

MICHEL WIELEMA, ERASMUS UNIVERSITY, ROTTERDAM

**Frans Hemsterhuis:
A Philosopher's View of the History of the Dutch Republic**

In the English-speaking world, the Dutch philosopher Frans Hemsterhuis (1721-1790) is still comparatively unknown. Despite the fact that he was the most original Dutch thinker of the eighteenth century, there is only one book on him in English, together with a few articles.¹ At the moment, his ideas are the subject of research both in the Netherlands itself and in Germany, France and Italy. In November and December 1990, two international symposia were held to commemorate his death two centuries ago. Attention was focused on his philosophical achievement as well as on the reception of his thought in the Netherlands and in Germany. The proceedings of these symposia will soon be published. A Dutch translation of his complete works and of some hitherto unpublished letters (he wrote only in French) is being prepared in three volumes.² This will enable the Dutch, for the first time, to read Hemsterhuis in their own language. Finally, the Royal Academy intends to prepare a critical edition of his writings to replace the well-known Meyboom edition.³

There are, therefore, plenty of signs of a contemporary revival of interest in Hemsterhuis' thought, a revival which owes much to the upsurge of interest in the history of Dutch philosophy in general which started in the preceding decade.⁴ There is a growing awareness of the importance of the past

record of philosophy in the Netherlands, both in a national and an international perspective. It is becoming clear that the Netherlands, especially in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, played an extremely important role in the development and transmission of philosophical ideas.⁵ Although Dutch philosophers were part and parcel of general European movements of thought, their contribution to philosophy was in many ways highly original.

In the case of Hemsterhuis, this contribution concerned such diverse topics as mathematics, astronomy, optics, philosophy, ethics, politics, history, aesthetics and religion. His ideas in these fields mark him as a thinker who has left behind naive Enlightenment rationalism, and has opened up the way for a more synthetic style of thinking, which attracted both Kant and the adherents of *Sturm und Drang* and romanticism.⁶ His aim was to bring Newtonian mechanical philosophy within the wider framework of a Socratic philosophy of man. He opposed the materialistic and naturalistic tendencies of French free-thinkers, and made the human individual the centre of his philosophy. Man, according to him, was a many-faceted being whose essential aspirations were of a moral, aesthetic and religious nature. He was born with a great number of faculties, which

needed to be developed and perfected; he was a being characterized by "perfectibility," an expression first used by Rousseau. His development involved his entering into relations both with his fellow men and with God, the omnipresent Creator, in order to develop his most important faculty, his moral organ, on whose effective activity human society, morality and religion depend.

Hemsterhuis spent most of his life elaborating these ideas. He was born in the Frisian town of Franeker as the son of the famous philologist Tiberius Hemsterhuis. He studied for a while in Leiden, but did not take a degree. His main interests in his youth were mathematics, optics and engineering. In 1755, instead of becoming a military engineer or a professor of philosophy and experimental physics, as he had hoped, he entered the service of the Council of State, one of the most important judiciary and advisory bodies of the Republic, where he performed the duty of clerk until his retirement in 1780. This gave him the opportunity to become well acquainted with Dutch politics and affairs of state without becoming actually involved in them.

He was an unambitious and quiet man, devoting his spare time to philosophy, numismatics, art and literature. In his career as a philosopher, two distinct periods can be discerned, separated by the year 1775. In the first, he wrote a number of philosophical "letters," of which the *Lettre sur la Sculpture* (1769), the *Lettre sur les Désirs* (1770) and the *Lettre sur l'homme et ses rapports* (1772) are the most important.⁷ In these his aim is to show that man is not simply a self-centred physical being, as the materialists would have him, but that he is motivated by the desire to become one with either an object of art, his

fellow man or God. This craving for union with the beloved, which is analogous to the force of attraction in the physical world, can only be effective if man develops his moral faculty, on which human society and religion are based.

In the second period, Hemsterhuis was deeply influenced by his friendship with Amalia, Princess von Galitzin (1748-1806), the wife of the Russian ambassador to the Republic. She was an extremely gifted and intelligent woman, eager to be taught mathematics and philosophy by the older Dutchman, whom she began to see as an eighteenth-century Socrates. For his part, Hemsterhuis found in her the homogeneous object with which his soul could be united. Creative forces were unleashed and he began to write four beautiful dialogues which are among the best writings that Dutch philosophy has produced: *Sophyle ou de la Philosophie* (1778), *Aristée ou de la Divinité* (1779),⁸ *Simon ou des facultés de l'ame* (1779) and *Alexis ou de l'age d'or* (1787).⁹ In these dialogues the central concept of Hemsterhuis' thought, the synthesis of Newtonian and Socratic philosophy, is applied to a number of traditional topics such as the problem of certainty, the nature of evil, the conception of beauty, the significance of history. Besides these, their friendship has left behind a great number of letters, in which matters of mathematics, science, philosophy, art, literature, history and politics are widely discussed. Most of these letters, which can be found in the Royal Library at The Hague and the University Library at Münster, to which city the Princess moved in 1779, are still unpublished and have not even been systematically studied. They are a veritable treasure-house of information for anyone interested in Dutch

as well as general European intellectual life in the eighteenth century.

Until now, Hemsterhuis has been considered primarily as a systematic philosopher of the human soul and of art, history and religion. But it is clear both from some of his minor writings and from his correspondence, that he also took a great interest in the history and politics of his own country. Although he had no political ambitions of his own, matters of state attracted his attention not only on account of his professional occupation, but also because they served as empirical illustrations of his philosophical doctrines. In good Enlightenment fashion, political history to him was philosophy teaching by example. As a consequence, his comments on Dutch history and politics contain some highly original elements which set them off from the views of empirical historians or professional politicians. Together they constitute a philosopher's view of the history of the Dutch Republic.

Fortunately for us, Hemsterhuis' mature years as a philosopher were spent during a period of great political upheaval in the Republic.¹⁰ There was plenty of material to contemplate. For example, there was the war with England (1780-1784). The Republic proved weak, and suffered blow after blow, causing great domestic tensions. In September 1781, Van der Capellen distributed his notorious pamphlet calling on all citizens to carry arms and defend their rights against the autocratic policy of the stadholder. In the years to come, the division between the Patriots and Orangists led to a full-scale civil war which brought the Republic to the edge of destruction. In September 1787, the old regime was restored with the help of a Prussian army.

Hemsterhuis had seen some of the worst times in the history of the Dutch Republic since the disastrous year 1672.

It is hardly surprising then, that in the years 1780-1787 he was fully occupied with political reflections. The military and economic decline of the Republic led him to contemplate the stark contrast between its former greatness and its present humility. He decided to write a philosophical history of this unique state, which according to him, in the course of its history, exhibited all possible modifications of which states are susceptible. Unfortunately he was only able to write a philosophical introduction; this fragment is known today as *Reflexions sur la République des Provinces-Unies*. It is supplemented by a small treatise called *Ebauche d'un avis du conseil d'état*,¹¹ which contains some very interesting historical remarks, and by a large number of important letters, which are for the most part unpublished. From these diverse sources it will be possible to derive a relatively complete view of Hemsterhuis' reflections on the Republic.

Hemsterhuis' political philosophy can be situated between the opposing views of Enlightenment and romanticism, between mechanism and organicism. As in his general philosophy, his aim was to synthesize Newton and Socrates. From Newtonianism derive the mechanical metaphors that he constantly used in describing the nature and workings of state-machines. The distinction between the organic whole of the individual and the mechanical aggregate of the state is one of the most fundamental in his philosophy. To him, states were artificial constructions of the human intellect, used only to maintain the degenerate body of law

that protects private property against theft and violation. After the manner of Rousseau, whose works he read, he considered the invention of private property the main cause for the degeneration of the original or natural society into an artificial society or state, in which man is only a cog in a machine. While original society, which had actually existed, as Hemsterhuis attempted to show in the dialogue *Alexis*, had been based on man's moral organ and so had at least in that sense a moral character, the artificial society of today is based only on intellect, and is far removed from morality. In fact, states do not have a moral organ, and can approach one another only as wild animals do. So although Hemsterhuis does indeed speak of states in terms of animals, he does not mean to say they are organic wholes, but rather that they are mechanisms which clash with one another like animals in search of prey. In other words: states still live in the state of nature and international relations are completely amoral.

As a consequence, man is aware of a wide gap between himself and the state. Laws are felt to be external forces which do not correspond with his moral conscience. The individual seems to belong to two orders of being, the eternal order, based on the immutable nature of things, and the temporal order, based on human convention; he seems to live an amphibious life, so to speak. For Hemsterhuis, therefore, the traditional distinction between nature and culture becomes a specifically political distinction between man and state. In order to return to a homogeneous existence, man has to abolish the artificial state, and again become a complete moral being; in this way he will be able to return to the original society of the golden age. This is not simply a quick return

to nature, but a long process in which the sciences of man will play a leading role. The physical sciences being relatively perfected, man should turn to metaphysics and psychology in order to discover his own true nature. Artificial society should not be perfected mathematically, as in Condorcet's social mathematics, but rather gradually abandoned. The epoch or perihelion of mathematics in which we live should give way to another perihelion of sensibility, like that experienced by the Greeks. True to the Socratic ideal, Hemsterhuis calls on man to strive after self-knowledge and thus perfect himself.

Against this background should be seen Hemsterhuis' comments on Dutch history and on contemporary events. First of all, he stresses the fact that the Republic was born as a result of a number of historical accidents, like the absence of the foreign sovereign (Philip II) and the outstanding talents of the first Dutch stadholders William, Maurice and Frederick. Rather than being the homogeneous creation of a single legislator, its institutions were derived from the necessities of the war against Spain. There was only so much unity as to make possible a combined war effort. Real sovereignty lay not with the central organs of state, like the States General and Council of State, but with the regents in the towns and provinces. So the Republic, like any artificial society, was only an aggregate with no organic unity. Unlike other states, however, it was an extremely incoherent aggregate, made up of highly heterogeneous parts, which were constantly tending to go their own way.

As such, the Republic was an extraordinary entity. Its constitution was extremely complex and weak, and its sovereignty was

divided among thousands. These weaknesses were only felt, however, after the war against Spain was over. In the absence of a common enemy, common policy proved almost impossible. Domestic strife weakened the state and made it vulnerable to foreign attack, as in 1672. Nevertheless, it managed to survive for two centuries. Its history seems like a "tissue of miracles," its survival only being due to the quarrels among its more powerful neighbours, which allowed it to develop into one of the wealthiest nations the world had ever seen. But with every change in the reciprocal relations between the great European states, the Republic was shaken and almost fell apart.

According to Hemsterhuis then, the Republic's main weakness was its incoherence. Unlike the states which were the products of autocratic legislation, it had no internal stability. Hemsterhuis doubted very much whether this situation could ever be amended. He said that even the great legislators Minos, Lycurgus, Solon and Plato, working together, would fail to produce a constitution that could turn this Republic into something decent. The positive aspect of this situation was of course the great freedom that every Dutch citizen enjoyed. In the Dutch Republic, individual freedom was greater than anywhere else in Europe, and this should not be sacrificed to the demands of the state. Industry and practical wisdom had been the fruits of liberty, and these were the envy of foreigners.

But in the years leading up to the Prussian intervention, Hemsterhuis feared that the Dutch adherence to individual independence would finally result in the destruction of this remarkable Republic. He especially abhorred

the growth of ideological differences between the Patriotic and Orangist parties, which were leading to full-scale civil war. These parties were themselves turning into political animals without any sense of morality, attempting to devour their opponent. Peaceful citizens were becoming armed soldiers — the Dutch need for individual independence carried to its extreme. Anarchy made any form of government impossible, and no one had enough common sense or authority to put matters right again.

Hemsterhuis blamed this mess primarily on the Patriots. After all, they strove for a democratization of the old system and called on citizens to carry arms. Hemsterhuis feared this would lead to complete anarchy. Himself a moderate supporter of Orangist ideas, he attempted to prove that the Republic, especially in times of foreign danger, is in need of a single executive power, a stadholder, to balance the authority of the cities and provinces. He should be a "great man," a man with great talents, like some of the preceding stadholders had been. But in practice this solution proved ineffective. The current stadholder, William V, was inept and wholly unable to perform his important duties. Neither in the war with England nor in the civil war did he prove a competent leader of the Union. In the end, only another miracle saved the Republic from destruction.

Hemsterhuis' defence of the existing constitution, supplemented by a strong executive power, comes as something of a surprise. One might have expected him to approve radical measures for improving the government of the Republic. His view is, however, that in a confederation such as this, only the present system can guarantee that a middle course is steered between anarchy and

despotism. Hemsterhuis not only experienced the ravages of anarchy himself, he also knew there was an example of despotism nearby: the kingdom of France. It is interesting to compare his comments on the Dutch Patriotic movement with those on the French Revolution. While deploring the impending destruction of the old system in the Republic, which at the last minute was avoided by the Prussian troops, he greeted with some enthusiasm the downfall of the French monarchy, one of the most powerful state-machines man had ever produced. While in the Republic individual freedom needed to be balanced by some degree of state authority, in France despotism had to give way to greater individual freedom. The French people took their destiny into their own hands, just as the Dutch had done two centuries earlier. What the outcome of this would be was uncertain, but with prophetic vision Hemsterhuis predicted a long period of barbarism before things calmed down again.

Despite the potentially revolutionary character of his political philosophy, of which the abolition of state-machines was a key element, Hemsterhuis' practical political view was, therefore, rather conservative. In France, on the other hand, the similar political philosophy of Rousseau played an important part in revolutionary ideology. According to Hemsterhuis, however, the Dutch state, because of its inherent weaknesses, needed to be strengthened rather than abolished. He did all he could to uphold the authority of the central organs of state, such as the Council of State, which he considered of prime importance. In 1784, for example, the Council came under heavy attack from the Patriots in the States of Holland. It was accused of neglecting the defence of the southern frontier. The real

target, however, was the Prince of Orange, who was a member of the Council. As a former employee and highly valued man of affairs, Hemsterhuis was asked to repel the attack. He drew up a document showing that the Council was not to blame, and that the only possible cure for the diseases of the Republic lay in brotherly co-operation of all to warn off the imminent dangers. In fact, by means of the Council he prepared a coup d'état against the Patriotic "tyrants" in the States of Holland, but "traitors" managed to have his document rejected.¹²

As can be seen from his use of such derogatory terms as "tyrants" and "demagogues," Hemsterhuis had a very low opinion of the Patriotic politicians. They claim they are promoting the interests of the nation, but in fact they are leading it to destruction. They even impair civil liberties by taking measures against their Orangist opponents. Small armies were roaming the countryside, spreading fear and crushing resistance. Hemsterhuis' opinion, however, was not always one-sided. In August 1787, for example, a "flying army" raided Delft, took possession of vital armouries and caused the Orangist magistrate to be replaced by a Patriotic one. Instead of expressing his indignation, as one might expect, he exults at the "beauty" and "skill" of this coup d'état, although he knew very well the disastrous consequences it would have. It is characteristic of his philosophical mind that he was also able to judge political events disinterestedly or even aesthetically. The frightful chaos in the Republic, which he compared to the chaotic universe of the ancient atomists, the extreme and abnormal behaviour that common citizens suddenly started to exhibit, the malign influence of partisanship upon people's morality, and

many other features, made the Republic for him a better school of psychology and politics than were all the writings of Greek and Roman historians together.

As a matter of practical politics, Hemsterhuis welcomed enthusiastically the restoration of the ancien régime by the Prussian army in September 1787. In a long letter to the Princess, written on the return of William V to The Hague, he describes vividly the panic that fell upon the Patriotic "tyrants" after they had heard of the capture of the town of Gorinchem a few days earlier. Many of them fled, and their houses were rifled. There was an unparalleled outburst of joy, people embraced each other in the streets. Not without a good deal of exaggeration, Hemsterhuis calls the former Patriotic rule "the most despicable tyranny that history records," based on wholly unacceptable ideas. He ends this letter, however, in a much more light-hearted vein. The tumult and uproar of the preceding days, including the big parade to celebrate the return of the stadholder, have done his poor ears no good: "For me, the universe in its audible aspect has turned into nothing."

In the last years of his life, Hemsterhuis was again able to enjoy life in a politically calm atmosphere. But he was well aware that the Republic was not set aright, and that the quiet was only apparent. Politicians kept looking back to the past in order to find remedies for the Republic's illness. But according to Hemsterhuis, it took "courage and innovation" to restore it to its former greatness. The constitution, laws and military discipline had all been destroyed, and had to be re-created. However, he did not make clear how this should be done. It might well have involved shaking off the cautious

conservative attitude that had characterized his political thinking until the Restoration.

As we have seen, Hemsterhuis was deeply concerned with the fate of his own country. He lived during one of the most turbulent periods of its history. As a philosopher, however, he was able to have a bird's eye view of events as they unrolled in chaotic order. He saw in them the consequences of "mechanical" politics, politics which is detached from its ethical foundations in man as a many-sided being. The mechanization of politics had brought with it the horrible phenomenon of the state-machine in which each individual is just another cog. It usurps man's moral faculty and so causes him to feel alienated from his fellows. Men turn away from politics to fulfil higher aspirations, for example in art or religion. But man is essentially a political being as well, as Hemsterhuis had learnt from Aristotle. Only in social and political activity can man's moral faculty be fully developed. Instead of politics using people, people should start using politics as a means of moral self-perfection, as in the Greek city states, where individual and society were one; each individual saw himself as the "mirror of the state."

Hemsterhuis may well have doubted whether a return to this Greek ideal was possible in modern Europe. Surely, the end of the Dutch civil war and the destruction of the French monarchy must at least have been good signs. What else should be done to promote this ideal? As a pupil of Socrates, Hemsterhuis, of course, laid great stress on education. In a highly interesting letter,¹³ he suggests erasing the word "fatherland" from every children's book and teaching geography without using maps that show the artificial boundaries of

states. In this way, the child should become a cosmopolitan and see the world or at least the whole of Europe as its fatherland. Too often states have usurped patriotism for their own immoral ends and thereby degraded this noble feeling into one of the most hostile sentiments that artificial society has produced. Patriotism should give way to love of humanity.

Although these and many other of Hemsterhuis' ideas were very progressive, his actual influence seems to have been limited to Orangist conservative circles. Gijsbert Karel van Hogendorp (1762-1834), for example, the conservative statesman who laid the foundations for the new monarchy of 1814, in his youth had conversed with Hemsterhuis and may well have been influenced by his demonstration of the necessity of a single executive power, whether it be a stadholder or a king.¹⁴ Van Hogendorp derived his ideas from the old régime, and like Hemsterhuis attached great importance to the Council of State, of which he was vice-president for three years. Another case in point is that of Philip Willem van Heusde (1778-1839), professor of history and Greek in the university of Utrecht, who called on his countrymen to revive Socratic philosophy as exemplified in the writings of Hemsterhuis.¹⁵ To him, the philosophy of Hemsterhuis was the best suited for a nation in which king and people co-operated in order to improve life in all areas. Had Hemsterhuis lived to see the birth of the Dutch monarchy, it is highly probable that he would have greeted it wholeheartedly, because it combined the best features of his beloved Republic in its heyday - strong leadership by a prince who happened to be a great man, great civil liberties, economic growth and prosperity - with a unified constitution that corrected its main defects: its incoherence and complexity.¹⁶

REFERENCES

¹ See H. Moenkemeyer, *François Hemsterhuis* (Boston, 1975), an excellent survey. By the same author, "François Hemsterhuis: admirers, critics, scholars," in *Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 51 (1977), 502-525, on the reception of Hemsterhuis' philosophy. Also in English: M.J. Petry, "Hemsterhuis on Mathematics and Optics," in *The Light of Nature. Essays in the History and Philosophy of Science presented to A.C. Crombie*, J.D. North and J.J. Roche, eds. (Dordrecht, Boston, Lancaster, 1985), 209-234. The best biography is still the book by L. Brummel, *Frans Hemsterhuis. Een filosofenleven* (Haarlem, 1925). K. Hammacher wrote a profound interpretation in German: *Unmittelbarkeit und Kritik bei Hemsterhuis* (Munich, 1971).

² It will be published by Ambo in Baarn. Volume one will contain Hemsterhuis' writings on mathematics, astronomy, optics and general philosophy, volume two will comprise his writings and a number of unpublished letters on education, politics, and history, and volume three will contain his works on ethics, psychology, aesthetics, and philosophy of religion. Each volume will also contain an introduction and explanatory notes.

³ *Oeuvres Philosophiques de François Hemsterhuis*, L.S.P. Meyboom, ed., 3 vols. (Leeuwarden, 1846-1850; reprint Hildesheim, New York, 1972).

⁴ One important sign of this revival can be seen in the foundation of a national society for the promotion of research into Dutch philosophy: the "Werkgroep Sassen voor de geschiedenis van de wijsbegeerte in Nederland." It was founded at the Erasmus University in May 1989. Its main activities consist in organizing conferences on chosen topics and publishing a bi-annual journal, *Geschiedenis van de wijsbegeerte in Nederland*. A start will soon be made with the publication of an international series, *Studies in the History of Ideas in the Low Countries*.

⁵ For a recent general survey, see M.R. Wielema, "Philosophy in the Netherlands in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries," in *Rivista di storia della filosofia* 44 (1989), 353-363.

⁶ See K. Hammacher, "Hemsterhuis und seine Rezeption in der deutschen Philosophie," in *Algemeen Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Wijsbegeerte* 75 (1983), 110-131.

⁷ The *Lettre sur l'homme et ses rapports avec le commentaire inédit de Diderot* was edited by Georges May (New Haven, 1964).

⁸ A Dutch translation of *Aristée* and some minor scientific writings was published recently: *Frans Hemsterhuis. Waarneming en werkelijkheid*, M.J. Petry, ed. (Baarn, 1990), as vol. 14 in the series *Geschiedenis van de wijsbegeerte in Nederland* (Baarn: Ambo, 1986-1992), which consists of twenty volumes in which the main Dutch philosophical classics are presented in editions which are both popular and critical. The other authors in the series include: Siger van Brabant (1240-1281), Johannes Buridan (1295-1358), Marsilius van Inghen (1330-1396), Heymeric van de Velde (1395-1460), Rudolf Agricola (1444-1485), Desiderius Erasmus (1469-1536), Dirk Volckertsz. Coornhert (1522-1590), Hugo de Groot (1583-1645), Gerardus Vossius (1577-1649), Arnout Geulincx (1624-1669), Petrus van Balen (1643-1690), Bernard Nieuwentijt (1654-1718), Willem Jacob 's Gravesande (1688-1742), Paulus van Hemert (1756-1825), Philip Willem van Heusde (1778-1839), Cornelis Opzoomer (1821-1892), Jacobus Moleschott (1822-1893), Gerardus Heymans (1857-1930) and Herman Dooyeweerd (1894-1947). Spinoza (1632-1677) has been excluded from the series, because excellent Dutch translations of his writings already exist.

⁹ The unfinished dialogue *Alexis II ou du Militaire* (ca. 1783) was published by E. Boulan in *François Hemsterhuis, le Socrate hollandais* (Groningen, Paris, 1924), 111-136.

¹⁰ Hemsterhuis' comments on Dutch history have until

now escaped the attention of historians. For example, his name is not even mentioned in two recent books on Dutch eighteenth-century intellectual history: M.C. Jacob and W.W. Mijnhardt, eds., *The Dutch Republic in the Eighteenth Century. Decline, Enlightenment, and Revolution* (Ithaca, London: Cornell U P, 1992) and W.R.E. Velema, *Enlightenment and Conservatism in the Dutch Republic. The Political Thought of Elie Luzac (1721-1796)* (Assen, Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1993).

¹¹ For an excellent survey, see S. Schama, *Patriots and Liberators. Revolution in the Netherlands 1780-1813* (New York, London, 1977), chapters 1-3.

¹² These two treatises were not published in Hemsterhuis' lifetime. They appeared in J.H. Halbertsma's *Letterkundige Naoogst*, vol. 2 (Deventer, 1845), 564-588 and vol. 1 (Deventer, 1840), xii-xxiv, respectively. Hemsterhuis comments on these matters in his correspondence on 25 October and 2 December, 1784. The letters are partly written in cipher, a method he frequently used for transmitting politically risky messages to Münster.

¹³ This letter, dated 2 May 1785, has been published by Marie Müller in "Mindestens Europa. 1785. Ein Brief des Philosophen Hemsterhuis an die Fürstin Galitzin," in *Westfalen. Hefte für Geschichte, Kunst und Volkskunde* 33 (1955), 37-41.

¹⁴ On Van Hogendorp, see H.L.T. de Beaufort, *Gijsbert Karel van Hogendorp. Grondlegger van het Koninkrijk* (Den Haag, 1963).

¹⁵ On Van Heusde, see J.M.M. de Valk, *Philip Willem van Heusde. Wijsbegeerte van het gezond verstand* (Baarn, 1989).

¹⁶ I wish to thank Prof. Dr. M.J. Petry for the grammatical and stylistic revision of this article.