual and internal nature of religion, and turning to a spiritual church whose believers were in their opinion scattered throughout the world.

The inherent plea for religious tolerance and the search for a universal god, the critical point of view regarding expansionist policies, the disenchancing perspective of traditional heroic travelogues and of the colonial enterprise made Glazemaker’s translation of *Peregrinação* a convenient vehicle for more easily introducing some radical ideas.
Wy zagen toen / o schrikkelijk schouspel / twaalf lighamen / die men opgedolven had / en noch tien of twaalf lighamen / die half opgegeëten waren (WR 190).

(Then we saw a horrible sight, twelve corpses that had been unearthed and another ten or twelve corpses that had been partially devoured.)
PART III

RECEPTION OF MENDES PINTO’S WORK AND HIS FORTUNE IN THE LOW COUNTRIES
1 Fernão Mendes Pinto: Nonconformist 170

1.1 The Seventeenth Century

Before Glazemaker’s translation in 1652, the Dutch readers had access either to the Portuguese, Spanish or French editions of Peregrinação. 171

The Library of the University of Amsterdam (UBA) owns a copy of the editio princeps (1614). The book very likely once belonged to Adriaen Pauw (1585-1653), son of Reinier Pauw (1564-1636), a wealthy merchant with interests in the WIC and director of the VOC. 172 Adriaen Pauw, a merchant like his father and raadpensionaris of the province of Holland, was a moderate Calvinist and an advocate for peace with Spain. He allied with the Arminians for the control over the States of Holland (1630). 173

---

170 For the list of works published in the Low Countries that mention Fernão Mendes Pinto or his book, see Volume II, Addendum IV.
171 In 1655, the work compiled by Samuel Purchas was translated and published in the Netherlands entitled: Pelgrimagie, gedeelt in twintich boecken, waer van het eerste boeck begrijpt de voyagien en reysen, ghedaen door de oude coninghen, patriarchen, apostelen en philosophen als mede de voyagien van Bachus, Ceris, Hercules, de Argonauten, Cadmus, de Grieeksche vloot naer Troyen, die van Menelaus, Ulysses, en Aeneid: de vermaerde tochten der Assyriërs, Aegyptenaren, Scythen, Aethiopiers, Persiaenen, en anderen. Het eerste deel. (Pilgrimage, divided over twenty books of which the first contains the voyages and travels made by ancient kings, patriarchs, apostles and philosophers as well as the voyages made by Bachus, Ceris, Hercules, the Argonauts, Cadmus, the Greek fleet to Troy, those of Menelaus, Ulysses and Aeneid: the famous expeditions of the Assyrians, Egyptians, Scythes, Ethiopians, Persians and others. Volume 1) translated by I. G. and published by Jacob Benjamin in Amsterdam. Only the first volume was published which means that Fernão Mendes Pinto’s “Observations of China, Tartaria and other Eastern parts of the world” (Purchas: 1625: Vol. XII, pp. 59-141) was not translated into Dutch. Another reason for not including Mendes Pinto in the Dutch Purchas edition could be the recent publication of Glazemaker’s translation in 1652 and reprint a year later.
172 The WIC (Geoctroyeerde Westindische Compagnie, Dutch West Indian Company) was active from 1621 until 1791.
173 See Part I, section 1.1.
Pauw was the owner of the largest library in that period (Answaarden 1993: 90-91). On the endpaper of this copy of the editio princeps there is a note, written in Dutch, in the handwriting of the time, that reads: “there is nobody who describes China better than he does” and ends by mentioning that a “roteiro” of Brazil will also be sent (Answaarden 1993: 87). The Pauw family had many interests in the Far East, as well as in Brazil thus it is not surprising that they were eager to possess books on travels dealing with the Portuguese expansion, history and politics, either in Portuguese, Latin, Spanish or French.\(^{174}\)

The inventory of Hartelief van Cattenburgh and his wife’s library, drawn up in 1672, mentions a possible collection in which several travel accounts by Thomas Herbert, Pietro della Valle and Fernão Mendes Pinto were bound together under the designation: “Eenige voyage van Herbert delavalla van Bartama di pinto in 4 deelen” (Some voyages of Herbert delavalla of Bartama di pinto in four parts) (Chong 2006: 117, 120).\(^{175}\) Van Cattenburgh, who died in 1669, the same year as his wife, was a Rotterdam wine merchant specialised in overseas trade. The inventory reveals their

---

\(^{174}\) Latin, French and Spanish were cultural languages; Portuguese was the lingua franca in the colonies (Boxer 1992: 132-3; Horst 2000: 173). The brothers Houtman used to carry documents written in Portuguese for the foreign sovereigns on their voyages to the East (1595 and 1598). It was also common to have on board some sailors who could speak the language (Sijs 2000: 128-9, 142). In Van Neck’s travel journal a Javanese and Malay vocabulary was included as these were the languages spoken at the East Indies and Moluccan Islands. The justification given for the fact that a Portuguese vocabulary was not included was that these were easily available at Dutch bookshops (Van Neck 1601: unnumbered). The mentioning of the Portuguese word “roteiro” on the endpaper of the copy in the UBA confirms the influence of the Portuguese language among merchants and travellers. The Dutch traveller J. H. van Linschoten included many Portuguese words in the description of his Itinerario (1596).

\(^{175}\) Pietro della Valle was translated by Glazemaker, see \[40\]. Sir Thomas Herbert’s account was translated by Lambert van den Bosch and published in 1658 (Dordrecht, A. Andriessz & N. de Vries) and 1665 (Amsterdam, Arent Gerritz van den Heuvel). It was not uncommon to combine different texts on related subjects in one book. I found a reference to a binder of travels by Mendes Pinto, William Lithgow, Thomas Herbert, Mandelslo and Olearius, published by Rieuwerts and Hendricksz in 1652 (Google Books, http://books.google.pt/books?id=iYJuPgAACAAJ&source=gbs_slider_thumb, accessed on 31 August 2010).
interest in works that described exotic lands and daring voyages, but also many texts on religious tolerance as the couple had strong Remonstrant beliefs.

After his father’s death, Joannes Thysius (1622-1653), son of a wealthy Amsterdam merchant, was educated in Leiden by Constantin l’Empereur (1591-1648), the Dutch Hebraist and Orientalist. Under his supervision, the young humanist scholar started to collect valuable books at a very young age. In his collection, housed at the University of Leiden, we found a copy of Wonderlyke reizen (Catalogus der Bibliothek van Joannes Thysius 1879: 272).

Another humanist, Hugo Grotius, evokes Mendes Pinto in his defence of the Christian faith at the service of Christians of every confession (Heering 2004: xix). The reference by Grotius was the first I found in a Dutch publication (See Addendum IV). During the early Enlightenment (from c. 1650 to c. 1750), Grotius was often considered the great exegetical innovator who initiated the process, which later culminated with Spinoza (Israel 2001: 447). In August 1618 Grotius was arrested by the stadhouder Maurits Prince of Nassau (1567-1625) because of his involvement with the Arminians.176 While imprisoned at Loevestijn castle he wrote Bewijs van den waren godsdienst (Evidence of the true religion), which was done entirely in verse and secretly published after his escape in 1622, without naming any publisher or publishing place. In 1627, Grotius published the Latin version under the title De veritate religionis Christianae. This text underwent a process of extended modifications during the year of 1639 and was edited a year later with a substantial apparatus of notes with aiming at

176 See Part I, section 1.1.
producing additional testimonies or evidence. With the exception of the Calvinist Counter-Remonstrants, Grotius’ book was received with praise (Heering 2004: 217).177

Grotius’ ideal was an internally tolerant state Church and he advocated that as long as the fundamentals of the Christian dogma remained intact, everything that is secondary should be open to debate (Israel 1995: 440, 501). In his opinion, works considered as heretical ought not to be forbidden, and could be used in the apology of Christianity, just as Augustine and Jerome had done before him (Heering 2004: 208). He believed that if testimonies from various sources were in conformity with one another, they indicated a universal consensus, a sign of universal truth. Thus, he used all kinds of analogies between sacred history and profane authorities (Heering 2004: 164).

Grotius mentions Mendes Pinto twice in his notes. The first time occurs when he refers to him as one of the modern writers to affirm that very similar accounts to the story of the Genesis were found among non-Christian peoples, namely among the inhabitants of Pegu and Calaminhan (Grotius 1674: 68). The second reference made to Mendes Pinto occurs in a chapter in which the belief in afterlife is defended, and an example is given from the Indians in Siam that Grotius found in Mendes Pinto (Grotius 1674: 120). Grotius, however, never mentions the title of the book he consulted which could have been the Portuguese, Spanish or French version.

Another writer who refers to Mendes Pinto is Nicolaas Witsen (1641-1717). Witsen was a cartographer, diplomat, traveller, director of the VOC and burgemeester (burgomaster) of Amsterdam. In 1662 he held a debate at the Amsterdam Athenaeum Illustre (forerunner of the Universiteit van Amsterdam), in which he argued against the influence of comets on the welfare of all earthly things (Jorink 2006: 155). The

177 In 1653, Rieuwertsz published a copy of Van de waerheyt des Christelijke godts-dienst (Of the Truth of the Christian Religion) (Schaap 1978: 35).
disputatio was dedicated to his uncle, Johannes Hudde (1628-1704), a mathematician and former burgomaster of Amsterdam who corresponded with Spinoza for some time. Witsen also befriended Baltasar Bekker (1634-1698), a pastor and the author of the controversial *De betoverde weereld* (The world bewitched), in which he stated that witches and demons did not exist. Its publication in 1691 led to Bekker’s deposition from the ministry and his trial for blasphemy.

Witsen is the author of *Aaloude en hedendaagsche scheeps-bouw en bestier. Architectura Navalis et Regimen Nauticum* (Ancient and Contemporary Naval Architecture and Management, 1690), a richly illustrated treatise on shipbuilding, its history and organisation. In chapter sixteen Witsen describes all kinds of vessels that were used in Asia. On pages 261 to 263 he mentions Mendes Pinto and he quotes literally from Glazemaker’s translation (*WR* 124-127; *VA* XCVII-XCVIII; *P* 98-99). The passage begins with reference to “Balonnen, gedeën, en manchuas” (balões, guedés and manchuas), that form a floating city during a fair that takes place for a two-week period in China. The text goes on describing the organisation of this city during that period of the year, its wealth and beauty. Trading takes place peacefully thanks to special security measures. Any criminals are immediately punished. Thus, it is possible to offer rich presents to idols in chapels, as at night the streets and boats are illuminated making it nearly impossible for thieves to rob the chapels. Other religious traditions, rituals and indulgencies are mentioned. But there are also all kinds of leisure-time activities and public shows: plays, acts with wild animals, music and dancing. This is place to suit all tastes and necessities: there are professional mourners and there are booksellers who sell books about the creation of the world – according to the narrator these creation stories are lies – and about the history of China. There are midwives,
women who help interrupt pregnancies, wet nurses and surgeons, good-looking men and women who wish to marry, boys and girls for hire, and other people who want to comfort those who have lost loved ones.

This is an absolutely remarkable text in a technical book about shipbuilding. Considering Witsen’s milieu, his travels and penchant for sciences and natural history at the expense of traditional theology, it is clear that the inclusion of this short episode is not arbitrary. He wants to discretely call the readers’ attention to the description of a society that is completely different from that of Europe and to hold it up as a mirror, an almost perfect but pagan society that reveals itself as being prosperous, well-organised, efficient, fair, safe, and above all, free. At this floating market people can practice their religion, mourn, solve problems and have fun. This is a place where books about the creation of the world are for sale. Only these books do not tell the traditional story as in the Genesis because they are not bibles. What story do they tell then? In Witsen’s work they can be interpreted as a hidden reference to the “pre-Adamites” discussion. The reference to books on the history of China is another related controversial item that challenged chronologists, especially since the 1660s.\textsuperscript{178}

Through Mendes Pinto, Witsen describes a place where female and male prostitution is legal. It is also a place where women have the right to sexual pleasure just like men and have the power and means to interrupt unwanted pregnancies. This is not a description of a “primitive” pagan society. Without moralizing, the other is presented as equal or even superior, living in a society in which men, as well as, women are free. Witsen presents in this brief text values that were discussed by a group of radical

\textsuperscript{178} See Part I, 6.6.
thinkers to whom Glazemaker and Rieuwerstsz belonged: sexual equality, freedom of
lifestyle and of opinion, toleration and the amelioration of human society.

Witsen obtained from the Dutch traveller, Johan Nieuhof (1618–1672), some of
his material on Chinese boats. Nieuhof considered Mendes Pinto’s book important
enough to be added to the travelling library of his company when he embarked on the
first Dutch embassy to the Chinese emperor that took place from 1655 to 1657, and was
led by Pieter de Goyer and Jacob Keyzer (Teensma 1992: xxvii-xxviii).179 Nieuhof’s
account on China was published in 1665 with 150 illustrations by his own hand and was
soon translated into French, Latin, German and English. Teensma quotes from the
Dutch version a comment on the sculpture of a dangerous serpent:

De Chijnesen vertellen hier zoo veel avontuurtjes van, dat Fernando Mendez mett
de zwelgslang van ’t groote huis des rooks well an de wind mag loopen (Nieuhof
1987: 40).

(The Chinese tell so many stories about it that Fernando Mendez Pinto may be
very close to the truth with [what he calls] the Ravenous Serpent of the House of
Smoke.)180

In the French translation of Nieuhof’s travels, referring to several books about
the discoveries in the East, the author comments:

Mais entr’icelles on ne lit rien de plus prodigieux que les voyages de Fernand
Mendez Pinto tant pour avoir veu & remarque tres judicieusement ce qu’il y a
entre les Royaumes d’Afrique & d’Asie (Nieuhof 1665: 15).181

179 Olfert Dapper (c. 1635-1689), though he never travelled outside Holland, wrote a comprehensive
treatise on Asia (1672). His travel accounts were drawn from various sources: van Linschoten, Della
Valle, Barros, Castanheda, Bernier, Herbert, Marco Polo, Olearus and many others. However, he never
mentions Mendes Pinto.
180 I was unable to find this reference in the French translation of Nieuhof.
181 And three years later in a Latin translation: “Multa, & alia vana incrediblia jactant, coque minus
mirum prodigiosora a Fernando Mendez Pinto de domos fumigante memorari” (Nieuhof 1668:78-79).
Men like Pauw, van Cattenburgh, Grotius, Witsen, Nieuhof and Lysius have in common that they belonged to the liberal and more open-minded fraction of the Dutch population. Unbiased and probably spurred by commercial interest, they were interested in travel writing even if, or, exactly because this was a source of subversive thought.

Someone who seemed not to have been so free-thinking, but whose curiosity was stimulated by adventurous and exotic tales was Simon de Vries (1628-1708), one of the most prolific and popular writers, who refers several times to Mendes Pinto in the four volumes of his Curieuse aenmerckingen der byzonderste Oost en West Indische verwonderenswaerdige dingen (Remarkable Annotations of the Most Admirable Things in the East and West Indies) (1682). De Vries had started his career as the owner of a bookshop in Utrecht, but after a few years he devoted himself to writing and translation. He was an orthodox Calvinist and publicly criticised the above-mentioned Cartesian writer Baltasar Bekker on his book De betoverde weereld (1691-1693). Though De Vries was not an advocate of radical ideas, he wished to edify his readers and thus, his books contain a wealth of information (Braggerman 1993).

De Vries’ book is a catalogue of exotic wonders and curiosities about the East and its peoples which nowadays we would classify as a sort of popular science book. It is composed of stories and faits divers from his own collection completed with a selection of his translations of Ost- und West-Indischer wie auch Sinesischer Lust- und Statsgarten (1668) by the German Erasmus Francisci (or Erasmus Finx) (1627-1694), who like De Vries, was also a popular polygraph. In his foreword, De Vries warns the readers that he had to adapt Francisci to the Dutch public’s taste, as the German original included many “buytensprongen” (excesses), though he does not explain what exactly

182 The name “Simon de Vries” is not uncommon in Dutch. He should not be confounded with a correspondent and disciple of Spinoza who was a merchant in Amsterdam (1633-1677).
he means with the word (Braggerman 1993: 115). As far as I was able to understand, Francisci rewrites chapters 148 to 199 of Peregrinaçam in an abridged form. The episode is retold as a dialogue between Sinnebald, Basilowitz and Angelott. Francisci based himself on the French and Dutch translations, which he sometimes confronts in his notes. It is not clear which French translation the German writer had at his disposal (Francisci 1668: 1537, 1538, 1578).183

De Vries’ four-volume work begins with a list of authors in which we find Mendes Pinto’s name three times (S. Vries 1682, Vol. I: Register der Autheuren). De Vries also refers to Glazemaker’s Dutch translation of 1652 and the French translation of 1645, but what is remarkable is the fact that he mentions a German translation entitled Wunderbahrlichen Reisen, Ulm, 1649. I have not found any other reference to this translation, as far as it is known the only German translation that was available to De Vries – but not to Francisci – was the anonymous translation dated from 1671 and published in Amsterdam with a different title: Wunderliche und merkwürdige Reisen Fernandi Mendez Pinto. Moreover, Francisci confronts the French text with the Dutch one and does not mention a German translation. Thus, even though De Vries mentioned a German translation in the register, he never referred to it in the book.

On another occasion, chapters 127 and 128 of Peregrinaçam – the episode about the Talapicor and religious rituals – are retold but no source is cited (S. Vries 1682, Vol II: 815-828). Similar to Francisci, the episodes taken from Mendes Pinto are interwoven in a dialogue between the German Sinebald, The Dutch Floris and the English Angelot.

The episodes about the queen of Aaru and about the way the Achinese came in possession of that kingdom (P 29-32) were summarised by De Vries. The name “Pinto”

183 He probably took other episodes as well from Mendes Pinto.
is mentioned as the narrator of *Peregrinaçam* is one of the characters in this episode and De Vries refers to him in his notes, as he alludes to the French and Dutch translations, declaring that the Dutch translation was abridged (S. Vries 1682, Vol. II: 597-600). On many occasions, De Vries does not refer to the Dutch translation but seems to prefer to rely on the French instead – a preference that is explicitly mentioned, sometimes with a reference to his source’s chapters.¹⁸⁴

When browsing through this work we get an idea of what could be known about China from published sources about the Far East (and West Indies and South America), in the Dutch Republic during that period. In Volumes III and IV the chapters bear titles as: “Looking after the Poor”, “Martyrs”, “Justice”, “Temples of Idols”, “The False Religion”, “Universities”, “Comedy”, “Funeral Ceremonies”, “Letter Style” or “Court Splendour”.¹⁸⁵ As an example, in “Comedy”, De Vries narrates an episode at the court of the King of Bungo where his daughter and other girls performed a farce in which they parodied the Portuguese merchants (*P* 223; *VA* CCXXII; *WR* 275).

Under the title “Labours of Love”, De Vries gives examples of acts that reveal Christian love and compassion, or the lack of it. Antonio de Faria is presented as a “Zee-rover” (sea pirate) by the “vermaerde” (famous) Fernand Mendez Pinto,¹⁸⁶ his travel companion. The Dutch word *vermaerd* reveals a positive image of Mendes Pinto.¹⁸⁷ De Vries retells the story about the Chinese boy (*P* 54), who was taken

¹⁸⁴ There are occasions however, in which he refers to Glazemaker’s translation: “De Portugeezsch Fernand Mendez Pinto verhaelde in de Beschrijvingh zijner Wonderlijcke reyzen” (The Portuguese Fernand Mendez Pinto narrates in the description of his Marvellous Travels, Vries 1682 Vol. III: 167).
¹⁸⁵ Marilia dos Santos Lopes cites Francisci’s *Neu-polirter Geschicht-kunst und Sitten-Spiegel Ausländischer Völker* (1670) in which he used *Peregrinaçam* as a source for his information on the Orient. It is very likely that De Vries also used this work by Francisci as both use similar methods (Lopes 2010: 267-9).
¹⁸⁶ The reference to “Fernand” seems to indicate the French translation by Figuier: *Les Voyages Adventureux de Fernand Mendez Pinto*.
¹⁸⁷ Whereas the term “berucht” (infamous, ill-reputed) has a negative connotation (*WNT*).
prisoner by Faria, and Faria’s death during a storm at sea. In De Vries’ opinion, the pirate got what he deserved (S. Vries 1682, Vol. III: 100-103).

In the third volume of De Vries’ work, Pinto is again referred to on several occasions. De Vries defends Mendes Pinto’s credibility against other writers, such as Nieuhof and the German Johan Ristius (or Rist), who doubted some of his reports (S. Vries 1682, Vol. III: 65).  

Remarkable is De Vries’ critique of the Dutch translator who labelled the sudden cure of a pagan sovereign’s blindness as “een fabel gelijck te zijn” (like a fantastic story) (S. Vries 1682, Vol. III: 67). According to De Vries: “Welck oordeel by Pinto zelfs niet gevonden werd; maer integendeel” (an opinion that was not even found in Pinto; quite on the contrary). As it seems highly improbable that De Vries had access to the Portuguese or Spanish text, by “by Pinto” what is meant is the French translation. In fact, the French translation – as well as the original Portuguese text – leaves no doubt that the narrator unquestionably considered the case of the blind king as a miracle. The very moment the pagan sovereign performed a noble deed, God, who does not distinguish between Christians and non-Christians, cured his blindness. Glazemaker did not omit this miracle in his translation but added his own opinion: judging it “fabelachtig” (unbelievable) (WR 151). Was De Vries aware of Glazemaker’s manipulation in favour of a text that conveyed a heterodox perspective, considering miracles or disasters as phenomena that could be scientifically explained? This perspective eventually led to the one presented in Baltasar Bekker’s book, so criticised by De Vries.

---

188 De Vries quotes Francisci with whom he agrees regarding Pinto’s reliability.  
189 Unlike other descriptions of miracles, this supernatural phenomenon was not omitted by Glazemaker because it stresses the existence of a universal concept of righteousness. Baptism is not a prerequisite for moral goodness.
Though De Vries had access to both the French translation, as well as to Glazemaker’s text, he relies more on the former: De Vries usually refers to the French translation instead of the Dutch. The confrontation between the two versions must have led to De Vries’ mistrust in Glazemaker and his publisher Rieuwertsz. As De Vries owned a bookshop, he must have been aware of Rieuwertsz’s and Glazemaker’s reputation as Mennonite/Collegiants who backed the controversial preacher Galenus de Haan. As mentioned before, Rieuwertsz was much talked about during his life.\textsuperscript{190}

Though he mistrusted Glazemaker’s translation, De Vries considered Mendes Pinto as a reliable source. Mendes Pinto’s untrustworthiness was no issue, the French 1645 translation that he had at his disposition did not contain the “Deffence apologétique” published in 1628, nor did the Dutch translation raise the question. Without an outspoken apologetic defence of Mendes Pinto, the matter of his credibility or lack of it is not emphasised.

It was Francisci and De Vries’ task to provide as much information as possible to their public, this information was not only geographical or botanical, but more and more about the customs, religion and organisation of other peoples (Lopes 2010: 261, 267). Their efforts led to a shift away from the traditional biblical worldview to a scientific one: a radical transformation that perhaps was not intended by De Vries, who wanted merely to instruct and entertain his readers.\textsuperscript{191}

\textsuperscript{190} See Part I, section 3.2.
To finalise, the first attempt to comprehend and organise the collected literature of early printing (from 1550 onwards) was compiled by Cornelis à Beughem and edited in Amsterdam in 1685. In it, approximately 3000 titles are cited, among them is the Dutch translation by Glazemaker (1652) and the anonymous German translation (1671) (Beughem 1685: 548, 500).
THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

1.2.1 JACOB CAMPO WEYERMAN

The journalist and talented writer, Jacob Campo Weyerman (1677-1747) refers several times to Mendes Pinto. Weyerman was a painter and eccentric writer known for his adventurous life, colourful prose and satiric vein. He had lived for some time in London and travelled through France and Germany. A man of vast reading, he had translated Jonathan Swift and Don Quijote. He specialized in periodicals, but was arrested and condemned for libel. He had apparently started making a living by publishing scandals, but soon enough he began to extort money from public figures by announcing that he would publish rumours about their lives unless they paid him to keep silent. He was condemned for slander and died while imprisoned. There might have been political reasons behind the accusation (Bostoen 1997: 6, quoting P. Altena).

In his weekly publications, he used to mix political commentaries with gossip. His papers were eagerly read because his style was modern and innovative, and combined poetry with prose, fiction with non-fiction (Bork 1985: 642-3; Hanou 2002: 40; M. Vries 2009: 308-310). In spite of his complex metaphors and obscure references or hints, Weyerman is presently considered a free-thinking writer (Israel 1995: 1047; Berti 1996: 31; Hanou 2002: 60; Jacob 2006: 163). He was rumoured to belong to Jean Rousset de Missy’s (1686-1762) Freemasonic lodge in The Hague, at that time a city fermenting with radical activities.
I had access to several of his works that are available on the Internet. The rate in which Weyerman evokes Mendes Pinto in such a casual and natural way gives us the impression that his readers were quite familiar with the Portuguese writer.

1.2.1.1 In Vino Veritas?

In Weyerman’s journal Den Ontleeder der Gebreeken (The Dissector of Deficiencies) from October 18, 1724 we find a story entitled “De zilveren schuimspaan” (The silver skimmer). The epigraph was taken from Juvenal’s Satires:

Pauci dignoscere possunt

Vera bona, atque illis multum diversa, remota

Erroris nebula. Quid enim ratione timemus,

Aut cupimus (Den Ontleeder der Gebreeken, October 18, 1724).
Juvenal explains that only few human beings know exactly what is right. It is an ironic warning, for it is not clear if the reader belongs to this select group, and at the same time, a sceptical insinuation: do we ever know what we truly want?

“Hermes” is the name of Weyerman’s alter ego in De Rotterdamsche Hermes and Den Amsterdamschen Hermes. Margaret Jacob traces Weyerman’s preference for Hermes/Mercury to his readings of freethinkers such as Giordano Bruno (1548-1600) and to Bruno’s fascination for the Egyptian deity Hermes Trismegistus and pantheism (Jacob 2006: 163).

The narrator of “De zilveren schuimspaan”, formerly known as Hermes and in this story as Dissector, considers himself a “twyfelaar” or according to his explanation:

Sceptici, een soort van bespiegelende Filosofen, die de Waarheid naliopen doch die dezelve nooit konden grypen, of vangen (Den Ontleeder der Gebreeken, October 18, 1724).

(Sceptics, a kind of pondering philosophers who pursue the truth but were never able to grasp or catch it.)

We are informed that one day the narrator was visited by the deities Jupiter and Mercury, his half-brother, as Hermes is the Greek god corresponding to the Roman Mercury. While they talk, they enjoy their food, wine and cigars:

Jupyn was Staatsman, en Merkuur,

Loog, zo geweldig, op den duur,

Gelyk een Pinto, die gants China heeft doorwandelt (Den Ontleeder der Gebreeken, October 18, 1724).

(Jupiter was a statesman, and Mercury,

Lied so very much, that eventually

---

195 According to the dictionary: Twijfelaar: someone who is sceptical regarding religious dogmas or principles; someone who investigates certain propositions in a critical way, a pyrrhonist, a sceptic. (WNT)
He resembled Pinto, who crossed on foot the whole of China.)

Mercury’s lying is probably due to the Mosel wine. He offers a silver skimmer to Hermes/Dissector and tells him the spoon had been made by Momus, inherited by Ennius who gave it to Lucilius and then afterwards to Petronius, Bussy de Rabutin, Regnier, Boileau, Butler, Oldham, Baltasar Graciaan, Aretyn, Sanches, Schippius and Louw Braak.196 Momus is the Greek god of satire, Ennius (c. 239 BCE-c. 169 BCE), Petronius (c. 27-66 CE), Bussy de Rabutin (1618-1693), Mathurin Régnier (1573-1613), Nicolas Boileau (1636-1711), Samuel Butler (1612-1680), John Oldham (1653-1683), Baltasar Gracian (1601-1658), Pietro de Aretino (1492-1556) and Johann Balthasar Schupp (1610-1661) were all satirists, while Aretino was also notorious for his erotic writings. The Portuguese philosopher, Francisco Sanches (1550-1622), was a sceptic: thus, a “twyfelaar” like Dissector. The universality of Juvenal’s epigraph is ironically emphasized in this list of authors by Weyerman: were they led by reason or by desire?

With the spoon these satirists or sceptics skimmed the flaws of people – or deities in the case of Momus. But at that moment the narrator wakes up discovering it was only a dream and he has to manage with his dissecting knife, a metaphor for his own reason. What is the aim of this very short story? It is difficult to recover the context of Weyerman’s references. However, Weyerman entertains his readers in a humorous way and at the same time refers to a list of controversial writers. Apart from the list of satirists and the Portuguese sceptic Sanches, it is not clear how we should interpret in this story the indication of one other author: Mendes Pinto. Does Hermes/Dissector consider him a satirist or a sceptic like the others, or does he refer to him simply as an

196 I was unable to find any information on the Dutch Louw Braak. It can be a corruption of another name.
example of a liar? In fact, travellers’ tales were often regarded with suspicion and accused of dubiousness, inexactness or exaggeration. Though travel writers usually insisted on the status of their work as an eye-witness account, there was no way in which the reader could verify the veracity of the descriptions. On the one hand, writers were aware that their exaggerated descriptions, and excessive iconography responded to the public’s demand for adventure and novelty. On the other hand, the description of a reality never seen before, so different from the travellers’ and their readers’ world, pushed the problem of credible representation to its limits. The difficulty they faced was to find words able to express new realities, which did not possess a previous textual existence.\textsuperscript{197} Therefore, they were often branded as liars (Sell 2006: 2).

But did Mercury lie or did he speak \textit{in vino veritas}? Mercury is not represented in a negative way, he wants to offer the narrator the spoon. Hermes/Dissector is, after all, related to him. Thus, if Mercury is a liar, is his brother Hermes/Dissector a liar too? Or do they all, including Mendes Pinto, tell the truth?

At the beginning of the passage the narrator considers himself a “twyfelaar” which, according to Weyerman’s definition is: somebody who pursues the truth. This pursuit means that he questions what most people take for granted, as do satirists and sceptics who defy traditional thinking. Does it mean that Mendes Pinto also defies traditional thinking? And if he challenges traditional thinking, in what way does he do it? We shall have to look at other references and their contexts in order to find a pattern.

\textsuperscript{197} The illustrator faced a similar problem in representing a reality he had never seen before. See Part II, section 2.1.1.
1.2.1.2 Travel Liars?

In another passage, Weyerman associates Mendez Pinto again with scepticism:

Indien men niet van de goede trou der Reizigers verzekert ja overtuigt was, zou men somtyts aan de voorvallen van De Bruin, Robinson Crusoe, Tavernier, Ferdinand Mendez Pinto, Le Blanc, Constantin van de Renetappelen, en de Filozofale koude van den Ridder Jan Mandeville mogen twyffelen, te meer, wanneer de laatste verhaalt, hoe de gestrengheid van de Vorst op Nova Zembla zoo vehement was, dat aanstonts de gesprokene woorden coaguleerden (De Rotterdamsche Hermes, March 6, 1721).

(Unless we were not sure, yes, even convinced of the travellers’ honesty, one would sometimes doubt the adventures of De Bruin, Robinson Crusoe, Tavernier, Ferdinand Mendez Pinto, Le Blanc, Constantin van de Renetappelen, and the philosophical coldness of the Knight Jan Mandeville, all the more so, when the latter tells how the frost in Nova Zembla was so intense that the spoken words immediately froze.)

Again, it is very difficult to understand the context of this passage as Weyerman often refers to recent events and gossip, and I was not able to find out what or who is meant by “Constantin van de Renetappelen”. In his texts, Weyerman reveals to be an avid reader of travel writing. However, he does not make a distinction between fictional characters like Robinson Crusoe or historical travel writers. At first sight, the inclusion of Mendez Pinto in this list of authors seems to be the case of another travel writer accused of descriptions that were totally or in part invented. The Mandeville that comes immediately to our mind is Sir John Mandeville, the fictitious author of Travels (c. 1356) and of the episode about the frost in Nova Zembla. But in the 1720s, Bernard Mandeville (1670-1733), the Anglo-Dutch deist and philosopher provoked quite a stir.

---

198 Is the name a corruption of Constantin de Renneville? See note 34.
199 I will use the label “travel writing” as the analysed texts possess different characteristics but all take a voyage as an essential condition.
on the continent with his *Free thoughts on religion* (1720). Hence, the allusion to Mandeville’s “Filozofale koude” (philosophical coldness), is a tactic used by Weyerman to refer to the radical philosopher in an indirect way.

1.2.1.3 WHICH MANDEVILLE?

Three years later, Mandeville and Mendes Pinto are again associated when Weyerman criticises *De Leidsche Courant*, a rival weekly published by Felix de Klopper, or “Broeder Felix” as Weyerman calls him, who also owned a coffeehouse in Leiden:

> Begint de vloer van je Coffikamer niet te zinken, door ’t gewigt van die loode Leugen, *Broeder Felix*, en is ’er wel een *Pinto*, of een *Mandevyl*, op den aardbodem, die tegens u de tanden durft laat blikken, in Beuzelsprookjes? *(Den Ontleeder de Gebreeken of November 29, 1724).*

(Does the floor of your coffee room not start to sink under the weight of that lie as heavy as lead, Brother Felix? And is there a Pinto or a Mandeville on earth who dares show his teeth to you in insignificant fairy-tales?)

Which Mandeville is hinted at and how does Weyerman interpret Mendes Pinto’s account? Not only was Bernard Mandeville considered dangerous, but travel writers generally sailed perilously close to subversiveness too. Travellers were considered suspicious by the establishment because the new worlds they met and

---

200 A French version of this work was translated by Justus van Effen in Amsterdam in 1622. (Israel 2001: 626). Van Effen (1684-1735) one of the most important Dutch language writers of the eighteenth century and an influential figure of the Dutch Enlightenment, launched the *Hollandsche Spectator* (1731-1735) inspired by the English journal. During some time Van Effen frequented the The Hague circle of Rousset de Missy. Almost at the same time an anonymous Dutch translation of *Free Thoughts on Religion* was published: *Onpartydige gedachten over de godsdienst, de kerk en des volks geluk* (Hanou 2008: 15-16). Some years earlier, in 1714, Mandeville had published *Fable of the Bees*.

201 The use of italics in the word “*Filosafale*” is remarkable.

202 See also “De Hollandse Leidsche Courant” Mr. W.P. Sautijn Kluit in *Handelingen en Levensberichten Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde*, 1868, pp. 3-86.
described conflicted with the traditional, theologically sanctioned ideas. The reason why Mendes Pinto is called an impostor is because of this conflict with traditional ideas. It was more convenient and easier to label him as a liar, than to give him the credits he deserved with his ground-breaking information. In Mendes Pinto’s account, numbers and geographical or historical names are often inaccurate, but the importance of his account resided in the scientific information it contained.

1.2.1.4 DE BRUIJN, TAVERNIER AND LE BLANC

Going back to the second citation in 1.2.1.2 (De Rotterdamsche Hermes, March 6, 1721), the travel writers Weyerman mentions were more or less aware of the public’s distrust regarding their credibility but they had also provided, consciously or not, factors that eventually point at some form of deism, such as the idea of a natural religion, a universal god, the rejection of Christian dogmas, the awareness of religious tolerance and the acceptance of foreign societies with their different institutions and customs. The Dutch traveller Cornelis de Bruijn (1652-1727) explains in one of his forewords that he intended to be more accurate than others had been before him, having, therefore, included his own illustrations (Hanou 2002: 29-30). He also reveals a tolerant mind and a universalistic concept of religion and of god, and tends to a more deistic attitude (Hanou 2002: 33). Mendes Pinto, torn between devotion to his religion and anti-sectarianism, tends, like De Bruijn, to argue in favour of a universalistic god and a universalistic moral. He describes natural religions and he does not shun criticism by

203 See for example De Bruin’s “Preface” (1700: n.p.) in Voyage au Levant: c'est-à-dire dans les principaux endroits de l'Asie Mineure, dans les iles de Chio, de Rhodes, de Chypre. Delft: H. de Kroonevelt. Nicolaas Witsen supported De Bruijn and requested him to provide him from foreign parts with written accounts and reliable visual material.
non-Christian protagonists. The way he describes China’s judicial system leads the reader to conclude that it is more just than Europe’s, and his China reveals utopian characteristics such as religious tolerance.

The French Huguenot, Jean Baptiste de Tavernier (1605-1689), sparked controversies with his publication of *Les six voyages* with respect to its veracity (Lach 1993: 1069). He described heliocentric societies and so did Vincent Le Blanc (1554-c. 1640) (Fausett 1994: 36). Le Blanc’s *Voyages fameux* (edited in 1648 by Pierre Bergeron, a lawyer) contains two different parts, one that describes what the traveller had seen, which we could designate as realistic, and another part that is more philosophical and which forces the reader to compare the happy state of society in foreign lands with their own society’s miserable state in Europe (Atkinson 1920: 30). The book contains arguments for religious freedom, the right to employment and prompt justice, and is considered a forerunner of utopian writing in the extraordinary voyages by Foigny and Vairasse (Atkinson 1920: 33).

Of the travel writers mentioned by Weyerman, Glazemaker had translated Tavernier and Le Blanc as well. It is probable that Weyerman had read Glazemaker’s translation *Wonderlyke reizen.*

1.2.1.5 **Tavernier and Le Blanc**

On another occasion, Weyerman links Mendes Pinto again to Tavernier and Le Blanc while he criticises all kinds of professions; regarding travellers he says:

---

204 Although Weyerman uses the same name Figuier adopted in his French translation when he refers to “Ferdinand Mendez Pinto” instead of “Fernando” as used by Glazemaker (*Rotterdamsche Hermes* 29 October 1720). For Tavernier see [63] and Le Blanc [15] in Addendum I, Vol. II.
en een Reiziger (*Tavernier, le Blanc, en Pinto uitgezondert*) vult ons, gemeenlyk, den kap met een Uitlegger vol Leugens (*Den Amsterdamse Hermes*, September 16, 1723).

(and a traveller (except for Tavernier, le Blanc, and Pinto) usually draws us in with empty talk.)

Weyerman’s satirical stressing that the travellers mentioned in brackets do not deceive us seems to be a hint for the attentive reader. It was of course convenient for the establishment and established church to label them as liars because they defied the traditional beliefs.

### 1.2.1.6 TAVERNIER AND POSTEL

On another occasion we find Mendes Pinto’s name in association with Tavernier and Guillaume Postel (1510-1581), the French Orientalist, traveller, linguist and geographer. Once more, we are dealing with an unorthodox writer, as Postel was an advocate for the unification of all Christian churches. His tolerance eventually caused him problems with the Inquisition and led to his imprisonment.

O Heilige Schimmen der beruchte Reyzigers Postel, Tavernier, en Pinto, staa me by, in de Ordonnantie van dit Tafereel! Ommers zyt ghy Reyzigers die men veiliglyk vermag te geloven (*Den Echo des Weerelds*, April 15, 1726).

(Oh Holy Shadows of the infamous travellers Postel, Tavernier, and Pinto, stand by me, in the ordering of this scene! After all you are travellers that one can safely believe.)
This time the alert reader may trust these writers, but only after having branded them as “berucht” (infamous), in the sentence before.  

1.2.1.7 Robinson Crusoe

On another occasion, Mendes Pinto is again associated with Crusoe:

ja zoo wonderlyk als die van Robinson Crusoe; zoo geloofwaardig als die van Pinto; en zoo wel gerangeert als Tallarts Armée in ’t hartje van de deroute (De Rotterdamsche Hermes, September 4, 1721).

(yes, as marvellous as those of Robinson Crusoe, as credible as those of Pinto, and so well organised as Tallard’s army in the heart of the rout.)

1.2.1.8 Imaginary Voyages

205 At the end of the seventeenth century and beginning of the eighteenth century Postel, Aretino, Bruno or Spinoza among others were rumored to be the author of the most infamous of the clandestine manuscripts, Traité des trois imposteurs, a work which claimed that Moses, Jesus and Mohammed were impostors. The manuscript was augmented and clandestinely published in The Hague by Levier and Rousset de Missy, one of the leaders of Dutch Freemasonry, in 1719 under the title: La vie et l’esprit de Spinoza (Jacob 2006: 186).

206 The Duke of Tallard (1652-1728) had suffered a defeat at the Battle of Blenheim in 1704, a turning point in the War of Spanish Succession. He was captured in the rout, a disorderly and chaotic retreat and forced to surrender. This resulted in the victory of the opposing party. He was imprisoned in England and on his release in 1711 returned to France where he was made a duke in 1712, despite the calamity of Blenheim, and became a Peer of France in 1715.

207 In the last citation from the Rotterdamsche Hermes, Crusoe and Pinto are referred to in relation to Constantin de Renneville’s testimony of the unbelievable horrors he suffered while at the Bastille. De Renneville (1650-1723) was a French Protestant writer who had lived in the Netherlands for some time. Back in France he was denounced as a spy and imprisoned in the Bastille for eleven years. Freed through the intercession of Queen Anne he went to England where he wrote his memoirs, an account in which he did not spare the horrors he suffered while imprisoned. His L’Inquisition Françoise ou l’Histoire de la Bastille was printed in Amsterdam in 1715 in French as well as in English. Coincidentally – or not - the English translation was published by William Taylor, Daniel Defoe’s publisher. It was translated into Dutch in 1717 and was one of Weyerman’s favourite books (Groeneboom-Draai 1994: 446, 594). It was a narrative that, like the ones by Pinto and Defoe, was based on memoirs of a narrator and combined realism with the unbelievable.
We already commented on the association of Mendes Pinto and fictitious characters such as Robinson Crusoe.\textsuperscript{208} The reference to Robinson Crusoe points to a dissenting form of literature that was emerging: the imaginary voyage.\textsuperscript{209} The development of utopian literature in the sixteenth, seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century was closely related to that of travel writing. The boundaries between fact and fiction became more and more blurred as writers of imaginary travels, such as Daniel Defoe, consciously explore this breach (Zumthor 1994: 813, 817). It was difficult for the reader to distinguish whether he was dealing with an imaginary or a real travel account as the novelist imitated the language of the discourse of the travel journals.\textsuperscript{210} Travel writing had evolved into imaginary travel journals about utopian or anti-utopian realms that could be held as a mirror to persuade readers of the irrationality of European religion, politics, morality and society. The imaginary voyages describing primitive societies, which evolved into earthly utopias became a familiar genre in the Early Enlightenment. As travel writing was very popular among the public, this vehicle became a relatively safe way to spread enlightened ideas (Israel 2001: 272). The philosophical utopian travel narrative had its origin in France with Foigny’s \textit{La terre Austral inconnue} (1676) and Denis Vairasse’s \textit{The history of the Sevarites or Sevarambi}.

\textsuperscript{208} Mendes Pinto is mentioned twice together with Defoe’s protagonist or novel \textit{The life and strange surprising adventures of Robinson Crusoe, mariner of York}, published in 1720 and one year later published in Dutch under the title: \textit{Het leven en de wonderbaare gevallen van Robinson Crusoe}.
\textsuperscript{209} During the Middle Ages there were already imaginary travel accounts in Europe. The discovery of the New World intensified the production of the real and imaginary travel account.
\textsuperscript{210} Remarkable is the publication of an anonymous log-book of a real voyage \textit{Journaal Wegens een Voyagie, Gedaan op order der Hollandsche Oost-Indische maatschappij … Na het onbekende Zuid-land …} (Journal of a Voyage made by Order of the Dutch East-Indian Company … to the Unexplored South Land …) that was not published separately but incorporated in the edition of two imaginary voyages, namely the Dutch translation of Denis Vairasse’s \textit{Histoire des Severambes} and Foigny’s \textit{La Terre australe connue}. It was published in Amsterdam by W. de Coup, W. Lamsvelt, Ph. Verbeek and J. Lamsvelt in 1701 (KB Website Expositions and Collections, accessed 31 Aug. 2010).
(1675)\textsuperscript{211} *Histoire des Sevarambes* (1677) and was revived by Tyssot de Patot’s\textsuperscript{212} clandestinely printed *Voyages et avantures de Jaques Massé* (The Hague, probably in 1714) and *La vie, les aventures et le voyage de Groenland de Révårend Père Cordelier Pierre de Mésange* (Amsterdam, 1720).\textsuperscript{213} The first Dutch Spinozistic utopian travel narrative was *Krinke Kesmes* (1708) by Hendrik Smeeks (1645-1721) who was accused by the Reformed authorities of atheism and Spinozism (Israel 2001: 321-2). Weyerman was acquainted with this type of literature as he refers to it in his writings.

### 1.2.1.9 WOMEN AND OTHER RABBLE

We may conclude that Weyerman did not evaluate these books for their mere factuality; the autonomous quality they possessed was based on the imaginary aspect that made them more appealing. What is more, it was the possibility of imaginary constructs that made possible the suggestion of different systems of social or political organisation, and to write about these fictional worlds as if they were real. A novel had in common with a travel account the fact that it could challenge traditional, dogmatic thinking and denounce it.

\textsuperscript{211} The book by Vairasse was initially published in English, then in French in two parts (1677–1679) as *Histoire des Sévarambes* (1677).

\textsuperscript{212} Tyssot de Patot wrote in French but lived in Deventer and was accused of blasphemy, atheism, obscenity and Spinozism after publishing under his own name an audacious *Lettres Choisies* (1726). Tyssot de Patot was also acquainted with the The Hague group (Jacob 2006: 155).

\textsuperscript{213} The three authors were French Huguenots and had suffered religious persecution. It is remarkable how many radical thinkers came from groups such as Huguenots, Socinians, Sephardic Jews or Mennonites that had been severely affected by religious conflicts (Fausett 1994: 38-39; Israel 2006a: 116).
Only once does Weyerman mention an actual episode described by Mendes Pinto:

of heb je in *Ferdinand Mendez Pinto* gelezen, dat in het oosten de Vrouwen in Gezantschappen *geëmploieert* worden, als wanneer het haar vrystaat zonder *offenzie* eene *foeminine Oratie* te doen (*De Rotterdamsche Hermes*, October 29, 1720).

(or did you read in Ferdinand Mendez Pinto that in the East women are employed in embassies, when women are allowed to profess a feminine speech without offense)

Weyerman refers to chapter 172 in *Peregrinaçam*; p. 237/8 in *Wonderlyke reizen*, in which a woman who headed an embassy, on behalf of the emperor of Demak, was received with the highest honours by the local ruler.\(^{214}\) In this part of Asia, women were sent as envoys whenever matters requiring peace and harmony were being negotiated. The choice of this episode is revealing. Weyerman does not comment on whether or not a woman should exercise such an important function that in Europe was traditionally carried out by a man. He calls the readers’ attention to the fact that women are regarded differently in other societies. His comment fits into the tendency revealed by a radical minority that held egalitarian and democratic opinions and thus, defended women’s emancipation. Weyerman refers repeatedly to these freethinking writers or philosophers as Spinoza, Hobbes, Toland, Saint Evremond, Vanini, Jelles, Koerbagh, Duijkerius and Isabella de Moerloose.\(^{215}\) The mentioning of the radical writer Isabella

---

\(^{214}\) Glazemaker calls the readers’ attention by adding in the margin “Een Vrou tot Gezant aan de Koning van Zunda gezonden” (A woman sent as an emissary to the King of Zunda, WR 237).

\(^{215}\) John Toland (1670-1722) Anglo-Irish deist who had been exiled for some years in the Republic and one of the founders of the Masonic lodge in The Hague (Jacob 2006: 89). The French Saint-Évremond (1610-1703) was also exiled in Holland. Vanini (1584-1619), the Italian freethinker, was persecuted for his ideas and driven from one European country to another. He was condemned and burned at the stake at Toulouse, for atheism and witchcraft. Isabella de Moerloose (1660/1-after 1712) spent many years in prison because of her unorthodox manner of thinking, she was declared insane and is the author of *Vrede tractaet, gegeven van den hemel door vrouwen zaet* (Peace Tract Given by Heaven through Women’s
de Moerloose (*De Roterdamsche Hermes*, February 13, 1721) together with other heterodox writers suggests that Weyerman wants to draw his readers’ attention in a masked form to their pioneering ideas about equality and freedom.

**1.2.1.10 Conclusion**

Every time Weyerman refers to Mendes Pinto, other names of unorthodox writers, satirists or philosophers are linked. What all of them have in common was their allegedly corrupting effect on the reader (Leemans 2002: 275-6). He seems to dissociate himself by hiding behind satirical comments (Groenenboom-Draai 1994: 591; Schrijvers 2008: 567). Taking into account the context in which the name “Mendes Pinto” is referred to, leads us to conclude that Weyerman considered him a dissenter and that it was also too dangerous to refer to nonconformist writers or thinkers in a direct way. The issue was not whether or not the travel account was accurate, because Weyerman includes Pinto in the group of travel writers, who in their works described utopias or anti-utopias, imaginary or not, or to those writers whose ideology was not subordinated to theological or Church authority and whose scientific outlook clashed with the still prevailing biblical view of the world.216

Our conclusions regarding Weyerman’s satirical comments or his “writing between the lines”, as Leo Strauss mentioned this technique of writing (Strauss 1952: 24-25), agree with those of other researchers (Israel 2001: 13-14; Groenenboom-Draai 1994: 591). An outright defence of forbidden writers such as Spinoza, Toland or

---

216 Though a mere supposition, his imprisonment could have been a convenient way to silence an inconvenient writer.
Koerbagh was out of the question. By referring to controversial writers and thinkers together even if in a negative way, he is insinuating that they are not orthodox.\textsuperscript{217} It can hardly be proven as Weyerman’s aim was exactly its indemonstrability on the part of the official authorities. The ambiguity, irony, opaque language and constant association with other controversial authors or works were meant to be detected by insiders, a minority, that the author was actually addressing.

\textsuperscript{217} Jonathan Israel remarks that the extremely frequent and extensive use of the term “Spinozism” (or its derivatives) in Early Enlightenment discourse is intended to connect Spinoza’s philosophy with a wide-ranging network of radical thought, even when the term is used in a pejorative way (Israel 2001: 13/14). I believe Weyerman applies the same principle when he refers to Mendes Pinto and to an associated network of other writers whom he considered controversial.
1.2.2 Other Writers

The interest of a radical coterie in Mendes Pinto is confirmed by two other members of the circle in The Hague. Bernard Picart (engraver) and Jean Frederique Bernard (writer and bookseller) were the authors of *Naaukeurige beschryving der uitwendige godtsdienst-plichten, kerk-zeden en gewoontens van alle volkeren der waereldt* (1727-1738) a translation of *Ceremonies et Coutumes Religieuses de tous les Peuples du Monde* (1723-1743). During the early Enlightenment, multivolume encyclopaedic works produced for a broad market were an effective weapon against superstition and ignorance. Some were strongly pervaded by views on toleration and were vehicles of radical thought (Israel 2001: 134-5). This is the case of the work by these two French Protestants in which Mendes Pinto is referred to in Volume IV, chapter VIII (1729).

The French original as well as the Dutch translation by Abraham Moubach, were published in Amsterdam. It is considered to be one of the main sources documenting a history of religion, with extensive descriptions of the Jewish and Roman Catholic faith, Greek-Orthodox and Protestant churches, Quakerism, Anabaptism, Freemasonry, Islam, Buddhism, Chinese and Persian religions, and American and African creeds.

Its author Jean Frederic Bernard (1680-1744) was born in France and belonged to an influential Huguenot family that was forced to flee to the Dutch Republic. In Amsterdam, he became a publisher of lucrative French authors and of radical works.

---

218 Though not originally written in Dutch the work by Picart and Bernard was included in this list of references to Mendes Pinto in Dutch publications because both resided permanently in the Dutch Republic and had contacts with other freethinkers whether French or Dutch. Moreover, the complete text of the Dutch translation by Abraham Moubach is included in the site of the Digital Library of Literature from the Low Countries (dbnl) as is Bernard Picart’s name.
The other author was the French engraver Bernard Picart (1673-1733), who was also a Huguenot settled in Amsterdam. Together they were responsible for the seven-volume work that marked a major turning point in European Enlightenment thought towards religious belief, which was based on the radical idea that religions could be compared on equal terms (Hunt 2010: 1, 89, 98). They were convinced that the comparisons could lay bare the core doctrine of a universal natural religion that over the centuries had been covered by cultural accretions. The accounts of perverse superstitions and rituals became an indirect critique of Christian superstitions and rituals imposed by the clergy.

The description of the funeral rites for the holy Rolim that culminate with the self-sacrifice of six young men (P 167-168; VA CLXVI-CLXVII; WR 229-230), that were taken from Mendes Pinto, are summarized by Bernard (CCR 33-34; NB 28-29). Bernard compares the Rolim with the Pope, a comparison suggested by Mendes Pinto. In the Portuguese version he is “como o papa entre nós os Christãos”, in French “qui estoit comme leur souuerain Pontife”, Glazemaker calls him “opperste priester” (supreme priest) (P 168; VA CLXVII; WR 229). Like Grotius almost a century earlier, Picart and Bernard find evidence of a universal religion in Mendes Pinto’s account. The work by the two French Huguenots prepared the ground for religious tolerance and demonstrated the global impact of travel writing on Western consciousness (Hunt 2010: 1).

As we have seen, it was Glazemaker’s intention to transform Mendes Pinto’s account into a subversive text, but it seems that radicals like Picart and Bernard drew on the French translation. In the episode taken from Mendes Pinto’s account describing the funeral rites of the Rolim, Bernard’s (and his Dutch translator, Moubach’s) choice of

---

219 Mendes Pinto is referred to on another occasion in a footnote in the same volume (CCR 93; NB 80)
words reveal that Bernard used the French translation of _Peregrinaçam_, because Glazemaker mistook the French “ville”, in Figuier’s translation for the Dutch “straat” (street). Bernard copied the word “Ville” which Moubach translated correctly as “Stadt” (Picart 1728: 33; 1729: 28). This means that Glazemaker was not alone in interpreting Mendes Pinto’s text as potentially dissenting. It would be interesting to study the reception of Mendes Pinto’s work among other radical thinkers in Europe, especially the reception of the anonymous German translation that was based on Glazemaker’s and published in Amsterdam by the Hendrik and Dirk Boom brothers who belonged to the same radical group as Glazemaker and Rieuwertsz.

Another encyclopaedic work that mentions Mendes Pinto is the _Groot algemeen historisch, geographisch, genealogisch, en oordeelkundig woordenboek, behelzende zo het voornaamste, dat vervat is in de woorden-boeken van Morery, Bayle, Buddeus,enz._ (Great general historical, geographical, genealogical and critical dictionary, containing the most important that is included in the dictionaries of Moréri, Bayle, Buddeus, etc.), volume seven (1732). The first volumes were published by David van Hoogstraaten (1658-1724). After the publisher’s death, J. L. Schuer and Matthaeus Broërius van Niedeck continued his work. Van Hoogstraaten, a writer and linguist, was a friend of Petrus Rabus (1660-1702), founder and editor of _Boekzaal van Europa_ (Library of Europe), a Dutch periodical whose model was Bayle’s _Nouvelles_ (Israel 2001: 147).

As is explained in the title, the dictionary was based on other dictionaries but with different philosophical perspectives, revealing Van Hoogstraaten’s eclecticism. Louis Moréri (1643-1680) published in 1674 in Lyon _Le Grand Dictionnaire Historique, ou le Mélange Curieux de l’Histoire Sacrée et Profane_, that was in part a defence of the Roman Catholic Church. The French Huguenot, Pierre Bayle (1647-1707), who at the
beginning of the 1680s had fled to Rotterdam and is considered one of the most influential and controversial thinkers of the early Radical Enlightenment (Israel 2001: 333) published *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique* (Rotterdam, 1697), a critical dictionary with a list of all the “errors” of other dictionaries, especially the one by Moréri. Johann Franz Buddeus (1667-1729) is a German Lutheran philosopher. Though he was a moderate, he revealed, like Bayle, a critical conception of the history of philosophy. He sought to detach credulity and superstition in favour of a program of rationalisation (Israel 2006a: 479-80).

The entry that mentions Mendes Pinto in Van Hoogstraten’s encyclopaedia was taken from the *Bibliotheca Hispaina Nova* (1672) written by the Spanish historian and bibliographer Antonio Nicolás (1617-1684). The work is a vast bibliography of Iberian writers (from 1500 onwards). It was summarised in Dutch and reads:


(Mendes Pinto (Ferdinand) Portuguese who lived at the end of the XV century and spent a long time in the East Indies. He composed a Travel Account, which was only published in 1614 after his death, in his mother tongue under the title of *Peregrinaca*. [sic] But because in the account many things occur which truth was very much doubted, Franciscus de Herrera Maldonado assumed his defence and published it together with the Travel Account, which he translated into Spanish, in the year 1620, in folio. Afterwards, this Travel Account was translated into various other languages. *Anton. Bibl. Hispan.*)
This main entry word was a shortened form of the Latin entry published by Antonio Nicolás. It is remarkable that the Dutch authors decided to expurgate the Catholic connotations of the book. They omitted the apology by the Jesuit João de Lucena (1549-1600) and the Dominican Thomas Malvenda (1566-1628):


Some years later, in the obscure book Verhandeling over de zonnestofjes (Treatise on the Atoms of the Sun) written by an amateur natural philosopher Jan Marchant in 1768, I found another example of how Fernão Mendes Pinto was read as challenging traditional Christian thinking and stimulating the study of natural philosophy. In Marchant’s opinion, the element fire had lost its importance and he sets out to prove that the other three elements derive from it.220 He mentions that Mendes Pinto in chapters 109, 127, 163, 164, 166, 167 and 184 described the importance of the sun for the Chinese who worship a “Gód der Zonnestófjes” (god of the motes of the sun). In 1769 appeared an anonymous negative critique “Verhandeling over de Zonnestofjes door Jan Marchant.” Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen of Tijdschrift van Kunsten en Wetenschappen (Patriotic Literary Exercises or Magazine of Arts and Sciences) Vol. II Series I. pp. 325-327. See Volumde II, Addendum IV.

220
sun) (Marchant 1768: 9).\textsuperscript{221} The importance of the sun is associated with a growing heliocentric and scientific perspective. The word “zonnestofjes”\textsuperscript{222} was used during the seventeenth until the nineteenth century in literary circles to refer to atoms. It was the Dutch translation of “pulvisculi in sole volitantes” expression coined by the first Dutch atomist, Isaac Beeckman (1588-1637), of the description of atoms as the smallest particles that float like dust in a sunbeam, a reference to Lucretius’ image and explanation of atoms (Schrijvers 2008: 548).

Another example was Lectiones historico-ecclesiasticae ofte vermaakelijkheden uit de kerkgeschiedenis (Lectiones historico-ecclesiasticae or delight from Church History) (1779) by the Dutch child prodigy, physicist, mathematician and poet Pieter Nieuwland (1764-1794) who mentions a kind of penitence the Chinese practiced after a great earthquake. Nieuwland’s work is in line with Picart and Bernard’s Ceremonies et Coutumes Religieuses. His aim is to write an ecclesiastical history in which different rituals are catalogued. In Book IV he wants to collect all kinds of Bededags-brieven (Letters of days of prayers) about prayers or penance practiced in different times and cultures. Prayers were held or sacrifices made because people considered calamities as a divine punishment. Nieuwland had probably been inspired by the many bededagen held in the Republic in the aftermath of the Lisbon Earthquake in 1755-1756. They were held in order to thank and pray to God that such a catastrophe did not and would never occur in the Netherlands.

\textsuperscript{221} Quiay Figrau or “deos dos atomos do sol” in Glazemaker called “God der zonneveesjes” or “Dieu des Atomes du Soleil” in the French translation. The chapter numbers indicate that his source was not Glazemaker’s translation but the translation by Figuier. In this translation the numbers of the chapters are slightly different and correspond to chapters 110, 128, 164, 165, 167, 168 and 169 of Peregriaçaam.

\textsuperscript{222} From “zon” (sun) and the diminutive of “stof” (dust).
In Nieuwland’s list, that starts with the “heathen” and then goes on to other religions, he does not omit Jews and Christians, though nothing is said about the *bededagen* held in 1755-1756. With reference to Mendes Pinto, Nieuwland had read about a similar ritual in *Wonderlyke reizen* (Nieuwland 1779: 409). Though he does not specify the episode – he only mentions that he thought it was a little embellished by Mendes Pinto – he must be referring to the earthquake in Shaanxi in chapter 222, page 272-273 of the Dutch translation.\(^{223}\) The reason why Glazemaker translated the description dealing with the aftermath of the earthquake in Shaanxi was because of the genuine way the Chinese practice their penance:

> En hoewel zy Heidenen zijn / zo moet men echter belijden dat zy ons beschaamden / die Christenen zijn / en aanzagen hoe verre hun yver zich uitstrekte.

> Men volhardde sedert in veel andere goede werken / die met zo grote kosten gedaan wierden / dat ’et gelooffelijk is / dat / zo ’t geloof aan Christum daar by geweest had / zy aangenaam aan God geweest zouden hebben (WR 272-273).

> (And although they are heathen, one must nonetheless declare that they made us, Christians, feel ashamed, as we observed how far their zeal stretched.

> From then on they persisted in many other good deeds, which were done at such high expense that it is likely that if there had been faith in Christ, they would have been agreeable to God.)

> This was quite different from the Dutch reaction to the Lisbon earthquake. The general opinion, clearly expressed by Frans de Haes (1708-1761) in the poem *Het

---

\(^{223}\) Nieuwland refers explicitly to *Wonderlyke reizen*, thus, he cannot refer to the episode about the earthquake in Cohilouza and the stoning to death of a Christian missionary by Chinese bonzes, because Glazemaker omitted this passage.
verheerlykte en vernederde Portugal (Glorified and humiliated Portugal, 1758), was that the Portuguese, worshippers of idols, got what they deserved and as long as the Protestant Republic would persevere in its true faith, the Dutch had nothing to fear, quite on the contrary, marine trade and fishing would continue to prosper (Jong 1955: 203; D’haen 2005: 567-569). The Dutch did not reveal sincere regret and humble penance but rather a form of Schadenfreude.

It seems that Nieuwland’s as well as Marchant’s interest was stirred by the 1755 Lisbon earthquake. Marchant refers to it explicitly (Marchant 1768: 195-6) but he does not clearly pronounce whether or not earthquakes are divine punishments. In his book he tries to explain the importance of the sun and its atoms.

Mendes Pinto did not inspire only radical writers or scientists, I found three more references to Mendes Pinto in the eighteenth century: two books on Saint Ignatius de Loyola, one published in the Catholic Southern Netherlands (1736), which quotes from chapter 213 of the Historia Oriental, and the other one was published in Amsterdam (1737, 2nd edition 1767).224 Both refer to Mendes Pinto and mention the information he held on Saint Francis Xavier’s life and death in the Far East. One last reference was found in an anonymous article in Vaderlandsche Letter-oefeningen of Tijdschrift van Kunsten en Wetenschappen (Patriotic Literary Exercises or Magazine of the Arts and Sciences, 1784) about Dutch travellers.225 Mendes Pinto’s name is briefly mentioned as being “een kundig en oplettend reiziger” (a competent and observant traveller).

---

224 See Volume II, Addendum IV.
225 See Volume II, Addendum IV.
Mendes Pinto’s book is mentioned in several catalogues. The Dutch publisher Pieter van der Aa (1659 -1733) organised a catalogue *Bibliotheca Exquisitissima* (1729), with titles of books bound by him and which he offers for sale. Item 826 is a copy of *Peregrinaçam* (Lisboa 1614), item 2833 of *Historia Oriental* (Valencia 1645) and item 2836 of *Wonderlyke reizen* (Amsterdam 1652).\(^{226}\)

Finally, from 1747 till 1767 *Historische beschrijving der reizen* (Historical description of voyages) was published.\(^{227}\) It is the translation of the French *Histoire générale des voyages, nouvelle collection de toutes les relations de voyages par mer et par terre* by Abbé Prévost. In 1756, “Reizen van Fernando Mendez Pinto” (Travels by Fernando Mendes Pinto) and it was published in Volume XIV. It is the Dutch translation of the abridged version that was incorporated in the *Histoire Générale*. This abridged version was based on Figuier’s translation. The French editor justifies the inclusion of Fernão Mendes Pinto’s travels with the fact that the French translation by Figuier was hard to find on the market.

Like the French “Voyages de Fernand Mendez Pinto” the “Reizen van Fernando Mendez Pinto” was divided into six parts:

- *Eerste lotgevallen van Pinto* (First adventures of Pinto);
- *Tochten en ontmoetingen van Pinto met Antonio de Faria* (Expeditions and encounters of Pinto and Antonio de Faria);
- *Zonderlinge tocht naar ’t Eiland Calempluy* (Remarkable journey to the Isle of Calempluy);
- *Wederwaardigheden van Pinto in China en Tartarije* (Pinto’s adventures in China and Tartary);

\(^{226}\) In the *Catalogus Librorum Bibliothecae Augustini de Steenhaut*, Brussel (1758) item 2780 refers to *Les Voyages Des-mendes Pinto*, Paris. Augustin de Steenhaut (1672-1758) was an influential Flemish magistrate.

\(^{227}\) See Volume II, Addendum III.
Wederkering van den Schrijver uit zyne slavernij naar Indië (The author’s return to India, after his slavery);

Vervolg der gevallen van Pinto en zijne terugkomst te Lisbon (Sequel to Pinto’s adventures and return to Lisbon).

The French translation by Figuier was heavily abridged: the episode about Saint Francis Xavier and Father Melchior Barreto’s voyage is practically omitted in the French as well as in the Dutch version.

1.2.3 CONCLUSION

We can conclude that Mendes Pinto still enjoyed popularity among the public in the eighteenth century. In the first half of the century, Mendes Pinto, together with other heterodox writers, was often referred to by radicals in a kind of code language addressed at initiated readers. In the seventeenth century, excerpts of his work were interpreted as a plea for a universal religion and a universal morality, and in the eighteenth century, this tendency continues but now even without a theological grounding. The appeal Peregrinaçam had on heterodox thinkers was that virtuousness does not stem from religion or ethnicity and can be attained by everyone.

In his multi-volume history about the Radical Enlightenment Jonathan Israel has redefined Enlightenment. He traces its origins to a radical clandestine European movement, centred in the Dutch Republic in the mid-seventeenth century.228 In Israel’s opinion, Spinoza played a pivotal role in the movement. The Radical Enlightenment

---

228 Israel, Jonathan, Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750 (2001) and Enlightenment Contested: Philosophy, Modernity, and the Emancipation of Man, 1670-1752 (2006) both edited by Oxford University Press. His study confirms the results of other scholars such as Margaret Jacob, Silvia Berti, Wim Klever, M. Wielem, Wijnand Mijnhardt and Wiep van Bunge, who were aware of radical thinkers in Dutch society.
represents a current of thought that played an essential role in the establishment of egalitarian – racial, sexual – and democratic values, and in which we can find the roots of anti-colonialism and toleration (Israel 2006b: 524).

In the hub of this European intellectual turmoil, associated with the scientific advances earlier in the seventeenth century, Mendes Pinto’s book was appropriated by a clandestine movement. His denouncement of the Europeans by Asian characters, their violence and greediness, as well as the description of a tolerant, just and well-organised society met with the ideals of men like Glazemaker, Rieuwertsz, Witsen, and others, who were active in the diffusion of radical ideas. In the eighteenth century, men like Weyerman, Picart and Bernard continued their work. Furthermore, the references to Mendes Pinto’s oeuvre about the East Indies, China and Japan prove that the quest for a universalist morality based on equity was not limited to Western philosophical tradition (Israel 2006a: 869).
FERNÃO MENDES PINTO: ETHNOGRAPHER, GEOGRAPHER AND HISTORIAN

2.1 THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

As it seems, from the list (in Volume II, Addendum IV), Mendes Pinto is hardly mentioned for almost forty years. In fact, after the 1730s references to his name or work are scattered and diversified. Imaginary travel accounts such as the ones about utopias by Foigny, Vairasse, Smeeks, Tyssot de Patot or Swift, are new vehicles of unorthodox thinking.\footnote{See Hanou and Buijnsters for the several Dutch imaginary travel accounts in the eighteenth century (Hanou 2002: 73-94; Buijnsters 1969: 2-19).}

This was a period in which a moderate mainstream Enlightenment dominated. Jonathan Israel explains the defeat of the Dutch Radical Enlightenment, a clandestine movement characterised by its urbanism, as the result of urban decay, economic decline due to expensive warfare, and disruption of Dutch shipping and overseas trade that originated in the mid 1710s. The reaction was the restoration of the country’s moral fibre through a greater unity and more harmony between all churches. The result ended with a new shared Christian consciousness (Israel 2006a: 372-386).\footnote{Other scholars have come to similar conclusions. Piet Schrijvers, in his analysis of the reception of Lucretius, notices that after a relative demand in the seventeenth century that culminated in the first unabridged translation of De Rerum Natura in 1701 (2\textsuperscript{nd} edition in 1709) by J. de Witt, Lucretius is only marginally mentioned for a period of roughly 150 years. Schrijvers cites Hooykaas as well as Vermij who characterize the eighteenth century as a period of religiosity and belief in creationism (Schrijvers 2008: 563). The Dutch reaction to the Lisbon earthquake confirms this trend.}

A third reason for Mendes Pinto’s fall into oblivion was the fact that anything associated with Portugal and the Portuguese became marginalised and forgotten. The Lisbon earthquake in 1755 will only momentarily centre Europe’s attention on what once had been a maritime empire.
In the Republic, the fight between two groups that gravitated to opposite poles of the Enlightenment was on the agenda: the radical Patriots and the conservative Orangists. The Patriots struggled for the removal of stadhouder Willem V, Prince of Orange. The Radical Enlightenment advances in opposition to the mainstream and moderate Enlightenment, and comes to light in the 1770s, 1780s and 1790s (Israel 2007). In 1795, the stadhouder Willem V is overthrown and the Batavian Republic is proclaimed. The new Republic enjoyed widespread support from the Dutch population and was the product of a genuine popular revolution. However, it was founded with the armed support of the French. In 1806 the Kingdom of Holland was established under Louis Bonaparte. Nevertheless, Louis did not perform according to his brother Napoleon’s expectations. As a result, the country was annexed to France in 1810.

After the VOC had been dissolved in 1799, during the first decade of the nineteenth century the British gradually took possession of the Dutch colonies in the Far East. After Napoleon’s defeat and the peace settlements of 1814 and 1815, the colonies were transferred back to the Dutch in 1816. The Dutch, however, had difficulty in controlling numerous wars and rebellions by the population and, consequently, the Dutch finances became severely affected by these wars. In 1830, the loss of Belgium brought the Netherlands to the brink of bankruptcy. A concerted exploitation of Indonesian resources was initiated and contributed to the industrialisation of the mother country. This explains why the Dutch rationalised their administration of the East Indies throughout the nineteenth century. The Cultuurstelsel (Cultivation System) was implemented in 1830. An important part of the native population was forced, at low wages, to cultivate crops for the benefit of the Dutch government. The Dutch writer Multatuli (pseudonym of Eduard Douwes Dekker, 1820-1887) wrote his novel Max
Havelaar, of de koffij-veilingen der Nederlandsche Handel-Maatschappy (Max Havelaar, Or the Coffee Auctions of the Dutch Trading Company 1860) in protest against this policy. The book raised Dutch awareness, which eventually motivated the new *ethische politiek* (ethical policy) that emphasised the improvement of the indigenous population’s material living conditions. In around 1870, the system was abolished and the colony was opened to private investment.

From the mid nineteenth century onwards, a scientific career in the tropics was a lucrative alternative (Bank 2004: 263). There was a need for geographical maps and roads, and there was interest in the presence of profitable natural resources. In 1835-1836 civil-service training courses were established and in 1877, with the appointment of the first professor of Geography and Ethnology from the East Indies at the University of Leiden, they became academic courses. In support the Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde (Royal Institute for the Study of Linguistics, Geography and Anthropology) was founded in 1852. Its original objective was the advancement of the study of the anthropology, linguistics, social sciences, and history of the Dutch colonies, specifically the East and West Indies. Other organisations, each with their own publications, soon followed.

The aforementioned explains the many references to Fernão Mendes Pinto related with the Far East – usually with the East Indies and Dejima Island (Japan) – in scientific publications in the Netherlands or in the Dutch East Indies from the second half of the nineteenth century until approximately the end of World War II. Current the KITLV is called Royal Netherlands Institute of Southeast Asian and Caribbean Studies. After having run a trading post on the island of Hirado, the Dutch moved to Dejima, in the bay of Nagasaki, in 1641, where they stayed until 1859. The Portuguese had been expelled from Japan in 1639.
Indonesia declared independence and after an armed struggle, the young country was recognised by the Dutch in 1946.

From a positivist perspective, Mendes Pinto was generally esteemed for the geographical, ethnical and historical information he provided. Thus, his work was considered a relatively reliable source concerning the oldest European relations with Indonesia and Japan by the Dutch scholars Pieter Anton Tiele or Gerrit Pieter Rouffaer (Tiele 1879: 58-59; Rouffaer 1919: deel III, 410). Scholars were aware that the spelling of the names of places and persons were difficult to identify, and that Mendes Pinto used some fantasy when he described his personal adventures, but the majority trusted his historical accuracy.

Remarkable is the fact that Tiele does not limit his interpretation to the historical, geographical or ethnological facts, as he mentions Mendes Pinto’s use of Asian characters to voice his indirect criticism (Tiele 1879: Deel III, 58-59). Rouffaer’s entry in Encyclopaedie van Nederlandsch-Indië (1919: Deel III, 410) about Mendes Pinto agrees with Tiele’s opinion. He compares Mendes Pinto with Bontekoe, and mentions his possible Jewish origin (Teensma 1992: xxviii-xxix).233

---

233 Fernão Mendes Pinto’s possible Jewish origin had been voiced for the first time in 1904 by Cristovão Ayres.
3 Fernão Mendes Pinto: Literary Writer

In the twentieth century, Portuguese language and literature began to be studied at Dutch universities (Amsterdam, Leiden, Nijmegen, Utrecht).

Soon after World War II, the Dutch Lusitanist Hendrik Houwens Post (1904-1986) published Het heroïsche leven van Luís de Camoens: Portugees renaissancedichter en avonturier: 1524-1580 (The heroic life of Luís Vaz de Camões: Portuguese Renaissance poet and adventurer [1950]), a kind of biography of Camões, a poet the author felt a connection with. He worked on his book during the war and was thus limited in his research. His source for Mendes Pinto was a French translation from 1932 by Jacques Boulenger Les voyages adventureux de Fernand Mendez Pinto, 1537-1558, and not the original Portuguese text. Houwens Post’s tone is imperialistic and exalted; his book begins with a general introduction in which he mentions Mendes Pinto several times. He sees him as a precursor of Camões’ mentality, a sort of crusader, the kind of unsophisticated Portuguese adventurer Camões must have met in Asia.²³⁴ Houwens Post admires his strength and perseverance, his bravado and psychological understanding of the others. He compares Mendes Pinto’s sarcasm with Voltaire’s, though the Portuguese writer narrates his adventures without bitterness or pretensions. Therefore, Peregrinaçam is more gripping and humane. He considers the style natural and suggestive, and mentions that King Philip II acknowledged the book’s merit. He also says that Mendes Pinto not only described China, its customs, people and religions, his journeys to Japan and Francis Xavier’s missionary work, but also the robberies

²³⁴ On another occasion referring to Mendes Pinto, he considers him the discoverer of the Japanese islands in 1542 (Houwens Post [1950]: 35) or declares that the policy of the Portuguese was reckless exploration and thus condemned to fail (Houwens Post [1950]: 66).
committed by the colonisers. Since Antonio de Faria plundered the tombs of the Chinese emperors, it is no wonder that, according to Houwens Post, the Chinese hated the Portuguese. After the book having been en vogue at the time of its publication, Mendes Pinto acquired the reputation of being an arch deceiver, and only after the Europeans came in close contact with the regions he had described did it become clear that his book was a more reliable source than what it had been initially believed to be (Houwens Post [1950]: 66-73). Houwens Post's superficial description of Mendes Pinto reveals the ambiguity of his work as Mendes Pinto is described by him as a pious Catholic, a discoverer, an adventurer, and a pirate.

A few years later, Marcus de Jong (1901-1969) published *Beknopte geschiedenis der Portugese letterkunde* (Concise history of Portuguese literature [1958]). He considers *Peregrinaçam*, a title which he translates as *Zwerftocht* (Wanderings), as one of the most thrilling and “smakelijk” (appetizing) travel accounts in world literature and its author a master in the description of different peoples. He quotes Glazemaker’s Dutch title in full as a sample for the reader. In his opinion, Mendes Pinto is a precursor of the kind of exoticism we later find in Chateaubriand, Victor Hugo, Fenimore Cooper or Lafcadio Hearn. Though the narrator is not always reliable, modern Orientalists give him more credit than before. De Jong warns that even so, it is not certain if Mendes Pinto was one of the first three Europeans to set foot in Japan. Subsequently De Jong translates chapter 134\(^{235}\) where he carefully preserves the oral style and simple language that characterises Mendes Pinto (Jong [1958]: 43-47).\(^{236}\)

\(^{235}\) See Volume II, Addendum III. The translation is not identified and begins at the second sentence of chapter 134, which narrates the Portuguese stay in Japan and the offering of a harquebus.

\(^{236}\) De Jong had written an article on Mendes Pinto in 1946 in which he mentions the enduring popularity of the book in Europe, and the fact that the Dutch translation had been abridged.
In *Moderne encyclopedie van de wereld literatuur* (Modern encyclopaedia of world literature, second and totally revised edition 1980-84), the entry “Portugese Literatuur” by the Lusitanists J. van den Besselaar (1916-1991) and A. Willemsen is divided into two parts, one is about the literature from Portugal and the second one is about Brazilian literature. Each part is then subdivided into different periods. Fernão Mendes Pinto is briefly mentioned in one of the parts:

Written in a very vivid and captivating way the travel journal of F. Mendes Pinto, taking place in the Far East, the *Itinerário* [*sic*] (published in 1614), was completely or partially translated into many European languages. It is the account of the adventurer who does not cast a heroic light on Portuguese colonialism but considers it a personal adventure, risky but worthwhile undertaking it.

The author of this entry confused Jan van Linschoten’s *Itinerario* with *Peregrinaçam*. The idea that he did not sympathise much with Mendes Pinto’s book is confirmed on pages 244-245 for under the entry for Fernão Mendes Pinto by J. van den Besselaar we learn that:

---

237 The criteria established in the encyclopaedia are difficult to understand, the nineteenth century is represented by forty-five writers born between 1800 and 1900, while the twentieth is only represented by thirteen writers. This was probably because, as a rule, the secondary bibliography, presented by J. van den Besselaar, was tremendously outdated. While dealing with “Literature from Portugal in the twentieth century” many younger and older writers are mentioned that do not possess a headword on their own. This is the case of writers such as Cardoso Pires, Jorge de Sena, Alexandre O’Neill or Sophia de Mello Breyner Andresen, to name some of those who by 1980 were considered canonical writers in Portugal. On the other hand, we find Alberto de Oliveira (1870-1940), Alexandre da Conceição (1842-1889) or Domingos dos Reis Quita (1728-1770) under an entry of their own. In the last volume of the encyclopaedia, we find some pages with additions and corrections. Here we find a headword by A. Willemsen: “Portuguese literature in Africa”. Almada Negreiros, another writer that had been omitted, was also included by Willemsen in the additions.
Teruggekeerd in het vaderland, stelde hij zijn herinneringen op schrift in *Peregrinaçam* (=Omzwerving), dat pas in 1614 en wsch. met lacunes gepubliceerd is. … Aan de historische waarde van zijn mededelingen is dikwijls getwijfeld, maar de moderne kritiek is geneigd hem meer krediet te geven dan hij misschien verdient. Als de keerzijde van de officiële Portugese historiografie, die in de ontdekking en verovering van het Oosten het heroïsche tijdvak van Portugal ziet, is dit bonte verhaal van Pinto “anti-heroïsch” en vertoont het zelfs enige trekken van een schelmenroman: niet gehinderd door een veeleisende erecode, probeert hij van de Portugese expansie, waarvan hij de zwakke plekken goed kent en niet verdoezelt, zo goed mogelijk persoonlijk te profiteren. Hij legt een grote onbevangenheid aan de dag in zijn beschrijving en waardering van de oosterse culturen, zonder zich aan “exotisme” schuldig te maken (vol. VII: 244-5).

(Back in his homeland, he recorded his memories in *Peregrinaçam* (=Wandering), which was published probably with lacunae only in 1614. … The historical value of his account was often put into question, but modern criticism tends to give him more credit than he perhaps deserves. As the reverse of the official Portuguese historiography that considers the discovery and conquest of the East, Portugal’s heroic age, this gaudy story by Pinto is “anti-heroic” and with some characteristics of a picaresque novel: not hindered by a demanding code of honour, he tries to make as much personal profit as possible from the Portuguese expansion, of which he knows well the weak parts and does not cover them up. In his description he demonstrates great impartiality and respect for the oriental cultures, without being guilty of “exotism”.)

The reader has the feeling that the writer of this entry has never read Mendes Pinto for if by “personal profit” is meant material profit, then the narrator was not very fortunate as he complains about “essa miseria que trouxera comigo” (*P* 226). Like Houwens Post, Van den Besselaar translates *Peregrinação* as *Omzwerving* (Post 1950: 70). The three Dutch Lusitanists’ translation of the title neglect the religious connotation that the Portuguese word, especially as used by the narrator in the first and last chapter,
strongly implies. Nevertheless, all three are aware that for a short period of time Mendes Pinto was member of the Society of Jesus and that twenty-six chapters of his book describe Saint Francis Xavier’s missionary work and death in the Orient.

Van den Besselaar uses quotation marks twice in his entry, which reveals a distance to the terms quoted. The last sentence, the remark about Mendes Pinto’s description, in which he is not accused of exoticism, is remarkable as one of the three books Van den Besselaar quotes in the bibliography about Mendes Pinto, is by Le Gentil, who considers Mendes Pinto a precursor of this trend. The same goes for António José Saraiva in the introduction of his 1961 edition of *Peregrinaçam*. It is worth noting that Saraiva’s work is also referred to by Van den Besselaar.

The other expression in between quotes is “anti-heroic”, an interpretation suggested by Saraiva and Catz – referred to in the bibliography. Van den Besselaar seems to feel uncomfortable with anti-heroes who do not fit the “official Portuguese historiography”. There was an apparently official perspective on Portuguese culture, which was still authoritative ten years after the Carnation Revolution.

Van den Besselaar’s disapproval of contemporary criticism reveals that the contradictions and problems that a literary work such as *Peregrinaçam* engenders in the reader are deemed by him as shortcomings, as he is still suspicious of travel writing and its dealings with truth and fiction. His concept of literature seems to be based primarily

---

238 See Part II, 2.1.3.
239 A fact not mentioned in *Peregrinaçam*.
240 Jan Lechner comments that the title of the modern translation by Arie Pos is “wrong”. Pos translated *Peregrinaçam* as *Pilgrimage* while, according to Lechner, it should be either *Zwerftocht* or *Omzwervingen* (Wanderings). Lechner justifies his translation as he considers the book “an extensive account of several countries in Asia, the result of a sharp observation, a rich fantasy and often considerable exaggeration” (Lechner 2002: 99-100).
241 A. J. Saraiva is often cited in this period in Dutch editions. We should remember that during his exile he had been professor at the University of Amsterdam from 1970 to 1974.
on aesthetic criteria and is, therefore, not consistent with his interpretation of *Peregrinaçam* in the *Moderne encyclopedie van de wereld literatuur*.

In his article *De lotgevallen van Fernão Mendes Pinto in de Nederlandse pers* (The Adventures of Fernão Mendes Pinto in the Dutch Press) on the reception of Mendes Pinto that accompanied the Dutch translation of *Peregrinaçam* by Arie Pos, Benjamin Teensma (1932-) draws our attention to what Van den Besselaar termed the “veeleisende erecode” (demanding code of honour) by which are meant the principles of the Catholic religion (Teensma 1992: xxxiii). Neither Van de Besselaar nor Houwens Post knows how to interpret this contradiction in Mendes Pinto. Houwens Post tends to see him more as a crusader, Van den Besselaar as an opportunist. Teensma explains Mendes Pinto’s duality based on his Jewish background. His Jewish ascendancy is emphasised by Teensma, who is a specialist on Francisco Manuel de Melo. Melo was of New Christian origin, but this did not avoid him from qualifying the greediness demonstrated by the Sephardic Jews in Pernambuco as “tristíssimo vulgo”. Teensma regrets that Dutch Lusitanists have not yet studied the traumatic dualism present in many Portuguese New Christian writers. Mendes Pinto’s ephemeral enrolment in the Society of Jesus does not justify his religious origins or faith (Teensma 1992: xxxi, xxxiii). Teensma observes that the various references to Mendes Pinto in several Dutch encyclopaedias offer nothing new, as they traditionally refer to the adventurous contents of the book, its popularity and reliability, and he regrets that nobody has yet discussed its structure or style.

---

As mentioned before, the first unabridged translation of *Peregrinaçam* by Arie Pos (1958-) from the Portuguese into Dutch was published in 1992.\(^{243}\) The book was presented with an introduction by the translator, followed by an article written by Eduardo Lourenço “*Pelgrimsreis* of de eerste metamorfose van de Europese waarneming” (*Pilgrimage* or the first metamorphosis of European observation), the previously mentioned article by Benjamin Teensma and, finally, by a justification “Over de vertaling” (About the translation). The translator, who is also a specialist in historical relations between Europe and China, added a glossary, a geographical index and a register of the historical persons. Despite trying to respect Mendes Pinto’s style and directness, Pos introduced a division into paragraphs in the layout of the text, as the original text has no such division. His aim was to ultimately make the text accessible to a wider public.

In the introduction, Mendes Pinto’s work is contextualised by Pos. First, he calls the book “unclassifiable” pointing to its complex structure, its plural significance and contents. Then, he gives a short biography of the author and some historical information on Portugal and its discoveries in Asia. He also offers a survey of the reception of *Peregrinaçam*: the reasons for its popularity in the seventeenth century as a breathtaking adventure book, the discussion of Mendes Pinto’s reliability and its rediscovery in the nineteenth century as a trustworthy source. He also mentions Mendes Pinto’s own sources for the book and shows that, compared to other chroniclers, Mendes Pinto gave a more humane description of the pioneers in the Far East. Pos further mentions the literary aspects that attracted researchers for over the last forty years and the different interpretations that were given. Some considered it a satire, as it

\(^{243}\) See Volume II, Addendum III.
showed the reverse side of the Portuguese expansion, and criticising the Portuguese soldiers and missionaries but also revealing traces of Chinese xenophobia. While others, on the other hand, found picaresque aspects. More recently, according to Pos, the book has been analysed from a postcolonial point of view. Mendes Pinto’s positive interest in China and his exoticism have attracted modern scholars.

Pos admires Mendes Pinto’s literary craftsmanship. Mendes Pinto had never travelled in China because access to the empire was forbidden to foreigners. Thus, he had to rely on others for its description and justify his characters’ delay in China with a shipwreck followed by them being captured and forced to take a journey to Beijing.

Pos analyses Mendes Pinto’s antagonisms. The “pobre de my” contradicts the important assignments the same persona is charged with. If it was Mendes Pinto’s intention to criticise Portuguese expansion politics and its religious zeal, than it must be observed that the narrator presents himself as pious and patriotic. It is never clear whether Mendes Pinto agrees with the critical perspectives of the Asian protagonists. Pos wonders if Mendes Pinto wanted to advocate a universal Christianity and humanity as he always follows Christian criteria.

On the occasion of the publication of Pos’ translation, August Willemsen (1936-2007) wrote a review in NRC Handelsblad (9/10/1992).\textsuperscript{244} He considers the excellent translation of this classical Portuguese work a major literary event. After having introduced the writer, Willemsen mentions that the book had been widely read in the seventeenth century, though it fell into oblivion after other more refined forms of exoticism came in vogue. However, Mendes Pinto’s book can be interpreted in multiple ways. More important than the truth versus lies discussion, Willemsen focuses on the

\textsuperscript{244} The article was later published in Het hoge woord (1994).
“pobre de my” picaresque character, whom he calls a “schlemiel” (simpleton whose endeavours usually fail).

The organisation of the book into episodes and the links between them that form the structure of a comprehensive huge work proves, in Willemsen’s opinion, that Mendes Pinto was a “real writer”. It is this “real writer” who created the naïve narrator and who uses an unembellished and simple language that fits him. Most of the time, the writer reduces the narrator to a passive presence, which allowed the author to describe what happened around him. However, in his naïve way he reveals a critical and ironical vision of the world. Willemsen mentions yet another technique Mendes Pinto employed which is the use of indirect criticism when he lets Asian characters criticise the Portuguese. The character whose presence is the strongest is Faria, whom he sees as a satirical critical portrait of a hero, the merciless adventurer.

Though Willemsen is aware that Mendes Pinto was compelled to testify in his work his unfaltering faith and loyalty to the Crown, he believes the author was a true catholic as he belonged to the Society of Jesus for some time and befriended San Francis Xavier. Nevertheless, he wonders how the Inquisition allowed the publication of some parts of the book.

The comparison the journalist, J. W. Schulte Nordholt makes in Trouw (26/09/92) is quite interesting. He compares Pelgrimsreis with an oriental rug in which lies and truth, science and art, cruelty and goodness are interwoven. On this rug, the reader can fly and make a “pelgrimstocht” (pilgrimage) into the past.

Only recently has Peregrinaçam been studied from a new postcolonial perspective. Paulo de Medeiros, head of department of Portuguese Studies at the University of Utrecht, calls our attention to the fact that some of the Asian protagonists
criticise and offer alternatives for European society of that time and consider the Portuguese inferior to them. Another important element is Mendes Pinto’s description of an unscrupulous form of imperialism exercised by the Portuguese (Medeiros 2002: 149). The most important aspect is the ambiguous position of the narrator who sometimes takes part in the violence committed over the native population and, on other occasions, reveals himself to be very critical of the Portuguese.
4 FERNÃO MENDES PINTO: PROTAGONIST IN TWO NOVELS

4.1 J. J. Slaugerhoff’s *Het verboden rijk* and *Het leven op aarde* (The Forbidden Realm and Life on Earth)

The Dutch poet and novelist Jan Jacob Slauerhoff (1898-1936) was fascinated by Portuguese culture and literature. In Dutch literary history Slauerhoff is considered a major poet from the inter-war period. He was a ship’s surgeon and travelled during some years in the Far East, in the same seas where Camões and Mendes Pinto once sailed. 

On one of his travels he met Albino Forjaz de Sampaio, editor of *História da literatura portuguesa, ilustrada*. In the second volume of his *História*, Forjaz Sampaio mentions that Slauerhoff was writing a novel in which he presented the Portuguese poet Luís Vaz de Camões (c. 1524-1580), as a main character. In turn, Slauerhoff dedicated the prologue of his novel *Het verboden rijk* (The forbidden realm, 1932) to Forjaz de Sampaio. 

---

245 Slaugerhoff’s fascination with Portuguese culture and literature reflects itself in his oeuvre. In one of his poetry collections with the title *Oost Azië* (The Far East, 1927) there is a section called “Macao” composed by five poems: “De jonken” (The junks), “Kathedraal S. Miguel” (Saint Michael Cathedral), “Uitzicht op Macao van Monte af” (Macau seen from Monte), “Ochtend Macao” (Dawn Macau), “Camões”. In another section, we find a poem called “Portuguesch fort” (Portuguese citadel). A year later he publishes a poem called “Camões thuiskomst” (Camões’ homecoming, *Eldorado*). In 1933 there is another collection of poetry, *Soleares* in which we find a chapter “Saudades” composed of the following poems: “Het doode Macao” (Dead Macau), “Compagnie de Mozambique” (The Mozambique company), “Aankomst” (Arrival), “Lisboa”, “Fado’s”, “Vida triste” (Sad life), “O engeitado” (The rejected one), “Saudade” and “Fado”. In 1935, Slaugerhoff publishes a short story called “Laatste verschijning van Camões” (Camões’ last appearance). In this story, the two main characters from *Het verboden rijk* meet each other again. Shortly before his death another poem entitled “Camões” was published in *Een eerlijk zeemansgraf* (An honourable seaman’s grave). He also translated *O crime do Padre Amaro* (Father Amaro’s crime) by Eça de Queiroz. 

246 The novel was first published as a serial story in the newly founded literary magazine *Forum* from January until September 1932, and soon afterwards a slightly modified version was published in book
In Slauerhoff’s novel *Het verboden rijk*, which takes place partly in Macau and China, we find two characters called Mendez de Pinto and Antonio Farria. The fact that one of the two main characters in *Het verboden rijk* is named Camoës reveals Slauerhoff’s obsession with the sixteenth-century Portuguese poet, on whom he projected his own obsessions and anguishes, having thus, little in common with the historical person Camões was. Slauerhoff’s protagonist is an unpatriotic, arrogant, solipsistic and lethargic *poète maudit* who hates his talent (Couto 1999: 108-109). Exiled by the King to Macau, imprisoned while on board and again in Macau, condemned to travel on foot to Peking and sent away at the end on the oldest ship never to be seen again, Camoës sometimes reminds us of Mendes Pinto’s narrator and anti-hero.

*Het verboden rijk* was at the time of its publication considered by many critics as a failed novel due to its leaps in space and time, anachronisms, factual errors, alternating perspective and overlapping of the two main characters. Some viewed it as a kind of historical novel, while others as a travel narrative. Some parts reminded of a chronicle; others seemed to be part of a diary.

The novel consists of three narratives intertwined over a prologue and nine chapters. One narrative is set in the sixteenth century with a main character called Camoës and another is set in the twentieth century with an anonymous main character who is a radio operator on board of a ship. The third narrative is the history of Macau, a

---

247 Whenever referring to the characters in Slauerhoff’s novels, I will use Slauerhoff’s spelling of Portuguese and Chinese names.

248 See for example the criticism in favour or against, written in 1932-1934 by Anton van Duinkerken, Anthonie Donker, B. van Noort, Henri Borel, Jan N., Jan Engelman, G. Smit, J. van Heugten, J. Ionker, G. van Eckeren, M. Uyldert, H. Middendorp and F. Coenen (Kroon 1985: 56, 60, 64, 71, 77, 80, 279-286.).
history of isolation, abandonment and ruin, a place where East and West, present and past intersect. The two main characters have in common that they are outcasts who suffer from hallucinations. Near the end, in the Chinese desert and in Macau, these two characters overlap.

There are three narrators in the novel: two of them use the first-person and another the third, offering multiple viewpoints and destabilizing the reader. This is the first Dutch novel in which coherence is achieved differently from the conventional narrative method based on a logical pattern of cause and effect (Fenoulhet 2001: 118). The chain of cause and effect is broken and chronological linearity is replaced by what Joseph Frank coined “spatial form”. Coherence is achieved by the awareness of a pattern. The conventional causal/temporal syntax of the narrative is disrupted and the reader is forced to recognise the internal references and relationships (Smitten 1981: 20). As chronological linearity is suspended, historical facts are taken out of their context and used as functions of the text, apparently placed at random. Slauerhoff’s experiment with time permits Camoês to heroically defend the cathedral in Macau (HVR 485-6), a siege that actually took place in 1622, long after Camões’ death. Or, it allows the author to refer to Camoês’ calm during the earthquake in Lisbon in 1755 (HVR 451).

One of the sources for *Het verboden rijk* was the second edition of the historian C. A. Montalto de Jesus’ *Historic Macau: International Traits in China Old and New* (1926) (Fessard 1964: 220). This second edition appeared twenty-four years after the first edition and was expanded according to the author’s critical point of view of the last two decades and his disillusion over Portugal’s treatment of her colony. In the same

---

249 The other known sources were *Das Leiden des Camoës oder Untergang und Vollendung der Portugiesischen Macht* (1930) by Reinhold Schneider and “Luis de Camões. A sua vida e a sua obra” by José Maria Rodrigues published in *Historia da literatura portuguesa, ilustrada*, Vol. II (1930) edited by Albino Forjaz de Sampaio (Blok 1985: 43, 58).
year of its publication, 1926, the 28 May Revolution established a military dictatorship in Portugal. As a consequence, the book was immediately forbidden, confiscated and burnt in an auto-da-fé while the ruined author died in exile a year later.250

It is quite obvious that Slauerhoff selected from Jesus’ Historic Macau names, small episodes or facts at random that he distorted to fit into his perspective.251 He also took some episodes about Mendes Pinto from the book by Montalto de Jesus. Among other sources Montalto de Jesus based himself on Pêgreinaçam for the description of Portugal’s early history in the Far East. He is aware that Mendes Pinto was “much maligned” (HM 1926: 28) by others and, referring to his journey on foot through China, that “his notorious mendacity runs riot” (HM 1926: 15).

Montalto de Jesus included a short summary of Antonio de Faria’s exploits. He considers Faria a historical hero.252 He mentions how Antonio de Faria protected the Portuguese and the Chinese from sea pirates upon payment, and how his men and he destroyed Nouday and killed the mandarin who wore a breastplate that had belonged to Tomé Pires, the first Portuguese ambassador sent to Peking (HM 1926: 22; P 64-65). According to Montalto de Jesus, the reason for this destruction had been the mandarin’s refusal to free a group of Portuguese who had shipwrecked. The mandarin felt offended when Faria considered the Chinese emperor as an equal of the Portuguese king (HM

---

250 Montalto de Jesus’ book was published in English and was translated into Portuguese in 1990: Macau Histórico: primeira edição portuguesa da versão apreendida em 1926. (transl. Maria Alice Morais Jorge) Macau: Livros do Oriente.

251 For example, the great quantity of churches and processions that were held in Macau, especially during the Holy Week (HM 58; HVR 383). Montalto de Jesus mentions a young Verônica begging for mercy (HM 58; HVR 386), the name of a ship, Madre de Deos (HM 59; HVR 357); the story of Pedro Velho (HM 39; HVR 338); the composition of Macau’s population (HM 51; HVR 387); the Summers incident (HM 334; HVR 493) and the murder of Amaral (HM 349-358; HVR 493).

252 In fact, the character Antonio de Faria in Pêgreinaçam may have been based on a historical person (Alves 2010: Fernão Mendes Pinto and the Peregrinação, Notes, Vol. 3, 77).
1926: 33). This episode inspired Slauerhoff’s character in the prologue, named Farria, though he does not present him as a hero.

The prologue of *Het verboden rijk* begins with the brutal destruction of Lian Po (inspired by Montalto de Jesus’ reference to Liampoo, based on *Peregrinaçam*) by the Chinese in 1540. Antonio Farria, the governor of the colony, and his vice commander, Mendez de Pinto, are forced to abandon the location with a small fleet. Mendez de Pinto is deeply disappointed, he curses the “onderhandelingen met gele schurken” (negotiations with yellow villains), the “smeekbeden om (…) troepen” (petitions for troops), the “laatdunkende brieven van de sjacheraars in Malakka” (arrogant letters from the dealers in Malacca), the inquiries from the “pratte bewindslieden in Goa” (proud authorities in Goa), the “grievende brieven der prelaten” (offending letters from the prelates), and he even curses the King. He laments the fact that he is as destitute as he was when he left his homeland to which he cannot return as he would be condemned for heresy (*HVR* 358). He decides to dedicate his life to his vengeance and leaves with a few men on a small ship on which he hoisted a black flag never to be seen again (*HVR* 359). The reader knows that the black flag indicates that from now on he considers himself a pirate. His name is not mentioned anymore.

Like Mendez de Pinto, Antonio Farria wishes to cut relations with his mother country and seeks to establish a new colony eventually under his own banner. First he destroys Nan Wei where the mandarin had refused him to go ashore for provision and fresh water. Farria kills him after he recognises the breastplate the mandarin was wearing as having once belonged to Perez, the first Portuguese ambassador sent to Peking but who had been killed. The descriptions full of violence and bloodshed at sea as well as on shore remind us of *Peregrinaçam*. 
Finally, Farria goes further to the south where he establishes Macau. The reader is told by a third-person narrator that Farria’s vengeance did not have the desired outcome: ironically, Macau is “o mais leal”\(^{253}\) to the Crown even when there was “geen Koning en geen Portugal” (neither King nor Portugal), an allusion to the Spanish domination under Philip II. The prologue ends with the following affirmation:

Pinto noch Farria hebben zich gewroken. – En de wijze waarop een ander later wraak genomen heeft wordt niet als wraak maar als bijval gevoeld (HVR 365).

(Neither Pinto nor Farria revenged themselves. – And the way another took vengeance later was not felt as vengeance but as praise.)

The other one can only be Camoës, introduced as a first person narrator in the first chapter. It was not Camoës’ initial intention to write what was to be read by the public as a heroic poem, glorifying the Portuguese.

In chapter seven of *Het verboden rijk*, Camoës, who after a shipwreck near Macau was imprisoned in an underground dungeon, is condemned to accompanying on foot a Portuguese embassy to Peking. Conditions are so violent that all but him die during the journey. Alone in the Chinese desert, he is forced to assault a farmer, knock him down to rob his food, water and clothes:

Als soldaat was hij naar China gekomen; dat zijn eerste daad daar die van een sluiprover was roerde hem niet (HVR 462).

(He had come to China as a soldier, the fact that his first action there was that of a robber did not affect him.)

The novel then shifts to the 1920s, nearly four centuries later, when an anonymous radio operator wanders on board of his ship in the same region where Camoës had once travelled. Camoës and the radio operator are first person narrators and

\(^{253}\) Until 1999 the official name of Macau was “Cidade do Santo Nome de Deus de Macau, Não Há Outra Mais Leal”.
the main characters of the novel. Like Camoës, the radio operator suffers from hallucinations. The reader does not know whether the radio operator picks up strange messages from the aether or he makes them up. As a radio operator, he communicates with bodiless voices coming through the air. The reader is aware that the messages seem to be vaguely related with Camoës.

One day the radio operator passes the Ladrones Islands with his ship, when Chinese pirates attack them.\textsuperscript{254} He is summoned by the leaders of the gang, four of whom were Chinese, but the fifth, the principal leader, wore a mask and the radio operator suspected him to be a white man. After a hurricane, they enter a port where the ship is totally stripped:

\begin{quote}
Alles wees er op, dat de rovers genoeg hadden van het als passagier aan boord gaan en \textit{weer als in de oude tijd zelf roofjonken wilden uitrusten} (HVR 473).

(Everything seemed to indicate that the buccaneers had had enough of going on board as passengers and wanted to equip again their own pirate junks like in the old times.)\textsuperscript{255}
\end{quote}

The reference to the white leader and to the pirate junks in the old times suggest, in my interpretation, Mendez de Pinto’s reappearance, like Camoës, as a character living in the twentieth century, in the guise of an unnamed attacker.\textsuperscript{256} His men and he rob the radio operator’s ship of everything and the crew of their freedom. The prisoners are blindfolded and forced to walk for hours across the Chinese mainland, they pass through a city where:

\textsuperscript{254} The reference to the Ladrones Islands is not necessarily taken from Mendes Pinto or Montalto de Jesus (HM 1926: 39). Slauerhoff was aware of buccaneering in the Chinese Sea as he had been a victim of Chinese pirates.

\textsuperscript{255} Emphasis mine.

\textsuperscript{256} Except for the “Prologue” Mendez de Pinto's name is never mentioned anymore. In the prologue, however, Mendez de Pinto is described as being slim and this leader is fat.
van alle kanten werden wij aangegrepen en hete handen betastten ons, nieuwsgerige handen, grote grove en ook kleine kinderhanden, ook nagels drongen in ons vlees onder schel gejuich. Soms werd er één een raam ingetrokken, met lange spelden gestoken en weer vooruitgeduwd (HVR 474).

(we were seized from all sides and hot hands touched us, curious hands, big coarse hands and also small children’s hands, nails too penetrated our flesh upon strident cheering. Sometimes one was pulled into a window, stabbed with long needles and pushed forward again.)

The hostile environment, the strident sounds heard and harsh treatment of the foreign prisoners by the whole population, including the children, remind us of Mendes Pinto’s narrator’s arrival in Mochaa in chapter 5 of Peregrinaçam. The text seems to echo expressions, such as: “foraõ tãtas as bofetadas q nos deraõ” or “com grandes gritas & tangeres, onde ate as molheres encerradas, & os moços & mininos nos lançauão das genellas muytas panellas de ourina”. Plus, Camoës confinement in an underground dungeon where he is miserably fed once a day (HVR 449) seems to evoke Mendes Pinto’s narrator’s ensuing captivity in an underground prison in “hũa mazmorra que estaua debaixo do chão” where he was given “hũa pouca de farinha de ceuada para todo o dia”.

In Het verboden rijk, the radio operator was forced to enter the Chinese desert, where he realises he is the only survivor. The reader discovers that he is dragging himself in Camoës’ footprints. The radio operator’s mind is assaulted by Camoës who takes possession of his mind and his body. As a result, the two characters merge: Camoës/radio operator travels to Macau where Camoës fights against the Dutch, isolates himself in a grotto to write his epic poem but is eventually deported on board of an old vessel never to be seen again. The radio operator wakes up in a hotel, penniless.
and beaten up. He is aware that he was mugged but does not know by whom. He was able to free himself from his assailant and preserve his identity.

Slauerhoff’s novel is about the writer’s struggle for his own poetic identity: the radio operator, Slauerhoff’s *alter ego*, has no name. As a writer he belongs to a long tradition, a path trodden by other poets, that he wishes to abandon but cannot at the risk of losing himself. The influence of this tradition on his own poetic identity is felt as so overwhelming, robbing him of his own voice and consciousness, that it is nearly fatal. The literary tradition, of which Slauerhoff is part of, is represented by Camoës and to a certain extend by Mendez de Pinto, both of which are felt as a threat. This is metaphorically expressed by their attack on the radio operator and the control Camoës had over his mind and body. It is the pirates’ doing – led by a European – that sends the radio operator as a prisoner, stripped of everything but his clothes, into the Chinese desert where he can be assaulted by Camoës and survive, after a battle of life and death with his demon. In *Het verboden rijk* Camoës and Mendez de Pinto are the robbers and not Farria, who failed his intentions as he turned out to be the founder of Portugal’s most loyal colony.

Camoës and the radio operator, have in common with Fernão Mendes Pinto’s narrator, the fact that they are forced to travel as prisoners across the Chinese mainland. The two fictitious characters are the only Westerners able to penetrate into inland China, the forbidden realm. In the case of Slauerhoff’s novel, this realm is a timeless space where the poetical, healing word survives.

This mainland in Slauerhoff’s novel is not China, nor the Orient, but a bare desert, a *terra nullius*. Slauerhoff’s China in *Het verboden rijk* is either barren or hostile, in short, a dystopia. The world presented in the novel is the result of actions
done by men such as Farria, the clergy and colonial authorities the writer describes in his novel. In Slauerhoff’s novel there is no place for a harmonious and just society. Language has lost its communicative character and suffered severe erosion: letters are not received or read, words are not heard and orders are not obeyed. Thus, its world is dysphoric and fragmented: China is empty and Macau decadent, dirty and forgotten. The fragmented world of the novel reflects the social world of the twenties and thirties of the twentieth century. There is no place anymore for a heroic poem. Slauerhoff’s novel, a reflection of his world, is also fragmented: the pieces must be drawn together by the writer. However, the author has to steal these fragments from other poets before distorting and manipulating them, and inserting them in his own work. In this case, they are the ruins of Camões’ lyrical work and, to a lesser extend, of Mendes Pinto’s work with which he constructs his novel. Slauerhoff uses metaphors, images, fragments, names from Camões’ poems and from Mendes Pinto’s work because only writers can restore harmony and order through *logos*.

In 1934 Slauerhoff published a sequel *Het leven op aarde* (Life on Earth). In this novel the radio operator is no longer nameless; his name “Cameron” was put together with letters from Camoës’ name. This time Cameron travels deep into China where he hopes to find happiness. He enters the service of Hsioe, an unscrupulous and cruel dealer who trades anything: soy, opium, weapons, or people. Together with a few others Cameron is sent on a dangerous and gruelling mission. First, they travel the river upstream and sell rice at inflated prices to hungry populations that were victim of a flood. Wherever they go they bring destruction and misery. After some time, the true aim of their mission is revealed: the trade in weapons and munitions. The second part of the voyage is made on foot. When they arrive at the city of Tsjong King, they deliver
the weapons and munitions but are imprisoned. Tsjong King is a city that has always repelled foreigners and their firearms, and this delivery augurs its destruction. When Cameron hits an oil well by accident, the city is almost destroyed in a flood of oil. He manages to save the city but an explosion throws him into the air landing outside the city. When he gains consciousness he is being looked after by Wan Tsjen, a Chinese monk. As he does not wish to go back to the industrialised Occident, he travels with Wan Tsjen to the paradisiacal Land of Snow only to discover he cannot survive in that mystical and ascetic world and decides to settle in the Middle Kingdom.

Just as Het verboden rijk was composed with pieces from Camões’ poetry, Het leven op aarde is made with fragments from Mendes Pinto’s work: the journey, first by boat upstream and then on foot; the captivity of the group, the description of the river, the cities Cameron passes, the noises and bustle of the people and floating markets, the description of the temples and statues. Except in Slauerhoff everything is dirty, menacing and miserable; it is the opposite of what Mendes Pinto describes. China is not the representation of a prosperous well-organised country but of a region that was hit by a flood and extreme poverty, disease and hunger. Even the caves where once hermits lived are now empty (LA 558). Mendes Pinto describes a fair judicial system while Cameron witnesses the public lynching of a man by a mob (LA 564). In Het leven op aarde China is an anti-utopia.

The episodes of Cameron at the service of Hsioe, remind us of Mendes Pinto’s narrator at the service of Antonio de Faria: but unlike Mendes Pinto, Cameron despises his master. It soon becomes clear that Hsioe belongs to the most dreaded gang of pirates (LA 577). But there are other echoes of Mendes Pinto’s work in Het leven op aarde: rice has to be thrown overboard as ballast (LA 580; P 55), the representation of priests as
unscrupulous traders (LA 576), or the rendering of a Chinese letter (LA 615-626). We are aware of the echo of Mendes Pinto’s title, Hsioe sends Cameron on a pilgrimage before he starts his mission (LA 556). The introduction of firearms in Tsjong King has a parallel in the introduction of the harquebus in Japan by Mendes Pinto’s narrator. Wan Tsjen (LA epiloog), who is described as a holy monk and accompanies Cameron on his journey to the Land of Snow, has some analogy with the episode about Saint Francis Xavier who is escorted in Japan by the narrator of Peregrinaçam. Het leven op aarde becomes a rewriting of Peregrinaçam, the only possible rewriting more than four centuries later when Slauerhoff experiences the world as disintegrated and apocalyptic. Slauerhoff gives us an ugly and chaotic China where Chinese and Europeans are seen from a negative point of view. As for the title: is pilgrimage, Peregrinaçam, not often conceived as a metaphor of life on earth, Het leven op aarde?

Although there is no moralizing voice in the novel, Cameron is never presented as a pícaro or satirical hero. Whereas the pícaro struggles to survive, Cameron, at one point, refuses to eat. There is no place for humour, satire or innocence as evil, guilt and death pervade over everything. Nevertheless, evil has not reached Wan Tsjen and the other hermits who are the only human beings able to live in the Land of Snow; although they live in seclusion from society, leading an ascetic lifestyle and are mere shadows. In Het leven op aarde Cameron, like Camoës and the radio operator in Het verboden rijk, is completely isolated, and on his own. The tone of the novel is one of profound pessimism and hopelessness. Unlike Mendes Pinto’s narrator, for Cameron there is no

---

257 It is not a pilgrimage inspired by religious convictions. Hsioe orders Cameron to go on a pilgrimage to Sjan-Toeng to pray for the good result of the mission knowing this is not according to Cameron’s faith.

258 The only exception is Wan Tsjen.
return to his homeland and there is no paradise in China. In *Peregrinaçam* there is hope, in *Het leven op aarde* there is not.

Reminiscent of Mendes Pinto, Slauerhoff was accused of unlikeliness (the suspension of time and overlapping characters in *Het verboden rijk*) and of “making up” Chinese geographical names and topography, of historical inexactness and of inaccuracy referring to time and distance.\(^{259}\) Both writers only knew the coast of China and their knowledge of the inland had to be taken from reports by others.

Slauerhoff’s work called the public’s attention to Portuguese culture and Camões.\(^ {260}\) After World War II, Hendrik Houwens Post published a fictionalised biography of Camões, in 1952 Dolf Verspoor (1917-1994) translated some sonnets by Camões that were published in *De Gids* (1952-1953) and collected in *Saudades en andere verzen* (1953). In 2007 August Willemsen published a compilation of poems by Camões: *Ware voor zo lange liefde niet zo kort het leven. Lyrische gedichten.* (Were not life so short for so long a love. Lyrical poetry)

\(^{259}\) Slauerhoff’s China and Macau were created by him but unimaginable without the Chinese and Portuguese reality (Pos 1987: 113-115; 126).

\(^{260}\) Even so, the only person to recognise Fernão Mendes Pinto as an inspiration for Mendez de Pinto and Antonio de Farria, the two characters in *Het verboden rijk*, is August Willemsen (Willemsen 1992: 99).
4.2 Het China van Gaspar (Gaspar’s China) by Magda van den Akker

In 1989 the Flemish Lusitanist and Sinologist, Magda van den Akker, received a prize for her debut novel Het China van Gaspar (Gaspar’s China). What is meant by “Gaspar” is the Dominican missionary friar, Gaspar da Cruz (c. 1520-1570) a traveller who befriended Mendes Pinto in the Far East.

The novel is dedicated to Daniel Joaquim de Sousa Teixeira (1946-1968), a Portuguese student at the University of Leuven, who belonged to the revolutionary group Liga de União e Acção Revolucionária (LUAR). He was arrested by PIDE, the secret police of the authoritarian regime, and died shortly afterwards in prison. The book was also dedicated to Zeca Afonso (1929-1987), the famous Portuguese protest singer whose song “Grândola, Vila Morena” was used as the countersign for the Carnation Revolution.

The novel is composed of twenty-one chapters and a short epilogue by an anonymous first-person narrator, Van den Akker’s alter ego. In this epilogue Gaspar, Zeca, Fernão (Mendes Pinto) and Daniel are described as being together in a kind of paradise or afterlife. By presenting these four characters, based on historical persons, enjoying themselves in each other’s company, they are transformed into mythical heroes. Gaspar and Fernão are identified with Zeca and Daniel, as well as with their ideals.

---

261 Magda van den Akker published a work based on her research about Gaspar da Cruz: Gaspar da Cruz en zijn Tractado, Leuven: De Clauwaert, 1983.
Each chapter is divided into three short parts, the first is entitled “Fernão” and always begins with the indication of “Almada”, the place where Mendes Pinto spent his last years, and a date, as if Fernão, the first-person narrator, were writing in his diary. Fernão’s reflections about his life, past and present, centre on Gaspar da Cruz, the deceased friend he is addressing himself to. The first date is January 1583 and the last is July 8, 1583, the day of Mendes Pinto’s death.

The second part of each chapter is entitled “Gaspar” and is roughly situated in Évora in 1532 and ends in Arrábida, in February 1570, the place, month and year of Gaspar da Cruz’s death. Throughout the twenty-one chapters a third-person narrator gives us passages of Gaspar da Cruz’s life in Portugal and in the Far East where he met Fernão and became his friend.

The third part is called “Realia” and is composed by texts that are useful for the understanding of the historical and cultural background of the novel. We find passages taken from old documents, modern history books or literary sources. In the centre of the book in chapter X under “Realia”, the author has explicitly included a translation of part of Chapter 112 of Mendes Pinto’s *Peregrinação*.²⁶² It is a chapter about the charitable institutions and solidarity in China, about something that neither existed in Europe nor in China, because part of the description was highly idealised by Mendes Pinto (Ollé *Fernão Mendes Pinto and the Peregrinação*, Notes, Vol. III: 144). It begins by mentioning the many schools for poor orphans and other institutions that house poor women who are employed as wet nurses for abandoned children. In case the parent or parents of these abandoned children are discovered they are severely punished. If these children suffer from a disability they will be employed accordingly, for no employer can

²⁶² See Volume II, Addendum III.
obtain a licence if he does not also sustain those who are in need. Omitted by Van den Akker is the rest of the sentence: “porque dizem eles que é isto obra de proximidade mandada por Deus” and the rest of the paragraph about penance, superstitions, the goddess Amida and the thirty two-sects that exist in China which like “erpes corrompeo tamanha parte do mundo”. In this deleted paragraph the narrator clearly reveals his negative opinion about other religious sects with the exception of his own true religion. Van den Akker’s translation then resumes by explaining how other cripples, sick prostitutes and orphaned girls are taken care of. The last sentence about poor but dignified men that must be sustained by condemned corrupt lawyers and judges as a form of punishment was again omitted.

Though the translator of this passage is not mentioned, there is no reason to believe that the passage was not translated by the author, Magda van den Akker. Information on the source text is vague because the book only mentions that it is a reprint, published in 1983 in Lisbon. I assume it is Adolfo Casais Monteiro’s transcription of Peregrinação reprinted by Imprensa Nacional – Casa da Moeda.

In this chapter translated by Van den Akker, Mendes Pinto describes a sort of welfare state avant la lettre. By omitting the central part of Mendes Pinto’s chapter, the text is secularised and Mendes Pinto’s narrator’s complexity and contradictions are wiped out. In the part that was omitted we become aware of the narrator’s religious sectarianism and crusader mentality. In Peregrinação the narrator always maintains a balance between two antagonistic poles: open-mindedness and bigotry, but Fernão’s character in Van den Akker’s novel does not possess this typical trait. Nor is this Fernão the “pobre de my” and he is far from naïf. He is an older and more experienced friend of Gaspar and teaches him how to deal with the native population. While in China, Gaspar
verifies that his friend’s enthusiastic stories about the integration of the crippled and mentally ill are correct.

Van den Akker’s novel reflects the optimistic and youthful climate after the fall of three autocratic regimes in Europe: in Portugal and Greece in 1974 and a year later in Spain.
5 FROM SUBVERSIVE TO LITERARY WRITER

The first Dutch references to Mendes Pinto reveal that he was often read by influential people with an open-minded spirit in Remonstrant circles. Above all, it was his description of different religious rituals or beliefs that called their attention. Religious tolerance was necessary in order to promote commerce. Merchants and VOC directors were especially interested in his book. Apart from a popular adventure book, for them it was also a source of information about regions and people still unknown to the Dutch. Their commercial interest stimulated them to read travel accounts which encouraged their liberalism and in some cases led to philosophical speculation.

Glazemaker’s truncated translation omits many catholic references but not all of them. The almost complete absence of the traditional religious perspective made the text less ambiguous than it is in fact. The omission of the chapters that especially deal with Saint Francis Xavier and that in *Peregrinação* counterbalance the episode about Antonio de Faria, emphasises this. Glazemaker’s translation of the Antonio de Faria episode leaves us with a negative image of the Portuguese discoveries and with a positive image of China linked together by sensational adventures and exotic descriptions.

The hidden or cryptic references by Witsen and Weyerman, among others, confirm that Mendes Pinto was interpreted according to Glazemaker’s intention. The references were an indirect way to draw attention to this controversial text and its writer. This heterodox reading is not limited to Glazemaker’s translation because Picart, for example, clearly refers to the French translation. In the course of the eighteenth
century, however, the utopian description of China by Mendes Pinto is replaced by imaginary travels.

In the nineteenth century, Mendes Pinto is a source for many colonial scholars in their study of the Far East. Their aim was scientific as well as economic and political. Though the pun on his name “Fernão Mentes?” is still often mentioned, his historicity is stressed.

After World War II, the subsequent independence of Indonesia, and the study of the Portuguese language, history and culture at Dutch universities we verify that most Dutch Lusitanists reveal their discomfort on how to interpret the book’s ambiguities while the morality of the author/narrator is questioned.

The translation in 1992 by Arie Pos, is an attempt to set the book in a modern literary context. Huigen states that unlike English, French or Portuguese literature, travel writing has hardly been studied in Dutch literature (Huigen 2007 1-2). We could argue that Huigen ignored the recent text editions by literary scholars such as Marijke Spies, Diederik Wildeman, Vibeke Roeper and Roelof Van Gelder, or the studies by literary scholars such as M. Barend-van Haeften or Karel Bostoen, or by historians like J. L. Blussé and J. van Goor, and the efforts made by the Linschoten Society in editing contemporary travel accounts. But if we consult the results of a poll organised in 2002 by the Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde (Society for Dutch Literature) in order to try to establish a canon of one hundred Dutch literary works, we verify that travel accounts are entirely absent.

The entry on Mendes Pinto by Van den Besselaar in a literary encyclopaedia reveals he is dominated by an outdated aesthetical concept of literature which is difficult to apply in the case of Peregrinaçam. I believe this is one of the reasons why Mendes
Pinto had been omitted in the *Eerste Nederlandse Systematisch Ingerichte Encyclopaedie* (1946-1952), in the article about Spanish, Portuguese and Latin-American literature by the Hispanist J. A. van Praag. It is probably also the reason why the headword about Mendes Pinto in the reputable *Winkler Prins* (1982) was plagiarised from another encyclopaedia: *De Grote Oosthoek* (1976) (Teensma 1992: xxxi). Mendes Pinto’s name could not be excluded, but at the same time he continued to be largely unknown.

In the course of the last decades we witness a shift in opinion: what in a positivist reading were considered conflicting flaws in a work by an unreliable, contradictory and even unpatriotic writer, are now seen as qualities. More than a half century before, these characteristics had attracted J. J. Slauerhoff’s attention and he named a secondary character after Mendes Pinto. For his two Chinese novels he took fragments from *Peregrinaçam* that he twisted and manipulated into his novel. More recently, a chapter from the translation by Arie Pos was published in the anthology for young readers *Kom vanavond met verhalen*, 1999. The anthology was published in three languages, English, Portuguese and Dutch, and helps teenagers to think about war. The chapter that was taken from *Pelgrimsreis* describes Antonio de Faria’s sack of Nouday. It reveals a different concept of literature: the editors wish that the chosen texts stimulate young people to reflect on war and its consequences.

---

263 The other reason is the fact that Portuguese literature only occupies 44 half lines in the seven pages of the article by Van Praag (Teensma 1992: xxxi).

264 See Volume II, Addendum III.

265 The English title reads: *In times of war* and was published by Pavilion (2000) and the Portuguese title *Lá longe, a paz*. It was published by Afrontamento (2001). The poems and stories presented in the anthology were taken from Dutch, English and Portuguese – children and adult – literature and reflect different attitudes and periods.
Arie Pos’ PhD dissertation in 2008 about the image of China in Dutch literature and culture against an international background, includes a chapter dedicated to Mendes Pinto (Pos 2008: 70-76). His work is analysed from an interdisciplinary perspective, a fact that was stressed by the examining committee composed of literary and historical scholars specialised in sinology.

Fernão Mendes Pinto’s travels in the Low Countries have been long and sinuous. When Rieuwertsz put Wonderlandke reizen on the market, it was intended for a middle class public that could be read as a popular book of a traveller’s adventures or, due to Glazemaker’s translation, as a book with transgressive content intended for those readers who were willing to read between the lines. From the 1730s on, with the rise of the imaginary travel account, the decline of the Portuguese empire, the defeat of the radical undercurrent by a moderate mainstream Enlightenment and a consequent increase in religiosity in the Dutch society, Mendes Pinto’s book gradually falls into oblivion. In the nineteenth century though, Mendes Pinto was once again appreciated. With the colonial exploitation of the Dutch in the East Indies, the book was read for its information on the Far East. Only at the end of the twentieth century, with the publication of the unabridged translation by Arie Pos, did Mendes Pinto become valued for his literary qualities: an aspect the Dutch writer and poet, J. J. Slauerhoff had already noticed in the 1930s when he appropriated Peregrinaçam for his two novels, whose plot are in part (Het verboden rijk) or entirely (Het leven op aarde) situated in China. More than a half century later, Magda van den Akker has quite a different perception of Mendes Pinto when she presents her readers to a character based on him in her novel Het China van Gaspar.
... stont een stoel / daar men met zeven trappen by op klom / met drie rijgen
lóofwerk van yzer / koper en ebbenhouw / en met píjlers / die met
aprelemoereschelpen bezet waren. Op het hoogste was een hemel van wit Damast
/ met goude en groene zijde Franien bezoomt / en met lange en brede strikken (WR
132).

(...there was a chair to which one had to climb seven stairs with three strings of
iron, copper and ebony foliage and with pillars that were studded with nacre
shells. At the top was a baldachin of white damask, hemmed with gold and green
silk tassel and with long and large bows.)
CONCLUSIONS
In this dissertation, it has been my aim to investigate the importance of one specific translator, Jan Hendriksz Glazemaker (1619/20-1682), and focus on the many interesting and subversive aspects of his rendering of Fernão Mendes Pinto’s *Peregrinaçam* into Dutch. Glazemaker’s translation is entitled *De wonderlyke reizen van Fernando Mendez Pinto die hij in eenëntwintig jaren deur Europa, Asia, en Afrika gedaan heeft, daar in hij dartien malen gevangen heeft geweest, en zeventien malen verkocht is.* (The marvellous travels of Fernando Mendez Pinto that he made during twenty-one years through Europe, Asia and Africa, during which time he was imprisoned thirteen times and sold seventeen times). The book was published in Amsterdam, in 1652, by Jan Hendriksz and Jan Rieuwertsz, booksellers and printed by Pieter la Burgh. In 1653 a reprint by the same booksellers and printer followed.

Glazemaker, who did not know Portuguese, used as his source text the reprint from 1645 of the French translation by Bernard Figuier *Les voyages advantreux de Fernand Mendez Pinto* published in Paris.

My purpose was to show how a translation can serve the ideological commitments of the translator and how the act of translation is related to the political, religious, scientific and social context of the period in which it was realized. As such, I have wanted to stress the function of the translator and of the translation. Though there is no doubt that translation is a fundamental act of human exchange, the function of the translator and the impact of translation on the target culture have usually been ignored by the normative logic of translation (Venuti 1994, 2007).

A second fundamental element that tends to be overlooked is the historical context in which translations emerge and acquire meaning. Thus, it was necessary to
contextualise Glazemaker in his time and place in that, in order to understand the impact of subversive strategies of Glazemaker’s *Wonderlyke reizen*, the choices he made, and the changes he introduced when compared with Mendes Pinto’s *Peregrinaçam* and Figuier’s *Voyages advantvrevx*, an understanding of the time and place where the Dutch translator lived and was active is necessary.

Glazemaker lived in Amsterdam in a time when Dutch intellectual culture was being transformed by the “New Philosophy”: in which secular and mechanistic concepts, independent from the official and ecclesiastically sanctioned philosophy, were introduced in the way of thinking. It is a period that Hazard characterised as the crisis of the European mind, a deeply unsettling and traumatic era of new scientific advances and in which the Church, traditionally the main pillar of society, became deeply divided.266

Glazemaker, who was born into a Mennonite family, was influenced by the Collegiants, especially by the more rationalizing groups. He began translating in the 1640s and after some years, he dedicated himself to the translation of Descartes and became more and more involved in Spinoza’s network composed of radical freethinkers.

By analysing Glazemaker’s choice of the books he translated and the forewords he wrote, we become acquainted with his way of thinking and with his ideological evolution: from a liberal minded but pious, creedless Anabaptist, he gradually developed into a radical freethinker.

Another one of Glazemaker’s features that becomes clear from his Livy translation at the beginning of his career, is that he did not blindly obey his publisher’s orders. More often than not, Glazemaker decided to take control: De Bom mentions that

---

266 Israel advances slightly Hazard's chronology and considers the years 1650 until 1680 as a transition period (Israel: 2001: 20; Hazard 1961).
in his translation of Boxhorn, Glazemaker restructured the examples given in the source text (De Bom 2008: 221). As mentioned in Part I, section 7 of my dissertation, there are still other instances in which he acts not only as a translator, but as a compiler and editor as well.

From his edition of an anonymous pamphlet (1673), his translations of Spinoza (published in 1677 and posthumously in 1693) and from the sometimes cryptic forewords, it becomes clear that Glazemaker’s project is that of a cultural disseminator with an ideological and political agenda, an agenda that at that moment was considered highly subversive and forbidden because his ideas came close to those of Spinoza. By the 1650s, Spinoza and other members of his circle, such as Van den Enden and Koerbagh, were beginning to conceive a secular, philosophical system that could dismantle ecclesiastical authority (Israel 2006a: 64). Israel considers Spinoza and his circle, to which Glazemaker belonged, as the starting point of a clandestine current of thought that played a primary role in the grounding of the egalitarian and democratic core values and ideals of the modern Western world. The basic principles are: democracy, equality, freedom of thought and expression, and full separation of church and state.

The analysis of Glazemaker’s translation of Mendes Pinto’s travel account confirms this idea. His translation reads as a transgressive, potentially unsettling account: the text is stripped of miracles and saints, and the name Jesus is hardly ever mentioned; the same happened with regard to the Holy Cross and Trinity. Glazemaker excludes what cannot be explained from a scientific perspective, such as miracles. He
also removes references to many Catholic rituals in order to secularize the text.\textsuperscript{267} By stripping the text of some of its religious connotations, it becomes more secular, while other aspects become more enhanced. Not only is this the case with the episode of Antonio de Faria, but also with the descriptions of China, its people and customs.

One of the reasons why Glazemaker translates the book is because it focuses on items that were currently being discussed and that were not consistent with traditional learning based on the Bible: references to China’s history, the description of non-revealed religions, of pagans that were morally equal or superior to Europeans, and the description of a utopian China where several religions coexisted harmoniously.

Another reason for translating was the fact it revealed the unheroic side of the European expansion politics and contrasted with some of the popular Dutch Protestant travel accounts that had been published some years earlier. Not only did Glazemaker’s translation reveal the cruelty and greediness of the Portuguese colonizers, it also showed that faith was used to justify empire.

The way in which Glazemaker translated Mendes Pinto does not coincide with the results of the analysis of Glazemaker’s philosophical translations of Descartes and Spinoza by other scholars. These have revealed that he is considered a reliable translator. Akkerman however, does not hide the fact that there are some mistranslations and mistakes made out of negligence or haste, but on the whole he admires Glazemaker (Akkerman 1982: ix, xi). After having analysed the first eighty lines of Glazemaker’s translation of the \textit{Iliad} (1654), Smit comes to a similar conclusion; he also refers to Glazemaker as more reliable than other translators of his time although he is not as

\textsuperscript{267} The description of exotic and often barbaric religious rituals by Mendes Pinto are translated by Glazemaker because they function as a mirror for Christian rituals.
creative. Glazemaker’s style is simple and easy to read (Smit 1975: 586-590). De Bom considers that Glazemaker did not omit nor introduce additions in his translation of Lipsius, but that sentences were kept simple and not many figures of speech were used (De Bom 2008: 222-225).

Neither does Glazemaker’s way of translating used in Wonderlyke reizen, correspond to the assertions he made in his introductions to Descartes in which we become aware of his great effort to come as close as possible to the “zin” (meaning) and that he continued to improve his already published translations. In order to understand the meaning and to be as accurate as possible, Glazemaker often used more than one source text. However, Akkerman remarks that whenever he uses more than one source text he tends to follow the longer, more interpretative version, usually from the French (Akkerman 1982: xii). This is not the case of the translation of Mendes Pinto because, if Glazemaker wanted to keep close to the source text – the French translation by Figuier (1645) – than he would not have omitted episodes or passages the way he did. It means that, in this case, the source text was a pretext. According to his ideological agenda, he selects what fits his intentions and adds a new meaning to his source text.

Glazemaker’s manipulations of Mendes Pinto’s text do not seem to match his criticism in his Livy translation. Livy had been translated before into Dutch and Glazemaker criticises severely the former translator when he becomes aware that he left out important events of Roman history, and inserted ahistorical conjectures and discourses. On several occasions, throughout his translation of Livy, Glazemaker interrupts his text by calling the reader’s attention to his improvements. The

---

268 The aim of Smit’s work was the study of the heroic poem in the Netherlands and not of Glazemaker’s translation of Homer. For this reason Smit analysed only the first eighty lines of Book XIII of the Iliad translation by Glazemaker. Akkerman and De Bom proceeded to an analysis at a macro and microlevel of Glazemaker’s translations.
The only scholar who calls our attention to some insidious form of modification by Glazemaker, is Van Praag. His study reveals that Glazemaker also manipulated his translation of *L’honneste femme* in a similar way, though not as drastically as he did in *Wonderlyke reizen*.

Glazemaker’s aim as a translator was to educate the common public. He was an active adherent of the “New Philosophy” and translated either works in accordance to the new scientific and philosophical paradigm or works that could he adapt according to the new model of thinking. We must bear in mind that the works analysed by Akkerman and De Bom fit into the new paradigm adopted by Glazemaker. We also verified that the forewords written by Glazemaker are a way of extending his translations and reflecting on his intentions. This was especially the case of the passages in the forewords that were cryptical or obscure because their content was heretical and could not be put forth openly. The meanings in the passages could only be detected by insiders. The introductory texts accompanied the translation in order to control the reception of the book by the reader.

The “New Philosophy” Glazemaker wanted to disseminate often could not be published in a direct form: therefore, he resorted to various strategies from anonymous translations (or pamphlets) to manipulating translations. However, there are still many questions to be answered, for example, we do not know the extent of the circulation of his translations and their reception.
From this perspective, it would be interesting to study other translations made by Glazemaker or by other contemporary Dutch translators, in order to find out if ideological manipulation was a practice more common than it is believed to be. I am referring to Glazemaker’s translations of other travel accounts, for example, because his translations of Descartes and Spinoza have been dealt with and do not reveal this aspect. In this case, it was not necessary to manipulate the reader, the contents of his philosophical translations were already revolutionary and ground-breaking.

In order to find some confirmation for my interpretation of Glazemaker’s translation, it was necessary to research the reception of Mendes Pinto’s work in the Low Countries. That Mendes Pinto was a known writer is doubtless, the way Jacob Campo Weyerman refers to him or his book reveals that Mendes Pinto was a familiar name for his readers. Though I believe the common public mostly read Glazemaker’s translation as a popular travel account, there was also a small fringe of heterodox intellectuals interested in the more controversial aspects of the book. In fact, the reception of Wonderlyke reizen by Witsen, confirms the heterodox aspect of Glazemaker’s translation. In the case of Weyerman, it is not evident whether he was acquainted with the Dutch or with the French text. In other Dutch references to Mendes Pinto, or to his text, it is often not clear which source was used though Picart was acquainted with Figuier’s French translation. It means that he read Figuier’s translation as a potentially dissenting text and makes us wonder whether other radical intellectuals outside the Dutch Republic, during the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century, interpreted Mendes Pinto’s work as an unsettling work likely to undermine traditional beliefs. For example, for whom was the German translation, based on Glazemaker’s text and published by the sons of Jan Hendriksz Boom, another member
of the radical network, intended? What impact did the German translation have? Only further investigation can shed more light on the reception of Mendes Pinto’s work by heterodox thinkers.

If we want to know more about Mendes Pinto’s reception by radical intellectuals in Europe, it is necessary to discover who the French translator, Bernard Figuier, was. What was the Portuguese name of this “Gentil-Homme Portugais” and why was he established in France and where? In a period when many Portuguese of Sephardic origin had taken refuge in France it is important to know if he belonged to this group. I have demonstrated that he was highly influenced by the Spanish translation but the reason why is not clear. Was his knowledge of the Portuguese language not sufficient or did he follow the Spanish translation in order to guarantee his book would become a success like Herrera Maldonado’s had become?

From the 1730s on, Mendes Pinto’s heterodoxy falls into oblivion, interest in his work only reappears again in the nineteenth century. This time, it is consulted for its historical, ethnological and geographical information.

One of the first to interpret Peregrinaçam as a literary source, is the writer J. J. Slauerhoff (1898-1936) who creates two of his novels on pieces, or the ruins, of the book by Mendes Pinto. His reception of Mendes Pinto is unorthodox because he portrays him as a pirate and anti-hero in his novel, Het verboden rijk. Slauerhoff’s alter ego in this novel and in its sequel, Het leven op aarde, also represents an anti-hero who follows the footsteps of Mendes Pinto’s narrator in a dystopic China. More than half a century later, Magda van den Akker (1943) gives us a completely different view of Mendes Pinto in her novel. Her Mendes Pinto is not the naïf “pobre de my”, the anonymous first person narrator in Peregrinaçam, nor is he the sea pirate as in
Slauerhoff’s *Het verboden rijk*, but the older and more experienced friend of Gaspar da Cruz, the other main character in Van den Akker’s novel.

Only in recent years, especially after the publication, in 1992, in the Low Countries, of a second unabridged translation of *Peregrinaçam* has Mendes Pinto’s book become appreciated for its literary qualities.
... found the King sitting on an elephant, accompanied by more than a hundred men ... I turned my face to the place he indicated me, and found many corpses laid out and smothered in their blood.)
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