Since the publication of our Scriveriana I on *Two history books that never appeared* (Quaerendo, 27 (1997), pp. 77-112), it has been rather quiet around one of the most versatile personages in the intellectual environment of Holland in the Golden Age. And yet in the meantime quite a bit of new material has been presented, albeit from a different angle. J.W.J. Burgers published a voluminous study entitled *De Rijkcroniek van Holland en zijn auteurs*, Hilversum 1999, on the chronicle of Melis Stoke (first version *ca.* 1305), which includes his narrative of the assassination of Count Floris V of Holland (1254-1296). Other publications also touched upon Scriverius' activities regarding Stoke and the Counts of Holland, which we had discussed. The greater part of these activities was either entirely unknown, or else their true extent and implications were not yet really clear on the basis of the scant information available. Our own discoveries, then, were mainly based on new findings and documents derived from the Van Hoogstraten family archives, which have lately passed into the ownership of the ‘Stichting Familie van Hoogstraten’. As a result of the most recent literature and some of the feedback received after the publication of *Scriveriana I*, our conclusions and assumptions can – and must – be supplemented or corrected.

But before rounding off our research into Scriverius' Stoke studies in a 'Postscript', we should like to offer a first response to the recently published dissertation by Sandra Langereis, *Geschiedenis als ambacht. Oudheidkunde in de Gouden Eeuw: Arnoldus Buchelius en Petrus Scriverius* [History as a Craft. Antiquarian Studies in the Golden Age: Arnoldus Buchelius and Petrus Scriverius] (Hilversum 2001). It is only natural and right that the chapters dealing with Scriverius give generous attention to historiographical activities of his which were also subject of discussion in *Scriveriana I*. Where Langereis provides her own account of these activities she failed, however, to inform her readers that we have already discussed these activities in great detail in 1997.

Unfortunately, Scriverius is here once again discussed as an antiquarian only.
So as not to raise the incorrect impression that his only, or at least his major historical significance lies in the field of early Dutch history, it is good to recall the diversity of areas in which Scriverius moved. In fact, it took especially the modern historians a long time to award Scriverius the recognition and attention he deserves. He himself is partly to blame, because he occupied himself with so many other matters besides our national history from the Roman Age onwards. His effort to replace the dubious and partly mythical medieval chronicles and narratives with a critical historiography based on source studies was intended as a contribution towards establishing a cultural identity for the Dutch Republic, and especially the province of Holland within it, so that it might be able to rank equal with France and England, even with ancient Rome.

However, more was needed to make this a successful pursuit besides a history cleansed of fantastic fables. Holland at the same time had to remain competitive in the international Latin repubica litteraria in the field of learned studies, and develop in addition to its acknowledged niche in Neo-Latin poetry a vernacular literature respectable also according to humanist norms. Because of his diverse activities in all of these fields – and not only in these – Scriverius in a sense was the first to envisage with his work a coherent and clearly non-confessional cultural policy for the Republic, a policy which at the same time was not subordinated to the scrutiny of some sort of official state church. Although he himself usually remained more or less in the background, veiled somewhat either by a pseudonym or as the commentator of work by another author, Scriverius in many areas played an important, sometimes even decisive role.

His versatility causes his name to crop up in some context or other in almost any larger study on the cultural and scholarly life in the first half of the seventeenth century: in classical philology, in Dutch literary history, in the history of printing as the champion of Laurens Janszoon Coster, in the history of the furtherance of Dutch as a language of culture, and also in the story of the incisive political changes of August 1618 and the related imprisonment of Hugo Grotius and others.

On the part of the historians, Hugenholtz in 1986 was the first to have pointed out Scriverius’ significance for Dutch medieval historiography. In his analysis of

4 Cf. Hugenholtz’ remark as quoted in Scriveriana I, p. 78 and n. 5.
6 See the section on ‘Literary Politics’, pp. 13-20 (with pp. 36-45) in my article of 1977 mentioned in n. 5 above. In this article, the first general survey of Scriverius’ activity for more than a century (1874), I have tried to release him from the shadows and give him more prominence as a patron of a national culture.
7 In Gary Schwartz, Rembrandt (Maarssen 1984), Scriverius is even awarded an important role as someone who commissioned work from Rembrandt and later became a lifelong patron – without a shred of evidence for that matter.