



ANAIS DE HISTÓRIA DE ALÉM-MAR

Vol. X (2009)

ISSN 0874-9671 (impresso/print)

ISSN 2795-4455 (electrónico/online)

Homepage: <https://revistas.rcaap.pt/aham>

Julia Adams, The familial state. Ruling Families and merchant capitalism in Early Modern Europe, Cornell University Press, 2005, xi+ 202 pp.

Andreia Martins de Carvalho 

Como Citar | How to Cite

Carvalho, Andreia Martins de. 2009. «Julia Adams, *The familial state. Ruling Families and merchant capitalism in Early Modern Europe*, Cornell University Press, 2005, xi+ 202 pp. ». *Anais de História de Além-Mar* X: 413-417. <https://doi.org/10.57759/aham2009.37348>.

Editor | Publisher

CHAM – Centro de Humanidades | CHAM – Centre for the Humanities
Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas
Universidade NOVA de Lisboa | Universidade dos Açores
Av.^a de Berna, 26-C | 1069-061 Lisboa, Portugal
<http://www.cham.fcsh.unl.pt>

Copyright

© O(s) Autor(es), 2009. Esta é uma publicação de acesso aberto, distribuída nos termos da Licença Internacional Creative Commons Atribuição 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.pt>), que permite o uso, distribuição e reprodução sem restrições em qualquer meio, desde que o trabalho original seja devidamente citado.

© The Author(s), 2009. This is a work distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



As afirmações proferidas e os direitos de utilização das imagens são da inteira responsabilidade do(s) autor(es).
The statements made and the rights to use the images are the sole responsibility of the author(s).

No último capítulo, «Bacharéis na crise do império», analisa os momentos finais da relação colonial e como os homens de saber luso-brasileiros responderam às inquietações de seu tempo. Aos poucos, aumentava-se a percepção de que Portugal era cada vez mais dependente economicamente do Brasil e novas formas de relação entre as partes foram propostas, mas todas ainda defensoras de uma unidade imperial. Mesmo com a corte se transferindo para o Brasil esta unidade continuou a ser defendida inclusive pelos luso-brasileiros, muitos deles inseridos no corpo de magistrados. As noções da complementaridade das partes do império (sem qualquer noção de igualdade) e da «mãe metrópole» ainda marcavam boa parte dos homens de saber, mesmo que revestidas de noções modernas e de verniz liberal. A chamada elite coimbrã, hegemônica neste processo, era formada por bacharéis em leis dedicados à história natural, pois os magistrados já haviam percebido que ela era parte de uma «estratégia para se aproximar das autoridades lisboetas». (p. 285). De outro lado, os naturalistas de formação eram cada vez mais desviados para a burocracia, o que configurava a «falência do projeto científico em Portugal» (p. 287). De qualquer maneira, alguns princípios dessa ilustração marcaram as idéias de uma parte da nova elite do Brasil independente, em especial a noção de que o Estado era o instrumento por excelência para modernizar a sociedade e a economia.

O instigante trabalho de Raminelli abre inúmeras portas de entrada e, por conseguinte, permite vários debates: o papel do saber e suas relações com o poder; o caráter da ilustração em Portugal, a comunicação na sociedade do Antigo Regime, as redes do império, dentre outros. Uma primeira classificação (para usar um termo pertinente) o colocaria no rol dos trabalhos de história da ciência; entretanto, subtraindo qualquer prejuízo que uma divisão estrita entre as áreas possa acarretar, estamos mais próximos de uma história política renovada, que insere o saber na rede de relações sociais e políticas do império. O livro reflete a trajetória do autor, que principiou seus trabalhos com a história das imagens e análise de representações em relatos de viagem e crônicas coloniais, e agora dialoga com os debates sobre a natureza do império colonial, aproximando-se da história da ciência. A permear tudo isso, a clareza de que por trás do discurso há uma ordem a pautar as imagens e os textos: a ordem do discurso que se revela tanto na centralidade do governo imperial, quanto na interpretação das venturas e desventuras de homens de saber numa sociedade corporativa marcada pelo sistema de patronagem. Mais do que entender o que os autores produziram, procura saber como fizeram valer, ou não, o que produziram. Por fim, ao discutir as contradições, não de uma ciência a serviço do Estado, mas de um instrumento modernizador numa sociedade marcada pelas vicissitudes do Antigo Regime português, contribui para compreender mais um dos paradoxos no Antigo Sistema Colonial.

JOSÉ CARLOS VILARDAGA
Doutorando – USP/CNPq

Julia ADAMS, *The familial state. Ruling Families and merchant capitalism in Early Modern Europe*, Cornell University Press, 2005, xi + 202 pp.

When it comes to the history of state formation in early modern Europe, the Netherlands may seem an odd starting. However, sociologist Julia Adams obviously feels differently. This book provides an historical narrative of the economic and institutional development of the Netherlands during what has become known as the 'Dutch Golden Age'. The *Familial State* is the culmination of the author's work on the Netherlands, her first article dating back to 1994.

The book consists of an introduction and six chapters, alternating on the one hand between the Dutch case study, and the French and English case studies on the other. The comparison with England and France is twice as valid, since first, these countries are the canonical cases when it comes to studies of state formation in early modern Europe, and secondly, both of them had overseas enterprises.

Chapters 1 and 2 set the context and focus of the author's concerns, with an overarching view of the theoretical and secondary literature. Using a theoretical approach drawing mainly on Max Weber's concept of the 'patrimonial rule', Adams thinks of the early modern European states as "familial states stressing the ideal typical tie between paternal political rule and the multiple arrangements among the family heads that inhabit and shape the evolving political organizations and the economic flows they managed" (p. 4). So why use the Dutch case to develop a theory of state building in early modern Europe? She argues that the Dutch development in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries shows "a particular form of state construction and a partial collapse not well accounted for in the theoretical literature on state formation. The missing piece of the puzzle is the patrimonial institutional nexus" (p. 5). Although Adams admits that 'familial state' is a "rather abstract term" (p. 34), she argues that her definition enhances both the patriarchal notions involved in macropolitics and the practice of patrimonialism by the ruling elites. In this respect, the author expresses her distance from the feminist stricter definition of patriarchy as a form of male dominance, making it broader: "an image or ideology of paternal rule that may link familial with macropolitical, economic, or other sociocultural practices" (p. 32).

Consequently, her work focuses on the ruling elites, to which she refers during the course of the book as 'patricians', 'ruling elites', 'regent elites', 'ruling families'. However, along with the traditional and conservatist practices of these ruling elites comes "one of the most dramatic instances of state innovation in early modern Europe": "the founding of the chartered merchant and colonial companies, huge enterprises that undertook to project state sovereignty over great distances" (p. 19). In my opinion, this is the most interesting element of the book, since the chartered companies are "sovereign actors in their own right" (p. 19). Therefore, they are an element of the patrimonial state, and more importantly, the companies act "as a generative, not merely reflective, [actors] of state formation in Europe, via the conjoined mechanisms of trade and empire" (p. 21).

What are the "familial and gender-specific features of patrimonial politics" in the Netherlands (p. 29)? Chapter 3 shows how the tripartite connection between a "merchant capitalist class, an estatist state, and the elite patriarchal families" (p. 77) was a key element in the development of the Dutch republic during the Golden Age. Through venality and nepotism, the merchant capitalists, especially in Amsterdam, positioned themselves not only in the city's government, but also in the leading chartered companies, blending local government with overseas trade and constituting a "merchant-regent elite" (p. 80). Their actions were aimed at creating and safeguarding their local positions of power, their "local genealogies of office" (p. 5). Family and kinship were at the core of the concerns of the Dutch ruling elites and their practices had "important macrolevel political consequences" (p. 77). These practices were also extended to the offices of the chartered companies (p. 81). As an example, Adams mentions the Bicker-de Graeft clique, which dominated Amsterdam (the City's Council and their VOC representatives) during the 1620's. By their collective action they can be compared to the Italian medieval oligarchies, which for Adams shows that "the Dutch state was not 'the first modern state' – and its creaky antiquity was one secret of its success in the seventeenth century" (p. 104).

Chapter 4 gives us a comparative analysis of France and England during the seventeenth century. In the French case, she calls Colbert's action to dominate the French trading overseas companies a 'fatal misstep', but I would argue, one action that makes

sense. The lack of an independent and strong group of private merchants contributed to the actions by the French Crown to monopolize these enterprises. Faced with similar problems, the English opted for a different strategy.

In contrast to the French situation, the English traders successfully prevented the crown from investing money in their East India Company (EIC) venture. In England their success allowed them to take over the tax collection, i.e., the major source of crown revenue and become the major financiers of the English monarchs. Faced with competition by other private traders regarding the monopoly, the EIC unexpectedly did not succeed in gaining much support from the Stuarts and Hanoverians. Adams argues that the lack of direct investment in the overseas trade by the crown was because, unlike the Dutch, they had other available resources to hand, both material and political. Additionally, the English merchants were not a homogenous group and that also impeded their ascendancy and their claims for office-holding and privilege.

In chapter 5 Adams returns to analyze the decline of the Netherlands predominance in the European political and economical context. Here she successfully argues that the character of the Dutch governance, which had made their success, also carried the seeds of their decline. The integration of the merchant elite with the provincial government meant that their main concern was the maintenance of their positions within a local and provincial position. The *contracten van correspondentie*, which “formalized the distribution of city offices in written succession rules” (p. 148) embodied this predicament. Merchant capitalists had become state rentiers: “of the twenty-four new burgomasters in Amsterdam during 1718-1748, only two were active merchants” and the same pattern occurred with the VOC (p. 150). Faced with strong competition by their European counterparts, the regents and the VOC failed to overcome the stagnation of the economy, which “was unusually dependent on international markets” (p. 140). The wave of mercantilism and the rise of conflicts that spread throughout Europe only made matters worse. The lack of a central structure of government and the competition between provinces led to their inability to successfully collect taxes incapacity; this had a heavy toll on the Dutch finances and on the maintenance of the Dutch navy.

In the final chapter Adams goes on to examine what was happening in France and England during the “enigmatic Eighteenth century” (p. 164), which eventually led to the rise of England as the first truly modern state. In England, the central government used the overseas traders resourcefulness, in a movement that mirrored that of the Netherlands a century earlier. The EIC also controlled London’s government through the Aldermanic Court (City Council) and it was well represented in the House of Commons. In 1720, the overseas trading companies held more than a third of the Crown’s debt. What is crucial is the outcome of this process: “in a dramatic turn of events, the metropolitan state began to assert power over the EIC, and in the heat of the struggle the concept and practice of sovereign rule was reformed” (p. 190). The debate carried the spectre of absolutism in a country where it had been continuously rejected, which supports Adams’ claim that the EIC “played a transitional corporate role” (p. 179). The India Act (1784) is a landmark not only in terms of the history of the British Empire but also in the development of a national civil service. What Adams argues is that the English ruling elite welcomed this move as a way of promoting the sovereignty of the state – which, it should be stressed, did not endanger their own position.

On the continent, the Bourbon dynasty was in much deeper troubles. Independent merchants in France benefited the most from the demise of the latest version of the *Compagnie des Indes*, and especially the slave traders, who had the most to gain from the end of the ‘patrimonial companies’ and their monopolies. But again, the capital gained from the independent traders flowed back into securing local offices and state bonds, a familiar and

traditional investment. This is indeed a type of patrimonial behaviour that would persist. The lack of choices and alternatives by the French state caused it to reinstate the monopolies in 1785 just before the French revolution, “confirming the association of France’s privileged overseas traders with the increasingly beleaguered monarchy” (pp. 189-190).

Throughout the book, Adams shows how “the organization of Dutch governance also contributed to the decline of the Netherlands’ state and empire. Family investments in politico-economic privilege fostered Dutch federalism and weakened the navy and empire, even as elite family heads devised deals that enabled them to hold on to the patrimonial state as an intergenerational patriarchal preserve” (p. 197). Adams rightly claims that forms of patrimonial rule should also be taken into account when dealing with theories of state formation, more specifically regrading theories on the rise of the European modern state, which have traditionally given emphasis to war and empire building (following the works by Tilly and Wallerstein).

Although the author is armed with an extensive knowledge of secondary literature, which is well used throughout the book, there are a few areas which seem neglected. Generally, Adams seems more at ease with English research and with English history. A few works on the development of state institutions in southern Europe are missing and, surprisingly, more recent studies on French history of the *Ancien Régime*: one thinks of works by Dewald, Descimon, Nassiet, etc. Also, the collective volume edited by Reinhard, *Power elites and state building*, based on the trans-national project on State Formation run by the European Science Foundation, should definitely have been included. Again, for the Italian context, there are a few studies that would have enriched the patrimonial rule argument – namely the book published in 1985 by Daniela Frigo: *Il padre di famiglia: governo della casa e governo civile nella tradizione dell’economica tracinque e seicento*. Even if they are not the focus of her book, a few titles are also missing when it comes to studies on the Iberian Empires, which probably has to do with the scarcity of English bibliography on the subject; while acknowledging Boxer’s classic *The Dutch Seaborne Empire*, she fails to include Boxer’s works on the Portuguese Empire.

If one works in early modern European history the processes described here seem almost too familiar. It is interesting to see how movements that initiated in the sixteenth century have their expressions in the *longue durée* – sometimes the obvious needs to be restated and re-contextualized in a broader perspective. Adams states from the beginning that this is a “macrohistorical work” (p. 10) written as a “historical narrative” (p. 7). However, as a social scientist, she can’t help but to try to use a “systematic and structuralist” approach (p. 11). This is both the book’s strength and its weakness. At several stages you wish that she presented more data to sustain her claims – since it seems clear that there is a great deal amount of theoretical and empirical research behind it. On the other hand, it is precisely the combination of the two – theoretical framework and empirical analysis – that constitutes the book’s greatest strength.

Julia Adams embarked upon an difficult task and she did it within 200 pages. Although I may be in the minority when it comes to the historians’ stance (see Boettcher’s review), I think that any quibbles by no means diminish her endeavour. It is stimulating to see how similar concerns can arise across disciplines. Historians of early modern Europe may benefit from this kind of approach and a comparison between the Iberian Empires would be a worthwhile project. This book could have an impact on the more recent developments on Iberian historiography, namely the relationship between the centre and the peripheries and the impact of the latter on the centre. Issues regarding the development of central and imperial institutions and of concepts of sovereignty are central to the debate. *The Familial State* certainly makes a valuable contribution and presents an excellent opportunity for a lively and engaging debate between sociologists, historians, scholars of state and empire building alike.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Julia ADAMS, "The Familial state: elite family practices and state-making in the early modern Netherlands", *Theory and Society*, Vol. 23 (1994), pp. 505-39.
- Julia ADAMS, "Trading states, trading places: the role of patrimonialism in early modern Dutch development", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 36 (1994), pp. 319-55.
- Susan BOETTCHER, review of Julia Adams, *The Familial State: Ruling Families and Merchant Capitalism in Early Modern Europe*, review published by H-Low-Countries@h-net.msu.edu (November, 2007).

ANDREIA MARTINS DE CARVALHO

Doutoranda do King's College London - University of London;
membro do Centro de História de Além-Mar

Juliana G. MEIRELLES, *Imprensa e poder na corte joanina: a Gazeta do Rio de Janeiro (1808-1821)*, Rio de Janeiro: Arquivo Nacional, 2008, 252 pp.

A obra de Juliana Gesuelli Meirelles resultou de pesquisa de mestrado desenvolvida de 2003 a 2005 no Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas da Unicamp, sob orientação de Leila Mezan Algranti. A autora é graduada em Jornalismo pela PUC de Campinas, bacharel e mestre em História pela Unicamp e, atualmente, é doutoranda em história cultural na mesma universidade. A dissertação que originou a obra – *A Gazeta do Rio de Janeiro e o impacto na circulação de idéias no Império luso-brasileiro (1808-1821)* – foi vencedora do prêmio «D. João VI de pesquisa – 2007» promovido pela Comissão Luso-Brasileira para a Salvaguarda e Divulgação do Patrimônio Documental (COLUSO) em parceria com a Universidade de Coimbra e com a Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro.

Periódico oficial da Corte portuguesa sediada na América, a *Gazeta do Rio de Janeiro* circulou entre 10 de setembro de 1808 e 31 de dezembro de 1822, tendo seu nome alterado para *Gazeta do Rio* a partir de janeiro de 1822. Era de propriedade dos oficiais da Secretaria de Estado dos Negócios Estrangeiros e da Guerra, contando, ao longo de sua existência, com três redatores: frei Tibúrcio José da Rocha, de 1808 a 1812; Manuel Ferreira de Araújo Guimarães, de 1813 a agosto de 1821; e Francisco Vieira Goulart, até 1822. Juliana Meirelles dedica-se a analisar o papel desempenhado pela *Gazeta do Rio de Janeiro* nos momentos finais de vigência, na América, daquilo que muitos historiadores chamariam de «absolutismo português». Sobre esse aspecto, procura verificar a qual tradição de imprensa a *Gazeta* estava vinculada para melhor definição de suas origens, usos sociais e sentidos históricos. Seu objetivo principal é compreender as dimensões da concepção jornalística da *Gazeta do Rio de Janeiro*, tomada como o marco da introdução da imprensa no Brasil. Resultado do viés interdisciplinar empreendido pela historiadora, essa abordagem é a grande originalidade da obra.

Na introdução, apresenta as produções historiográficas internacionais com as quais dialoga (José Tengarrinha, Robert Darnton, Daniel Roche e Lúcia Garcia Pallares Burke) para, em seguida, realizar um breve panorama da historiografia nacional sobre a introdução da imprensa no Brasil. A partir da delimitação de lacunas na historiografia nacional, apresenta os objetivos de sua obra. Recusa o esclarecimento, usual em trabalhos acadêmicos, sobre seus métodos de análise das fontes, justificativa do recorte temporal e categorias de análise utilizadas, deixando a cargo do leitor, no decorrer da leitura, a compreensão de suas escolhas.