

University of Groningen

'Her haggling nature never leaves her'

Rädecker, Tsila

Published in:
Jewish Culture and History

DOI:
[10.1080/1462169X.2017.1360596](https://doi.org/10.1080/1462169X.2017.1360596)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2017

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Rädecker, T. (2017). 'Her haggling nature never leaves her': Dutch identity and Jewish stereotypes in the writings of Nicolaas François Hoefnagel (1735-1784). *Jewish Culture and History*, 18(3), 303-312.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1462169X.2017.1360596>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

'Her haggling nature never leaves her'. Dutch identity and Jewish stereotypes in the writings of Nicolaas François Hoefnagel (1735–1784)

Tsila Rådecker

To cite this article: Tsila Rådecker (2017) 'Her haggling nature never leaves her'. Dutch identity and Jewish stereotypes in the writings of Nicolaas François Hoefnagel (1735–1784), *Jewish Culture and History*, 18:3, 303-312, DOI: [10.1080/1462169X.2017.1360596](https://doi.org/10.1080/1462169X.2017.1360596)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1462169X.2017.1360596>



© 2017 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 07 Aug 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 425



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

‘Her haggling nature never leaves her’. Dutch identity and Jewish stereotypes in the writings of Nicolaas François Hoefnagel (1735–1784)

Tsila Rådecker

Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

ABSTRACT

This article investigates how Nicolaas François Hoefnagel (1735–1784) uses pejorative images of the Jew to delineate the boundaries of Dutch identity. It explores Hoefnagel’s dislike for Jews and his quest to morally enhance the Dutch. Against the background of contemporary situations, Hoefnagel set old stereotypical images of the Jew. The Jew became in this respect an instrument for the moral rearmament of the Dutch nation. As such this article will show that his construction of Jewish stereotypes served as a sounding board for Dutch identity.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 12 May 2017
Accepted 20 July 2017

KEYWORDS

Jews; Dutch; satire; identity; eighteenth century

‘He describes the crime and malicious shortcomings. He castigates the abuse, he punishes the false deceit. Never did men hear his Writing speak forged truth.’¹ In the above citation the eighteenth century most prolific hack writer Nicolaas François Hoefnagel (1735–1784) defends his work *De Echo* (The Echo), by stating that his prose functions as a mirror, exposing the shortcomings of Dutch society and its members. Hoefnagel’s writings are a typical product of the Dutch eighteenth century. According to many of his contemporaries², the eighteenth century was an age of deterioration. The Netherlands lost their leading position in the world economy as well as their colonies in the Atlantic. Compared to the seventeenth century, the Dutch Golden Age, the eighteenth century was a frail and feeble reflection of the former Dutch fame. In a plethora of writings, Dutch moralists, bemoaned the lost grandeur and condemned the elite of prodigality and moral decay. They believed that moral decay caused economic decline and therefore many sought the solution in the moral rearmament of the Dutch nation.³

This concern with morality also comes to the fore in the Dutch satirical literature and prints. Morality is not uncommon to satire, as this genre has a strong focus on the establishment of social norms. By ridiculing the Other, it constructs and demarcates the boundaries of accepted behaviour. Making fun of someone and ridiculing one’s accent, clothes and behaviour is not only a way of excluding the Other, it also reveals someone’s perceived and desired self-image. The sought-after identity is modelled in opposition to the ridiculed other and as a result it becomes a mould in which aspects and features of one’s self-image are

CONTACT Tsila Rådecker  t.s.radecker@rug.nl

© 2017 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

shown. The Other becomes in that respect a mirror of identity. Not surprisingly, many (enlightened) writers used satire as a tool for morally enhancing the Dutch citizens.⁴

During the eighteenth century an abundance of satirical journals, pamphlets and polemics were printed in the Netherlands.⁵ Enlightenment criticism of religious authority and the creation of the 'moral citizen' spurred many talented and not so talented writers to publish their opinions.⁶ It was the age of civil society.⁷ In various (ephemeral) journals such as *De Denker* (The Thinker, 1763–1774), *De Lantaarn* (The Lantern, 1792–1801) and *De Koopman* (The Merchant, 1766–1776) they moralized, criticized and commented on the Dutch Republic and its politics.⁸ According to enlightenment tradition, which placed emphasis on the humans' ability to reason for themselves, writers ridiculed especially old religious institutions such as the Catholic Church for their backwardness. Usurpation and injustices by religious leaders was a rewarding subject for many. Likewise, various plays, periodicals and polemics condemned the Jews for their faulty religion, isolation and otherness.⁹

This article investigates how Nicolaas François Hoefnagel uses 'the Jew' to delineate the boundaries of Dutch identity.¹⁰ Recent scholarship has brought attention to the way German immigrants, Catholics and other marginal groups functioned as (stylistic) means to contour the outlines of Dutch citizenship. Edwina Hagen, for instance, analyses how anti-Catholic feelings turned into a 'negative mirror image.' Moreover, she regards the satirical portrayal of Catholics not say so much as the shaping of the 'Catholic other,' but more as a definition of Dutch national self-esteem and religion.¹¹ Others likewise emphasized the role of marginal groups as counter image in the construction of the national Dutch identity.¹² In relation to the negative Jewish images postulated by Hoefnagel, the Dutch literature specialist A.J. Hanou even considers his satire benign because it refrained from ridiculing Jews as a group and only directed its criticism to Jewish representatives.¹³

In their emphasis on the function of stereotypical images, they however failed to address the (later) social and juridical implications preceding and following these constructions. Jews were prohibited to marry Christians, excluded from the guilds and not allowed to settle in many cities in the Netherlands until the emancipation of 1796. Moreover, well in to the nineteenth century Catholics and Jews were shunned from political office.¹⁴ Stereotypical images contributed to an overall negative attitude towards inhabitants of the Netherlands without a Non-Reformed affiliation. This article will explore Hoefnagel's dislike for Jews and his quest to morally enhance the Dutch. Unlike Hanou postulated, Hoefnagel sprouted his satire to the Jews as a group. As such, this article will show that both aspects were equally important in his construction of Jewish stereotypes.

Nicolaas François Hoefnagel (1735–1784)

Nicolaas François Hoefnagel, infamous for his satirical oeuvre, depicts the Jew entirely negatively in a wide range of typical anti-Semitic¹⁵ stereotypes and images of which only the most prominent will be discussed here. His work deploys a variety of derogatory images of the Jew, not found, for instance, with the satirist Jacob Campo Weyerman (1677–1747) and Pieter Langendijk (1683–1756), who employed the linguistic difference of the Jews for its *couleur locale*, but refrained from displaying the Jew entirely maliciously.¹⁶ For instance, in his comical play (1677–1747) *'tZamenspraak tussen Kidi en Saaki* [The Dialogue between Kidi and Saaki] Weyerman represents the Jew only with a strange accent.¹⁷ Unlike other writers, wherein the Jew merely served as one of many strange and unwanted types, Hoefnagel

actually provides a comprehensive picture of the Jews' inability to integrate in Dutch society. Another interesting aspect of Hoefnagel is his engagement with contemporary examples and his observations of real events. He does not merely repeat old stereotypes, but observes Jews and their behaviours, albeit in a very hostile and predisposed way as he blends it into the existing negative discourses on the Jew.

Hoefnagel typifies the eighteenth-century hack writer and producer of satirical literature. Born in a small town in the north of the Netherlands, he quickly moved to the capital city Amsterdam, where he developed into the most prolific hack of the Netherlands, leaving behind an extensive oeuvre.¹⁸ Hoefnagel's employment of negative Jewish stereotypes not merely served to ridicule the Jews, but became a way to limit the outlines of Dutch citizenship. This comes to the fore in two of his singly written journals, *De Neerlandse Overweeger* (The Dutch Contemplator, 1770) and *Neerlandsch Echo* (The Dutch Echo, 1771). His style can be characterized as a potpourri stream of mostly unrelated anecdotes, wherein Hoefnagel shows how the Dutch ought to behave. According to Hoefnagel, 'one shows first his virtuous soul and afterwards one's lineage.'¹⁹ He condemns scandalous behaviour and ridicules and mocks the non-Dutch. Hoefnagel based his stereotypes on older negative discourses on the Jew and combined it with contemporary ideas on what it entailed to be Dutch. His writings are an example of the mixture of satire and morality in popular formats, such as theatre and journals. In the eighteenth century Dutch Republic, many writers tried to educate the Dutch into moral and god-fearing citizens.

Hoefnagel's image of the Jew

A typical feature of Hoefnagel's Jewish stereotypes is the play between fact and fiction. By displaying some knowledge of Jewish culture and religion, Hoefnagel shows his credence. He uses the Yiddish adjective of haggling, namely *shachern* and mimics the Yiddish by placing for each vowel an h. Although at first sight, Hoefnagel displays some knowledge of the Jewish religion and culture, his Yiddish is, however, seriously flawed. For instance, his constant placement of the letter h for its vowel and its unnecessary omission in other instances probably created a comical effect, but contradicts the actual pronunciation of Dutch in the Amsterdam Yiddish.²⁰ Also, his reproduction of the Yiddish is erroneous. His transcription of the word *Bes ha-midresh* [school or synagogue] shows no similarity with the actual word as Hoefnagel corrupt it into 'bedame dril' and 'bedämadril.'²¹ Moreover, he confuses the speech of Ashkenazi and Sephardic Jews as he depicts a Portuguese Jew with the Yiddish accent: 'Noh, I will thou it, if te shee is dhry, if the bhig fish comes, who whill thrink te lhake. [Now, if you will, if the sea is dry and if the big fish comes, who will drink the lake?]'²²

The mix up of different Jewish accents points to the changing position of the Ashkenazic and Sephardic Jews in the Netherlands. During the seventh and eighteenth century because of immigration, Ashkenazim became the largest Jewish group. Already in 1674, the Ashkenazic community was double the size of the Sephardic community in Amsterdam and for the middle of the eighteenth century it could be estimated that the Sephardim made about a tenth up of the total amount of Jews.²³ Hoefnagel probably did not encounter so many Sephardic Jews or made no attempt to differentiate between them and the Ashkenazim. Despite the efforts of the Sephardic community to display *bom judesmo* (worthy Judaism) and distance themselves of the perceived rough behaviour of their Ashkenazic counterparts.²⁴

Hoefnagel's employment of facts and real events was a common and frequently used technique of satire writers.²⁵ His knowledge of the Jewish community probably derived from

what he picked up from within the Jewish quarter. The statement ‘if a *mousje* [pejorative name for a Jew] sees money, he gets the rash on the four corners of his body’ is a reference to the *arba kanfot* (*tallit katan*), a rectangular piece of cloth with at the four corners fringes, worn by religious Jews underneath their clothing.²⁶ He also demonstrates his ‘knowledge’ of Jewish festivals as he invokes the image of joyous Jews at Purim. For instance, he writes: ‘and the recruiter was as cheerful as a Jew with his harlequin suit on Purim.’²⁷ The joyous and excessive festivities in the Jewish quarter probably attracted a wide audience and not surprisingly Hoefnagel was familiar with the custom of dressing up and feasting on Purim. In other contexts, Hoefnagel mentions the fast on Yom Kippur when he states that one was ‘as a hungry *smous* boy on the Day of Atonement.’²⁸ Here Hoefnagel also shows his knowledge of the abstention of drinking and eating on this holiday.²⁹ The author of *Entdektes Judentums*, Johann Eisenmenger, used a similar technique as he extensively quotes from Jewish sources to prove his point; namely that Judaism was essentially inferior and bloodthirsty.³⁰ The entanglement of fact and fiction gives Hoefnagel’s observations an impression of objectivity.

One of the focal points of Hoefnagel’s satire is the employment of bodily repulsiveness in othering the Jew. ‘See, how dirty he looks’ one of Hoefnagel’s characters cries out, ‘that is because it smells too much of the Jewish nation.’³¹ First, Hoefnagel refers here to the Jewish nation. Clearly, he does not regard the Jews as part of the Dutch nation, but rather as a foreign entity. The other part of this citation relates to the idea that Jews had a uniquely foul smell. This was an old anti-Semitic accusation, already appearing in the Roman Period, wherein stench belonged to the Jew and was known as the *foetur judaicus*.³² Hoefnagel holds however the Jew’s bad hygiene responsible for their stench. The Jews’ bad odour resulted, according to the writer, from their lack of washing and beard fashion. In many instances, he combines the two, the beard and bad hygiene, by pointing out that the Jews never comb their beards. ‘Belief me, they [Jews] are like the beard of a Polish Jew that got moths in it.’³³ The Polish Jew symbolized for Hoefnagel the pinnacle of Jewish filthiness and the Jewish beard was a place, where saliva accumulated. Indeed, one of Hoefnagel’s characters wonders ‘which Jew has the most saliva in his beard.’³⁴ The aversion of bodily fluids, the beard and the Jew epitomized in Hoefnagel’s depiction and the Jewish dirtiness strikingly contrasted with the positively perceived image of Dutch cleanliness.³⁵

The otherness of the Jews also comes to the fore when Hoefnagel compares the ‘nature’ of the Jew with the ‘nature’ of the black Moor.³⁶ Both natures were intrinsic and unescapable.

I will show you that the old Dutch proverb is true, namely wash a black Moor as long as you like, he will lose his skin sooner than he will become white. This is also applicable to the descendants of Israelite girls, more namesakes of the patriarch Isaac’s wife, than among daughters of Christians.³⁷

For Hoefnagel, being Jewish was a permanent state of being, like the dark pigmented skin of a Moor. By defining Jewishness to a physical feature, he biologically defines the Jew.³⁸ Moreover, he points at the unbridgeable gap between the Jews and the Dutch.

Various anti-Jewish polemics, such as Johann Eisenmenger’s *Entdektes Judentum*, display the immutability as well as dishonesty of the Jew. Hoefnagel explores this theme in several ways by connecting the nature of the Jew with other negative qualifications.³⁹ His representation of the insincere conversion to Christianity and the ineradicable Jewishness of the Jew resemble the arguments used by Queen Isabella and King Ferdinand for the expulsion of

the Jews from Castille and Aragon in 1492, where the pureness of blood laws denied the possibility of Jewish conversion to Christianity. In addition, Hoefnagel continues:

You cannot make a black Moor white, which my readers will surely agree with me, but would my readers believe that there is stuff of which you can honestly turn a Jew into a Christian, the CONTEMPLATER [*de Overweeger*] has known several of these Jews, which became in name Christians, and after their conversion they were even more bad as before when they belonged to the bearded lot.⁴⁰

As it appears from the citation, Hoefnagel positions the Jew's dishonesty in opposition to Christian honesty. Something, which was according to him inherently bad, such as 'the Jew' could not possibly change into something good, namely Christian. Hoefnagel presents the Jewish wickedness as something ingrained in the Jew, which cannot be undone by conversion to Christianity. Moreover, by referring to Christianity as the norm, he excludes the Jews as part of the Dutch community. For Hoefnagel, the Dutch nation ought to be entirely Christian.

Hoefnagel invokes the common Christian depiction of the Jews as stubborn because of their reluctance to accept Christ as the messiah. The stubbornness here however is represented by the miserliness of the Jew. Again, Hoefnagel uses the example of the false conversion of Jews to Christianity to prove his point. Moreover, he substantiates his argument by citing Junius Juvenalis (late first century and early second century AD), author of the *Satires*.

The children who sprung from Jewish parents, by marriage or else, and are converted to the Christian faith should not be believed to be Christians, No! Her haggling nature never leaves her; they worship nothing but clouds, and are more willing to eat human flesh than bacon. Yes, even her great grand and grandchildren are glued to their Law.⁴¹

By citing such an ancient author, Hoefnagel not only plays with his own satirical genre but seems to make his argument appear as an undeniable aspect of the Jewish nature, that the Jew is never to be trusted, not in the past and not in the present.

Because of the guilds regulations, which did not allow Jews to enter, (petty) trade became the dominant occupation of the Dutch Jews. This in turn, established and legitimized the idea of the Jews obsessiveness with money. For Hoefnagel greed was an essential aspect for Jews as they always searched for easy bargains, and seduces the innocent with their malicious schemes. The breadwinning symbolized the greedy nature of the Jew in his depiction of a Jewish swindler.

That they can learn a bit from a *smous* living at Marken [area in the Jewish quarter], who stands with a small table, three buckets and some small nutmeg balls, or cork at the corner of the old bridge to recover their damage from the farmers.⁴²

The Jews here are presented as being occupied in shady breadwinning and tricking the Dutch inhabitants into gambling. Apparently, the occupation of the Jews was something on which the Dutch frowned upon and which was not regarded as a proper way of earning income. Moreover, it also relates to the 'supposedly' negative feelings of Jews towards Christians and separates the Jews from the Dutch.

Next to a dishonest profession, it was believed that Jews held a grudge against Christians. A belief widely spread in many anti-Semitic theological writings and especially notable in the blood libel story, wherein Jews used the blood of innocent Christian boys to bake their *matzes*.⁴³ In addition, various theological polemics regarded the Talmud as hostile to Christians and postulated the idea that it approved of robbing and deceiving Christians.⁴⁴

Because of this perceived Jewish resentment towards everything Christian, Jews engaged in swindling, deceiving and misleading.

Hand in hand with the negative depiction of the Jewish breadwinning, positive enlightened apologetics appeared. The Jewish overrepresentation in certain areas of trade was according to the apologetics a result of discrimination and economic restrictions. This is, for instance, the argument made by Isaac de Pinto in *Apologie pour la nation juive ou Reflexions critiques sur le premier chapitre du VIIe tome des oeuvres de M. de Voltaire au sujet des Juifs*. Hoefnagel explicitly mentions the *Apologie op de Joodsche Natie* of a certain D.C.L. which apparently accused Hoefnagel of blunt anti-Semitism.⁴⁵ According to Hoefnagel, the apologetic was worthless and the accusation false. Moreover, he ridicules its writer and restates his pejorative qualifications of the Jew. 'Well, you say: I am a libeller and you shall laud the Jewish Nation. You mean to praise? Are you looking to jeopardize my honour to gain some money?'⁴⁶

In addition, he reiterates his previous statements about the dishonesty of the Jews and rebukes the writer D.C.L. for its distinction between High German and Portuguese Jews.

Isn't it true, that the Jewish quarter⁴⁷ is the place where they sell swindler's merchandise? Or is it only applicable for the High German Jews? I notice that Your Honour holds them in contempt. No, the Portuguese Nation is also familiar with the art of deception.⁴⁸

Contrary to many enlightened writers such as the Sephardic Jew Isaac de Pinto and Abbé Grégoire, Hoefnagel does not distinguish between the two groups.

Hoefnagel's especially criticizes the attempt to positively regard the Sephardim and allocate all the negative aspects of the Jews to only the Ashkenazim. Hoefnagel prides himself that he equates the Portuguese and the Ashkenazi Jew; they are both swindlers and deceivers. Moreover, as stated above, he displays them both with a Yiddish accent.⁴⁹ The unwillingness of Hoefnagel to distinguish between Sephardim and Ashkenazim had probably much to do with the relative small number of affluent Sephardim. A result of the ongoing impoverishment of the Sephardic community in the eighteenth century a clear distinction between Ashkenazic poor and Sephardic poor was not so easy to make.⁵⁰

According to Hoefnagel amorality characterized the Jew, financially as well as socially. He narrates about the amorous liaisons of Portuguese Jews and Ashkenazi Jewesses. Portuguese Jews were often accused of having forbidden sexual relations with their Christian females. The chronicler Abraham Haim Braatbard (1699–1786), for instance, mentions a case in his chronicles, and even the criminal courts confirm a Portuguese propensity for deviant sexual behaviour.⁵¹ Hoefnagel also accuses Jewish females for sexual deviance. He narrates about a widow who started a brothel with her two daughters and converted to Christianity to hide their dishonest breadwinning.⁵²

Besides the emphasis on Jewish immoral sexual behaviour, the overall conduct of the Jew was by Hoefnagel depicted as noisy, uncivilized and coarse. Jews cursed and screamed out of discontent or as part of their selling techniques. In a satirical representation of the election of a new cantor, Hoefnagel compares the Jews, gathering for the election, with crawling vermin, ladybugs and frogs.⁵³ He depicts the election as noisy and quarrelsome as each group of Jews promoted its own candidate. 'Look the third is no less, he screams! You can tell he is used to yelling, *Old Blankets, Old Sheets ...*'⁵⁴ The quarrel then centres on a thief stealing pickles and both Portuguese and Ashkenazi Jews start a scuffle. Hoefnagel displays typical slapstick like scenes and the story ends with the arrest of the accused Jew by the authorities, who did not 'let themselves be fooled by a *smousje*.'⁵⁵ This depiction of the loud

and short-tempered Jewish community appears often in Hoefnagel's work.⁵⁶ For Hoefnagel, the Jew in general was quarrelsome, loud and uncivilized. Not at all, someone to consider a representative or member of the Dutch nation.

The negative image of the Jew as depicted by Hoefnagel employs familiar qualifications. Greed, immorality and barbarism characterized for centuries the perception of the Jew. Against the background of contemporary situations, Hoefnagel set old stereotypical images of the Jew and it lends his depiction credence. The Jew was made into an object of laughter and ridicule. The image of the smelly, deceiving insect-like Jew legitimized a negative attitude towards the Jew and Jewish customs. Moreover, it depicted the Jew as inherently different and alien to Dutch society. Such discourses prevailed throughout the eighteenth- and twentieth century, and substantiated arguments for denying Jewish access in society and politics.

The negative images of the Jew by Hoefnagel also served as an instrument in the moral rearmament of the Dutch nation. The Jew was everything the Dutch citizen was not. It was a tool to discredit the other and demarcate the boundaries of the Dutch identity. As such, Hoefnagel's portrayal of the Jews was simultaneously spurred by a deep anti-Semitic motivation and need to turn the Dutch inhabitants into moral citizens; the Jew served as a sounding board for the Dutch identity.

Notes

1. Nicolaas François Hoefnagel, *Neerlandsch Echo* (Amsterdam: F.H. Demter, 1771), i.
2. N.C.F. van Sas, *De metamorfose van Nederland: van oude orde naar moderniteit, 1750–1900* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2004), 72–4.
3. *Ibid.*, 176; Maartje Janse, *De Geest van Jan Salie: Nederland in Verval?* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2002), 30–5.
4. Ivo Nieuwenhuis, *Onder het mom van satire. Lasten, spot en ironie in Nederland 1780–1800* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2014); Janse, *De geest van Jan Salie*, 26–33.
5. Cf. P.J. Buijnsters and C.M. Geerars, "Bibliografie 18e-eeuwse satirische tijdschriften in Nederland," *Documentatieblad werkgroep 18e eeuw 2* (1969); G.J. Johannes, *Barometer van de smaak. Tijdschriften in Nederland 1770–1830* (Den Haag: SDU Uitgeverij, 1995); Rietje van Vliet ed., *Satirische tijdschriften in de achttiende eeuw* (Nijmegen: Vantilt, 2012).
6. Edwina Hagen, *Een meer of min doodlyken haat: Antipapisme en cultureel natiebeseef in Nederland rond 1800* (Nijmegen: Vantilt, 2008), 43.
7. Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989), 19, 25, 26; Boudien de Vries, "Voluntary Societies in the Netherlands, 1750–1900," in *Civil Society, Associations, and Urban Places in the Nineteenth Century Urban Place. Class, Nation and Culture in Nineteenth-century Europe*, eds. Graeme Morton, Boudien de Vries, and R.J. Morris (Aldershot: Routledge, 2006), 179–93.
8. Cf. Ton Jongenelen, "Mordechai. Illusie en werkelijkheid in het spectatoriale blad *De Koopman*," *Mededelingen van de Stichting Jacob Campo Weyerman 2* (2003); Nieuwenhuis, *Onder het mom van satire*.
9. Cf. M.J.P.M. Weijters, *Nathan en Shylock in de Lage Landen. De Jood in het werk van de Nederlandse letterkundigen uit de negentiende eeuw* (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1971), 9, 10; Jacob Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction. Anti-Semitism, 1700–1933* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980), 13–22; Marcel Poorthuis and Theo Salemink, *Een donkere spiegel. Nederlandse Katholieken over Joden, 1870–2005. Tussen antisemitisme en erkenning* (Nijmegen: Uitgeverij Valkhof Pers, 2006), 27–9. This otherness of the Jew persists in Christian Enlightenment thought. Cf. Anders Gerdmar, *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism. German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews, from Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 29–38.

10. See for an overview of Jewish stereotypes, Sander L. Gilman, *Jewish Self-Hatred: Anti-Semitism and the Hidden Language of the Jews* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986); Bernard Glassman, *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes without Jews: Images of the Jews in England, 1290–1700* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1975); Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction*.
11. Edwina Hagen, "Antikatholicisme, nationaal besef en de Nederlandse spectators, ca. 1750–1800," *De Achttiende Eeuw* (1998): 161, 162.
12. Harald Hendrix, "Vreemd volk in Holland. Xenofobie en xenofilie in historisch perspectief," in *Vreemd Volk. Beeldvorming over buitenlanders in vroegmoderne tijd* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1998), 12; Pieter R.D. Stokvis, "Nationale identiteit, beeldvorming, stereotypen en karakteristieken: Het debat over de nationale identiteit," *Theoretische Geschiedenis* 3 (1997): 279–88; Leo Lucassen, "Poepen, knoeten, mieren en moffen. Beeldvorming over Duitse immigranten en trekarbeiders in zeventiende- en achttiende-eeuwse kluchten," in *Vreemd gespuis*, eds. Jan Erik Dubbelman and Jaap Tanja (Amsterdam: Anne Frank Stichting, 1987), 37; Willem Frijhoff, "Het zelfbeeld van de Nederlander in de achttiende eeuw: een inleiding," *Documentatieblad Werkgroep 18e Eeuw* (1992): 5–28.
13. A.J. Hanou, "Een 18-eeuwse broodschrijver: Nicolaas François Hoefnagel (1735–1784) II," *Spektator* 2 ([1972] 1973): 544.
14. Tsila Rådecker, "Moses is tot [de] raad verheven'. De integratie van Amsterdamse, Rotterdamse en Haagse Joden in de 19e eeuw" 1 (2016): 24, 25; N. Randerad and D.J. Wolfram, "De Nederlandse bestuurscultuur in historisch perspectief," in *Schikken en plooiën. De stroperige staat bij nader inzien*, eds. Frank Hendriks and Theo Toonen (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1998), 40, 41.
15. I use anti-Semitism in the sense of holding prejudice or/and hostility towards the Jews as an ethnic, racial, or religious group.
16. See for a discussion of the satirical content of Jacob Campo Weyerman and the 'absence' of aggressive satire, Adele Nieuweboer, "Weyerman en de satire," *Mededelingen van de Stichting Jacob Campo Weyerman* 7 (1984): 61–63. See for a discussion of the play 'Quincampoix of de Windhandelaars' wherein the collapse of effect trade was blamed on the Jews. H. Bovenkerk, "Nederlandse schrijvers tijdens de Republiek over de Joden," in *Geschiedenis der Joden in Nederland*, eds. Hk. Brugmans and A. Frank (Amsterdam: Van Holkema en Warendorf N.V, 1940), 739, 740.
17. Rudolf Dekker, "Weyerman tussen van Overbeke en Derrida. De samenspraak tussen Kidi en Saaki," *Mededelingen van de Stichting Jacob Campo Weyerman* 20 (1997): 95, 96.
18. A.J. Hanou, "Een 18-eeuwse broodschrijver: Nicolaas Francois Hoefnagel (1735–84) I," *Spektator* 2 ([1972] 1973); Hanou, "Een 18-eeuwse broodschrijver: Nicolaas Francois Hoefnagel (1735–1784) II"; A.J. Hanou, "Bibliografie Nicolaas Hoefnagel (1735–1784)," *Documentatieblad werkgroep 18e eeuw*, 1 (1973); A.J. Hanou, "Bibliografie Nicolaas Hoefnagel (1735–1784) II," *Documentatieblad werkgroep 18e eeuw* 2 (1973).
19. Nicolaas Francois Hoefnagel, *Echte en waare verantwoording van Nicolaas Hoefnagel schrijver van de Neerlandsche Echo* (Amsterdam, 1771), 11.
20. Ariane Digna Zwiers, *Kroniek van het Jiddisj: taalkundige aspecten van achttiende-eeuws Nederlands Jiddisj* (Delft: Eburon, 2003), 470–92.
21. Nicolaas Francois Hoefnagel, *De Neerlandse Overweeger* (Amsterdam: F.H. Demter, 1770), 79, 321.
22. *Ibid.*, 278.
23. Jozeph Michman, Hartog Beem, and Dan Michman, *Pinkas. Geschiedenis van de joodse gemeenschap in Nederland* (Ede: Kluwers, 1992), 56.
24. Yosef Kaplan, "Gente Politica: The Portuguese Jews of Amsterdam Vis-à-Vis Dutch Society," in *Dutch Jews as Perceived by Themselves and by Others. Proceedings of the Eight International Symposium on the History of the Jews in the Netherlands*, eds. Chaya Brasz and Yosef Kaplan (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 28–37.
25. Pieter van Wissing, "De post naar den Neder-Rhijn: een 'mission impossible'?" in *Pers en politiek tussen 1780 en 1800. Stookschriften*, ed. Pieter van Wissing (Nijmegen: Vantilt, 2008), 48–52.
26. Nicolaas Francois Hoefnagel, *De Neerlandse Overweeger* (Amsterdam, 1770), 321.
27. *Ibid.*, 100.
28. *Ibid.*, 167.

29. Besides the mentioning of some Jewish holidays, Hoefnagel also pretends to know a great deal of the inner Jewish affairs. This is especially apparent in his biased report on the elections of a new cantor. *Ibid.*, 321–5.
30. Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction*, 13–22.
31. Hoefnagel, *De Neerlandse Overweeger*, 279. Cf. H. Bovenkerk, “Nederlandse Schrijvers tijdens de Republiek over de Joden,” in *Geschiedenis der Joden in Nederland* (Amsterdam, 1940), 744–52.
32. Hyam Maccoby, *Antisemitism and Modernity: Innovation and Continuity* (Milton Park: Routledge, 2006), 25.
33. Hoefnagel, *De Neerlandse Overweeger*, 186.
34. *Ibid.*, 146.
35. Hoefnagel likewise accuses Jewish females for their bad odor as he commonly refers to them as ‘ladies of stinky stank.’ *Ibid.*, 273. He also compares the Portuguese Jew with a pile of shit. *Ibid.*, 337–9. See for the idea of Dutch cleanliness, Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (New York: Random House, 1997), 381–8; B. V. Bavel and O. Gelderblom, “The Economic Origins of Cleanliness in the Dutch Golden Age,” *Past & Present* 1 (2009): 41–69.
36. Moors lived in Amsterdam during the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century due to the slave trade. Cf. R. Buve, “Surinaamse slaven en vrije negers in Amsterdam gedurende de achttiende eeuw,” *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde* 1 (1963): 8–17.
37. Hoefnagel, *De Neerlandse Overweeger*, 185.
38. This view of the unchangeable nature of the Jew reproduces older anti-Semitic images, especially from the Middle Ages, where the Jew was denied humanity. Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction*, 7, 19–20.
39. *Ibid.*, 13–22.
40. Hoefnagel, *De Neerlandse Overweeger*, 185.
41. *Ibid.*, 185, 186.
42. Hoefnagel probably hints at farmers who were reluctant to pay their loans back to Jewish moneylenders. Hoefnagel, *Neerlandsch Echo*, 14.
43. Cf. Alan Dundes ed., *The Blood Libel Legend: A Casebook in Anti-Semitic Folklore* (Madison, WI: UW Press, 1991).
44. Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction*, 18–20, 51, 82, 267, 285, 304, 305.
45. Hoefnagel probably referred to the apology of Isaac de Pinto (1717–1787) *Apologie pour la Nation Juive ou réflexions critiques sur le premier chapitre du VIIe tome des œuvres de Monsieur de Voltaire au sujet des juifs* (Amsterdam, 1762).
46. The Dutch word for to praise and price are one and the same. Hoefnagel, *De Neerlandse Overweeger*, 412.
47. Jews could settle in the whole of Amsterdam but they chose to live in the immediate vicinity of each other. Since the settlement of the first Sephardic Jews in the sixteenth century, the eastern area, located at the river the IJ of Amsterdam developed into a Jewish quarter.
48. Hoefnagel, *De Neerlandse Overweeger*, 413.
49. *Ibid.*, 337–9, 343.
50. Tirtsah Levie Bernfeld, *Poverty and Welfare among the Portuguese Jews in Early Modern Amsterdam* (Oxford: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2012), 76, 238, 240–2.
51. See for Braatbard: Leo Fuks, *De zeven provinciën in beroering. Hoofdstukken uit een Jiddische kroniek over de jaren 1740–1752 van Abraham Haim Braatbard* (Amsterdam: J.M. Meulenhoff), 149, 150. See for Portuguese sexual deviance: Lotte C. van de Pol, “Amsterdam Jews and Amsterdam Prostitution 1650–1750,” in *Dutch Jews as Perceived by Themselves and by Others. Proceedings of the Eight International Symposium on the History of the Jews in the Netherlands*, eds. Chaya Brasz and Yosef Kaplan (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 181; Lotte C. van de Pol, *Het Amsterdams Hoerdom. Prostitutie in de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw* (Amsterdam: Wereldbibliotheek, 1996), 134–6, 334.
52. Hoefnagel, *De Neerlandse Overweeger*, 187. See further for the connection of sexual deviance and the Jew: Sander L. Gilman, *The Jew’s Body* (New York: Routledge, 1991), 80, 112; Sander L.

Gilman, *Love + Marriage = Death: And Other Essays on Representing Difference*, Stanford Studies in Jewish History and Culture (Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Press 1998), 65–90.

53. Hoefnagel, *De Neerlandse Overweeger*, 322.

54. *Ibid.*, 323.

55. *Ibid.*, 325.

56. Cf. *Ibid.*, 189.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Note on contributor

Tsila Rädcker finished in 2015 her PhD *Making Jews Dutch. Secular Discourse and Jewish Responses 1796–1848* at the University of Groningen. She is the winner of the Hartog Beem Price for best MA thesis in 2011 and author of *Schuld en Boete in Joods Amsterdam. Kerktucht bij de Hoogduitse joodse gemeente 1737–1764*. Currently she is working on a biography of Dina Sanson, first police woman (1868–1929), which will be published in 2018 by the Amsterdam University Press. Her research interests include Dutch Jewish History, Haskalah and Social History.