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A Syrian ready to perish was my father...

Deuteronomy 26:5

When you look at the world is there a point in time when the seen becomes the remembered? How are they separate? It is that which we have no way to show. It is that which is missing from our map and from the picture that it makes. And yet it is all we have.

Cormac McCarthy, Cities of the Plain
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Introduction

The revelation of the past

In 1725, Johannes Lehnemann, elder of the Netherlandish congregation of the Augsburg Confession in Frankfurt, wrote a history of his congregation in the city of Antwerp from where his Lutheran ancestors had migrated 140 years earlier. In this work, titled Historische Nachricht, he described the establishment of the Lutheran congregation in early sixteenth-century Antwerp, its persecution by the Catholic Habsburg authorities and the migration of its members to Frankfurt in 1585. In that year Antwerp, which had been ruled by a Calvinist-dominated magistrate for almost seven years, was taken over by Habsburg forces after a long siege, and all dissenters, Reformed, Lutherans and Mennonites, were forced either to leave within four years or to convert to Catholicism if they wished to stay. The Habsburg takeover of Antwerp and many other rebel towns in the Southern Low Countries led to a mass exodus of Protestants to the Dutch Republic, the Holy Roman Empire and England.

In May 1585, three months before the city surrendered to its besiegers, a group of Antwerp Lutherans, among whom the converted Sephardi minister Cassiodorus da Reina, founded their own congregation in Frankfurt.

The refugee past of the Netherlandish Lutheran Church was essential to Lehnemann; he regarded it of crucial importance for the religious identity of his coreligionists and not only those of his own congregation. What the history of persecution and affliction revealed to him was the very nature of this world in regard to the followers of Christ, who would always be strangers on earth and subject to the attacks of the ungodly. Recalling the martyrdom of his ancestor Schobland Bartels,

1 Johannes Lehnemann, Historische Nachricht von der vormahls im sechzehnen Jahrhundert berühmten evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche in Antorff: und der daraus entstandenen niederländischen Gemeinde Augspurgischer Confession in Frankfurth am Mayn, Frankfurt a.M. 1725. The office of elder, which represented a typical Reformed institution, was exceptional in Lutheran churches, and the Netherlandish Church of the Augsburg Confession in Frankfurt was one of the few congregations with both elders and deacons. Members of the Lehnemann family served their congregation in these functions from 1644 until 1762. (Institut für Stadtgeschichte Frankfurt am Main, Niederl. Gemeinde Augs. Confession I, inv.nr. 1004).
2 See e.g.: Gustaaf Asaert, 1585. De val van Antwerpen en de uittocht van Vlaamlingen en Brabanders, Tielt 2004, pp. 33ff.
3 The Netherlandish congregation of the Augsburg Confession in Frankfurt was in fact never recognized as an independent congregation, but was part of the Lutheran Church of Frankfurt. In 1593 the Antwerp migrants were allowed to hold their own church services, led by Cassiodorus da Reina and Anton Serarius, a French Lutheran from Montbéliard. (Lehnemann, Historische Nachricht, p. 163).
who was burned at the stake in Antwerp in 1568, Lehnemann used the past to remind his fellow believers that the struggle was still going on.\(^4\) While in the present everything seemed to be safe, Satan was in fact still raging against the godly and would unleash new bloody persecutions in the present and future unless the hand of God prevented him from doing so.\(^5\) In its apocalyptic visions the past allowed a glimpse into the eschatological nature of the Christians’ position in a hostile world: until the fulfillment of all things, believers would always have to suffer hostility and persecution. In order for people to become aware of this fact the past needed to be remembered and used as a mirror for those living in the present – the history of the forefathers was not dead but revealed what was yet to come. As Lehnemann asked his readers:

> But who would want to doubt that the sufferings and severe examinations of faith, that were suffered by them (the martyrs of Antwerp), could not also be ordained by God to be suffered by us and our descendants? For Babylon is still drunk on the saints’ blood but not yet satisfied, and she still desires that those who refuse to worship the idol of the beast might be killed unless a higher power prevent it. Whenever one is most unaware of danger that can be the time when the believers need to be consoled and encouraged.\(^6\)

It is unknown how Lehnemann reacted to the mass expulsion of Lutherans from Salzburg in 1731 six years after the publication of his *Historische Nachricht*, but his apocalyptic framing of the history of his own congregation suggests that he found his concerns about the future confirmed by this last great mass migration of Protestants in early modern Europe. Obviously, the members of his congregation saw the exile past of their ancestors mirrored in the present situation of the persecuted Salzburgers, and in 1733, they held collections to assist their exiled

\(^4\) Schobland Bartels was in fact not a direct ancestor of Lehnemann but an uncle of his grandmother. Not only Lehnemann, but also his wife Rebecca von Heyden descended from the Bartels family.  
\(^6\) ‘Nun wer wolte zweiflen, daß die Leiden und schwere Glaubens=Prüffungen, so über jene kommen waren, aus Gottes Verhängniß nicht auch solten ihren Nachkommen begnen können? Denn Babel ist wohl truncken vom Blut der Heiligen, aber noch nicht gesättiget, und machte gern, daß, welche nicht des Thiers Bild anbeten, ertödet würden, wo es eine höhere Hand nicht daran verhinderte. Wenn man sich am wenigsten versiehet, so kan die Zeit am nechsten seyn, in welcher man den Glaubigen [sic] zu ihrem Trost und Aufmunterung im Leiden muß zuruffen.’ (Ibid., ‘Zuschrift’ [unpaginated foreword]).
Austrian coreligionists. In the seventeenth century the Netherlandish Lutheran congregation of Frankfurt already served as place of refuge for Lutheran believers who had fled their Catholic home territories. During the Thirty Years’ War ministers from re-catholicized parts of the Holy Roman Empire fled to Frankfurt and received assistance from the Netherlandish Lutherans, who still cultivated their identity as religious refugees. This tradition of charity for persecuted coreligionists was continued until the mid-eighteenth century when Lutheran clerics who had been expelled because of their attempts to proselytize in Catholic territories were welcomed into the congregation and supported by its relief fund. While the early modern culture of martyrdom had deep roots in all Christian confessions, not only martyrs but also exiles had their place in the confessional memory canons. In Lehnemann’s narrative the exiled forefathers are celebrated as exemplary Christians who should be imitated by their descendants. As Lehnemann argues, not only the martyrs needed to be commemorated but also those ‘who in all kinds of afflictions consequently confessed the name of Jesus, and therefore left their fatherland, their possessions and goods, rather than to deny it.’ The moral example of the exiled forefathers should be cherished among the members of the congregation since they taught contemporaries about the sacrifices which religious steadfastness could demand.

Lehnemann’s historical account was situated in, and at the same time performed, a culture of exile that shaped the religious identity of his Lutheran congregation. However, even though the congregation positioned itself in a history of suffering and victimhood and cultivated its exile past, Lehnemann lamented that not much of the Netherlandish origins of the Antwerp Lutherans was preserved in Frankfurt. While church services in French continued, the Dutch language had been

---

7 Institut für Stadtgeschichte Frankfurt am Main, Niederl. Gemeinde Augs. Confession I, inv.nr. 890, fol. 365.
9 The most famous case was the admittance of the minister Johann Philipp Fresenius in 1752, who was forced to flee several times in his life because of his polemic pamphlets against Jesuits and the conversion of Catholics (Institut für Stadtgeschichte Frankfurt am Main, Niederl. Gemeinde Augs. Confession I, inv.nr. 1.027).
11 ‘[…] die Bekenner aber, welche unter allerley Drangsauben den Namen Jesu beständig bekennen, und lieber ihr Vatterland, Haab und Gut, ja das Leben selbst verlassen haben, als solchen zu verleugnen wollen.’ (Ibid.).
given up for the similar German in 1636, and many church members belonged to the well-established elite of Frankfurt. In order to remember their Netherlandish past, Lehnemann recommended that his coreligionists study the original sources of the congregation:

From those we can learn about some of the old Netherlandish families, who have been forgotten by many due to the length of time and the changing customs. For the Netherlanders in this town clung to their mother tongue, their native manners of food and clothing and other customs for a long time, through which they could easily be distinguished from other burghers and inhabitants. Yet, by and by, they gradually adopted German customs and lost those of their homeland.\footnote{‘Woraus man unterschiedene von den alten Niederländischen Familien erkennen lernet, welche bey vielen durch die Länge der Zeit und Veränderung der Sitten ins Vergessen kommen sind. Denn die Niederländer hatten lange Zeit in dieser Stadt ihre Landes=Sprach, Manier in Speiß und Kleidung und anderen Gebräuchen gehalten, durch welche man sie leicht von den andern Burgern und Einwohnern hat unterscheiden können, welches aber alles nach und nach abkommen, und in die hiesige Teutsche Manieren verändert worden ist.’ (Lehnemann, \textit{Historische Nachricht}, p. 121).}

While the congregation continued to hold an annual commemorative service in which the fate of the exiled ancestors was remembered, the cultural identity of the Netherlandish Church of the Augsburg Confession’s members was hardly distinguishable from that of their German Lutheran neighbors. Their descent from persecuted Christians remained an important part of their religious identity, but the mother tongue and the local Antwerp customs of their ancestors increasingly belonged to the past.

While the preservation of memories of persecution and migration persisted longer in the Netherlandish Church of the Augsburg Confession than in many other Netherlandish ‘stranger’ congregations in Germany, England and the Dutch Republic, it was in itself not exceptional. The Dutch Revolt (ca. 1572-1648) and the religious persecutions preceding it had not only led to one of the earliest and largest mass migrations in early modern Europe but also to a memory culture that surpassed the boundaries of the Low Countries and informed the various memory canons of transnational Post-Reformation Protestantism. The persecution of dissenting believers in the Low Countries by the courts of the Habsburg regime and later the devastating acts of war had forced between sixty thousand and one hundred thousand people into exile, most of whom fled to the Northern Netherlands, to
England and the coastal and western parts of the Holy Roman Empire. These migrants formed long-lasting and close-knit diasporic networks, which, as this study will show, continued to exist for at least 150 years and were bound together by shared memories of war and persecution as well as the consciousness of a common origin. This diaspora represented new social identities and generated religious and political discourses that were often adopted by groups and individuals outside the actual migrant communities. The historical narrative of religious persecution, martyrdom and exile became a constitutive element in the national and transnational memory cultures of European and American Protestantism and is in fact still disseminated today. While such memories were strongly fueled by later migration movements, such as the exodus of Huguenots from France after 1685 and the expulsion of Lutherans from Salzburg after 1731, the mass migration during the Dutch Revolt, along with the experiences of the English Marian exiles in the mid-sixteenth century, laid a foundation for the grand narrative of persecution and exile for the sake of the Protestant faith.

While the various ways in which memories of persecution and expulsion were cultivated in the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth-century Huguenot diaspora have been well studied, little is known about the discourses and memories that preceded and ‘pre-mediated’ the canonical narrative of French diasporic Protestantism. Among those earlier exile narratives those of the migration from the Low Countries.

---


Low Countries and the sixteenth century wars of religion in France, which belonged to the canon of Huguenot memory, were the most iconic. Not only did the Huguenot diaspora incorporate memories of Netherlandish exiled Protestants, but it even experienced an institutional symbiosis with the French-speaking Netherlandish stranger churches in the Dutch Republic, England and the Holy Roman Empire. The Walloon Reformed Churches in Holland, Zeeland and other Northern Netherlandish provinces, as well as the French Reformed congregations in London, Frankfurt and other important exile towns of Netherlandish refugees were originally formed by fugitives from the Low Countries but eventually became populated by Huguenots from France, who after 1685 often outnumbered the migrants of Dutch origin. These new members of the stranger churches inscribed their own memories into the historical narrative of the already-existing Protestant diaspora.

The aim of this study is to examine the memory cultures of the diaspora of migrants from the Low Countries, who left during the Dutch Revolt and the organized persecution of Protestants and dissenters preceding it, and to explore the functions and meanings of the commemorated past in different social, religious and political contexts. The appeal of the refugee history of their ancestors and the identification with earlier persecution that was displayed by individuals like Lehnemann, who had more local than migrant ancestors, is remarkable. At first sight, to fashion oneself as a stranger and one’s religious congregation as a minority group should have been a rather unattractive option in early modern European societies, which relied on local networks of trust in which newcomers and aliens often occupied a difficult social position. Urban government was typically reserved for old-established oligarchies, and descent from local families was often a prerequisite for political and social participation in guilds and other corporate bodies. Yet, at the same time discourses of foreignness and alterity were vivid, and not only in religious contexts. In particular, those individuals and families with an exile background who were rather well assimilated in their new host societies strongly proclaimed their refugee identity and seemingly could benefit from doing so. Apparently, belonging to a minority with a refugee past could give individuals

and families but also institutions, such as the Dutch stranger churches in the North Sea and Rhine regions, a special status. The nature of this status and the changing functions of the disseminated exile identities demand an analysis that takes into consideration the specific political and religious circumstances in the various new hometowns of the refugees and their descendants. Yet, side by side with this rather local approach, the transnational and transregional component of the memory cultures of religious persecution and exile require a thorough analysis. Therefore, this study will also explore the ways in which the international diasporic networks were shaped and constituted by memories and a common sense of the past. While the various local stranger communities and churches in the cities of the Dutch Republic, England and Germany have already been studied as units, the question of how all these local communities were connected to each other and preserved a sense of belonging to a wider and transnational network has been addressed only quite recently. In particular, the more recent work of Ole Peter Grell has reminded us of the fact that the individual Reformed stranger churches did not see themselves as individual entities but as part of an international diaspora of ‘brethren of Christ’. According to Grell, the transnational networks of Calvinist exiles and their descendants

---

16 Surprisingly few studies have systemically examined the interactions between the Netherlandish migrants and the inhabitants of their host societies. The two most notable exceptions are: Heinz Schilling, Niederländische Exulanten im 16. Jahrhundert: ihre Stellung im Sozialgefüge und im religiösen Leben deutscher und englischer Städte, Gütersloh 1972 and Jesse Spohnholz, The Tactics of Toleration. A Refugee Community in the Age of Religious Wars, Newark/Delaware 2011.


persisted over three generations and were held together by shared religious views as well as mutual bounds of trust that were particularly important for the merchants among the migrants. These observations are of crucial value for further research and allow for a better understanding of the various migrant communities as parts of wider networks that spanned from Central Europe to the North Sea and Baltic coasts and the British Isles. Yet the question arises: how was the shared sense of belonging together, including in terms of religion, preserved among these networks over generations? This question becomes even more pertinent when we look beyond the three generations studied by Grell, who assumes that between 1650 and 1660, the descendants of the migrants ceased to feel ‘part of the international brotherhood in Christ’ and ‘came to see themselves as primarily Swiss, German, Dutch or English Protestants’.19 This view contains some inherent problems. The identification of groups and individuals with the transnational diaspora and its past lasted considerably longer than postulated by Grell, as will be demonstrated in this study. Even more problematic is the definition of diaspora on which Grell’s study relies, which assumes that the identification with the new home society put an end to the sense of diasporic belonging of the migrants.

The assumption of a historical watershed dividing first- and second-generation migrants who saw themselves as foreigners and their descendants who were primarily ‘German, Dutch or English Protestants’ overlooks the complex dynamics of migrant identities in a world before the emergence of modern nation states. As we will see, many migrants of the first generation seem to have been silent about their past and did their best to become part of their home societies, while it was actually only in the following generations that the refugee past of the ancestors was addressed and more actively cultivated.20 This pattern does not imply that migrants of later generations did not fully identify with their new Dutch, English or German host societies but rather that this behavior coexisted with their sense of belonging to the transnational diaspora and their allegiances to a wider ‘imagined community’ that united them with other refugees abroad. In achieving a better understanding of these processes of identification the field of cultural memory studies can be of great help and can overcome static notions of diasporic identities.

19 Grell, Brethren in Christ, p. 301.
20 See chapter 4 of this book.
that rely on the logic of belonging either to the new host society or the lost homeland.

Memories and the continuation of the diaspora

In the definition of William Safran one of the key characteristics of a transnational diaspora is collectively shared memories of a real or mythical land of origin and its history.\(^{21}\) The idea of a shared descent constitutes the diaspora and allows for its continuation. Migration scholar Ann Marie Fortier goes further and posits memory as the very core of a diaspora and the identification of its members with a greater imagined group: ‘How are diasporic populations constructed? Memory, rather than territory, is the principal ground of identity formation in diaspora cultures, where territory is de-centred and exploded into multiple settings.’\(^{22}\) While in most cases an imagined territory which is regarded as an original homeland is crucial to the continuation of diasporas, their very life consists of the preservation of the past. Without the notion of common history and identity grounded in the past diasporas cease to exist, and their former members silently become part of their respective host societies without the translocal and transnational linkages to other migrant groups abroad. In other words: diasporas are constituted by and end with their memories. All the customs, habits and beliefs that are handed down by the diaspora members to succeeding generations are part of a preserved and reconstructed image of the past.

Many studies on migrant communities and networks have asked how long migrants and their descendants continue to identify with a greater transnational diaspora, and at what point they start to integrate into their host societies and forget about their migration past.\(^{23}\) Such studies often depart from dichotomous notions

\(^{21}\) William Safran, ‘Diasporas in Modern Societies. Myths of Homeland and Return’, in: Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies vol. 1, nr. 1 (spring 1991), pp. 83-99. In Safran’s earlier work, the wish to return to the original homeland was strongly pronounced and even proclaimed as an essential characteristic of a diaspora. In the case of the Southern Netherlands refugees studied in this book, the wish to return to Flanders and Brabant was cherished only until the period of the Twelve Years’ Truce (1609-1621). In his more recent work, Safran turned to the more flexible and open concept of the ‘homeland’, which does not necessarily have to coincide with a real geographical region but can also refer to a more imaginary ‘home’. See: Safran, W. (2009), ‘The diaspora and the homeland: Reciprocities, transformations, and role reversals’, in: Eliezer Ben-Rafael and Yitzhak Sternberg (eds), Transnationalism. Diasporas and the Advent of a New (Dis)order, Leiden 2009, pp. 75-100.


\(^{23}\) In the case of the early modern Calvinist diaspora, see e.g.: Grell, Brethren in Christ; Grell, ‘The Creation of a Transnational, Calvinist Network’; Ni ek Al and Clé Lesger, ‘Twee volken besloten binnen
that assume fundamental distinction between a ‘here’ and a ‘there’ and a monolithic and stable concept of a homeland that is opposed to the new host society. When we look at the memories and identity constructions that are transmitted within a diaspora, the problems of such an approach become visible. Not only is the memory of the homeland highly flexible and subject to changes of perspective in each new generation, but from the earliest recollections onwards it is always a highly imaginary place. Its very being is already adjusted not only by looking back in time but also by a re-imagination from abroad. The continuity between the place of origin and its commemoration in the diaspora is not linear, and the opposition between homeland and the new host society is not a mere given but in first instance a reproduction of the specific circumstances in which migrants live among their new neighbors. Looking for a point in which the memory of the homeland is abandoned to make way for full integration into a new society relies on a rather mechanical and essentialist understanding of what a diaspora is and on what Rogers Brubaker has criticized as ‘groupism’, or the ‘tendency to take sharply bounded putatively homogenous groups as basic constituents of social life, chief protagonists of social conflict, and fundamental units of social analysis.’

To overcome such notions, which have often clouded the analytical clarity of a wide range of migration research, this study will depart from a different notion of diaspora. My starting point is that individuals are not merely born into a stable migrant community that shapes all aspects of their lives but always have to negotiate and re-imagine their migrant identities and thereby continually reinvent the existing diaspora. To employ the famous definition by Stuart Hall, their cultural identity is ‘not an essence but a positioning’. Being part of a diaspora is not an allegiance that

---

is simply inherited and continued but depends on a production and reproduction of identities, which at the same time are subject to continuous ‘transformation and difference’. According to Hall, this reproduction of identity depends on a recollection of the past, but at the same time ‘telling’ the past is always a ‘re-telling’ that changes the transmitted narratives and memories.27

Thus diasporas are subject to continuous change not only in their collective narratives but also in function. The various aspects of individuals’ lives that are shaped by diasporic identifications vary not only between generations but also between social strata as well as different expectations of the various migrants’ futures. While endogamy, for example, can be an essential characteristic of a diaspora, especially in its early stages when the expectation to return ‘home’ is still realistic, intermarrying with natives of the new host society does not necessarily inhibit the continuation of diasporic remembering. Among the migrant families studied in this book, those who soon struck roots in their new homes and married into local circles often fashioned their exile identities far more explicitly than those who practiced endogamy for generations.28 At the same time, individuals with strong ties to their former home societies often did not articulate memories of their life before their migration and seem to have been incorporated into their new hometowns rather easily. These observations require an explanation, and at the same time they already have some important a priori methodological implications: what they show is that diasporas are neither all-encompassing entities that determine each part of a migrant’s life nor monolithic ethno-demographical facts that can be extracted from sets of data on marriage patterns or social and economic behavior. Instead, I propose to conceive of diasporas as horizons of belonging and identification which may be expressed only occasionally and do not have to conflict with the loyalties migrants feel towards the communities where they reside.29 To understand how and in which contexts migrant identities and memories shaped the

27 Ibid., pp. 234, 222.
28 See e.g. the Martens and Van Panhuys families described in chapter 4 of this book.
29 This understanding of diaspora is related to that of Rogers Brubaker, who conceives of the concept of diaspora as ‘a category of practice, which is used to make claims, to articulate projects, to formulate expectations, to mobilize energies, to appeal to loyalties’. Brubaker, however, goes even further and proposes to abandon the notion of ‘a diaspora’ and rather speak of ‘diasporic stances, projects, claims, idioms, practices, and so on’.
lives of individuals in their new host societies we will have to explore the various meanings of the transmitted exile memories and the discourses in which they could be articulated and integrated into historical narratives of the migrants’ neighbors.

As the perceived and lived connections between dispersed populations, diasporas rely for a great part on narrative structures and motifs which construe the bonds and ties between the various groups in their new host societies. Literary scholar Esther Peeren has employed Mikhail Bakhtin’s concept of the ‘chronotope’ in the study of diasporas. While this concept was originally developed by Bakhtin as an analytical tool in the study of narrative texts, Peeren argues that it can be fruitful in the cultural analysis of diasporic memories. In Bakhtin’s work a chronotope signifies the unity of time and space that guides and organizes the plot in a textual or oral narrative. While personal memories always consist of such chronotopes, far-reaching interruptions in one’s biography such as the sudden loss of a home undermine their linear sequence. The life-world of migrants, especially those who were subject to forced expulsions, does not consist of closed sequences of chronotopes but hybridizes both the ‘here’ and ‘there’ and the ‘now’ and ‘then’. As Peeren argues: ‘Diasporic subjects are never wholly part of either the home or the host chronotope: they do not move from one to the other without the interference of memory, but are always in negotiation with both’.

While this negotiation and fusion between the ‘here’ and the ‘there’ may appear as a commonplace, Peeren’s observations offer some enlightening insights into the nature of diasporic memories and identities. Instead of assuming a ‘true self’ of migrants that posits them either in their host society or their remembered lost homes, Peeren asserts that diaspora members always participate in and, at the same time, transcend both chronotopes. This ‘dischronotopicality’ creates plural identities and positionings that refer not only to the remembered past but also to the anticipated future.

This observation sheds new light on how long diasporas persist and at what point migrants can be considered fully ‘integrated’ into their host societies. Instead of stressing a terminology of either integration or exclusion I propose a change of perspective and a shift to the question of how memories of a lost past are construed.

31 Ibid., p. 75.
and cultivated in new social and geographical contexts. Such transcultural incorporations of migrant memories into new settings are multiform and, of course, always gradual. In the case of the early modern Netherlandish diaspora, even at the point when the descendants of migrants fully participated in their new host societies, a sense of belonging to or originating from a transnational diaspora continued for centuries. Given the complex intermingling and hybrid discursive patterns in which such allegiances were disseminated, we should take the situationality of the articulated memories into account. For members of eighteenth-century migrant churches, which had been founded 150 years earlier, memories of exile and persecution were addressed only on annual commemoration days and probably did not play any significant role in many aspects of an individual’s daily life. Or, as was the case in the numerous dispersed merchant families, trade and acquaintance networks between England, Germany and Holland that were ‘inherited’ from distant ancestors were still maintained, even if the various participants did not consider themselves ‘exiles’ anymore. Yet, such linkages and allegiances reminded individuals of another horizon of belonging and of a past that at times could be experienced as part of their own identity.

Migration and memory

Even though diasporic networks intrinsically rely on shared memories, the field of social and cultural memory studies has traditionally shown little interest in the phenomenon of migration and dispersion. It is rather surprising that this topic has only recently been addressed by students of memory. Since its emergence in the first half of the twentieth century but even more since its revival in the 1980s, the field of memory studies has primarily been concerned with the constructions of the

32 See e.g. the various conference volumes that have appeared during the last six years: Irial Glynn and J. Olaf Kleist (eds), History, Memory and Migration. Perceptions of the Past and the Politics of Incorporation, Houndsmills, Basingstoke/New York 2012; Julia Creet and Andreas Kitzmann (eds), Memory and Migration. Multidisciplinary Approaches to Memory Studies, Toronto/London 2011; Kuah-Pearce Khun Eng and Andrew P. Davidson, At Home in the Chinese Diaspora. Memories, Identities and Belongings, Houndsmills, Basingstoke/New York 2008; Baronian, Besser e.a. (eds), Diaspora and Memory; E. Boesen and F. Lentz (eds), Migration und Erinnerung. Konzepte und Methoden der Forschung, Münster 2010. All these studies treat only modern and contemporary cases. The nexus between memory and migration in early modern history is examined in very few modern studies, e.g. in: David Trim (ed.), The Huguenots. History and Memory in Transnational Context, Leiden 2011 and: Van Ruymbekke and Sparks, Memory and Identity The Huguenots in France.
past of modern nation states as well as memories of violence and war. The field has often referred to the concept of the ‘sites of memory’, largely due to the influence of the French historian Pierre Nora. While this concept did not exclusively refer to spatial sites, the notion of a primarily place-bound memory seemed helpful in order not to further blur the often-discussed distinction between memory and history, with the result that other forms of memory, such as the travelling memories of migrants and nomads were long neglected. However, on a world-historical scale it is arguable ‘that migration rather than location is the condition of memory’, as Julia Creet asserts. While, of course, collectively shared memories often have a clearly identifiable location as their narrative stage, only very few memories do in fact remain local. Typically, narratives about the past soon start to ‘travel’, not only with migrants but also with temporary travelers and, perhaps more importantly, through media with a wider reach. This is not only the case in the contemporary world but also in pre-modern times.

Recent studies on memory cultures among migrants and displaced groups sometimes argue that such people develop exclusive discourses about their past, which are clearly distinguishable from the memory cultures of their host societies. In many cases, migrant communities even form isolated ‘memory ghettos’ into which their members seclude themselves and which, as Maggi Leung asserts, can provide a private ‘comfort zone’. These exclusive memory cultures set their members apart from the rest of society and cannot easily be shared with people outside one’s own minority group. In many cases the discourses in which images of the past are articulated within a migrant community may prove incompatible with the collective memories of their host society and its imagination of the past. In such cases the distinctive diasporic identity is reproduced and marks a clear difference between the

migrants’ own imagined community and that of their neighbors without a migration background. This view draws on the assumption that the maintenance of boundaries between the own group and the local population of the migrants’ host societies is an essential characteristic of a diaspora community.\(^{37}\) While boundary-maintenance is clearly an aspect of a migrant population’s self-identification as a diaspora, the boundaries that are maintained between migrants and the society they live in are not self-evident. In order to preserve a stable and distinctive group identity, a diaspora group has, of course, to cultivate a habitus that demarcates a difference between itself and the rest of society, yet these culturally produced boundaries are always to certain degree embedded in the host societies of the migrants.

Without denying the existence of ‘memory ghettos’ that provide boundaries between migrants and local populations, this book will examine to what extent migrant experiences of the past relied on sharply drawn boundaries between their own memory cultures and those of their local neighbors in their new hometowns. As I will argue, the numerous Southern Netherlandish refugees who left their homelands during the second half of the sixteenth century did not live in such isolated memory ghettos at all. Even though they developed very lively memory cultures and preserved their identity as religious exiles for centuries, the discourses in which their memories were articulated and transmitted were never totally separated from the memory canons of their host societies. On the contrary, exile memories and identities incorporated collectively shared narratives about the past as told by the original inhabitants of their new hometowns. For individuals belonging to the transnational diaspora of Reformed migrants from the Southern Netherlands their diasporic identity was not an all-encompassing narrative but rather one that could coexist and be combined with memories of the various host societies in which they found themselves. In many cases, migrants could also benefit from the fashioning of distinctive exile identities as the examples in chapter 4 of this book show. The gains of the cultivation of the refugee past depended, of course, on the specific situation in the migrants’ host societies. In places where their religious confession or political conviction was shared by the local population descent from people who had suffered for the ‘true faith’ could bring considerable prestige. Such
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was often the case in the Reformed circles of the Dutch Republic and also among English Puritans, who honored Huguenots and Dutch Calvinists as persecuted coreligionists who had been steadfast enough to leave their homes for the sake of their convictions. In such surroundings, remembering the history of confessional persecution was not an issue that divided migrants and native Protestants but rather one that united them in their collective identification with a shared religious cause. When members of the Netherlandish stranger churches organized commemorative meetings to remember their persecuted ancestors, these gatherings were frequented by English Puritans as well as the descendants of Flemish refugees, and it is no coincidence that they were often held on the coronation day of Queen Elizabeth I of England, who was already celebrated as a champion of Protestantism and had long been commemorated as a loyal host by Netherlandish exiles. In this environment belonging to a persecuted minority had a status that appealed to many locals and the memory cultures of the migrants were much more easily combined with the historical narratives of their host societies than in other places. But even in surroundings where the descendants of Netherlandish exiles did not find many sympathizers their memories did not remain isolated and were shaped and informed by the memory canons of their neighbors.

Transmigration and its multiple ties

The incorporation of multiple local and regional narratives into the diasporic memory cultures of Netherlandish migrants was partly due to the structure of the migration processes from the Low Countries. We must not forget that the vast majority of the migrants who fled religious violence and military devastation did not migrate directly from their hometowns to their new places of permanent residence but often relocated several times before settling down permanently. Many of the first-generation migrants continued to move hence and forth for decades, and sometimes their children and grandchildren retained this pattern. During the second half of the sixteenth century, this migration pattern could be attributed to the direct
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military situation in the Low Countries and the political change that was brought about in the various provinces. Some exiles, especially clerics such as IJsbrand Balck or Gaspar van Heyden, were exiled three times or more and lived a life of constant peregrination.\(^{39}\) The great migration from the Low Counties was not a one-directional ‘exodus’ but a complicated process that can be roughly subdivided into three major migration waves: one that started in the 1530s and reached its height in the 1540s and 1550s, one between 1566 and the early years of the Dutch Revolt in the 1570s, and the last one in the mid-1580s, when the so-called ‘Calvinist Republics’, Antwerp, Brussels, Ghent, Bruges, Ypres and Mechelen were one by one taken over by the Habsburg armies. Outside of these major migration waves there was an almost continuous stream of Flemish and Brabant migrants from war-torn rural areas who moved to the Dutch Republic, England and Germany especially during the 1590s and the 1630s.

The destination of refugees during first migration period, from the 1530s onwards, was England and the western parts of Germany. Since the early 1520s, the Habsburg authorities had made the struggle against heresy one of their main objectives in dealing with the situation in the Low Countries, and the prosecution of heretics was executed in a systematic manner. The dissenting migrants consisted mainly of Anabaptists and, after 1540, increasingly of Calvinists although the confessional allegiances of many refugees were initially vague and it has been assumed that their adherence to a clear-cut confessional group developed only in their exile towns.\(^{40}\) The first Netherlandish refugee communities emerged in Wesel, Frankfurt and London and later also in Aachen, Cologne, Emden and Hamburg as well as in Sandwich, Norwich and Southampton. These towns formed pivots of later Netherlandish refugees networks, and cities like London and Frankfurt remained centers of migrants from the Low Countries for centuries.\(^{41}\)

The Habsburg authorities in the Low Countries expected local town authorities and magistrates to assist in the struggle against heresy and to take severe measures to punish heretics. These measures were highly unpopular among the town
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39 See chapter 1 in this book.
41 On this first major wave of migration, see: Johan Decavele, *De dageraad van de Reformatie in Vlaanderen*, Brussels 1975, pp. 577ff.
magistrates who feared social unrest, and they were often willing to connive at suspicions of heresy. In 1566, a storm of iconoclastic fury shocked the Catholic authorities in virtually all provinces of the Netherlands, and the Habsburg government reacted in 1567 with the institution of the so-called Council of Troubles, a central law court that dealt with the prosecution of the iconoclasts and those who were held responsible for having permitted such actions. The Council of Troubles, initially under the direction of the notorious Duke of Alba, sentenced thousands of Protestants and dissidents to death, though often in absentia. The Council’s institution, along with the arrival of Alba’s ‘Army of Flanders’ from Spain, launched the second major migration wave to England and the Holy Roman Empire. Among the refugees of the 1560s were not only staunch Protestants but also many who feared they might be associated with heresy and rebellion. The extreme measures and the ‘broad sweep’ of the Council of Troubles disturbed many who still saw themselves as loyal Catholics but felt that Alba’s approach to the problem of heresy was disproportional. Nevertheless, direct action against the new measures of the Habsburg regime was not yet successful. In 1568, William of Orange, who had fled to his own territories in Germany, launched a military campaign against the Habsburg forces in the Low Countries, but it failed after only a few weeks. People who saw themselves suspected of support for Orange and disloyalty to the authorities fled their hometowns and went to the western parts of Germany, especially to the coastal town of Emden, which had become an important safe haven for persecuted Protestants from the Low Countries since the 1550s.

In addition to the persecution of dissenters the Habsburg government’s general disrespect for the tradition of provincial and civic particularism as well as Alba’s plans to increase taxes, especially his levy of the ‘Tenth Penny’, which was demanded in 1569, were major sources of discontent in the towns of the Low
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Countries. While most towns were not willing to join Orange’s revolt in 1568, the situation changed during the following years. In 1572, a second campaign, which combined the pillage of coastal towns and villages by the so-called ‘Sea beggars’ with an attack by Orange’s troops, encouraged a number of towns, especially in Holland and Zeeland, to openly revolt against the Habsburg government. As a result, many Protestant exiles returned to the Netherlands while at the same time thousands of Catholics fled the rebel towns and went to Amsterdam, which remained loyal to the king until 1578, as well as to Antwerp and Cologne. After 1576, when the Pacification of Ghent was signed, the prosecution of heretics also ceased in the important Flemish and Brabant towns, such as Ghent, Brussels and Antwerp, with the result that great numbers of exiles returned, eager to build a ‘godly’ society. New magistrates were soon installed and eventually dominated by Calvinists. These newly formed ‘Calvinist Republics’ became centers of the Reformation in the Netherlands and cultivated a particularly radical form of Reformed Protestantism, which again forced many Catholics into exile in Germany and loyal cities in the Low Countries. Besides Antwerp, Ghent had become an especially important town for Netherlandish Calvinism and harbored a theological academy where Reformed clerics were trained and prepared to serve their congregations all over the Low Countries. The ‘Calvinist Republics’ had only a short lifespan, and between 1580 and 1585 they were one by one taken over by Alexander Farnese, the new General Governor of the Netherlands. The surrender of Antwerp, in particular, which was the most important trading town in the South of the Netherlands, launched a large exodus of Protestants to the Dutch Republic, Germany and, to a lesser degree, England. Even though the inhabitants were not punished for their heretical beliefs by the Catholic victors, they were forced to convert to Catholicism or to leave the town within a few years. The ‘reconciliation’ of the Southern rebel towns marked the end of the period of mass migration, even though the migration from the Habsburg-
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48 Israel, The Dutch Republic, p. 196.
49 Ibid., p. 219.
ruled Flemish and Brabant countryside continued on a smaller scale until the early seventeenth century.

Exact numbers of migrants who left their homes due to the religious persecution and the war are hard to come by. As already mentioned, estimations vary between sixty thousand and one hundred thousand people not including Catholic refugees. In the first years of the ‘Calvinist Republic’ of Antwerp, about eight thousand people left the town, many of whom most probably left for religious reasons. Also virtually all the Northern rebel towns produced their own Catholic refugees although the numbers vary from city to city. However, even the numbers of those refugees who fled because of their Protestant sympathies are anything but clear. Those cities where reliable numbers are available, for example Antwerp or Mechelen, where the populations decreased by one half during the mid-1580s, do not offer a complete picture because many of those who left had been living in these towns as migrants. In earlier estimations, many migrants were probably counted twice or even thrice because they did not simply move from one place to another but often re-emigrated again and again. In the face of the complex historical developments and political alternations the migration of individuals and families was seldom a one-directional process in which one left his hometown and settled down permanently elsewhere but more likely a long route of re- and transmigration during which individuals and families repeatedly relocated again and again, sometimes for decades. Even those migrants who settled down permanently in one place typically remained connected to other migrant towns through family members and friends.

Such phenomena have only recently received attention from students of migration. As scholars in the field of modern transnational studies have noted, migration has often been studied as ‘a unilinear, stage-like process of incorporation or assimilation’ while individual practices of migrants and their various allegiances to diverse social and cultural entities were overlooked. Furthermore, the notion of
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migration as a one-directional movement with clearly defined points of departure and arrival is contradicted by the findings of modern migration studies. Instead of moving from one nation-state to another and leaving all their ties behind migrants often stay engaged in processes that bridge and transcend the boundaries between the various stations of their travel. Scholars such as Nina Glick Schiller and others have therefore argued that contemporary migrants should be characterized not as ‘uprooted’ but rather as ‘becoming firmly rooted in their new country, but maintaining multiple linkages to their homeland’.  

To avoid the misconception that the migration of groups and individuals brings an end to the ties with the former homeland or to earlier stations of their migration to which they have said goodbye for good the term ‘transmigrant’ was introduced. Not only in many present-day migration movements but also in the networks of the early modern Netherlandish diaspora one-directional migration was not the norm. Not only merchants but also people of other professions continued to migrate between the various exile towns in the North Sea region, the Rhine region and the Dutch Republic. Even among the numerous textile workers who left Flanders in the late sixteenth century such transmigration movements were not uncommon, and many weavers and bleachers moved via Western German territories or the English coast to the Dutch Republic. These migration routes did leave their traces, and many migrants built networks on which they and their descendants could rely later. As chapter 5 of this study shows, many families continued to travel and migrate along the same routes as their forefathers until the late seventeenth century.

The continuous transmigration of many early modern migrants from the Low Countries shaped the narratives and memories that were preserved and handed down to future generations. While many accounts of the refugees’ past employed a
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54 Nina Glick Schiller, Linda Basch and Cristina Szanton Blanc, ‘From Immigrant to Transmigrant. Theorizing Transnational Migration’, in: Anthropological Quarterly 68 (1995) 1, pp. 48-63. While transnationalism of this kind is often thought of as a very recent phenomenon and linked to theories about the ‘end of the nation state’, Leo Lucassen has questioned the newness of such phenomena. As he argues, during the height of modern nationalism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, migrant communities were able to surpass national borders and also ethnic differences, for example in the case of Catholics who formed transnational networks during the German Kulturkampf of the 1870s. (Leo Lucassen, ‘Is Transnationalism compatible with Assimilation? Examples from Western Europe since 1850’, in: IMIS-Beiträge 29 (2006), pp. 11-31.)


narrative mode that suggested a linear departure from the lost to the new ‘home’ and served as tales of origin, the sources also reveal a sense of belonging to a travelling diaspora that was not located in a fixed territory but spread among Germany, the Dutch Republic and England. Studies on modern transmigrant networks show that diasporas create links and bonds in their various host societies but at the same time cultivate the idea of an imaginary homeland that serves as a binding factor. As Michael Peter Smith has put it, the experience of migration often produces a ‘multiple emplacement or situatedness both here and there’.  

The diaspora’s ‘cultural bifocality’ also invokes the notion of a homeland or a ‘there’ of the sort which ‘Benedict Anderson would call an “imagined community”, invented by deterritorialized people to make present felt absences in their lives’. While the notion of a common origin structured the narratives through which individuals identified themselves with the wider Netherlandish refugee diaspora, it was, however, not always clear what the common homeland actually was. The exile experience historically coincided with the emergence of a supra-regional patriotic discourse that united the various provinces in the Low Countries, and the absent homeland was often created only retrospectively. It is therefore not surprising that refugees played an important role in the production of what Simon Schama has called ‘patriotic scripture’ and engaged in discourses that would contribute to a ‘proto-national’ consciousness in the Dutch Republic.

_Diasporic imagination and patriotic discourse_

Research on modern transnational networks has shown that transmigrant communities often harbor a strong ambiguity regarding the memories of the lost homeland. As Louisa Schein has demonstrated in the case of Chinese and Laotian refugees looking for marriage partners in their countries of origin, the imagined homeland served as a nostalgic projection while ‘dreamlike memories’ of a home
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that ‘housed the most archaic pockets of their tradition left on earth’ went together with a deep abhorrence of the political reality of the present. The complex discourses about the lost homeland of early modern Netherlandish refugees are deeply marked by such ambiguities. While, for example, many Southern exiles in the Dutch Republic insisted on the unity of all provinces of the Low Countries and claimed that Holland was also their home, at the same time they referred to themselves as strangers. The cities of Brabant and Flanders remained their imagined homeland even when it had become clear that a return would not be possible in the foreseeable future. The situation of exiles outside the Netherlands was even more ambiguous: while most of them had fled from the Southern Netherlands, the Dutch Republic increasingly became the cultural and geographical center of the transnational diaspora although memories of the lost South were still preserved.

Given the complexity and variety of early modern social identities the term ‘cultural bifocality’ is arguably an understatement, and it might be more appropriate to speak of ‘multifocality’ here. As Alastair Duke has put it, the early modern Netherlands consisted of ‘multiplicity of fatherlands [that] had its counterpart in the plethora of nations,’ and Ole Peter Grell has characterized the lifeworld of Calvinist migrants in the Dutch Republic as grounded in the ‘experience of multiple geographies’. 61 In fact, the identity formation of groups and individuals during the Dutch Revolt was both shaped and at the same time challenged by the experience of migration. While the political unification of the Seventeen Provinces of the Low Countries was a slow process, accomplished by the Burgundians and Habsburgs during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the trend towards aggregation was almost constantly thwarted by persistent regionalisms and localisms. Not only the various provinces but also the self-confident trading towns of the coastal regions insisted on their old and traditional privileges, which were threatened by the ongoing centralization efforts. 62 The promotion of distinct local identities thus often served direct political goals.

The identity formation of the numerous migrants during the Dutch Revolt was shaped by the interplay of these various local, regional and transregional

62 See e.g.: Israel, The Dutch Republic, pp. 129ff.
constructions of identity. As Judith Pollmann has argued, the older discourse of a 'common Netherlandish fatherland', launched by William of Orange and his followers was rediscovered by a later generation of Southern Netherlandish refugees in the Republic, who on the eve of the Twelve Years’ Truce spread their message of a conjoint struggle of all free Netherlanders against the Spanish yoke of suppression.63 What makes the memory practices of these refugee pamphleteers and authors so intriguing is the interplay between various discourses that were employed to refer to new constellations of identity. Both Northern Catholics in the South and Southern Protestants in the Republic propagated a common Netherlandish identity while deploying elements of regional and local as well as confessional and political discourses. These constructions of a common identity also laid a claim on the territories of the opposing political camp and thereby created the paradoxical situation in which the proclamation of unity actually led to separation. At the same time, however, they also legitimized the position of the migrants: not only had they suffered persecution for the just cause, but if the Netherlands were the homeland of all patriots, Brabanders and Hollanders were not total strangers in Holland and Zeeland.

Modern migration historians have pointed to the phenomenon of ‘diasporic nationalism’, which projects a national community on an imagined space of either a distant homeland or a permanent diaspora in which the community is united by a common heritage. These diasporic nationalisms do not necessarily conflict with loyalties and affections towards other national or local entities, such as nationalist sentiments of the host society. As Matthew Frye Jacobson demonstrated in the case of Irish, Polish and Jewish immigrants to the United States, European ethnic nationalism or Zionist enthusiasm often went hand in hand with American patriotism.64 Frye Jacobson, who focused on periodicals, novels and other literary texts to study the diasporic imagination of European transnational communities in the United States, argued that ethnic Americanism itself was often informed by an amalgam of various European nationalisms held together by an appeal to the ‘love of Liberty’. Even if many aspects of modern nationalism do not allow for direct

comparisons with early modern local patriotism and regionalism, we can gain valuable insights from these findings. The diasporic networks and communities of Netherlandish refugees during and after the Dutch Revolt had a supra- and translocal character in multiple ways: not only did they share the experience of ‘multiple geographies’ and center their group identification around the imagination of a lost and distant homeland, their evocation of patriotic sentiments referred to constructions of identity that united and redefined the various local and regional identities.

These observations may also lead to a better understanding of what Schama called ‘patriotic scripture’.\(^{65}\) While Schama gave an impressive description of a discourse on Dutch patriotism that was disseminated in pamphlets, songs and historiographical works, its multiform frames of reference and the various and sometimes contradicting motivations of the agents behind it remain largely undiscovered in his work. The public manifestations of Dutch patriotism were in fact of a highly hybrid and ambiguous nature. The notion of a common fatherland was decisively shaped by refugees and exiles from both sides, and the theme of exile itself served as a political argument that could be deployed for various purposes. At the same time, unifying patriotism coexisted with and combined various localisms. Furthermore, the biblically inspired exodus-narrative that was often referred to and had its culmination in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century notion of a ‘Netherlandish Israel’ was a far more complex discursive constellation than Schama envisaged.\(^{66}\) To gain a better insight into the dynamics of Dutch and Southern Netherlandish supra-regional patriotisms, their various hybrid and intermingling strands need to be dissected and re-examined. While the exodus-discourse is often exclusively ascribed to Calvinist orthodoxy, its possible appeal to adherents of other confessional currents requires an explanation. As this study shows, even the most loyal Reformed pamphleteers and chroniclers were able and willing to switch between various discourses and argumentations.

Exile memories and their changing meanings

\(^{65}\) Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, pp. 51ff.
The chronological scope of this study covers the period between ca. 1550 and 1750, and the various functions and meanings of the migrants’ memories of persecution and exile varied immensely. This study departs from the imagination of a wider diaspora, which produced a religious discourse of exile and homelessness that could be adopted by migrants to create a meaningful narrative of their present situation. Chapter 1 shows how a widely shared and recognizable discourse of exile emerged in the migrant networks and how it structured allegiances and identifications with the imagined diaspora. The religious discourses of exile that emerged during the early migration period from the Low Countries laid the foundations for a culture that would be continued and redefined throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Chapters 2 and 3 examine the ways in which Southern Netherlandish migrants in the Dutch Republic, especially in two of the most important migrant towns, Haarlem and Leiden, used their past to promote concrete political visions and, once they realized that a return to their lost homes would not be possible in the near future, tried to define their position in the new host society. Chapter 4 shows how memories were preserved in family circles for decades and centuries and analyzes how the past was reinvented by future generations who needed to make sense of their ancestors’ history in the present. Chapters 5 and 6 focus on the translocal connections of migrant networks, especially between Frankfurt, London and the Dutch Republic, and examine how migrant networks persisted until the eighteenth century and how memories played an important role in this process. Finally, the cultivation of exile memories in Pietist circles is explored, and chapter 6 shows why non-migrants could be attracted by exclusivist diasporic networks and how memories of exile and homelessness became part of new religious cultures that strived for piety and exclusivism.

While not only Southern Netherlandish Protestants and Mennonites from various confessions and sub-confessions but also Catholics suffered exile during the Dutch Revolt, this latter group did not produce a long-term diaspora that persisted for generations, and therefore Catholics are included only in the first two chapters and used to illustrate that religious cultures of exile were not a uniquely Protestant phenomenon. While most of the Northern Catholics were clerics who did not hand down their experiences to (legitimate) progeny, the notion of a wandering diaspora often died with them and was not continued by non-migrant coreligionists. Another
group that is dramatically under-represented are women. While students of memory have often identified early modern women as important agents in the oral tradition of family memories, the only documents in the studied family archives written by women were succinct data on births, deaths and marriages. Only in the context of the Pietist and orthodox-Reformed cultures in chapters 4 and 6 do women such as Anna Maria van Schurman, Jacoba Lampsins or Elisabeth Bartels-Schütz play a more important role. While most women in the Netherlandish diaspora, especially in the rich merchant circles, were more literate than the average European woman of the time, few women seem to have taken it upon themselves to write about distant genealogical issues. Future research on the transmission of early modern diasporic memories should also take into consideration nonliterary social practices which allow for a better grasp of wider populations who participated in translocal cultures of exile and homelessness.

The research on which this dissertation is based was part of a wider research project, which was supervised by Judith Pollmann and examined the memory cultures of the Dutch Revolt in the early modern Southern Netherlands and the Dutch Republic as well as the various ways in which the past shaped social, political and religious life in the two newly emerged states. Some of the practical choices made during my research reflect the collaboration with my colleagues in this project. As already mentioned, exiles played an important role in the formation of new ‘proto-national’ Netherlandish identities and historical narratives. However, this topic is not the main focus of my research but is treated in the dissertation of Jasper van der Steen about the formation of new ‘memory canons’ in the early modern Low Countries. Marianne Eekhout wrote her dissertation about the local and civic cultivation of the past in Northern and Southern Netherlandish towns. While my research examines the acculturation of migrant memories in local contexts, the civic memory cultures themselves are discussed in her work. The work of Erika Kuijpers, who participated in the research project as a postdoctoral researcher, examines how individuals dealt with traumatic experiences and memories, and Judith Pollmann’s forthcoming book aims at a fuller understanding of early modern memory cultures in
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general and the differences and similarities between modern and early modern ways of remembering. As a whole, the research project offers a more complete view of how memories of the Dutch Revolt shaped new social identities and affected the lives of individuals and groups in the Low Countries, and this study also serves as a contribution to this largely unexplored topic.
Chapter 1 - Imagining the Diaspora

The formation of diaspora narratives
The Netherlandish diaspora networks that persisted for about two centuries relied on narratives that explained the reasons for their existence and provided commonly recognizable tales of origin. The discourses in which these narratives were developed emerged in the 1550s and were continued and modified by subsequent generations of migrants. Writings of the first generation of the diaspora set the tone for later chronicles and other historiographical works of the various stranger churches. This chapter describes the emergence of discourses that shaped the later diasporic networks and provided images with which individuals and groups could identify. Such processes of identification were necessary for the formation of the diaspora. Refugees from the Low Countries and their descendants saw their fate not as an individual experience but as one shared with a wider community of exiles with whom they remained connected, often over great distances.

Historians and church historians have sometimes attributed the cultivation of a diasporic mentality and a pronounced theology of exile to specific branches of Western Protestantism, especially Calvinism. We must, however, not forget that these religious diasporic discourses had their own development and were not initially and self-evidently part of the new confessional cultures that emerged in the sixteenth century. This chapter explores how these discourses came into being and how they were appropriated by groups and individuals within the refugee networks.

While the scholarly discussion of a specific Reformed ‘exile theology’ has long focused on Calvin’s works, it is unclear to what extent his writings influenced wider audiences of exiled believers and how the consciousness of belonging to a religious diaspora was cultivated in the exile networks. To answer these questions, I will treat

a wider range of sources relating to the early Netherlandish diaspora, such as pastoral works on exile, sermons and pamphlets of exiled clerics as well as historiographical works on persecution and flight.

While going into exile eventually came to be regarded as a sign of religious steadfastness and acquired a certain prestige in itself, this was not initially the case. As defenses of refugees from the 1550s show, the choice to flee could be seen as an act of cowardice. In particular, the flight of clerics who were responsible for the spiritual well-being of other believers was considered to require a justification. The purity of the motives for emigration was also sometimes addressed: were the refugees really driven by their faith or did they seek their fortune abroad? Even if such discussions ended after the first phase of the mass migration from the Netherlands, they shaped the way in which religious exile would be perceived later.

**In defense of the diaspora**

In June 1558, around the feast of Corpus Christi, inquisitor Nicolaas de Castro travelled to the North Holland town of Alkmaar to arrest Cornelis Cooltuyn, a former Catholic priest who had become notorious for preaching evangelical doctrines and refusing to say mass. However, before De Castro could reach Alkmaar Cooltuyn was warned and left the town in haste to head for Emden, one of the major safe havens for Dutch Protestants and other dissenters at the time. In his well-known pastoral work *Dat Evangeli der Armen* (‘The gospel of the poor’) Cooltuyn later stated that the person who had warned him and thereby saved his life must have been an angel. The decision to include this element in the narrative was more than a mere mystification of the story and played a crucial role in the rehabilitation of the clergyman who now served the Reformed congregation in his Northern German exile town. Among his fellow brethren the choice to avoid martyrdom by going into exile was not yet necessarily considered a virtuous deed for the sake of one’s faith. From the first days of the Reformation in the Netherlands the new Reformed martyrs had been commemorated and celebrated as exemplary believers who had feared neither death nor torture in order to remain loyal to the ‘true religion’. By the 1540s
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Flemish rhetoricians were composing songs about the old and the new martyrs, and in 1559, the same year that Cooltuyn’s *Dat Evangeli der Armen* saw the light, Reformed minister Adriaan van Haemstede published his famous martyrrology which would become the canonical martyrs book of Dutch Reformed Protestantism.\footnote{Adriaan van Haemstede, *De historien der vromer martelaren / die om het getuygenis des evangeli haer bloet vergoten hebben: van tijden Christi af tot dezen tegenwoordigheghen tijde toe opt corte by een vergaert*, Antwerp 1559.}

Although van Haemstede was an exile in Emden too and certainly did not condemn fleeing one’s homeland for religion’s sake, martyrdom had gained such a prestige that other refugees, especially among the clergy, obviously felt the necessity to defend their choice not to have ended their lives as martyrs.

*Dat Evangeli der Armen* was composed as a pastoral device for ‘miserable Christians’ and, as the title page revealed, had been written by Cooltuyn ‘to comfort himself, while in exile and also others who are in affliction’.\footnote{Cooltuyn, *Dat Evangeli der Armen*, p. 217.}

In the introduction to this work Cooltuyn explained his decision to choose exile over martyrdom. Though the martyrs needed to be praised, Christ had not commanded his disciples to let themselves be slaughtered like sheep but to leave for another town when their message was outlawed. Even Jesus himself had fled his persecutors several times, and, as Cooltuyn argued, martyrdom was acceptable only for those who had not been forewarned and were surprised by the enemies of the Gospel.\footnote{Ibid., p. 240.}

Becoming a martyr deliberately and without utter necessity was therefore not only against Christ’s explicit orders but also a sign of recklessness rather than of piety. Furthermore, acceptance of the Christian message did not depend on the death of its witnesses, as the cases of Jan Hus, Jerome of Prague or Jan de Bakker had shown. To preach the gospel was far godlier than to suffer death and torture, Cooltuyn asserted.\footnote{Ibid., p. 241.}

In his defense of the choice of exile and his plea to avoid martyrdom, he even went so far as to praise St. Peter for his denial of discipleship at the court of the High Priest Annas. Instead of accusing the apostle of cowardice, he depicts Peter’s betrayal as prudent and defends it by misquoting a verse from Ecclesiastes 3: ‘He, who loves danger, shall perish in it.’\footnote{Ibid., p. 240: ‘Die dat Perijckel liefheft, sal daer in in vergaen (Eccles. 3)’. This quote does in fact not resemble any verse in Ecclesiastes 3.}

Finally, the assertion that it was an angel who...
had warned him to flee Alkmaar provided Cooltuyn’s argument with the highest possible authority: going into exile was fully in accordance with the will of God, whose angel had saved the life of His servant.

Church historians have often seen the cultivation of religious exile identities as characteristic of Netherlandish and international Calvinism while early modern Catholics and Lutherans are believed to have condemned the choice to flee religious persecution as cowardice.76 As Geert Janssen has recently shown, the question of whether it was legitimate for Christians to choose exile over martyrdom was indeed discussed by Catholics who faced violence at the hands of Protestant rebels.77 However, the attitudes towards the decision to flee soon changed, and exile was described in a fashion very similar to Protestant writings on this topic. In fact, as the example of Cooltuyn shows, a comparable discussion took place among Protestants, who had to decide how to respond to persecution two decades earlier. Going into exile was not glorified from the initial starting point of Netherlandish Reformed Protestantism but seems to have required justification.

Just as in Catholic circles, the question of how to deal with religious persecution was also discussed among adherents of the Lutheran confession. When in 1566 the Lutheran congregation in Antwerp was confronted with increasing pressure by the government of Margaretha of Parma, the ministers requested advice from the University of Rostock on how to respond to the present hardships. The answer from Rostock, published in the same year under the title Ein Schrifft an die Christen zu Antuerpen der Theologen zu Rostock (‘Missive to the Christians of Antwerp from the theologians of Rostock’) was clear: above all their evangelical faith must be maintained; however, participating in violent resistance against the secular government was forbidden.78 The refusal of the Antwerp Lutherans to

partake in the resistance against the Habsburg authorities would remain a contentious issue for decades, but it fostered the early decision of the Lutheran community to go into exile in Frankfurt where many of its merchant members had contacts.\textsuperscript{79} This Lutheran exodus from Antwerp preceded the great Reformed trek of 1585 by almost ten years: in 1576, after the Spanish Fury, many of the Lutherans had already left. The choice to leave was, however, not made impromptu but after thorough theological consideration based on scholarly advice from Lutheran divines from Germany. Fleeing one’s homeland obviously demanded a justification in order not to be regarded as cowardice or opportunism.

Another indication of the suspicions against the choice for exile can be found in the works of Dirck Volkertsz. Coornhert, a Haarlem artist and poet inclined to an idiosyncratic form of ‘libertine’ spiritualism. In a dramatic play on the departure of the biblical patriarch Abraham from his homeland Chaldea, Coornhert reflected on the experience of leaving one’s homeland for the sake of faith. Coornhert himself had been forced to flee his native Holland several times in the 1560s and 1570s and wrote a number of biblical plays in which he reflected on the experience of exile and dispersion. In \textit{Abrahams Uytgangh} (‘Abraham’s exodus’) which he published in 1575 and dedicated to his Wesel host and protégé, Arend van Wachtendonck, he introduced the allegorical character \textit{Communis opinio} who tries to prevent the biblical patriarch from leaving. \textit{Communis opinio} represents the voice of the refugee’s contemporaries who accuse him of motivations other than piety, such as social and religious elitism, economic considerations or cowardice. Even though the author lets Abraham emerge triumphantly, he also warns of unjustified reasons for choosing exile. In the preface to the poem, Coornhert presents the two allegorical characters \textit{Cruysvlucht} (‘Flight from the cross’) and \textit{Raedwel} (‘Good counsel’). \textit{Cruysvlucht} is eager to flee his homeland in order to avoid the plagues God has sent to punish the wrongdoings of the country, as he confirms. \textsuperscript{80} \textit{Raedwel} admonishes him to meditate on the causes of the plagues, live a righteous life and hope that God would take away the afflictions. As a role model of the righteous

Refugee Raedwel introduces Abraham, who did not leave his homeland to follow his own desires but to be obedient to God, who called him out of Chaldea and promised him a future in Canaan. The justification of the choice for exile is accompanied by a model that exemplifies which motivations and behaviors are appropriate for Christian refugees. Following Abraham’s example is not only justified; as in the work of Cooltuyn, Coornhert praised living as a stranger in the diaspora as an act of obedience to the will of God.

‘Exile theology’ and confessional identity

In the works of exiled authors such as Cooltuyn, Coornhert and many others the status of the exiled Christian who fled his homeland to remain loyal to his faith was celebrated and provided the great numbers of Netherlandish refugees with an appropriable image of their own situation and a collective identity to which they could relate. The sixteenth-century Netherlandish diaspora was not only an empirical given, consisting of a multitude of individual exiles but also an imagined community connected by bonds of confession and regional origin as well as friend- and kinship relations. As Esther Peeren has argued, the representation of the diaspora is never separable from its lived conditions. Only through developing a collective consciousness of being in exile and fashioning collective diasporic identities do actual diasporas come into being. The religious exiles from the Netherlands did not perceive their own fate as an isolated case but identified with larger groups of people, whom they necessarily did not personally know but with whom they felt united in the same religious conviction and often the same common political cause.

The fashioning of religious exile identities was not restricted to any confessional current: not only Reformed authors but also Catholics, Mennonites and even anti-confessional spiritualists mirrored the fate of the contemporary refugees with the heroes of biblical accounts of dispersion and exile. The question of whether and how the exile experience shaped the various forms of the newly emerged confessional currents and how it contributed to new forms of theology has recently been the subject of debate. Scholars working on early modern Calvinism have emphasized the significance of the exile situation for the constitution of a specific
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81 Esther Peeren, ‘Through the Lens of the Chronotope’, p. 70.
form of Reformed faith and worship. According to Heinz Schilling, the Calvinist refugees who had to flee their homelands developed a specific kind of ‘exile theology’ that evolved when the Reformed refugee communities tried to maintain their own religious identity and to distinguish themselves from the natives of their new abodes. Thereby the characteristic Calvinist features, such as the emphasis on predestination, strict ecclesiastical discipline and the presbyterial-synodal church order were adopted or further developed. When the Reformed Church became the ‘public church’ of the Dutch Republic these distinctive characteristics were, at least partially, preserved, and the church was able to maintain its identity as an exclusive group of believers gathering around the communion table as full lidmaten, whereas the services were also frequented by the larger group of liefhebbers, who did not fall under the discipline of the church.

In his examination of Reformed exile theology Schilling draws heavily on the ideas of Heiko Oberman, who drew a strict distinction between the communal and the city reformation, on the one hand, and the Calvinist ‘Reformation of the refugees,’ on the other. Whereas the communal and the city reformers envisaged an all-embracing church for the whole community or even tried to transform it into a kind of Erasmian magnum monasterium, Calvin did not understand his own position as that of the Leutpriester of Geneva, or the people’s priest of the Genevan city-state. He did not receive his calling from the city council, as had been the case in the late medieval Praedikaturen. He insisted that he had been called to his ministry directly by God, just as Isaiah to his prophecy, David to his kingship, and Paul to his apostolate. Reading the Scriptures as an exiled refugee in light of his own experience, he addressed his listeners and readers not as citizens of Geneva or any other European region, but rather as uprooted wayfarers who had signed up for the hazardous trek to the eternal city.
According to Oberman, central aspects of Calvin’s theology, such as the doctrine of divine predestination, were rooted in the experience of being persecuted and cannot be understood outside the context of the exile situation.⁸⁷ Oberman argued that in pre-modern Europe being banished and exiled was regarded as divine punishment for those who had fallen into apostasy or were abandoned by God’s mercy and providence, such as the wandering Children of Israel after their rejection of Christ, whereas Calvinism brought about a radical reevaluation of the diaspora experience: wandering through a hostile world became solid evidence that God directed his chosen few through the desert to the Promised Land.⁸⁸

To be sure, the focus on particular socio-historical constellations, such as the exile situation of French and Dutch Calvinists or the local structures of the southern German towns experiencing a typical ‘city reformation’, has contributed much to the understanding of certain confessional cultures and forms of worship that emerged during the sixteenth century. Nevertheless, Oberman’s answer to the question of how these specific historical contexts contributed to the formation of distinct religious and confessional phenotypes has two essential limitations. First of all, Oberman and Schilling were primarily interested in, and have vigorously emphasized, the notion of the religious confession. As Schilling writes in a recent article, the fundamental distinction between the confessional cultures of continental Lutheranism and Western European Calvinism was the prominent ‘peregrinus mentality’ of the latter. By contrast, Schilling argues, the experience of exile was absent from the historical identity of Lutheranism and its religious-sociological shape that was rather
determined by stability and legal security under the protection of the Peace of Augsburg. It was characterized by the continental parochialism of the regional churches, which cared for the spiritual and social welfare of the natives and was inclined to perceive strangers as intruders and troublemakers.⁸⁹

In fact, the experience of exile was by no means exclusively Reformed, and as historians of Central Europe and other regions have recently demonstrated, being
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⁸⁷ Oberman, *Two Reformations*, p. 162.
⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 83.
exiled and banished could also play an important role in the theology of other confessions. Not only Calvinists but also Lutherans, Mennonites and Catholics fashioned themselves as ‘the persecuted Children of God’ and regarded exile as a creditable mark of the ‘true Christians’.

A second problem with the notion of an exclusively Reformed exile theology, as defined by Oberman and Schilling, is the lack of clarity about the social as well as the theological locus of this phenomenon. When Oberman spoke of the ‘Reformation of the refugees’, he did not get far beyond an impressive exegesis of Calvin’s works. Building on Oberman’s work, Schilling proclaimed the decisive impact of a Reformed exile theology for the constitution of a specifically Dutch form of Calvinism. However, this postulate has not yet been tested by a systematic study of primary sources. It is therefore still unclear what happened ‘between’ Calvin’s ideas and the concrete form of exile theology in the Netherlands. Even if Oberman’s turn to the ‘Reformation of the refugees’ started as a bold attempt to ground the study of theology in social history, the focus on canonical reformers like Calvin remained dominant although the direct impact of Calvin’s genuine ideas on the diasporic networks is highly questionable. Not only were works like the Institutes available relatively late in the Low Countries and the typical exile destinations of the Reformed refugees, but assuming primacy of the influence of a, though highly approved and authoritative, theologian like Calvin above the practical experience of the great numbers of refugees themselves would be incompatible with Oberman’s own program of a ‘social history of religion’.

In order to reexamine the notion of such an exile theology, I propose to address ‘theology’ in a broader sense and to conceive of it not as a static system of
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doctrines but as a historical and context-bound interpretation of human experiences in the light of faith.\footnote{The notion of theology as a practice, which is not limited to academically trained divines, has become increasingly important in the field of historical theology during the last twenty years (See e.g.: Angie Pears, \textit{Doing contextual theology}, Abingdon 2010.). In the context of this development, Stephen B. Bevans has identified five types of contextual theology. My characterization of ‘exile theology’ corresponds to what he calls the ‘praxis model’ (Stephen B. Bevans, \textit{Models of Contextual Theology}, Maryknoll 2002, p. 82.).}

Theological reasoning is, of course, never restricted to divines and academics but is a practice of professional theologians and laypeople alike. The sources to be studied here are therefore not restricted to academic books and tracts. In order to get a fuller grasp of how the experience of religious exile was articulated in theological terms we should also consider sermons, literary texts, pamphlets and personal writings as well as social practices. By doing so I hope to present a clearer and more contextualized picture of what early modern ‘exile theology’ was and in which social and religious milieus it was practiced and cultivated. What can be gained by ‘zooming out’ of the theological characteristics of the various confessional currents and their canonical heroes is a better explanation of the cultivation of exile identities by adherents of various early modern confessions. As the source material from the Netherlands shows, the fashioning of such identities and theological explanations and justifications did not differ very much between Reformed, Mennonite or Libertine or even Catholic authors.

\textit{Making sense of exile}

A crucial challenge for many of the exiles who had left the Netherlands during the religious persecutions was how to interpret their present situation and God’s purpose behind it. Particularly during the first two migration waves of Protestants and dissenters from the Netherlands in the 1540s and 1550s and during the early Dutch Revolt between 1566 and 1572 going into exile was rarely motivated by economic consideration but above all by the need to escape immediate danger. Open dissent could easily cost people their lives, and flight was the only way to avoid martyrdom. The desperation surrounding the forced peregrination through foreign lands and the threatening insecurity are clearly expressed in the early writings of refugees. Many of their works remained highly influential and were frequently reprinted and, in the
case of manuscripts, conserved and treated as objects of commemoration. Among those works was Jan Utenhove’s *Simplex et fidelis narratio* (‘Simple and truthful narration’) which became a formative and canonical narrative of the Netherlandish diaspora. The book was not only reprinted more than seven times between 1560 and the early seventeenth century but also translated into German and spread among the Reformed territories of the Empire. Utenhove’s work described the burdensome odyssey of a group of 175 Dutch refugees, who had first fled to England but were forced to leave their exile abode after Mary Tudor’s coronation in 1553. During the winter of 1553/54 they sailed along the North Sea coast to seek asylum in the ports of Northern German and Danish towns but were expelled due to the agitation of Lutheran clerics and city councils. The *Simplex et fidelis narratio* stylized the refugees as steadfast Christians, persecuted for the sake of faith, and at the same time accused Lutherans of confessional fanaticism. Until the eighteenth century Utenhove’s work remained a cornerstone of Reformed exile narratives in Germany and England and strongly informed the stranger congregations’ chronicles and their sense of the past. Similarly, an early history of the war in the Netherlands, written by Emmanuel van Meeteren in England, was highly influential in the later memory cultures of the diaspora abroad and was still used in eighteenth-century chronicles of stranger churches. Among the more theological and pastoral works on exile Hieronymus van der Voort’s pastoral works on flight, war and banishment had their heyday a considerable time after his death, and they were reprinted several times.
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during the seventeenth century. These works, along with those of writers like Jean Taffin, Caspar Cooltuyn, and Ysbrand Balck in the Reformed tradition or Menno Simons and Dirck Coornhert in the Mennonite and Libertine camps would shape the emerging discourse on exile for decades and remain popular.

Like Cooltuyn’s *Evangeli der Armen*, Van der Voort’s *Een schoon profijtelik boeck, ghenaemt den benauden, verjaechden Christen* (‘A fair and useful book, called the afflicted and exiled Christian’) was intended to serve as a pastoral manual on the question of how to deal with affliction and exile as a believer. Styled in the form of the contemporary popular *rederijkers* poetry, the work is structured in thirteen questions, posed by the ‘poor afflicted Christian’. The answer to these questions consists exclusively of Bible quotes dealing with exile, suffering and war. Though dedicated to the Woerden nobleman Roeland van der Staken, on whose soil Van der Voort and other exiled ‘Christians’ were allowed to live, the book is explicitly addressed to ‘those who are aggrieved, displaced from their homeland and afflicted by depressing thoughts’. The ‘scriptural’ answers to the question of the afflicted believers point to God’s providence that assures them of His guidance and final relief of earthly afflictions. To illustrate God’s guidance practically, Van der Voort ends the book with a brief narration of his own deliverance after he had been accused of heresy under Alba’s Council of Troubles. This story is also meant to provide his work with more authenticity; not only had he suffered greatly under the persecuting regime, but God had not forgotten him in his afflictions:

> After my death, you shall hear speak of me,  
> for this is my book and no one can doubt it,  
> which I have written, having fled  
> from Lier in Brabant,  
> when the Duke of Alba came there,  
> a tyrant in all his deeds,  
> with his Egyptian locusts, which devour all the green.  
> Though they leave the land bare-branched, they are not sated.  
> They harm not only the Christian but every man,
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97 Hieronimus van der Voort, *Een schoon profijtelik boeck, ghenaemt den benauden, verjaechden Christen*, Haarlem 1612.

98 On sixteenth-century *rederijkers* (rhetoricians’) poetry and drama in which religious topics were frequently discussed, see: Gary K. Waite, *Reformers on Stage. Popular Drama and Religious Propaganda in the Low Countries of Charles V, 1515-1556*, Toronto 2000.

99 Ibid., fol. E9v.(Finis): ‘Derselffde is nut mijn Boeck te hooren spreken, die daer bedroeft zijn, ut haer vaderlant gheweken, desolaet met ghepeynsen behaeyen.’
But from their hands I was saved by God Himself in all His grace, on the ninth of July in 1568, He fulfilled His work and I could escape by daylight, but unrecognized by the guards in front of my house. When God intends to intervene, no one and nothing can resist.\footnote{Ibid., fol. E10r.: ‘Want naer mijn doot, suldy noch hooren spreken, My dats mijn boeck dwelck niemant en sal weiren Dwelck ick ghemaect hebbe, zijnde gheweken, Wt Liere in Brabant, doen daer quam ghestreken Duck de Alba, tyrannich in al zijn affeiren, Met de Egiptische Sprinchanen die tgroen vertreiren Ja dlant cael maken, en blijven noch onversadich, Niet den Christenen alleen, maer ecken schadich, Wt hare handen tooch my de Heere ghenadich Alsmen vijftienhondentachtentestich dicteerde, Julij neghen, twas Gods werck ghestadich Dat ick sdaechs wt mijn cot, deur de wakers passeerde, Waer God een aenslach drijft noyt yet en facteerde.’}

The notion of a final triumph through God’s providence is inherent in virtually all the pastoral writings of the Netherlandish refugees. However, this triumph was not always sought in this earthly life but in the great reward the true believers would be granted in heaven. This notion is strongly pronounced in the numerous writings which Menno Simons published about exile. In his *Eyne troestelijke van dat lijden, cruyze, unde vervolginge der heyligen* (‘A consoling exhortation of the suffering, cross and persecution of the godly’) the Beatitudes of the Sermon of the Mount (Matthew 5) are applied to the persecuted believers, particularly verses 10 and 11: ‘Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness’ sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven’.\footnote{Menno Simons, *Eyne troestelijke vermaninge van dat lijden, cruyze, unde vervolginge der heyligen, unme dat woort Godes, unde zijne getuichenisse*, s.l. 1554/1555(?), fol. A1r.-A3v.} The righteous, Menno explains, had always been persecuted, from Abel to Jesus and his followers. The prophets of the Old Testament were often forced to flee as were the first Christians.\footnote{Ibid., fol. B3v.; fol.E4r.} Contemporary believers had no reason to think that they would be an exception:

I hope, dear Brethren, that these examples have made clear to you of which kind the people the godly were and which spirit was in them, namely Christ Jesus, the silent, peaceful, innocent and obedient Lamb of God. And his members were banished, plundered, betrayed, incarcerated, tortured,
mutilated, drowned, burned and strangled, without any mercy and from the beginning until this present day.\textsuperscript{103}

The world as a hostile place for the godly from its foundation onwards is a notion shared by pastoral authors of all confessional allegiances, who argued that being cast out was the ‘natural’ fate of believers. According to Doede van Amsweer, a nobleman from Groningen who had converted to Reformed Protestantism when travelling in Germany and had to flee his homeland after the Catholic recapturing of the Ommelanden, the present state in the Netherlands had to be understood as an affliction brought upon Dutch Protestants by Satan himself, whom God allowed to test the faith and loyalty of the believers, as He had tested Job in the Old Testament.\textsuperscript{104} Doede van Amsweer’s work, which he dedicated to his fellow exiles, consisted mainly of a translation of a tract by Hieronymus Savonarola on Psalm 31 that encouraged believers to remain steadfast and not to doubt the rightfulness of their cause. Banishment from one’s homeland was Satan’s attempt to discourage the exiles and to tempt them to compromise with the ungodly customs of the world. What they needed to do was to understand the causes behind their afflictions and persevere to prove their godliness.

\textit{Punishing the wicked – chastising the elect}

Many of the writings on exile and persecution written by refugees from the Low Countries share a paradoxical tension: on the one hand, exile is increasingly revaluated and praised while, on the other hand, the reason for flight is often sought in a godly punishment. In 1606, playwright and rhetorician Jacob Duym, who had fled to Leiden after the fall of Antwerp in 1585, published his \textit{Ghedenck-boeck}, a collection of propagandistic plays about the Dutch Revolt in which the atrocities of the Spanish enemy were graphically depicted and the patriotic Netherlanders of all

\textsuperscript{103} Ibid., fol. G3r.: ‘Ick verhope weerde Broeders, dat hier in dese aenghetoghene Exempelen […] bewesen is wattet alle wegen voor eyn Volck geweest is, uth wat Vader se gheboren sijn unde wat Gheyst se gedreven heeft, die Christum Jesum, dat Lystijcke, Vreenstamge, Unschuldige, unde Gehoorsamige Lam Gades [sic], unde sijne heylighe Ledematen van Aenfange heer so unbermhertelijcken hebben uthghestoten, geplundert, belogen, ghevangen, ghepijnc, afghehouwen, verbraden, versticket, ummeghebracht unde vermoort tot op dese yeghenwoordigen dach toe.’

provinces, who had heroically defended their country, enthusiastically praised. In one of the plays, *Belegheringhe der stadt Antwerpen*, a confusing ambivalence appears. In the play, the city of Antwerp is presented as an allegorical personage, the innocent virgin Antwerpia, who has to suffer under the iniquities of the besiegers. She trusts in God's providence and remains confident and virtuous. Once the city is conquered by the Spanish, the tenor of the play seems to change radically: when Antwerpia laments her fate, another allegorical personage, *Gods stranghe rechtvaerdicheyt* (‘God’s severe justice’) appears and explains the reason for the fall. God has punished the corrupt city, ‘whose sins stink towards heaven’. At once, Antwerpia seems to be transformed from an innocent virgin into a guilty city deserving of punishment.

How can this ambivalence be explained? In the collective memory of the Northern Netherlands, especially in orthodox-Reformed circles, the fall of the Calvinist cities in the south served as an exemplary warning against earthly vanities and the arrogance of the rich. The theme of the downfall of the proud and luxurious Flemish and Brabantine merchant towns was often addressed in Reformed sermons. During the Twelve Years’ Truce, Reformed minister Jacobus Trigland warned his Haarlem congregation not to forget the terrible example of Antwerp, which was punished for its arrogance and luxuriousness. In a sermon on Exodus 8:1-20, held in the late 1580s by Sluis minister and former Carthusian monk Wilhelmus Commantius, the punishment of the Southern cities was compared to the fate of the seven churches in Asia from the Book of Revelation and their downfall under the Turks hundreds of years later. The punishment of Egypt by the ten plagues could also serve as an example of God’s intervention in the plans of the disobedient, who resembled the people in the fallen Southern cities. At the time when the sermon was preached, the Reformed congregation in Sluis consisted mostly of refugees from the ‘punished towns’ in the South.

---

109 Ibid., p. 21.
Johannes Arcerius from Noordhorn, all the congregation’s ministers between 1578 and 1587 were themselves Flemings and Brabanders.\textsuperscript{110} What was the significance of the interpretation of the fall of Antwerp and other Southern cities as a divine punishment for people who were Southern exiles themselves? When the Reformed refugees presented themselves as the new children of Israel, why did they wish to understand the exodus from Antwerp as a righteous judgment? A typical feature of sixteenth-century exile theology in the Netherlands was the notion of the twofold nature of God’s punishment. This notion can also be found in the works of Calvin as he tried to explain why the elect were faced with persecution and exile. For him, the afflictions Christians had to suffer in this world were in the first instance meant to test their faith and confidence in God: as Abraham was tempted by the command to sacrifice Isaac, the obedience of His elect was still tested from time to time. By being afflicted and persecuted, they were cleansed ‘just as gold is tried in a furnace of fire’.\textsuperscript{111} By recalling the famous verses from Proverbs 3:11 to the minds of his readers, Calvin sees earthly tribulations as a sign of God’s love towards His elect: ‘For whom the Lord loveth he correcteth; even as a father the son in whom he delighteth’. By chastising the believers, God purifies them and thus saves them from damnation, which is prepared only for the wicked.\textsuperscript{112} Once having been subjected to God’s chastisement, the elect are consoled by the knowledge of the intention behind it:

\begin{quote}
Poverty, indeed considered in itself, is misery; so are exile, contempt, imprisonment, ignominy: in fine, death itself is the last of all calamities. But when the favour of God breathes upon us, there is none of these things which may not turn out to our happiness.\textsuperscript{113}
\end{quote}

The twofold nature of divine punishment was an often recurring theme in theological treatises and sermons among Dutch exiles. In the \textit{Evangeli der Armen}, Cooltuyn asserted that all afflictions in this world occurred only to benefit the true believers. The work is composed as a dialogue between the characters Theophilus and Dorothea, who reflect on the question of God’s will in human suffering and

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{110} Ibid., pp. 33-39.
\textsuperscript{111} Calvin, \textit{Institutes of the Christian Religion}, p. 498.
\textsuperscript{112} Ibid., p. 499. Calvin refers to 1 Corinthians 11:32 here.
\textsuperscript{113} Ibid., p. 500.
\end{flushright}
affliction. The Reformed Theophilus teaches the sick Dorothea the basic Protestant doctrines, and they discuss the question of why God lets His children be persecuted. In his explanation and justification of human suffering Cooltuyn draws on the fundamental distinction between ‘natural’ and ‘godly’ men. While natural men seek only earthly joys and pleasures, they forget about God and become more and more removed from His will and presence. To keep the believers close to Him, God chastises them and lets them suffer, lest they become too focused on the world and its concerns.\textsuperscript{114} For the children of God, suffering does not mean only chastisement but also sanctification: in their afflictions they can grow in godliness and are constantly reminded that their home is not in this world but in their eternal fatherland. Earthly afflictions like war, persecution and exile serve only to draw the believers closer to God.

In his devotional work \textit{De marques des enfants de Dieu} (‘The marks of the children of God’) Walloon Reformed preacher Jean Taffin developed the notion of a twofold judgment into an elaborate theological scheme.\textsuperscript{115} To him earthly tribulation was not so much a necessary evil that belonged to the earthly life of every Christian as the distinguishable ‘mark of the children of God’. At first sight, the experience of persecution would make the believers doubt God’s benevolence towards them:

What appearance is there (saith the flesh) that wee are the children of God? Our goods are violently taken from us, our possessions are confiscate, and our offices and Estates are taken away. We are driven out of our countrey, yea from countrey to countrey like vagabonds: we are hated of mother and father, and of our own kinsfolke and friends: we are drawne and kept in prison [...]: To be short, we see nothing but the wrath and the curse of God upon us.\textsuperscript{116}

In fact, Taffin elaborates, the experience of tribulations in the world is not a result of ‘the wrath and the curse of God’ but, on the contrary, a sign of His fatherly love. Only the reprobate are struck by God’s anger – for them, the horrors of this world are indeed meant as a punishment, whereas they serve the elect as a purifying

\textsuperscript{114} Cooltuyn, \textit{Dae Evangelie der Armen}, pp. 271ff.
\textsuperscript{115} I quote from the English translation by Anne Prowse: Jean Taffin, \textit{Of the markes of the children of God and of their comforts in afflictions. To the faithfull of the Low Countrie. By Iohn Taffin. Ouersee ne againe and augmented by the author, and translated out of French by Anne Prowse}, London 1590.
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid., p. 136.
chastisement. As an example of those for whom persecution and exile are a sure sign of God’s judgment, he mentions the Calvinist apostate Jean Haren: God ‘hath set him forth for an example of his judgments, that those that make profession of Religion, and chiefly the Ministers of the word, may study more and more to walke with a good conscience to keepe themselves in their vocation [and] to renounce the passions of the flesh.’ ¹¹⁷

The elect, on the contrary, are not punished but rather benefit from the tribulations in the world:

This which thou lamentest, is thy medicine, and not thy punishment. As in a house where there are many children, the rod is necessary: and as in a Citie subject to divers diseases, and where there is an evil ayre, Physicians are needfull: so in the house of God, where there are many children inclined to evill, the rod is many times more necessary than bread. ¹¹⁸

The believers should regard persecution and afflictions as a beneficial ‘medicine’ provided by God:

And indeed, behold the difference betweene a mad man, and one that is sicke of a corporal disease; the mad man is angry with the Physician, chaseth him away & throweth away the medicine; but the other sendeth for a Physician, taketh the drinke at his hand, thanketh him, yea and giveth him a reward. [...] let us not bee like mad men rejecting the medicine, let us give him thankes and blesse him, after the example of Job. ¹¹⁹

Reformed minister Ysbrand Balck, who preached the two last sermons before Reformed worship was made illegal, had to leave Antwerp twice, once in 1567 and then again in 1585. Balck argued in a vein similar to that pursued by Taffin: In both his farewell sermons, he chose to preach on the parable of the small mustard seed which became a strong and powerful tree (Mark 4:30). Referring to Hebrews 12:6-8, he tried to show that it was not only necessary that true believers be chastised by their Lord but that this chastisement was the sure sign that they were not ‘spiritual

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. 125.
¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 186f.
¹¹⁹ Ibid., p. 188.
bastards’ but the Father’s true beloved sons.\textsuperscript{120} Whereas the reprobate expect the elect to despair of the present situation, the elect are in fact consoled by it through the knowledge of their adoption by God: through this knowledge, ‘we do not become desperate notwithstanding all the […] persecution, banishment and exiling, strangling, killing and murdering […].’\textsuperscript{121}

In his introduction to the printed edition of the sermon from 1590, Balck makes clear that the fall of the town should be regarded as a warning from God himself. God had not yet given up on all the inhabitants of Antwerp, and His intervention has been fruitful indeed: even the ‘ghecrulde en ghedrulde Joffrouwen’, the cuddled and finely dressed damsels, whose lax morals had provoked the fall, understood the warning and were saved from eternal damnation.\textsuperscript{122} Chastising the elect was necessary for their salvation and the perseverance of their faith and their godly life. Like Taffin and Balck, rhetorician Hieronimus van der Voort, who had fled his hometown Lier for Holland, underlined the necessity of chastisement for true believers:

\begin{quote}
Everything that happens, be it persecution, be it prosperity or poverty,
Be it word or fire, comfort or discomfort, honour or humiliation,
it all only serves to benefit you, otherwise it would be prevented.
\textit{Because the rod is used to bring forth both knowledge and virtue.}\textsuperscript{123}
\end{quote}

Similarly, Menno and Coornhert saw the earthly tribulations of exile as a learning process: suffering was meant only to keep the godly oriented towards their master.\textsuperscript{124} On the way to their final destination they needed to be chastised in order to remain pure:

\begin{quote}
Wat u nut is, tsy vervolch, rijcdom oft armoede,
Sweert oft vier, gemac oft ongemac, smaat oft eere,
Want tot kennis en deucht, gebruuyctmen de voede.
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{121} Ibid., p. 145.

\textsuperscript{122} Ibid., \textit{Voorreden aende verstroyde Ghemeynte van Antwerpen}, IX.

\textsuperscript{123} Hieronimus van der Voort, \textit{Een schoon profijtelik boeck, ghenaemt den benauden , verjaechden Christen}, Haarlem 1612 (reprint), fol. E9r.: ‘Wat u nut is, tsy vervolch, rijcdom oft armoede,
Sweert oft vier, gemac oft ongemac, smaat oft eere,
Want tot kennis en deucht, gebruuyctmen de voede.’

\textsuperscript{124} Menno Simons, \textit{Eyne troestelijke vermaninge van dat lijden, cruyce, unde vervolginge der heyligen}, fol. O1v.ff.
This is how my God works:
He tests whom He loves the most.
He takes away knife and fire
and every harmful thing from His children
and gives them his cross-book, so they can learn patience.  

Exile and persecution as the mark of God’s true children

Perhaps the most prominent aspect of exile theologies during the Dutch Revolt was the emphasis on exile and persecution as marks of true Christian identity. This notion was not something exclusively Reformed and had earlier also been articulated by Luther and others, and it is telling that it was not Calvin or A. Lasco but the territorial reformer of Wittenberg, who regarded persecution and tribulation as marks of the True Church. Taffin encouraged the ‘faithfull of the Low Countrie’ in their confidence in divine providence by pointing to ‘the testimonies of your Adoption, and the full assurance of the certaintie of it’. As he assured his readers, afflictions in this world ‘have beene foretold, and therefore they ought to confirme us in the assurance of our adoption’. 

Taffin’s intention was to prevent persecution and exile from making his persecuted coreligionists doubt God’s benevolence towards them and from interpreting suffering and affliction as a sign of His wrath, as had been the case with numerous Huguenots after the massacre on St. Bartholomew’s Day. To refute their doubts and to encourage them in their faith, he points to earlier persecutions, like those of the first Christians:

[I]f the most excellent servants and children of God have always beene most afflicted, Afflictions ought not to make us doubt of our adoption and salvation, except wee will call in doubt the salvation and felicitie of those, whom we confesse to be very blessed children of God: Especially, if affliction doe serve greatly to pull our hearts from the earth, and to lift them

---

125 Coornhert, Abrahams Uytgangh, p. 302:
‘So gaet het oock te wercke met mynen Gode.
Die oeffent meest dien hy die meeste liefde draechn
Hy neemt sijn Kinders vuur en mes dat hun mach deren,
Ende gheeft hem’t kruys-boeck om gedult te leeren.’


127 Taffin, Of the markes of the children of God, preface To the faithfull of the Low Countrie, fol. A7r.

128 Ibid., p. 140.
up into heaven, to purifie our faith as gold in the fire, and to fashion us into a true obedience of God.\textsuperscript{129}

The notion of the continuity of Christian suffering in this world became a strong argument to explain the present situation. Ysbrand Balck listed the miseries of the believers of the Old Covenant: Joseph was brought as a slave to Egypt, Moses found himself wayfaring through an endless desert and David had been an exile for ten years. The first Church was severely persecuted for three hundred years, and in Balck’s own time, not only did the believers in the Netherlands have to flee their homes, but also the Swiss, English, Scottish and French Christians were persecuted by the wicked.\textsuperscript{130} Also Menno saw the entire history of the Church and the believers of the Old Covenant as marked by hostility from the ungodly world.\textsuperscript{131} The elect are recognizable by inverting the values of their environment and ‘searching the wisdom which is eternal and therefore they look like fools to the world.’\textsuperscript{132}

For Balck and Taffin as well as Menno or Coornhert exile acquired the character of an existential metaphor for Christian life. Addressing the question of the assurance of salvation of the individual believers, Taffin delineates the human condition after the fall of Adam and Eve as a situation of exile:

If there were two or three hundred inhabitants of some town banished for some offence, and after a generall pardon should be published, that all the banished of such a towne should have free liberty to returne thither, with all assurance to enter againe upon all their goods and honours: suppose thou wert one of those banished, and that he that hath given the pardon were a faithfull and true Prince: wouldest thou not believe, that thou wert comprehended in the pardon [...]? Now, wee have beene banished from the kingdome of heaven by the transgression of Adam. Iesus Christ dying for these banished persons, causeth a generall pardon to bee published by the preaching of the Gospell, with permission, yea with commandement to returne into heaven.\textsuperscript{133}

\textsuperscript{129} Ibid., pp. 138f.
\textsuperscript{130} Balck, \textit{Het cleyn mostert-zaet}, pp. 50ff.
\textsuperscript{131} Menno Simons, \textit{Eyne troestelijke vermaninge van dat lijden, cruycze, unde vervolginge der heyligen}, fol.: B1v.: ‘Ja, van deze aengheteykende Bangheyt, Druck, Droeffenisse, elende, bannen, slagen, scelden, belieghen, verraden, vangen, beroven, smadelijke doot unde Cruyce der Heiligen avervloeyet [sic] die ganse Schrift beide mit Vermaningen unde ooc mit exempelen unde geschiedenissen an allen orden.’\textsuperscript{132} Ibid., fol. L3v.: ‘Se soecken de wijsheyt de eeuwich is unde daerumme moeten ze hier aller werft naren zijn.’
\textsuperscript{133} Taffin, \textit{Of the markes of the children of God}, pp. 53f.
The exile situation is freed here from its concrete historical actuality and presented as the spiritual *conditio humana*. Those who follow the call to return to the ‘kingdom of heaven’ are still part of estranged humanity, but they have become conscious of their situation and do not regard themselves as inhabitants of this world but rather as homeless travelers on the way to eternity. Exile as a religious metaphor for the present state of the world was applied even to Christ himself. In 1560, the consistory of the Dutch Reformed stranger congregation in London wrote a letter to Queen Elizabeth, in which they identified their Lord with the mass of persecuted believers in this world. As they stated, ‘Christ [was] now an exile in His members’ and lived with his followers in a state of homelessness until all things were restored and the believers gathered in their father’s house.\(^\text{134}\)

Exile as a metaphor for Christian life in general did not always have confessionalist implications. In the works of Coornhert, who resented confessional strife and antagonism, the *verstrooying* (‘dispersion’) of the true Christians refers not only to violent persecution and expulsion but also to the contemporary situation of confessional division. As a spiritualist he felt that the true Church was shattered into pieces and divided between the various antagonizing confessions. None of the institutional churches could claim to be the true Church. The state of the true believers, who were divided along confessional lines, was one of isolation and dispersion. In his work *Ghelove ende wandel der verstroyde ende eenzame Christenen* (‘Faith and conduct of the dispersed and solitary Christians’) which mainly consisted of scriptural quotes, he distinguished the visible institutional churches from the spiritual body of Christ.\(^\text{135}\) Those who belonged to it were in fact free from church organizations and found themselves as a solitary minority among the hard-hearted masses who had subscribed to one of the various churches instead of following Christ in the right manner. For those who did, the present situation in the church was one of exile and dispersion – the visible Church was not their home, and they longed to be united in Christ. Sixteenth-century ‘exile theology’ could thus have implications that were fundamentally different from and opposed to the confessional Calvinist discourse in which early modern exile religiosity has often


\(^{135}\) D.V. Coornhert, *Ghelove ende wandel der verstroyde ende eenzame Christenen*, Gouda 1590.
been located by modern historians. Discourses of exile were omnipresent in the early modern Netherlandish religious landscape, and their uses could widely differ. The meanings of the exile metaphor were multifaceted – while they overlapped in some aspects, they also at times opposed and contradicted each other.

**Exile as God’s command**

Such a topical transfer from social and political reality to theological discourse was not rare and would shape the discourse on exile for a long time to come. Going into exile often meant sealing a religious choice and was also addressed as such. When the former priest Jean Baquesne from Normandy publicly renounced his old faith and converted to Calvinism in the Walloon Church in Middelburg, he addressed his spiritual development in terms of confessional exile:

> Because it is Babylon, of which the heavenly voices commands us to depart, saying: Come out of her, my people, that you not partake in her sins, and that you not receive of her plagues. Therefore I have departed from my birthplace and my parents and relatives and have joined the true children of God (being obedient to God’s commandment and following the example of the great patriarch Abraham, whom God commanded to leave behind his homeland and his kinfolics and to move out of his father’s house to seek the land God had promised him). I have left behind impure popery, the whore of Babylon and her evil pits. I have eluded the devil’s power, the veneration of the idols and the home of the Anti-Christ, by which I mean the Roman Church, which is concealed in falsehood, and now I throw myself into the bosom of the True Church.  

While Baquesne’s equation of conversion with exile seems rather metaphorical, for masses of early modern Europeans conversion did in fact mean not only a change of religious and ideological mindset but also of physical and social space. The imagery

---

136 Jean Baquesne, *Bekeeringhe ende wederroepinge des pvasdoms, openbaerlick ghedaen inde Francoische Kercke der Stadt Middelburgh*, Middelburg 1612, fol. A3v.: ‘[…] want tis het Babel, uyt welcke de hemelsche stemme ons beveelt te vertrekken,seghende: Gaet uyt van haer mijn volck, opdat ghy haerder sonden niet deelachtich en wordt, ende haer plagen en ontfangt. Daarom is’t dat ick (Godts gebodt onderdanich zijnde, volgende d’exempl des grooten Patriarchs Abrahams, den welcken de Heere beval uyt sijn landt ende meeschap te gaan, en sijns Vaders huys te verlaten, ende te trekke int landt dat hy hem wijzen soude) oock vertrokken ben uyt de plaetse mijnder geboorten ende hebbe mijn Ouders ende vrienden naer den vleesche verlaten, ende hebbe my comen voeghen by de de ware kinderen Gods.  Ick hebbe verlaeten ’t onreyne Paudsom, de hoere van Babel, ende hare fenijnighe putten, ende hebbe my ontrocken uyt des duyvels macht, uyt ’d aenroepinge der Afgoden, uyt de wooninge des Antichrists: Ick meene de Roomschke Kercke die vermont is is met gheveynstheyt, opdat ick my mocht werpen in de schoot der waerachtighe kercke.’
of leaving Babylon or Ur is used in many of the writings of Protestant exiles. Jacob Fokkens’ pamphlet that urged Catholics to flee the ‘city of sins’ and join the true Christian Church, first published in 1635, was reprinted until the late seventeenth century.\footnote{137 Jacob Fokkens, \textit{Fuga e Babylone, dat is: een vermaeninghe om uyt het Roomsche Babel te gaan, ofte een meditatie over de woorden der Openbaringe Johannis, int XVIII. cap. IV.}, Delft 1635. The last known edition is: \textit{Fuga e Babylone, dat is, Vlucht uyt Babel : of Geestelyke bedenking over Apoc. 18. vers 6.: tot waerschuwingh van alle roomsch-gesinden}, Gorinchem 1679.}

In the opposite confessional camp Catholics called on their undecided fellow-believers not to compromise with the rebels and employed the same language. Johannes Costerius, a priest in Oudenaarde, addressed the Catholics in the so-called Calvinist Republics in Flanders and Brabant and used the same Bible verse as Jean Bauquesne and Fokkens in his conversion testimony: ‘Come out of her, my people, that you not partake in her sins, and that you not receive of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God has remembered her iniquities’ (Revelation 18: 5). His \textit{Institutio necessaria de exitu Aegypti et fuga Babylonis} is set up as a plea for exile and urged the Catholics in the rebel towns to join their exiled brothers in Cologne or Douai.\footnote{138 Johannes Costerius, \textit{Institutio necessaria de exitu Aegypti et fuga Babylonis id est de egressu Catholicorum et civitatum haeretoricorum Iuramentis & Edictis, varioque; inevitabili contagio pollutis}, Douai 1580. See also: Janssen, ‘Quo vadis? Catholic Perceptions of Flight’; Janssen, ‘The Counter Reformation of the Refugee’.}

Exile was increasingly propagated as a religious necessity in the various confessional camps. Both Catholics and dissenters urged their coreligionists to stay loyal to their faith and leave their hometown if they were ruled by ‘heretics’ or ‘idolators’. In the early seventeenth century, Calvin’s tract against the Nicodemites was translated into Dutch and spread among the remaining Protestants in the Southern territories. His work was included in an anonymous pamphlet that urged Protestants from the southern provinces to migrate to avoid contamination from the ungodly religious practices of their neighbors.\footnote{139 Philips of Marnix, Lord of Saint-Aldegonde, who had left his Southern homelands for Holland, addressed his fellow-southerners, who thought that they could be steadfast enough to stay at home and remain Protestants. In his epistle \textit{Trouwe vermaninge aende christelick gemeynten van Brabant, Vlaanderen, Henegou, ende ander omliggende landen} (‘Faithful...’) 58
exhortation to Christian congregations of Brabant, Flanders, Henegouwen and other surrounding areas’) he even depicted the purges of Protestants after 1585 as a work of God, who wanted to lead His elect out of Egypt and Babylon. For Marnix, going into exile became almost a kind of religious imperative. He warned the Reformed believers not to act against God’s will:

Do not provoke and enrage the Eternal God only for the sake of temporal welfare, but follow the calling of the Lord with an alert and obedient heart and without looking back, when he wants to call you with Abraham from Ur in Chaldea and with Lot from Sodom and Gomorra.140

The purges in the south were God’s way to lead the faithful away from the fleshpots of Egypt; in the diaspora they would be free to practice their faith according to His commandments. To Marnix the exile question was of such enormous importance that he accused all those who stayed behind of forsaking their faith: he who loved his parents or children more than Christ was not worth the appellation of a Christian, and staying among the ungodly was hardly better than participating directly in their idolatry.141

The story of Abraham, who had been commanded to leave the Promised Land, became immensely popular in the emerging diasporic culture, and the biblical patriarch was celebrated as an exemplary role model. What made the story so attractive to discourses of the Netherlandish diaspora was the possibility to compare it to the present situation in various aspects. Not only did Abraham leave his homeland and all his social ties behind to head for the unknown, but his decision also marks an inner conversion: he submits himself to God’s will and cuts the bonds with the idolatrous practices he was accustomed to. In Coornhert’s play, Abraham is contrasted with other kinds of migrants, who seek only their earthly fortune and are admonished by the authoritative voice in the play. Abraham, however, is only acting on command:

141 Ibid., p. 519
Therefore I will quickly and humbly
obey my Lord’s command, and leave behind
my country and all my kin,
and move out of my father’s house,
heading for a strange land, which the Lord will show me.
He, who follows God, shall live with Him everywhere.\textsuperscript{142}

In a biblical play on Hagar, Abraham’s maidservant, published in 1615 by Abraham
de Koningh, also a refugee from Antwerp in Amsterdam, the same aspect of
Abraham is portrayed:

\begin{quote}
Now I forsake myself, my flesh, my goods and comfort,
my friends and fatherland and all my kin
for the sake of obedience to God,
who is pleased by it more than by sacrifices,
and worship Him with all my soul.
Idolatrous fatherland! Spellbound Chaldeans!\textsuperscript{143}
\end{quote}

Refugees like Coornhert, De Koningh and many others staged Abraham explicitly as
a spiritual hero \textit{and} as a migrant. By spiritualizing his choice for exile he could serve
as an example for all believers not only those who had left their homeland.
Coornhert explicitly exhorts the believers to follow Abraham’s example and join in
his spiritual pilgrimage:

\begin{quote}
Blessed he who with his heart and mind
flees all earthly desires
and always looks towards heaven.
He who travels through this world as if on pilgrimage
and faithfully desires only the Lord as heritage.\textsuperscript{144}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{142} Coornhert, \textit{Abrahams Uytganck}, p. 273:
‘Daeromme wil ick nu oock met spoedicheyt snel,
Onderdanigh volbreghen mijns Heeren bevel,
Ende gaen uyt myn landt, uyt alle myn maghen,
En uyt mijn Vaders Huys, ommte te beiaghen
Een vreemt Landt, dat my die Heere sal thoonen.
Die Godt volcht, Godt sal over al by hem woonen.’

\textsuperscript{143} Abraham de Koningh, \textit{Hagars vluchte}, Amsterdam 1615, p. 83:
‘”K ontsteel nu, als mijn selfs, eer lichaems goed’r end’rust,
Geboort’vriendt, Vaderlandt end’al mijn bloeds na-magen,
Uijt g’hoorsaemnheijt, die Godt, meer als ’t vet offer, lust,
Met een siel-grage dienst, devotich, op te dragen.
Afgodisch Vaderlandt! Betooverde Chaldeen!’

\textsuperscript{144} Coornhert, \textit{Abrahams Uytganck}, p. 315:
In the emerging imagination of the diaspora, exile and migration thus gained increasing religious prestige. Migration’s connotations of pilgrimage and asceticism often referred back to medieval discourses on monasticism. In many circles having been in exile became such a powerful recommendation that even one’s enemies were ready to acknowledge this sacrifice. When Menno Simons distanced himself from the early Anabaptists in Munster, he depicted them as cruel fanatics without any understanding of the biblical message. However, he still acknowledged that they must have been earnest and really believed that their course

‘Wel hem die so met hert, zin en gemoed,
Van d'aardsche lusten spoedt
Ten Hemel waert altyd,
Die als een gast ter wereld Pelgrineert.
Geloovigh vast den Heer tot erf begeert.’

145 Hans Bol was also a migrant from the Southern Netherlands. After having lived in Heidelberg in the 1560s, he moved back to his hometown Mechelen, but fled to Antwerp in 1572. In 1586 he left Antwerp for Amsterdam where he died in 1593 (See: Hans Bol, in: NNWB, vol. 8, p. 168.
was just since they had been willing to go into exile, to ‘leave behind their houses and homes, their goods and lands, their fathers, mothers, wives, children and even their own lives.’

At home in the diaspora
In some periods of the Dutch Revolt, for example in the early 1580s in the Southern Calvinist cities or after 1572 in Holland, many refugees were convinced that the time of exile lay behind them and that they could look back from a safe distance. In 1582, Antwerp minister and former exile Gaspar van der Heyden dedicated a treatise on the sacrament of Baptism to the magistrate and described the past from the triumphant perspective of having persevered in the times of hardship:

I have ventured to dedicate his aforementioned tract on the Holy Baptism to Your Honorable Lordships, whom God has installed as the Lords and providers of His Church and the regents of this republic, not only because you are so learned and able to judge what God’s Word teaches on this matter, but also because the Lord has called me to the service of the Holy Gospel in this town and has appointed and gathered Himself a congregation through my humble talents. I have nourished this congregation night and day for three years, until I was forced to flee the town and forsake all my possessions in order to save my life. How much the congregation had to suffer in the meantime: on the one hand, because the persecutions and, on the other, because of the hostilities of all kinds of sects and heresies. Nevertheless the Lord has always protected and maintained it, so that it could remain undefeated and, as it pleased Him, proclaim Jesus Christ, His son, as King, while Satan’s dominion was scattered in many pieces.

---

146 Menno Simons, *Een schoone ende profitelijcke vermanende ende bestaRefinding redene aan die overheyt, gheleeerde, ende ghemeyn volck, aan die verdorven secten, ende aan die ghene die om des Heeren waerheyt daghelijcx vervolghinghe lijden moeten. Noch een troostelijc vermaen tot de bruyt Jesu Christi*, Antwerpen 1552(?), fol.L3v.: ‘[…] ende daer voor hebben si verlaten huys, hof, lant, sant [sic].

147 Gaspar van der Heyden, *Cort ende claer bewijs vanden Heyligen Doop*, Antwerpen 1582, fol. A2: ‘Dit voors. Tractaet vanden H. Doop heb ick my verstout U.E. toe te schrijven, dien Godt als Voedster-heere synen kercken, ende tot Regeerders deser Republijck en gestelt heeft, niet alleen omdat U.E. als gheleeerde ende verstandige in Godes woort connen oordeelen wat vander saken is, maer ooc dwylie my de Heere van omtrent over 30 Jaren in deser stadt, totten dienst synes H. Evangeli beroopen ende door myne geringen gaven hem een ghemeynfte versamelt heeft, die ick met vele tranen, arbeys, perijckels ende sorghen, dry Jaren lanc dach en nacht opgevoestert hebbe, tot dat ick eyndelijck, ghelijc vander doot verlost wert, ende met verlies myner goederen de selve moeste verlaten, maer hoe veel aenstonts die daerentusschen geleden heeft, ter ende syden, door de vervolghinge. ter andr anden door menigheley secten ende ketteryen, so heefte nochtans de Heere doorgaens beschermt, ende geheandheeft, datse onverwinnelijck gehebleven is, tot dat het hem believed heeft, synen sone Jesum Christum openbaarlijk tot ener Coninck te doen wtoondigen, Satan’s rjck in velen deelen verstoort hebbende.’
Of course, exile was not yet over for Van der Heyden and many of his coreligionists in Antwerp. In 1585, Van der Heyden had to leave again for Germany and served the congregation in Frankenthal where he had already preached until 1574. Among the congregations he served were those of Antwerp, Emden, Frankfurt, Frankenthal and Middelburg. His colleague Ysbrand Balck shared this fate. In Antwerp, he held the same farewell sermon twice, when he was forced to leave in 1567 and again in 1585. In his foreword to the printed edition of 1590 he perceived his entire life in terms of exile: since the first days of his conversion from Catholicism he had not had any permanent home and was constantly travelling among the various Calvinist exile towns. For many, the topos of the ever-wandering pilgrim who travelled as a stranger through this world was more than mere imagination. Many Reformed refugees indeed moved hence and forth between Antwerp, Emden, London and Holland. Along the translocal networks of their faith, they lived in a diasporic space that connected the safe havens of Calvinism in the North Sea, the Rhine region and the Baltic.

As Daniel Rogers, diplomat of the English Crown and son of an Antwerp mother and an English father, stated in 1578, those who rejected Catholicism had become ‘strangers in their own country’. In his ode on the exile town Frankenthal that had been granted to the Netherlandish refugees by Frederick III, count of the Palatine, Rogers praises the town as a place where Netherlandishness was cultivated outside the Low Countries and where the strangers could find a better home: ‘Despite his harsh fate, every exile, who is able to preserve his homeland in his place of refuge, can count himself fortunate.’ According to Rogers, the refugees preserved their Netherlandish customs, style of clothing and food and had transferred their home into another geographical region without really losing it. While the Low Countries were vanishing, in Frankenthal they could arise to new glory, and its inhabitants were planted like trees from foreign coasts into new and

149 Ibid.: ‘Foelix sorte suam, saeva quae siti, obtin et exul Sede peregrinam patria cuncta colens.’
even more fertile soil.\textsuperscript{150} Netherlandishness is detached here from geography and transformed into a cultural and religious identity that can take shape in the diaspora.

Many dissenters who had not yet gone in exile themselves developed a strong consciousness of belonging to the diaspora. Indeed they felt that they had become ‘strangers in their own country’, as Rogers had put it. Around 1575 the Antwerp regent and merchant Peter van Panhuys commissioned a painting by Maarten de Vos that depicted his entire family including their wider network of friends as the ancient Israelites on their way from Egypt to the Promised Land. The core of the family, Peter van Panhuys and Gillis Hooftman and their wives and children, still lived in Antwerp at the time, but others among the depicted persons lived in England or Germany by 1575, for example Johan Radermacher and his wife, a niece of Gillis Hooftman, or Lucas d’ Heere who had fled Antwerp due to his religious convictions earlier.\textsuperscript{151} Even though many persons portrayed in the painting were not physically present at the same place at one time, they were united in the imagined space of the diaspora.

Maarten de Vos, \textit{Mozes toont de tafelen der Wet}, Catharijneconvent Utrecht (Item on loan from Mauritshuis, The Hague).

\textsuperscript{150} Ibid.: ‘Non aliter quam quae persis venit arbor ab orbis
Translata floret fit meliorque suo.’

For the Van Panhuys and Hooftman families themselves, exile became a reality only after the recapturing of their hometown in 1585. However, they partook in the culture of the diaspora much earlier and given their dissenting religious views and practices, it was only realistic of them to be prepared for exile. The identification with the exodus narrative remained strong among the Van Panhuys circle. When Peter van Panhuys died shortly after having left Antwerp to travel via Amsterdam to his children in Germany, Johan Radermacher wrote the text for his epitaph and portrayed his old friend as a pilgrim on earth:

I’ve carried my city’s heavy burden  
in many honest and honorable functions:  
as bailiff, custodian, juryman and treasurer,  
I have served in Antwerp I came here after a grave siege.  
I died here as a pilgrim, three days after my wife  
and now we lie lost in the dust of the earth.  
No earthly goods, nor friends, nor doctors  
could delay the hour of death.  
If Christ had not payed for us, we’d have become ashes in hell.  
Therefore love God, avoid sin and the world’s illusions  
‘cause everything that shines and twinkles,  
decays like dust and smoke,152

The exile heritage of the Van Panhuys family was commemorated for many generations, as will be shown in chapter 5. The foundations of this discourse, however, had been laid in the sixteenth century when the migration experience demanded a religious interpretation and created a range of new identities.

152 Album Joannis Rotarii, fol. 169r:  
‘Stadts lasten swaer ick droech; tis eerlyck alst wel sticht;  
Almoessenier, Rentmeester, oock schepe, lest thresorier  
T Antwerpen uut gedient. Uut swaer beleg'ring quam ick hier  
Als pilgrom, daer ick storf', myn wyf dry daeg' tev oren.  
Nu liggen wy hier int stof, der Werelt als verloren:  
5 doods ure en condem t goet, vrinden, noch meester uutstel,  
Hadd' Christus niet g'rantsoent, wy waren t'aes der hellen.  
Daerom Lief Godt, vliet sond', t bedroch der werelt varen laet:  
Want hoe schoon dat hier blinckt, als wolck end roock alles vergaet.’
Chapter 2 - Recapturing the patria

Memory and the anticipation of the future

After the fierce strife between the armies of the Habsburgs and the United Provinces during the 1590s and the first years of the new century it became clear that the two sides had reached a stalemate. The prospects of a definitive victory for either side appeared hopeless.\textsuperscript{153} Except for Southern refugees, who hoped for a reconquest of Flanders and Brabant many in the Northern camp had lost heart. Among those who still hoped for an imminent change in the military stalemate was Francois van Aerssen, the ambassador of the Dutch Republic in Paris, who had left Brussels with his parents in the 1580s. Even when it became apparent that France would not intervene in the conflict, Van Aerssen refused to give up his optimism and did not cease to repeat that ‘war and peace take turns like day and night’ and that the military situation could change unexpectedly.\textsuperscript{154}

Among the great numbers of refugees in the Northern Provinces there were many who refused to see the cities of Holland as their new home and give up their hope to return to the South. Antwerp merchant Johan Thijs had followed the military developments in the Netherlands and the Holy Roman Empire closely ever since he had left Antwerp after the capitulation of his home town to Farnese’s armies. In his letters to his brother-in-law Andreas de Bacher from the 1590s Thijs reported the latest news from the Low Countries and France and informed his kinsman about the situation in the Empire. His hopes for a return to Antwerp were directly connected to his political vision of the conflict: the Southern Netherlands had to be recaptured with the assistance of a broad alliance of German Protestant rulers. When enquiring into Spanish military actions in the Empire during the 1590s, he did not do so out of purely economic interest in the safety of trade routes but primarily because of the significance of the war in Germany for the cause of the Revolt.\textsuperscript{155} Thijs considered the events in Germany of crucial importance for the situation in the Netherlands. Once the Spaniards had gone too far on German soil, he hopefully concluded one of his letters, the German princes would no longer remain patient: ‘And when the

\textsuperscript{153} Israel, The Dutch Republic, pp. 259f; Geoffrey Parker, The Army of Flanders and the Spanish Road, 1567-1659, Cambridge 1972.

\textsuperscript{154} A. Th. van Deursen, Maurits van Nassau. De winnaar die faalde, Amsterdam 2000, p. 187.

\textsuperscript{155} See: e.g.: Arch Thys. 133: A4: Brieven aan Andreas de Bacher. July 8, 1598 and February 16, 1599; Arch. Thys. 133: B1: March 17, 1599.
Protestants have moved to the battlefield, I am confident that they are willing to help the cause in our countries [...]'.

The notion of a united international Protestant alliance played a central role in Thijs’s thinking about the war in the Netherlands. This perspective was typical for the network of Reformed Antwerp merchants in the Republic and the Empire. Since their departure from Brabant in the 1580s men like Anthoine ‘l Empereur, Daniel van der Meulen and Jacques della Faille had followed international politics closely, and in their view the Revolt was part of a broader, international conflict. When in 1588 the Spanish Armada was heading northwards, Van der Meulen and Della Faille were eager to receive the latest news about this campaign. Partly, their interest was due to their trading activities with England, but for them the stakes were higher than that: a victorious fleet would threaten not only Britain but soon also the Netherlands. Della Faille was right in his assumption that the Spanish Armies planned to prepare an invasion of England from Flemish soil, and he was well aware of the consequences of such an operation: the war would enter a new stage. Two years earlier he had been concerned about the outbreak of civil war in the Empire when the war between the prince-bishop of Cologne and Imperial troops threatened to escalate, and there were rumors about the election of the Danish king as a counter candidate to Emperor Rudolf by the Protestant electors. Like Della Faille and Thijs, Anthoine ‘l Empereur eagerly collected and reported international news: not only did he take notes about recent military actions in Central Europe and the Empire, but he also copied texts such as Henry IV’s declaration of his conversion to Catholicism or pamphlets about the wars of his time.

That this interest in international news cannot solely be attributed to their economic interests is best illustrated by the letters from Johan Thijs to his brother-in-law Andreas de Bacher, who served the Duke of Brunswick as a medical attendant. To the physician De Bacher trading affairs were of little interest anyway, and we can clearly detect patterns in the correspondence that show the connection of

156 Arch Thys. 133: A4.: Brieven aan Andreas de Bacher. July 8, 1598: ‘Ende ist dat de protestanten hebben haer moeten int velt begeven is mijn vertrouwen datse de saecken in dese landen voorts sullen helpen […].
157 RAL, Archief Daniël van der Meulen, 96, inv. nr. 538, Brieven van Jacques della Faille, nr. 95-96; June 10, 1588; nr. 98-99; July 4, 1588.
158 Ibid., 55-56; November 16, 1586.
159 Arch. Thys. 279: Stukken afkomstig van Anthoine ‘l Empereur: Nouvelles. (1593, 1596, 1606.)
recent news to the greater context of the Revolt and the expectations the refugees had of the future. In the period from 1596 until 1601 the letters are full of references to the war and the hope for international Protestant support in the Low Countries while the correspondence from 1601 onwards seems devoid of any mentions of war or politics. In 1596, Thijs expected an intervention of fifty English war ships and was hopeful that Elizabeth I could turn the tide in the Netherlands: he had heard the good news from Antwerp and expected the end of Habsburg rule in the South to be at hand: ‘In all of my days, I have never had more hope than now.’\textsuperscript{160} During the following years his hope was built more on Protestant support from the Empire: even though he was concerned about Spanish raids in Cleves and elsewhere in Germany, the news about these events stimulated his optimism since these actions could stir the Germans up against the Spaniards and lead to a united Protestant front against Habsburg aggression:

We are greatly astonished by the enemy’s boldness that makes him vandalize the German soil in such a way. I reckon that he will not fare well in the end. We assume that this will cause their ruin and bring about a hope for peace. In our regions, they will have few chances, and in Brabant hope will not be given up. Therefore the princes in Germany will have to put them in their place. And if the Protestants will enter the battlefield, I trust that they will quickly help the cause in this country, since they are also clearly interested in what can be accomplished in one go. Therefore I ask you to tell me, what morale is among you. The Spaniard and his associates, who serve the Pope, think they accomplish great things, but they reckon without their host and we can fairly say that God is laughing at their plans.\textsuperscript{161}

How closely Thijs’s hope for an international front against ‘the Spaniard’ was connected to his own wish to return to Antwerp is clearly expressed in his letters:

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{160} Arch. Thys. 133: A3.: Brieven aan Andreas de Bacher. February 22, 1596: ‘Ick en heb mijn daegen geen beter moet gehad als nu.’
\textsuperscript{161} Arch. Thys. 133: A4.: Brieven aan Andreas de Bacher. February 8, 1599: ‘… ons verwondert seer de stouticheijt van den vijant dat hij den duytsen bodem soe derft beschadigen. Ick gisse dat het hem tot leste niet wel vergaen sal. Wij beelden ons in dat het een orsaeke sal wesen van haar verderfeniit ende een hoope van eenen vrede, bij ons sullen sij luttel kanß vinden, ende te brabant en begevense den verloren hoop niet, ergo de prinsen in Duyltslant die sullense moeten weijsen waer sij te huis horen. Ende ist dat de protestanten hebben haer moeten int velt begeven is mijn vertrouwen datse de saecken in dese landen voorts sullen helpen flitts dewijl sij merkelijck mede geïnteresseerd sijn welck met eender moeijite geschieden kan. Daerom bidde ick U.L. sal mij believeen eens te advijzen wat voor moet bij U.L. is, de spaniart ende geassesseerde die den paus dienen mijnen wonder aen te rechten maer sij rekenen sonder haeren weert men mach wel seggen dat godt haer raetlagen belacht.’
\end{flushright}
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Our hope is that the war, which has endured for so long now, will soon be over and that at last we can return to Antwerp, the city of our fathers. Because the haughtiness of the Spaniard has already reached its climax and it seems that he who has afflicted all the world may now be afflicted himself and since the spring he has suffered harm and derision not only at Schenckenschans but also in Nijmegen.\(^\text{162}\)

Thijs’s letters are full of such considerations until mentions of war and politics suddenly stop in the spring of 1601. While he had frequently expressed his hope once to return to his fatherland, Antwerp, since his departure from the Scheldt town, now he apparently had resigned and lost his confidence in a future in the South. On April 20, 1601, he wrote to De Bacher that although he had remained optimistic until the beginning of that year, he had now changed his mind:

But now I am in doubt and I start to question the (possibility of a coming) peace. Therefore I have resolved to buy a house here and to forget Antwerp.\(^\text{163}\)

After this letter and the self-imposed dictate to forget mentions of international politics and warfare become scarce, and Thijs’s decision to concentrate on a future in Holland seems to inhibit his interest in the cause of the Revolt. Only at a few moments, when he dares to catch a new glimpse of hope, does he resume writing about the course of the war and his wish to return to the South though mostly in a tone of resignation: even if there is no reasonable chance, he writes, ‘we still keenly desire to return to our fatherland’.\(^\text{164}\)

Until early in 1606, there was no change in Thijs’s view of the Revolt. In the years between 1601 and 1606 he seems to have tried hard ‘to forget Antwerp’, a goal not completely met. The silence about the past in the South and the desire to return was suddenly interrupted in 1606. In January of that year, Thijs apparently

\(^{162}\) Arch. Thys. 133: B1: Brieven aan Andreas de Bacher. July 13, 1599: ‘Onse hoope is dat wij haest een eynde hebben sullen hebben van dese swaere oorloge soe lange geduurt ende dat wij thans naer Antwerpen onse vaderlijcke stadt geraicken sullen want de grote hooftart van de Spaniaert is op het hoogste geweest ende t’schijnt dat die alle de werelt bedroefft heeft wel mocht bedroefft worden hij heeft sint het voorjaer passelijke schaede geleden ende spot, soe bij de Schenckenschans als bij Nimegen.’

\(^{163}\) Arch. Thys. 133: B2: Brieven aan Andreas de Bacher. 20 april 1601: ‘Maer nu sta ick in bedencken ende beginne te twijffelen aen de vrede. Soo dat ik geresolved heb allier een huis te koopen ende Antwerpen te vergeten.’

\(^{164}\) Arch. Thys. 133: B3: Brieven aan Andreas de Bacher. November 20, 1602: ‘[…] doch verlanct ons seer om weder in ons vaderlant te comen.’
suddenly regained his hope for a reversal of the course of events. In a letter to his brother-in-law he writes:

You give me back the hope that the chances may and can now turn quickly. I believe that finally we may well see a sudden change. For it has been a long time now and we get old – we get old and many of us die on the road because we still cannot enter the Promised Land.\textsuperscript{165}

In the same passage, Thijs again expresses his confidence in the ‘kings of France, England, Sweden and the princes of Germany’, who would no longer be willing to tolerate ‘the government of the Spaniards and Jesuits’.\textsuperscript{166}

The case of Johan Thijs seems to be typical for migrants of his generation who had left their homes in the Southern Netherlands and hoped for a return until the eve of the Twelve Years’ Truce. Particularly among the educated elite who had access to international news and media a well-defined consciousness about the causes and the perspectives of the war had emerged. This does not, of course, not imply that confessional and political consciousness determined all the decisions and actions of these people. As the correspondence of Thijs reveals, the wish to return to the South was prevailing. However, a return could not be envisaged at any costs but only once the Reformed faith had been reestablished and the ‘the haughtiness of the Spaniard’ broken.\textsuperscript{167} When the Truce was announced in 1609, the Thijs family, like the majority of their fellow-Antwerpers in the North, did not attempt to go back. On the contrary, they tried to sell the property in the South - even if the profits such sales yielded were very low.\textsuperscript{168} The only perspective Thijs and others could envisage for achieving a final return to Antwerp was a victory of the Republic’s Armies in alliance with other European Protestant forces. The vision of a united Protestant force against ‘the Spaniard’ was not based so much on deep-rooted confessional

\textsuperscript{165} Arch. Thys. 133: C3: Brieven aan Andreas de Bacher. January 26, 1606: ‘U.L. geven mij moet dat de cansen zich wel haest wenden ende keren conde. Ick gelove wel datter entlijck wel ligetijck een subite verandering conmen mochte. Dan de tijt valt ons lanck wij worden oudt(,) oud ende veel sterven daer onder wech dat wij het belooffde land niet in konnen conmen.’

\textsuperscript{166} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{167} This sheds new light on the findings of Oscar Gelderblom, who has studied refugees like Thijs first and foremost from an economic perspective. In Gelderblom’s view, the decisions of Thijs and other exiled Antwerp merchants were primarily dictated by economic considerations. However, as the correspondence of the Thijs family shows, not only religious commitment but also strong ties to what they perceived as their home played a crucial role in their deliberations about where to relocate and anticipate a possible future. See: Gelderblom, \textit{Zuidnederlandse kooplieden}, pp. 74ff.

\textsuperscript{168} Arch. Thys. 133: D1. Brieven aan Andreas de Bacher. December 14, 1606.
antagonism but rather originated in the hope to return to the South - something which could be achieved only with the assistance of fellow-minded allies.

As we have seen, the possibility that he would never return home again occurred relatively late to people like Thijs. At least until 1601, he considered himself as only a temporary resident of the Northern Netherlands, and even a few years later he was still open to idea of an imminent return. The memories of his lost home were directly channeled into the wish to return. In 1594, when he was still residing in Prussia, Thijs had written to a business partner, who had likewise left Antwerp after 1585:

We desire to live again in our father’s town, from which we are far away since we have to wander as exiles through foreign countries for ten years now. And our children grow up, and I don’t want them to grow up as strangers. I have often considered buying a house here and becoming a citizen, but thinking of our fatherland I have refrained from doing so.\textsuperscript{169}

As the correspondence of De Bacher, Della Faille and Johan Thijs shows, memories of the past and the anticipation of the future were connected to such an extent that giving up the hope to live in Antwerp once again made it necessary to forget the past. A form in which the past could be preserved in a closed and nostalgic way – devoid of direct political implications - could not yet be found: giving up hope implied oblivion and silence about the past.

‘Hot’ and ‘cold’ memory

Egyptologist Jan Assmann and political historian Charles S. Maier have introduced a conceptual distinction between ‘hot’ and ‘cold’ memory.\textsuperscript{170} In a comparison between collective memories of the National Socialist terror and the crimes against humanity committed under Stalin Maier concludes that the latter had a less personally

\textsuperscript{169} Johan Thijs, as quoted in: Gelderblom, Zuidnederlandse kooplieden, p. 182: ‘Wy syn begerende dat wy onse vaders stede weder bewoonen moechten daer wy nu int tiende jaer uwyt syn ende in ons ballinckschap in vreemde landen hebben moeten wandelen. Ende onse kindekens worden meter tyt groot dewelcke ick niet gerne soude willen vervremden. Ick hebbe wel offtermael voorgenomen hier een huys te koopen ende de borgerschap te winnen, dan heb hetselve als ick op ons vaderland gedacht hebben noch ter tyt naegelaten.’

confronting impact while the former continually forced future generations to position themselves in regard to the Nazi atrocities. According to Maier, the cruelties of the Holocaust continued to force the question ‘What would I have done?’ and delivered a clear political message for the future. In contrast, the mass killings under the Stalinists did not contain such a clear message, as they were not perceived as explicitly directed against any particular minority. Unlike the ‘hot memory’ of the Holocaust that cried for a ‘never again’, their place in collective memory soon became ‘cold’ and ceased to motivate political action in the present and future.

While the implications of Maier’s coinage of these terms differ in many respects from the commemoration of flight and persecution of Southern Netherlandish migrants, his concepts may be helpful in understanding how migrant memories in the early-seventeenth century changed. For many refugees keeping alive the memory of their homeland served to anticipate a return and, in a published form, also to propagate a continuation of the war against the Habsburg forces in the South. These memories were not politically neutral but, to the contrary, cried for action. Once they saw that the military attempts to recapture their homes had failed, the migrants often became silent about their past. In many cases, it was only in the next generation that a new ‘cold’ form of memory came into being, and the past was retold without a direct call for action or a territorial claim. As chapter 4 of this book shows, the exile fate of their ancestors was a closed narrative that belonged to their past but lacked painful immediacy and direct political implications.

As the next section shows, the ‘hot memory’ that prevailed among the first migrant generation was clearly recognized by contemporaries, who tried to canalize such memories for political purposes. Many Southern writers and pamphleteers in the North realized that the hope for a future in Brabant and Flanders could be awakened only by keeping the past alive. By referring to the lost home in pamphlets and plays and integrating memories of dispersion and persecution into a historical narrative that proclaimed a ‘common fatherland’ of the inhabitants of all the seventeen provinces who were willing to fight for their freedom, they called for a continuation of the war and warned of a peace pact with the enemy that would lead

171 Ibid.
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to definitive loss of the Southern territories. This use of memory was paralleled by other exiled groups from the Netherlands: while Protestant Southerners in the Dutch Republic called for recapturing their homes, Northern Catholics who had left for the Southern Netherlands also strove for a return of their lost homelands under the reign of the Catholic Church. Among the Holland Mission, which clandestinely operated in Holland and Utrecht, many missionaries were exiles from the Northern Provinces and were driven by the wish to win the North back for Catholic faith. As this chapter shows, the discourses in which Southern Protestant and the Northern Catholic exiles engaged to urge recovery of their lost homes were not exclusive but made use of the same motifs. Not only did their publications mirror and imitate each other's arguments, but they also directly reacted to claims of the opposite party and tried to counter them with arguments of their own.

Keeping the past alive
The year 1606 marked a crucial point in the formation of attitudes towards the past and the future of many Southern refugees in the Republic, and Johan Thijs was by no means the only one to catch a glimpse of hope for a possible recapture of the Southern cities. In May 1605, the States Armies under Maurice had launched a campaign against Antwerp that would be fended off easily but nevertheless reawakened the hopes of numerous Southerners and stirred the imagination of many: in Amsterdam and other Holland towns wagers were made about a coming conquest of Antwerp, and, as Johan Thijs’s nephew Samuel de Bacher reports, people were ready to invest great fortunes in these bets.¹⁷² Rumors about the military actions on the Scheldt and even an victorious siege of Antwerp spread fast and remained persistent. De Bacher, who was critical enough to dismiss these rumors as mere cock-and-bull stories, was still excited about the idea of a coming defeat of the Habsburg regime in the South. Even if he noted that the stories could not be trusted, between 1605 and 1606 he repeatedly reported rumors of a Habsburg defeat and added that one ought to keep praying to God for a victory against the Spanish enemy.¹⁷³

When in January 1606 Johan Thijs manifested new hope for a victory in the South, other Southern exiles tried to exploit the changing atmosphere by launching a propagandistic publication campaign. On 1 January 1606, Southern nobleman Jacob Duym, who had fought during the siege of Antwerp and afterwards been imprisoned by Parma’s troops, published his Ghedenck-boeck, a collection of six plays about the Revolt against the Habsburg regime, intended to make its readers aware of ‘all the evils and the great mischief committed by the Spaniards and their associates’ against the Netherlandish people. Duym, who had settled in Leiden

175 Jacob Duym, Een ghenedenck-boeck, het welcke ons leert aan al het quaet en den grooten moëtwil van de Spaingnaerden en hare aenhank ons aen-ghedaen te ghenedenck. Ende de groote liefde ende trou vande Princen uyt den huys van Nassau, aen ons betoon, eeuwelijk te onthouden. Speel-wiys in dicht ghestelt
after his release from captivity, believed it necessary to remind his fellow-
countrymen of the past which he feared might otherwise easily sink into oblivion. Ten years earlier he and other fellow-Southerners had already warned that the memories of the war, especially in the South, were vanishing and that this amnesia prevented an adequate understanding of the present political situation. When the Leiden Chamber of Rhetoric De Witte Acoleyen (‘The white columbine’) announced the motto for an upcoming festivity in 1596, ‘Voor een beveynsde paeys, een rechte crijch te preisen is’ (‘Why a just war is to be praised over a crooked peace’) the participants were asked to write verses, songs and plays on the topic of war and peace.¹⁷⁶ The members of the Flemish chamber of Leiden, De Orange Lelie (‘The orange lily’) were especially eager to spread their message that a coming peace treaty with the Habsburgs could not be trusted and that the war needed to be continued. Starting with Abraham who attacked and defeated the captors of his nephew Lot, they referred to a vast number of historical parallels. As they asserted, Moses and Joshua could never have entered the Promised Land without the use of force, and the kings David and Hezekiah were required to use force to defend that Land. In addition to biblical parallels the recent past was also evoked: the rhetoricians depicted the Peace of Augsburg and the Pacification of Ghent as failures that had been unable to prevent Catholic cruelties, and they reminded their audience of the events during the St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre.¹⁷⁷ When Duym’s Ghedenck-boeck was published in 1606, ten years later, it also contained one play with the title Een bewys dat beter is eenen goeden Criipgh, dan eenen ghegheveynsden peys (‘A proof that a good war is better than a crooked peace’) that echoes the contributions of the 1596 festivities. This suggests that Duym’s influence as the chairman of De Orange Lelie was crucial in 1596 and that he shaped the views of the other contributors.

¹⁷⁶ See: Johan Koppenol, Leids Heelal. Het Loterijspel (1596) van Jan van Hout, Hilversum 1998, pp. 94ff. ¹⁷⁷ Den lust-hof van Rethorica, waer inne verhael ghedaen wordt, vande beschrijvinghen ende tsamen-
consten der Hollantscher Cameren vanden Reden-rijckers, binnen Leyden gheschiedt, den 26 Mey, des Iaers 1596, ende de volgende daghen, met het gene aldauer ghedaen, ende verhandelt is, Leiden 1596, pp. 143ff.
Duym was not the only author concerned about possible peace negotiations who tried to warn against them by referring to the war past. Another reconnection of the present situation of 1605/1606 to events in the late-sixteenth century was made in the renewed publication of Everard van Reyd’s *Trouhertighe vermaninghe aen het Vereenichde Nederlandt* (‘Faithful admonition of the United Netherlands’) by Irenius Ammonius, a pseudonym of the publisher Johan van Sande. Van Reyd, the famous chronicler of the Dutch Revolt, had tried to warn his fellow-countrymen against entering a truce with the Habsburg Regime in the late 1590s by depicting the cruelties committed by the Spanish Armies and the House of Habsburg in the Netherlands, the Holy Roman Empire and other parts of Europe. All these events were proof that the Spaniard could never be trusted and that peace was no option – the atrocities committed by the enemy and his notorious treacherousness were evidence enough. Like the playwright Jacob Duym, Van Sande applied this message, originally dating from the turn of the century, to the present situation, in which alert observers were already able to anticipate the coming necessity of negotiations between the two warring parties. Both Van Sande and Duym stressed the contrast between the ‘free’ and the ‘overlorded’ Netherlands: the Dutch Republic and the Southern Provinces under Habsburg rule. In their publications the authors presented themselves as ‘lovers of freedom,’ and the only place indication on Van Sande’s pamphlet was ‘buiten Antwerpen’ (‘outside Antwerp’) to denote the Schelde town as occupied territory where the voice of freedom could not be raised. Duym, who reenacted the fall of Antwerp in one of the six plays of the *Ghedenck-boeck*, addresses fellow-Southerner and member of the exiled council of Brabant, Lodewijk Meganck, in the preface and points to the ‘overlorded’ and ‘desolate’ state of Antwerp, which is sharply contrasted with its former bloom and with the prosperity and freedom of the Northern Provinces.

---

178 Irenus Ammonius (Johan van Sande), *Trouhertighe Vermaninghe aen het Vereenichde Nederlandt, om niet te laystenen na eenige ghestroyde ende versierde vreed-articulen, nu onlangs wtghgenen ende ghestroyt, ???*, 1605.
180 Ammonius, *Trouhertighe Vermaninghe aen het Vereenichde Nederlandt*, A1. Such fictitious place indications were not uncommon in early modern pamphlets, but instead of choosing another town he deliberately signifies Antwerp as an overlorded city.
the war past present in collective memory, Duym also tried to remind his public in the North that not all the Netherlands shared the same conditions and that the South was still in the hands of the enemy. By referring to traumatizing events during the war, he dramatized the imagined present state of the Southern Provinces and connected it to an image of the past many Northern readers were familiar with.\textsuperscript{182}

\textit{Exile and the reclaiming of the homeland}

The need to recapture the lost ‘fatherland’ was felt not only by Protestant exiles in the Dutch Republic but also by Northern Catholics who had fled to the Southern Netherlands after the rebel takeover of their home provinces. Although the numbers of Protestant refugees during the Dutch Revolt greatly exceeded those of the Catholic migrants, the experience of exile was shared by adherents of virtually all confessions. As the writings of members of the various refugee groups show, there were more similarities than differences between the sentiments about losing one’s homeland and being forced to live in exile. Though, of course, not all Catholic refugees who left their hometowns for territories under Habsburg control subscribed to a clearly defined confessional identity, Catholics from Holland were well represented in the Society of Jesus and the Holland Mission, as the registers and necrologies of the Jesuit Order attest.\textsuperscript{183} Among the men who entered the Holland Mission a sense of fighting for a spiritual reconquest of their homes was very vivid, and, as their necrologies suggest, they cherished this motive until late in their lives. The descriptions of the lives of Jesuits from Holland and other Protestant territories, written by their brethren, show rich evidence about the way in which these refugees narrated their lives and how they understood themselves and their situation.\textsuperscript{184} A typical description of an exiled brother’s life is the necrology of Johannes Riserius


from Amsterdam. Born in 1573 to Catholic parents, he lost his father at young age and was raised in the ‘true faith’ by his devout mother, whose description in the necrologies bears strong resemblance to the archetypical pious Catholic mother figure, Augustine’s mother Monica.185 After suffering hatred and affliction at the hands of the new Protestant magistrate of Amsterdam, he fled with his mother to Emden, a place more famous for its numerous Protestant refugees. As the necrology suggests, mother and child were actively persecuted by the new regime but could escape, which appears as a rather implausible claim. Living in exile since his early youth, Riserius was guided by the wish to restore the ‘true Religion’ in Holland, his fatherland. ‘Having already seen the beginning of great dangers, pains and persecutions, which even grew larger, he became a member of the Holland Mission for forty years and was sent away to be trained as cleric’.186 In the discourse of the newly awakened confessional zeal of the Holland Mission and the Jesuit Order the experience of exile and the wish to recatholicize the Northern Netherlands were closely linked: Northern exiles like Isisdorus van der Ilen, Justus Diercx, Theodorus Kvidt, Cornelius Vermeersch, Johannes van Gouda or Petrus den Hollander were highly praised for their efforts to fight for the True Church and their fatherland as well as for their often highly exaggerated successes in the conversion of heretics in the North.187

The achievements in the conversion of Protestants by the members of the Holland Mission, who had returned to their former homelands as ‘internal exiles’, were the pride of the organization and were widely praised. Johannes Riserius, his biographer claimed, had on a single day converted twenty Calvinists, three Lutherans as well as fifty others, whose confessional affiliation was not entirely clear.188 When the Jesuit Chronicler Albertus Miraeus published his Elogia illustrium Belgii scriptorium in 1602, he glorified the efforts of exiled writers who had boldly fought ‘the churches of the Manicheans, the Donatists and the Pelagians,

185 KB Brussel, Afdeling handschriften, ms. 6485 Bibl. roy., fol.10r.
186 Ibid.: ‘Adeo jam cum in puero praefatum videtur periculis, laboribus, persecutionibus quibus jam grandor, ac Religiosus in missione hollandica per annos 40 et exportus et exercitus fuit.’
188 KB Brussel, Afdeling handschriften, ms. 6485 Bibl. roy., fol.10v.
nowadays to be known as Lutherans, Calvinists and Anabaptists. Clerics, who sought refuge for the sake of their faith were presented as exemplary believers, and their exertions for the Church were celebrated. Not only were their battles against heresy and the conversion of Protestants recalled but also their efforts for their fellow-exiles, whom they had provided with pastoral care in times of affliction. Petrus Cunerus, born in Zeeland and later active in Friesland from where he was banished by the new Protestant regime, was one of those who had remained not only loyal to the true religion and the King but who had also strengthened the faith of his exiled fellow-believers in Cologne. The motif of the faithful refugee who had left his homelands for religion’s sake had become an exemplary figure who could serve to propagate a new zeal for the Post-Tridentine Church.

Within this climate a remarkable medial constellation emerged that transferred the exemplary use of the religious exiles’ fate between the antagonistic confessional camps and linked their situation to the most emblematic religious and political martyrs of the Revolt. In 1610, Louvain professor and widely acknowledged Neo-Latin playwright Nicolaus Vernulaeus published a play titled Gorcomienses, sive fidei exilium (‘The Gorcumers, or: Faith in Exile’) that bore strong thematic and intertextual connections to the work of Northern Protestant writers like Duym and Daniel Heinsius who had experienced exile themselves or come from Southern families. The play was printed in Cologne by Bernardus Gualteri, a Catholic publisher with close connections to Dutch Catholic printers and people who had experienced exile in Cologne. In this work, Vernulaeus depicted the fate of the martyrs of Gorcum, nineteen Catholic clerics who were killed by the Sea Beggars in 1572. The Gorcum martyrs served to illustrate the present situation in the Netherlands: not only had pious Catholics in Holland been killed and been forced to flee to Catholic territories, the ‘true faith’ itself was exiled from the Rebel

189 Albertus Miraeus, Elogia illustrium Belgii scriptorium, qui vel Ecclesiæ Dei propugnerant, vel disciplinas illustrarant, Antwerp 1602, 84: ‘Ut magnum illud Ecclesiæ Manichaeos, donatistas & Pelagianos; sic nostra aetate Lutheranos, Calvinistes & Anabaptistes in Germania strenuè Canisius oppugnavit.’ Petrus Canisius, to whom this passage refers, was not really an exile since he had left Nijmegen before Protestantism had become dominant. Nevertheless, he had to consider his home soil as occupied by heretics after 1591 when Catholic worship was outlawed.
190 Ibid., pp. 26f.
191 Nicolaus Vernulaeus, Gorcomienses, sive fidei exilium, Cologne 1610.
provinces. In crucial passages of the play, a choir of banished Hollanders takes the stage, lamenting their fate and the fact that the natural bond between the Netherlands and the Catholic faith had been destroyed. The same motif had been employed in Daniel Heinsius’ Latin drama *Auriacus, sive Libertas saucia* (‘Orange, or: Injured freedom’) from 1602 and Jacob Duym’s vernacular adaption of the same material, *Het moordadich stuk van Balthasar Gerards, begaen aen den doorluchtighen Prince van Oraignen. 1584*, (‘The murderous act of Baltasar Gerards, committed against the illustrious prince of Orange’) which was included in the *Ghedenck-boeck*. Heinsius too connected the figure of the martyr to the situation of exile: while Vernulaeus chose the martyrs of Gorcum, in the work of the two Protestant writers William of Orange is presented as a secular martyr. Instead of the emblematic figure of the *Fides exilium* (‘Exiled Faith’) the two Protestant playwrights stage the *Libertas saucia* (‘Violated Freedom’). This choice shows the fundamental values of the discourses into which the three authors inscribe their works: while for Vernulaeus, the Catholic faith is intrinsically linked with the Netherlands, for Heinsius and Duym, the emblematic condensation of the roots and aims of the entire conflict is freedom, which has been violated and needs to be reconstituted.

The theme of exile constitutes an argumentative pattern crucial for the deliverance of the political message of the plays. The choirs of exiles are depicted as the characterizations of the true Netherlanders, who are exiled and estranged from their roots by the violence of foreigners. In Heinsius’ and Duym’s plays, Netherlandish freedom is abolished and replaced by Spanish tyranny: the innate sense of freedom of the exiled Flemish nobles is damaged, and they lament the loss of their old ‘Vlaanderlandt’:

Oh Flemish land, how long must you wait for your honor,
instead of freedom you only taste oppression,
and your enemy is always nearby.
Even you, oh noble town of Ghent,
how much you have to suffer, what tidings do you hear,

---

your friends are chased away, you lost too much.  
Fortunate are those who left,  
And you will live with those who hate you most.  
In the name of the Lord shall we be free  
and you have to learn Spanish instead of Flemish.194

Flanders is bereft of its old freedom and put under a foreign yoke. By marking the new order explicitly as foreign, the territories under Habsburg rule are depicted as estranged from their original identity: ‘instead of Flemish’ Flanders has ‘to learn Spanish’ now. The old ‘Flemish’ values, most notably the sense for freedom, can live on only in exile where the confession of ‘God’s word’ is still possible.

The same argumentative strategy is employed in the Catholic counterpart of the two William of Orange-plays: here it is Holland that has lost its true identity, defined by unconditional loyalty to the Catholic faith and the King. After Holland is taken over by the heretics, the Calvinists, Lutherans and Mennonites, who worship Eribus, the God of darkness, the old natural bond with King and Church is broken.195 As in Heinsius’ and Duym’s plays, the Netherlands are afflicted by an inquisition, presented as an allegorical personage. In Gorcomienses, the Spanish Inquisition of the two William of Orange-plays is turned into a ‘Heretical Inquisition’ installed by the cruel adherents of the new heresies.196 Whereas the two Northern playwrights present the Spanish Inquisition as something foreign and opposed to Netherlandish values and traditions and installed by foreign powers, in Vernulaeus’ work, the heretics also come from abroad, and they are inspired by foreign ideas: their goal is to destroy the Netherlands and install a foreign regime there.

The three plays, all from the first decade of the seventeenth century, use the theme of exile for the same function. Their aim is to show that the contemporary

---

194 Jacob Duym, Het moordadich stuck van Balthasar Gerards, fol. C1r.:  
‘O Vlaenderlandt wat is u eer yet lang nakende,  
In plaets van vrijheyd zult ghy dwanck zijn smakende,  
En uwen vyand sal u altijt zijn omtrent,  
En u noch boven al o edel stad van Gent,  
Wat sult ghy lijden noch, wat sult ghy moeten horen:  
U vrienden zijn verjaegt, ghy hebt te veel verloren.  
Gheluckich zijn sy al die u verlaten eest,  
Want ghy nu wonen sult met die u haten meest.  
In vrijheyd sullen wy zijn inden naem des Heeren  
En ghy sult nu in plaets van Vlaens, Spaes moeten leeren.’

195 Vernulaeus, Gorcomienses, pp. 37f.
196 Ibid., pp. 34ff.
Netherlands are in a state of inversion: while the ‘true Netherlanders’, and with them the identity of the country itself, are forced into exile, the opposing parties in the struggle are identified as foreigners or at least forces who try to impose foreign policies. Depicting the fate of the exiles and linking their situation with well-known narratives about religious and political martyrdom become a powerful argumentative strategy to reclaim the provinces lost to the antagonizing camp.

‘Memoria magistra vita’
The necessity to remember the events of the past is emphasized in various ways in the plays and media employed by exiled writers in the period before and during the Twelve Years’ Truce. The entire *Ghedenck-boeck* was intended to keep the war past present in collective memory and to warn against a coming peace with the enemy, and other Southern exiled writers such as Willem Baudartius or Johannes Gysius also devoted their works to this project. Although their works were published only after the conclusion of the Truce, the intention of the publications was clear: to remind the fellow-Netherlanders of the atrocities committed by the Spaniards and to point out that the struggle had not yet been completed, despite the twelve years of peace. The Southern Provinces were not yet free of the Habsburg rule, and thousands of Southern Protestants were still in exile in the Republic. The need to spread this message was considered so urgent that Baudartius’ *Morggen-Wecker der vrije Nederlandtsche Provincien* (‘Wake-up call to the free Netherlandish Provinces’) was even adapted into a children’s book: *De Spieghel der jeugd* (‘The Mirror of the Youth’) that was frequently reprinted and reedited until far into the eighteenth century and also translated into French. The fear that the people in the Northern Netherlands, especially the generations who had not lived through the war themselves, would soon forget about the experiences of their parents and settle for accepting the present state of division between North and South, haunted many of

---


those who had left their homes in Flanders, Brabant and other Southern Provinces.
The new media campaign of the first two decades of the seventeenth century was put
into service to fight this threatening ‘sleep of oblivion’. 199 In the dedication to
stadholder Maurits, Jacob Duym stated as a reason for his publication of the
_Ghedenck-boeck_, that

> it is highly lamentable that some youths cannot believe or at least not
> remember what their parents, their friends or their fatherland have suffered
> [...]. Therefore I have found it necessary to present a ‘memory-book’,
> wherein all people can see as clear as a mirror the bloodthirsty heart, the old
> hatred and the hidden evil plans the Spaniards and their adherents have
> borne, and still bear, towards the miserable Netherlands. 200

In the _Ghedenck-boeck_, Duym not only presented a selection of notable
events of war past that needed to be remembered but also constructed a vast ‘poetics
of remembering’, a program to show memory itself as a necessary device to enable
one to act prudently in the present because of having understood the past. The plots
of the plays are often guided by the recollection of memories that show the
protagonists the way through difficult situations. In _Een bewys dat beter is eenen
goeden Crijgh, den eenen ghegheveysnden peys_ the author introduces an allegorical
personage, _Goeden Raed_ (‘Faithful counsel’) who recalls the atrocities of the
Spaniards whenever the Netherlanders’ memory is threatened by oblivion. When the
States seem to tend towards a peace treaty with the enemy, ‘Faithful counsel’ points
out the fate of the overlorded provinces in the South, which are cruelly oppressed by
the Habsburgs. When his arguments fail to not convince, he recalls the massacre
committed by Alba’s troops at Naarden in 1572. 201 In such events, the counsel
shows, lies the true nature of the enemy; a lasting peace can never be established
since the Spaniards would use it only to strengthen their own position and commit
new cruelties in the Netherlands.

199 Baudartius, _Morghen-Wecker der vrije Nederlantsche Provincien_, fol. 2r.
200 Duym, _Ghedenck-boeck_, preface, fol. *2v-r: ‘[...] tis grootelijcx te be claghen dat sommighe jonghers
nen konnen ghelooven oft immers niet en onthouden t’gheen dat haer Ouders, Vrienden, oft haer
Vaderland wedervaren is [...]. Heeft my daer om hoogh-noodich ghedocht een _Ghedenck-boeck_, alle
menschen voor te stellen, daer sy soo claer als in eenen spieghel sullen mogen sien het bloeddorstich hert,
den ouden haed, den heymelicken boosen raed, die de Spaignaerts ende hare aenhanck dees onse
bedroefde Nederlanden gedraghen hebben, ende noch draghende zijn.’
201 Duym, _Een bewys dat beter is eenen goeden Crijgh, den eenen ghegheveysnden peys_, fol. C4r-v, in:
_Duym, Ghedenck-boeck._
In the play about William of Orange, Duym shows an exemplary, heroic case of how memories of the past can be used to make sound judgments in the present. The Prince and his wife, Louise de Coligny, are presented as prudently guided by the recollections of the past. Their experience with the Spaniards and French Catholics has left them under no illusions about the risks of concluding a peace with the enemy. When a truce between the rebels and the Habsburg is proposed, Louise (or Lowisa) falls into a mood of anxiety:

The Prince
In times of war you are not fearful, Why is it that you fear peace?

Lowisa
You should not be surprised about that, Was it not a false peace, that fell from heaven down upon me like a thunder? Was it not peace that took away both my father and my spouse? Was there ever a more solid peace, than when Navarra married our king’s daughter? Does he, who fears peace, do wrong? My father, who defended himself knightly, and did not surrender to his enemy: He is lying dead because of the peace, that led to his murder and also my husband, Téligny, died by the peace. And that is why I give the true vengeance to God. O, we see a lot, which goes disguised as peace.

Duym, *Het moordadich stuck van Balthasar Gerards*, fol. F1v:

‘Den Prins.
In d’ oorlogh’ en zit ghy het vreesen niet gheewnt [sic],
Hoe naer vreest ghy den peys?

Lowisa
Sulcx waer van my gheen wonder,
En wast den valschen peys niet, die snel als den donder,
Daer uyt den Hemel viel, en my quam over t’hooft,
Ben ick niet door den peys van Vaer en Man beroof?
Was daer oyt peys, daer eck op vaster mochte bouwen?
Als men Navarra saagh ons Conincx Dochter trouwen?
Doet hy oock qualick dan die hem voor peys verveert,
Miin vader die hem had so Ridderlijk verweert,
En voor den vyand oock en wilde geensins swichten:
Leyt hy daer niet door peys, en moord die sy doen stichten,
En mijn man Tillingni, door den peys oock dood bleef,
Daer ick d’oprechte wraeck nu miinen God af geef,
Och onder t’dexel van peys, men veel ghebeuren., diet.’
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The fate of her father, Admiral Louis de Coligny, and her first husband, Charles de Téligny, who were both killed during the St. Batholomew’s Day massacre in Paris, have taught Louise that the idea of a secure peace was an illusion. The fact that this massacre, too, occurred during a formal state of peace between the Huguenots and the Catholic League has taught her that the enemies of Protestantism are not to be trusted. The message of the fervent pro-war plays of Duym is clear: the Dutch need to remember, and remembering can lead to only one conclusion: the need to continue the war and resist the temptation of accepting a ‘crooked peace’. For him and many other Southern exiles in the Republic, the Southern Provinces, which still bore the yoke of the Spanish enemy, could not just be given up. Even if he himself could no longer carry arms to recapture his fatherland, he had to use his pen as a weapon and argue for the absolute necessity of remembering what had happened.

Remapping the Netherlands

The political and social world of first-generation Southern exiles like Duym, Thijs or Baudartius as well as of the Northern Catholics who joined the Holland Mission had changed dramatically within a few decades. They were born into a world in which the later divisions between the two new States and the various confessional camps were yet unknown, though not entirely unpredictable. Handling the new situation in exile proved to be a difficult challenge, and few people were willing to accept the new boundaries created by the Revolt. In the years before the Twelve Years’ Truce, Southern exiles in the North became more conscious of the fact that the negotiation of an armistice or even a peace between the two parties would lead to a point of no return in the course of future events. Even among the exiled wealthy Antwerp merchants for whom geographical mobility had been a fact of life for generations the notion that their homeland would be lost to them forever had great effect. While this group has often been studied from an economic perspective and their motivation to leave Antwerp has often been explained by referring to the economic decline of the Scheldt town and the attractiveness of Amsterdam, we have seen that their wish to return persisted for a long time. Their personal letters, which often express a sense of nostalgia and grief about their lost homes, show that a future return to the South was not in the first instance a question of the economic circumstances in Antwerp but depended on the political and religious course of events: for Thijs and his family,
returning homewards would become an option only when their hometown would be ‘liberated’ and their confession of faith accepted.

For others, like minister Baudartius or war veteran Duym, things were even clearer: a return was not possible as long as the South was ‘under the Spanish yoke’. Their aim was to spread this message among their fellow-countrymen and propagate a continuation of the war that could lead to an eventual liberation of the Southern Provinces. The motivation of many Northern Catholic exiles who became active in the Holland Mission was quite comparable: what they wanted to bring about was a ‘spiritual’ reconquest of their lost homes. The provinces they still regarded as their homelands were to be reconciled with the Old Faith. Instead of actively propagating to achieve this by military action, their strategy was to reconvert the heretics and strengthen local Catholic communities.203

In the first two decades of the seventeenth century, the Netherlands were remapped in many respects. For a great number of people, the conclusion of the Twelve Years’ Truce would define their future destination for good, and the choice to live in one of the newly-emerging states had been made by most of the exiles in the years before the treaty became effective. For most of the wealthy Southern merchant families in Holland it became clear that they had to settle down in Amsterdam, Leiden and Haarlem and to sell their properties in Antwerp, even if real estate prices were not attractive in this period. For others, like Jacob Duym, the sense of belonging to their old homelands was so pressing that they moved to places in the border region where they could practice their Protestant faith across the border. Duym, even before the Truce was finally concluded, decided that his campaign to warn of the coming peace had failed, and in 1608 he settled down in Muisbroek, close to the fort of Lillo, an external bastion of the Republic, where

Protestants from the surrounding countryside were able to attend Reformed services on Sunday.\footnote{Johan Koppenol, 

Exiles from both confessional and political camps continued refer to the united ‘Seventeen Netherlands’ as they had existed before the Revolt had split the various provinces apart. The ‘common homeland’ now existed only as an imaginary place in the past. In the various discourses about the past the division in the collective memories about the period before the war is easily detectable. For Catholics the attachment to the Old Faith was inherent to the Netherlands and was destroyed by heretics, who had invaded with their ideas from abroad. In the construction of the past as disseminated by Southern Protestant exiles in the North their old homelands had always been recognizable by their sense of liberty and the maintenance of the ‘word of God, as for example Duym tried to make clear, which of course implied that the ‘new’ character of the Reformation had to be concealed.\footnote{Duym, *Het moordadich stuck van Balthasar Gerards*, fol. B4r.}

By 1609, the two emerging Netherlandish states had become a ‘no man’s land’ in which both sides claimed authority over the past and in which great numbers of people from the opposing camps made claims about the unity of the various provinces, a unity that would never be established again.\footnote{See also: Pollmann, ‘No Man’s Land.’}

In the same year as the *Ghedenck-boeck*, Duym published yet another book, in which he spread his belligerent message: *Oudt Batavien nu ghenaemt Holland*, published under the pseudonym Saxo Grammaticus of its co-author Petrus Scrivereus.\footnote{Grammaticus, Saxo, *Oudt Batavien nu ghenaemt Holland: hoe, ende in wat manieren, ende van wien Hollandt, Zeelandt, ende Vrieslandt eerst bewoont is gheweest*, Leiden 1606.} Scrivereus, who had written a antiquarian work about the ancient Batavians who had presumably lived in the delta of the Rhine during the Roman occupation, had completed this book with a chronicle of the medieval counts of Holland as well as a history of the Dutch Revolt, both written by Duym. In his contribution to the work, Duym explicitly depicted the present state of the Netherlands as he saw it, and he did not miss any opportunity to point to the
situation in the South, which was still overruled by foreigners. In the introduction to his chronicle of the Revolt, he explains the situation in the various provinces and divides them into two categories: under an image of the Court of Holland, he shows the coats of arms of all the ‘free’ provinces, while the ‘overruled’ provinces are listed under a depiction of the Court of Brussels. By making clear that the latter is the rightful political center of the Netherlands, he points to the provisional character of the Republic’s present state. Whereas in The Hague a just government rules the free provinces and the South is still in the hands of strangers, the division between the two states can only be temporary: to restore the old Netherlands authority has to be reassigned to Brussels. This can, of course, be established only once the old seat of government is freed from the Spaniards. The depiction of the court of Brussels is accompanied with the following epigram:

This noble court does still exist  
As it is depicted here,  
and praised as a royal edifice.  
Brussels, your name will be honored  
When you will truly rule yourself.

At present Brussels does not yet rule itself but is subjected to foreign rulers: to regain its old glory it has to restore its old power and free itself. The imagery of exile is skillfully applied to the political situation of the Netherlands as a whole: while freedom and justice prevail only under the rule of the Court of Holland, they are banished from the actual political center of the Netherlands, which is Brussels. Duym depicts the present state in the Netherlands as a highly paradoxical situation, in which the lawful authority is held only by a transitory organ exiled from its original destination.

As the cases of Duym, Thijs and many other exiles show, the commemoration of the war and the lost homeland were intrinsically connected with the call for what was perceived as a restoration of the old order, which was in fact a
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208 Oudt Batavien nu ghenaemt Holland, pp. 194, p. 196.
209 Ibid., p. 194: “Dit heerlijck Hoff, is noch in wesen,  
Als dit hier staat ghefigureert,  
Een Conincklijk, ghebou ghepresen,  
Bruessel u naem, daer door vereert,  
Als ghy oprrecht, u self regeert.”
highly imaginative construction. This way of remembering implied the anticipation of a changing future and the necessity to act. A new form of memory emerged among a younger generation, who had experienced the loss of their old homes at a young age or who had been born in the new host towns of their parents. Descendants of Southern Netherlandish migrants who were born in England or Germany also had a different outlook. Among them was Jacob Celosse, who succeeded Duym as the chairman of the Flemish rhetoricians chamber *De Orange Lelie*. Born in Sandwich in 1560, thirteen years after Duym, he had never lived in the homeland of his parents, and Leiden was his new home.\(^{210}\) Under his direction, the Flemish chamber participated in the festivities during the celebration of the Twelve Years’ Truce and contributed verses that praised the end of war, especially in Flanders. While Flanders is still called the ‘fatherland’ in these texts, the bond with the lost home is presented in a different light. Instead of sentimentally looking back, the migrants are warned against a nostalgia that could possibly lead to a return to the Southern Netherlands. Remigration to the homeland is presented as dangerous because of the threat of Catholicism in the South. The refugees are called to flee the Catholic ‘beast’ and remain steadfast in their faith and not to ‘break the bond’ with God:

```
But in this celebration,
oh fear your God, your Lord,
and flee the beast,
that violates His name the most.
And if you return
to the fatherland,
be mindful of the Divine creed
that is planted into you,
and do not let this truce
break the bond at any price,
and do not look back,
for this would be shameful and deeply sad.\(^{211}\)
```


\(^{211}\) *Den Nederduytschen Helicon*, Alkmaar 1610, p. 280:
‘Maer in dees feest // och vreest
U Godt, u Heer,
Vliedt doch het beast // ’t welc meest
Schendt Godes eer,
Neemt ghy den keer
Na ’t Vaderlandt,
Denckt om Gods leer,
U ingheplant,
```
One generation later, the perspective towards the past in Flanders has changed even more drastically. In 1632, Jacob van Zevecote wrote two plays on the siege of Leiden that incorporated the same elements we have seen in Heinsius’ and Duym’s works and in which a choir of Flemish refugees also appeared. Van Zevecote, a former Augustinian monk, was born in Ghent in 1596 and in 1624 migrated to Leiden where he became a Calvinist. For him, it was immediately clear that his exile would not be temporary and with his conversion to Protestantism he had cut his ties to the past in Flanders. In his works the refugees have a different outlook than those in Vernulaeus’, Heinsius’ and Duym’s plays. Instead of lamenting the loss of their homes, they praise their new home town and affirm their loyalty to Leiden. Addressing the ‘virgin Leiden’, they proclaim:

Readily shall I leave behind
the sweet Flemish air,
that brought me into this life,
as well as all my people.
For you shall be my last drop blood,whic nourishes and keeps me alive,as long as I can die as your citizen. \(^{212}\)

For five pages Leiden is praised while Flanders is addressed only occasionally. At the same time, the past of the Flemish refugees is presented as a victorious history: they sacrificed their wealth and left their country behind but were rewarded with a new home. While they first had to endure Spanish cruelties, they witnessed the downfall of their enemies during the relief of Leiden where they now could live in peace, ‘delivered from bloodshed and Spanish tyranny’. \(^{213}\)

\(^{212}\) Jacob van Zevecote, Gedichten (ed. Ph. Blommaert), Gent / Rotterdam 1840 , p. 233 (Belech van Leyden):

‘Ick sal de soete Vlaemsche locht,
Die my in ’t leven heeft gebrocht,
En al mijn volck gewillich derven,
Voor u sal sijn het leste bloet,
Dat my bewaert en leven doet
Is ’t dat ick mach uw borger sterven.’

\(^{213}\) Ibid., p. 232:

‘Daer wy verlost van moordery,
The outlook of most refugees of the second generation had changed: the immediacy of their parents’ sense of the past had vanished and made room for a rather ‘cold memory’ that no longer called for action but told them who they were in their new host societies. This way of remembering did not necessarily diminish the importance of the past but led to a form of commemoration that provided the descendants with a narrative about themselves, which also allowed them to relate to their new neighbors in different ways. The waning of an immediate ‘hot memory’ did not imply oblivion but a change in the meanings and functions of exile memories.
Chapter 3 – Strangers, burghers, patriots

Re-imagining Southern Netherlandish identity in the exile towns

While many refugees from the Southern Netherlands hoped to return once their hometowns were recaptured by the States Army, these hopes evaporated after the military stalemate and the ensuing Twelve Years’ Truce. Many realized that the exile towns in Holland, the Holy Roman Empire and England would now be their permanent homes. However, the willingness to stay and to participate in local life and politics was not always rewarded, and due to the independent political orientation of the various Dutch Provinces, immigrants could be regarded as ‘foreigners’ and therefore excluded from political participation. At times, refugees could also become targets of strong anti-immigrant sentiment and rhetoric. In the refugee towns outside the Low Countries, such reactions were even more common since the immigrants could not refer to a shared ‘national’ bond or a common past. Instead, refugees often pointed to the shared religious allegiance or the common political enemy, Spain, from which they had escaped. As Heinz Schilling has demonstrated, the religious factor was of crucial importance for the degree of acceptance granted to migrants from the Netherlands in their new host towns.214

Not only in England or Germany but also in the Dutch Republic, Southern Netherlandish exiles often experienced hostilities from their new neighbors. This was especially the case in periods of political and religious conflicts, for example during the troubles that led to the dismissal of the Earl of Leicester as Governor General of the Netherlands in the 1580s or the Twelve Years’ Truce (1609-1618). In both cases, immigrants from the Southern Netherlands were often associated with Calvinist radicalism and attacked in pamphlets, songs and other popular writings. Not only in the Dutch Republic but also in the exile towns outside the Netherlands migrants sometimes had to cope with xenophobic sentiments, especially in England in the late sixteenth century. This chapter will explore the position of Southern Netherlandish refugees in their new home towns and the role of memories both in conflicts between natives and immigrants and in processes of incorporation of migrants into local communities. The antagonism between local populations in Holland and migrants from Flanders and Brabant has become a topos not only in

214 Schilling, Niederländische Exulanten, pp. 164-166.
seventeenth-century pamphlets and popular print but also in modern
historiography. However, on the basis of a close reading of these sources, I want
to argue that pointing to migrants as the main agents behind social unrest was
mainly a rhetorical figure that could be deployed in particular instances and
sometimes even by individuals who were migrants themselves rather than an
expression of a deep and permanent gap between natives and aliens.

On the basis of stereotypes that were sometimes constructed in pamphlets
and popular literature, modern scholars have often reproduced an assumed cultural
contrast between a Southern and a Northern Netherlandish culture that divided
Holland natives from Flemish and Brabanter newcomers. As Jan Briels writes:

That in regard to their culture, the Northern Netherlands had always been
inferior to Brabant and Flanders, which overshadowed all other parts of the
Netherlands before 1572, had left its traces in the minds of the Hollanders,
who had to look up to the rich South for a long time without being able to
bring a substantial change to this situation.

This rather essentialist view of the relationship between the inhabitants of the
Northern and the Southern Provinces has often been used to explain the growing
political and cultural divergence between the two societies during the Dutch Revolt
and also the position of Southern migrants in the North. This chapter will offer an
alternative interpretation of anti-immigrant arguments that were used during
moments of conflict, such as the troubles between Remonstrants and Counter-
Remonstrants during the Twelve Years’ Truce. Instead of departing from a
principled difference between a Southern and a Northern Netherlandish culture, it
might be fruitful to take a closer look at the production of these assumed differences
in popular discourse and the construction of images of Southern identity. As a more
thorough examination of these identity constructions shows, stereotypes about

215 Asaert, 1585. De val van Antwerpen, pp. 280ff.; Briels, De Zuidnederlandse immigratie. 1572-1620,
pp. 65f.
216 J. Briels, De Zuidnederlandse immigratie in Amsterdam en Haarlem omstreeks 1572-1630. Met een
keuze van archivalische gegevens, Utrecht 1976, pp. 39f.: ‘Dat de Noord-Nederlanders in cultureel
opzicht altijd de mindere waren geweest van Brabant en Vlaanderen, die vóór 1572 alle overige delen van
Nederland in betekenis verre overschaduwden, had niet nagelaten zijn sporen in de Hollandse geesten
achter te laten, die al lang hadden moeten kijken naar het rijke zuiden zonder voorlopig bij machte te zijn
in de situatie substantieel verandering te brengen.’ See also: J. Briels, ‘Brabantsche blauwstaakt en Hollandse
botmuil. Cultuurontwikkelingen in Holland in het begin van de Gouden Eeuw’, in: De zeventiende eeuw
radical Calvinist Flemings and Brabanders, on the one side, and native Hollanders with only lukewarm sympathies for Reformed confessionalism, on the other, did not so much reflect socio-historical circumstances but were part of often inconsistent discourses on what constituted Netherlandish identity and what could be used as arguments in political and religious debates. Collective memories played an essential role in these arguments, and the history of the early phase of the Dutch Revolt as well as the migration of Protestants from Flanders and Brabant were iconic episodes that were often recalled in the discussion of the present state of politics and religion. However, during conflicts in which an aggressive anti-immigrant rhetoric was employed, the lines between migrants and locals were often blurred so that identifying radical Calvinism with ‘foreigners’ often proved useful to Remonstrants or Mennonites, who could be migrants from Flanders themselves, in bolstering their arguments against their adversaries. In reaction to such claims and identifications memories of flight and persecution were, however, also used to incorporate migrant history and identity into the memory canons of the host societies of the migrants. As we will see later in this chapter, memories of the early Dutch Revolt could also serve to strengthen the ties between migrants and locals. As many migrant authors suggested, the past united rather than separated newcomers and natives, and the deliberate choice to settle down in a new town and their gratitude for the hospitality of locals made the migrants into self-proclaimed loyal citizens.

The social and political position of Southern migrants in the Dutch Republic

Even if the exclusion of migrants from social life and public offices in the Dutch Republic is sometimes exaggerated in modern scholarly literature, in the period between 1587 and 1618 Flemings and Brabanders certainly had difficulties if they wanted to participate in local politics. Formally, their host towns had legal grounds to exclude them from offices and sometimes even from full citizenship. The reasons for these restrictions were older than the Dutch Revolt and the mass migration it brought about. All polities and regions in the Netherlands had traditionally
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217 The distinction between two fundamentally different types of religiosity that divided Southern and Northern Netherlandish Protestants is for great parts due to the influence of the seminal work of H.A. Enno van Gelder. (H.A. Enno van Gelder, Revolutionnaire reformatie. De vestiging van de Gereformeerde Kerk in de Nederlandse gewesten, gedurende de eerste jaren van de opstand tegen Filips II, 1575-1585, Amsterdam 1943.)
cultivated a strong provincial outlook with historical roots that dated back to the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century resistance against the increasing centralization of the Low Countries under the Burgund and Habsburg authorities. While the Grand Privilege of 1477 had already excluded foreigners from political offices in the various provinces, in many cases Flemings and Brabanders were still able to enter the Court of Holland, especially in the early sixteenth century when the Grand Privilege was no longer binding. Until the 1540s, there were no formal grounds on which to exclude persons from other provinces from provincial politics, but in the mid-sixteenth century the situation changed and provincial governments sought to introduce measures against the appointment of foreigners. Ironically, this practice did not have its origins in the North but in the South. In 1545 the central government appointed Antwerp merchant Jacob Grammary as revenue officer in Holland and at the same time issued a privilege for the States of Brabant that allowed them to exclude ‘strangers’ from public offices. The States of Holland tried immediately to also receive a similar privilege, which was denied. However, less than ten years later a new request from Holland was granted, and Holland was now also allowed to exclude Brabanders while natives of Flanders and Mechelen could still be appointed.

In daily practice, this right to exclude foreigners was not applied as strictly as would legally have been possible. Especially in the early phase of the Dutch Revolt, between the 1560s and the mid-1580s, political participation of newcomers was not uncommon and surprisingly many Southerners were elected to the rebel city councils and magistracies of Holland and Zeeland. In the magistrates of Vlissingen and Middelburg and in the provincial government of Zeeland Flemings and Brabanders were quite well represented. Johan Nicolai, former burgomaster of Brussels, was appointed as secretary of the States of Zeeland and was even recommended as having ‘fled hither because of his great piety’.

---


221 See e.g. Briels, *De Zuid-Nederlandse immigratie*, p. 79.
Holland towns Southerners were able to enter the magistracies until the late 1580s.222

The situation changed in 1586 when Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester became Governor General of the Northern Netherlands after the assassination of William of Orange. Dudley, who lacked the sensitivity to deal with the strong provincial traditions and privileges, soon became entangled in a series of conflicts with local regents and magistrates, particularly in Holland and Utrecht. As a result, he sought his allies outside these circles and found them among a number of exiled patricians from the Southern Netherlands who sympathized with orthodox Calvinism. When conflicts between liberal Protestants and orthodox Calvinists in Utrecht escalated in 1586, Leicester intervened and purged the city council to install a new magistrate that mainly consisted of Reformed regents, including many exiles from Brabant and Flanders, such as Gerard Prouninck, who became second burgomaster of Utrecht.223 When Leicester left the Netherlands in 1587 the appointment of the ‘foreigners’ he had installed was undone, and from then on, Southerners were more structurally denied access to any public offices in Holland and Utrecht. The association of radical Calvinism with ‘strangers’ from Brabant and Flanders was reinforced by an attempted coup in Leiden where a number of Calvinists, including the Flemish theologian Adrianus Saravia, tried to bring the town under Leicester’s control and to purge the magistrate of Libertine elements.224 Three Flemings were executed and a number other conspirators were condemned to death in absentia and fled with Saravia to England where the latter had lived after his flight from Antwerp in 1585. These events remained present in collective memory and were often used to identify Southerners as radicals who needed to be excluded from political office. While the Leicester faction indeed consisted of many Calvinist Flemings and Brabanders, and even in modern scholarly literature the conflict is often depicted as one between migrants and natives, we should not forget that

among the town magistrates who supported Dudley were many that did not contain any newcomers. Among the strongholds of Leicester were not only all the towns in Friesland with the exception of Franeker but also all the Holland towns north of Amsterdam and Haarlem: Alkmaar, Hoorn and Enkhuizen as well the various smaller municipalities. None of these places had seen any substantial influx of Southern refugees.

The iconic image of the Leicester troubles as a clash between natives and strangers should therefore in first instance be regarded as a discursive product of the conflict itself. Anti-Calvinists denounced their enemies as ‘foreigners’ and fashioned themselves as natives adhering to their local traditions and liberties. That phenomenon was already noted by Pieter de la Court, who in 1659, more than seventy years after the events, wrote that the involvement of ‘a few’ Flemings had given the local Libertine regents the opportunity to depict the entire conflict as a rebellion of foreigners and to exclude them from political power. Fortunately, this exclusion was due only to the ‘arbitrary’ reasoning of elite members and did not become a formalized prescription in the long run so that De la Court still harbored hopes of a political career for himself. Even if the participation of Southerners in Holland and Utrecht politics declined for a longer period, De la Court was right. While a number of Southerners managed to keep their offices even after the Leicester period, such as the Brabander Nicolas de Sille who remained pensionary of Amsterdam until his death in 1601, it became easier for them to enter politics after the Twelve Years’ Truce. In 1606 Brabander Jan Jansz Teyts was elected to the magistrate of Haarlem, and after the triumph of the Counter-Remonstrant party in 1618 others followed. While the exclusion of foreigners was structural only during the period between the Leicester coup and end of the Twelve Years’ Truce, the image of rebellious Flemings and Brabanders remained a part of collective memory and could be brought up again when it seemed appropriate.

225 Israel, The Dutch Republic, pp. 228, 229.
228 Van Deursen, Bavieren en slijkgeuzen, p. 315.
Leiden and Haarlem as exile towns

The two most important textile towns of Holland were Leiden and Haarlem, which by the end of the sixteenth century also had the highest percentage of migrants from Flanders and Brabant. The new industries were for a great deal built by migrants from the war-torn South and attracted increasing numbers of newcomers. As a result, the two towns became where the conflict between Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants was most explicitly fought out by identifying one of the parties as ‘strangers’ who tried to disturb the local peace. In the rhetoric of many pamphlets the religious conflict which had its origins in an academic theological dispute between the Leiden professors Jacobus Arminius, who originated from Holland, and Franciscus Gomarus, a Fleming, was presented as a conflict between native Hollanders and Flemish newcomers.229

In both towns migrants from the South played a crucial role in the development of the local industry. After 1577, when Haarlem had taken the side of the Dutch rebels, the North Holland town became the destination of great numbers of immigrants from the Southern Netherlands, especially linen weavers and yarn bleachers from West Flanders but also merchants from Antwerp. Haarlem’s siege and capture by the Spaniards in 1573 and a devastating fire in 1576 had left the city in a desolate state.230 Laborers and capital from the Southern Netherlands were welcomed in Haarlem, and migrants helped to rebuild the town and to stimulate the local production and trade of linen, beer and other commodities. Although exact numbers are unascertainable, the proportion of Southerners among the Haarlem populace must have been tremendously high: in the main period of immigration, until 1622, the population grew from eighteen thousand to forty thousand people.231 Scholars who have studied Southern exiles in the Northern Provinces during the Dutch Revolt assume that about half of Haarlem’s inhabitants in the early-seventeenth century had a Flemish or Brabantine background.232 Most of the immigrants were refugees from the war-torn areas in Flanders where violence and destruction had made life impossible or inhabitants of the Southern Calvinist

229 Ibid., p. 314.
231 Briels, Zuidnederlanders in de Republiek, p. 19.
232 Ibid.
republics conquered by Parma’s armies in the early and mid-1580’s. Others had not
directly fled to Haarlem but first settled in England or the German Empire and later
moved to North Holland, such as large groups of textile workers from Goch.
Particularly in the first decades after their arrival, the refugees formed a close and
clearly recognizable group, living in their own ‘Flemish Quarter’ with their own
bakers, shopkeepers and midwives. They founded their own Flemish chamber of
rhetoric, and, those who were not Dutch-speaking Calvinists, established their own
Mennonite, Lutheran and Walloon Reformed churches, the latter in close alliance
with the Dutch Reformed congregation.

Even though Leiden became the most important textile town in the Dutch
Republic, its situation after the Habsburg campaigns into Holland differed in many
aspects from that of Haarlem. While Haarlem was severely damaged in the siege,
Leiden, which was besieged a year later, emerged triumphantly, an event that led to
a vivid culture of civic commemoration that would prevail for centuries. Despite
Leiden’s victory, the city also lost a substantial part of its population, and both
towns had to be repopulated and rebuilt. The possibilities of recruiting Flemish
textile workers were soon discovered, and from the late 1570s onwards the Leiden
magistrate made contracts with exiles from Colchester who were allowed to settle in
Leiden. In 1591, the town authorities created a new settlement for newcomers
working in the textile industry in Maredorp, a town quarter north of the Rhine River,
which would become a typical Flemish neighborhood. Even though the percentage
of Flemings and Brabanders seems to have been lower than in Haarlem, Leiden’s
spectacular population growth between the late sixteenth and early seventeenth
century was also due to the numerous Southern migrants. As in Haarlem, the
refugees established their own institutions, including a social welfare system and a
chamber of rhetoric, which was originally set up for Flemings but also had Brabant
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members and even had a Brabander, the aforementioned Jacob Duym, as chairman. In the Dutch Reformed Church as well as in the various minority churches, Southerners were well represented and able to exercise influence.

In both towns the great masses of Southern refugees were often identified with the Reformed Church and especially its more orthodox branches even if many of the migrants, especially in Haarlem, were in fact Mennonites. To be sure, in the early years of the seventeenth century, the membership of the Reformed Church consisted largely of Flemings and Brabanders because of the reluctance of the local populations of many Holland towns to officially become church members.\textsuperscript{237} Especially among the Reformed elders and deacons, Southerners were strongly represented. Since it was difficult for them to participate in the politics of their new home towns, influence in the Church was an attractive alternative. In order to prevent an overrepresentation of migrants among the elders and deacons, the Reformed congregations of Leiden and Haarlem limited their participation to one half of the consistories while the other half had to consist of Hollanders.\textsuperscript{238} This strong representation of Flemish and Brabant migrants made it easy for adversaries of the Reformed Church to attack it as consisting primarily of ‘foreigners’ who tried to stir up their coreligionists against other groups, such as Mennonites and Remonstrants.

During the troubles of the Twelve Years’ Truce this strategy was often employed. The conflict, which had started in 1604 as a controversy between two Leiden professors about the nature of godly predestination, almost led to a civil war in the Dutch Republic in the late 1610s. While the Remonstrants, sympathizers of Jacobus Arminius, who nuanced John Calvin’s ideas on predestination and emphasized the role of the individual’s acceptance of God’s grace, were backed by the States of Holland and the province’s land’s advocate Johan van Oldenbarnevelt, orthodox Calvinists became increasingly dissatisfied. In many Holland towns, these Counter-Remonstrants refused to attend sermons of ‘Arminian’ ministers and gathered in private houses and other buildings.\textsuperscript{239} In 1617/18, the conflict escalated

\textsuperscript{238} Noord-Hollands Archief, Stadsarchief Haarlem. Raad inv.nr. 462 (1611-1635). I am grateful to Marianne Eekhout for this reference.
\textsuperscript{239} See e.g.: Van Deursen, \textit{Bavianen en slijkgeuzen}, pp. 252, 267.
until stadholder Maurice of Nassau chose the side of the Counter-Remonstrants in 1618. In August of this year, Oldenbarnevelt was arrested and in 1619 tried for high treason, while many city councils were purged of Remonstrant sympathizers. Years before the intervention of the stadholder libertines, Remonstrants and Mennonites had already labeled Haarlem’s and Leiden’s orthodox Calvinists as ‘Flemish’ radicals who wished to turn their towns into a ‘new Geneva’ where dissenting beliefs would not be tolerated. These accusations were spread in pamphlets, songs and other media that often referred to the past of the migrants and stimulated the recollection of memories of the early period of the Dutch Revolt, which would play an important role in the conflict as we will see below.

*Haarlem and the memory of the London martyrs*

In 1618, the Reformed Church in Haarlem found itself in trouble. The escalating tensions between Remonstrants and Calvinists had left deep splits in its congregational life: a majority of the church members had publicly manifested their dissent with the libertine elements in church and magistrate, and some parents even refused to let their children be baptized in services led by Remonstrant or even moderate Calvinist ministers. Polemical pamphlets on both sides had provoked a nasty conflict that led to the banishment of five people from the city by the magistrate. However, intra-confessional disputes among the Reformed were not the only cause of unease. Adherents of other denominations also took a hand in the confessional polemics. The descendants of two Flemish Mennonite artisans executed in London forty-three years earlier accused the Calvinists of sharing responsibility for the death of their ancestors. When the London Mennonites were examined by Bishop Grindal in 1575, several members of the local Dutch Reformed Church had acted as translators and had also tried to convert the ‘heretics’ to the ’true Christian Religion’. Fearing unrest among the religious exiles in the city, the magistrate had

---

240 Noord-Hollands Archief, Acta van de kerkeraad van de Hervormde Kerk te Haarlem, January 7, 1618.
forced all exiles to sign a declaration that affirmed the authority of the bishop of London to punish heretics. In the eyes of many, and not only Mennonites, signing the declaration proved the complicity of the Calvinists in the executions.

The memory of the London martyrs would remain a contentious issue between Mennonites and Calvinists both in England and on the continent for decades to come. A few months after the execution members of the Dutch Reformed congregation in London were confronted with accusations of being ‘inquisitors and persecutors’. Two years later the Reformed Stranger Church in Frankenthal near Heidelberg reported similar experiences with local Anabaptists. In 1576, the issue even led to a split within the Antwerp Church ‘under the cross’. In particular among the stricter members of the congregation many were upset by the rumors from England, and a number of them converted to the Mennonites because they believed that Mennonites lived a much godlier life than the Calvinists whose consistory was full of ‘drunkards and adulterers’. Two young members of the Reformed consistory, Elder Hans de Ries and Deacon Albrecht Verspeck, who propagated a church discipline that was much stricter than that practiced in any Calvinist Church, became followers of Menno and eventually notable leaders of the Waterlander Mennonite communities in the Northern Netherlands. De Ries, who advocated severe penalties, such as public repentance and collective shunning, even when dealing with issues traditionally treated as adiaphora, played a decisive role in the commemoration of the London martyrs. When in 1589 Rotterdam Calvinist elder Pieter de Bisschop suggested that the London Mennonites had been executed because of their rebellious attitude and for insulting Queen Elizabeth, de Ries published a rebuttal in which he tried to defend the honor of his coreligionists: referring to the canonical non poena sed causa-doctrine, he argued that his London brothers were true martyrs - they had not been killed for lèse-majesté and insurgence but for the sake of faith.

244 Ibid., p. 707.
In 1615, three years before the descendants of the martyrs came into conflict with the Reformed Church in Haarlem, de Ries and another Flemish coreligionist, Haarlem elder Jacques Outerman, had published the so-called Haarlem martyrology or De Historie der martelaren, a work often reprinted and also re-edited under different titles.\(^{248}\) In the Haarlem martyrology the case of the London martyrs was treated at length and documented with an extensive range of source material. De Ries must have been well informed about the executions during his time as a Calvinist: in the 1576 correspondence between the congregations in London and Antwerp both the cases of the London Mennonites and the quarrels with de Ries and Verspeck were discussed as main topics.\(^{249}\) Many of the sources de Ries used were accessible to him only as someone who had belonged to Reformed circles, such as the letter from Calvinist refugee Jacques de Somere to his mother in Ghent.\(^{250}\) This letter was later reprinted in all other Mennonite martyrologies throughout the seventeenth century and became one of the main sources about the martyrs. If the persons accusing the Reformed church in Haarlem did not remember the details about their dead ancestors, they could look them up in de Ries and Outerman’s book.

*Remembering Flemish radicalism*

Another Mennonite attack against the Reformed Church and in particular the Counter-Remonstrant party, which was depicted as consisting exclusively of Southern exiles, came with Marijn de Brauwer’s 1618 pamphlet *Eenvuldighe waerschouwinghe aen de gevluchte vreemdelinghen* (‘Simple warning to the fled strangers’). De Brauwer, himself a refugee from West Flanders, accused his Calvinist fellow countrymen of living like parasites among the citizens of Haarlem - instead of being grateful for the patience and tolerance they had enjoyed for almost

\(^{248}\) Hans de Ries and Jacques Outerman, *Historie der martelaren, ofte waerachtighge getuygen Iesu Christi die d’ Evangelische waerheyt in veelderley tormenten betuygt ende met haer bloet bevesticht hebben sint het jaer 1524 tot desen tyt toe*, Haarlem 1615. The Hoorn martyrology from 1617 (*Historie Der Warachtighe getuygen Jesu Christi*, Hoorn 1617) is actually another edition of de Ries and Outerman’s work. The book was not uncontroversial in Mennonite circles since the various cases were harmonized in accordance with the theology of the Waterlanders. The doctrine of incarnation as proclaimed in the martyrs’ quotes in the Haarlem martyrology became a particularly contentious issue between Waterlander and Flemish Mennonites. See: Gregory, *Salvation at stake*, pp. 241f.


forty years, they tried to overrule the natives and impose their own rules on their fellowmen. In the days of persecution they had been welcomed to Holland as poor refugees, but now they acted as persecutors themselves. The central arguments of De Brauwer’s pamphlet refer to memories from the South and the first period of migration to Haarlem. The true nature of the Calvinists had already been visible back in Flanders: wherever they had become powerful, they tried to ‘kindle the fire of Geneva’ and sought to persecute and expel those they called heretics. If the Calvinists were to seize power in Holland, they would act ‘as they had done in Ypres’. Apparently the mere reference to that city said enough – further explanations of what actually happened under Calvinist rule in that city in the 1580s are absent from De Brauwer’s text. The collective memory of the Haarlem exile community was vivid enough to make clear that he referred to the expulsion of Mennonites and Catholics from Ypres during the siege by the Habsburg armies. The events in the Flemish Calvinist republics of the 1580s were notorious, and the former inhabitants of these cities frequently found themselves under attack in Haarlem. The magistrates of the Southern rebel towns, especially of Ghent, had come into conflict with William of Orange in the late 1570s because of their strict religious policies and were accused of hindering the Revolt against the Habsburgs with their radicalism. In 1587, exiles from Ghent were insulted as ‘noose-bearers, image-breakers, chalice-thieves and traitors to their fatherland’. The insulting nickname ‘noose-bearers’ (stropdragers) was an old designation for citizens of Ghent since after a revolt in 1540 Charles V had deprived the town of all its privileges, and the city’s magistrates were forced to repent with a noose around their necks. In 1597, the insults were repeated, and Ghent refugees in Haarlem were again confronted with accusations of Calvinist radicalism and rioting. References to the Calvinist Republics that had existed between 1578 and 1585 in Ghent, Antwerp and
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Mechelen were widely recognized – their memory belonged to the common knowledge in the cities of the North.

Replies to the 1618 pamphlet followed immediately. In the same year various anonymous Counter-Remonstrants tried to counter De Brauwer’s allegations. The author of *Het loon van den Brouwer* ‘The reward of De Brouwer’ tried to dismiss the allegations of the Mennonite author by simply pretending to be uninformed about the events in Ypres:

> He [De Brauwer] mentions an incident that took place in Ypres, but he does not tell what happened, when it took place and who was responsible. He blames the strangers who fled here for it, but it is better to believe that the town council was responsible and not the refugees, if the incident took place at all.256

Only a few sentences later the anonymous author appears to know much more about the case than he had pretended. He counters De Brauwer’s arguments by referring to Munster where everyone who was dissatisfied with the Anabaptist leaders was banned from the city:

> But that is what your Munsteran fanatics did, when they chased out of town all those who did not belong to your sect, the bad as well as the good.257

Driving non-Calvinists out of the town was exactly the accusation that De Brauwer had levelled at the Reformed. This argument was clearly understandable, and by mentioning Munster as a counter-example, the author of *Het loon van den Brouwer* proved to be informed about the case. In 1578, Ypres had become a Calvinist Republic, and only a few months after the regime change Catholicism was banned. The new regime would last for only five years – after the Duke of Parma’s siege in 1583, the town had to surrender, and many of its inhabitants fled northwards. The last years of Calvinist rule had been devastating. Struck by famine and plague, the

---

256 *Het loon van den Brouwer, voor zijn werck t’ onrecht ghenaemt, Eenuuldighe waerschouwinge, aen de ghevluchte vreemdelingen*, Haarlem(?) 1618, fol. 8: ‘Hy (De Brauwer) seydt v oorts dat tot Iperen yet gheschiedt te zijn, doch verhaeldt niet wat, oock niet wanneer , ofte aen wie, ’t welck hy oock de ghevluchte vreemdelingen te laste leyt, doch tis b eter te ghelooven, indien daer yet gheschiedt is, dat d’Overheyt van Yperen daer aen schuldich is, ende niet de ghevluchte vreemdelingen.’

257 Ibid.: ‘Maer u Munstersche sulcxs toonden, als den verwoede, want die van hoere Sect niet was ’tsy quaat of goede jaechdemen ter Stadt uyt.’
townspeople were also confronted with thousands of refugees from the surrounding rural areas where continuous warfare had created a state of virtual anarchy.\textsuperscript{258} To control immigration under these severe conditions, the magistrate had ordered that all refugee families without provisions for at least three months had to leave Ypres. Those who resisted would violently ‘be led out of the town and treated as rebels’.\textsuperscript{259} During the siege the measures became more and more draconian, and when winter drew near, great numbers of people, most of them Catholics, were sent away. In December 1583 Ypres citizen Augustijn van Hernighem noticed that again many strangers were to be expelled – even though ‘their crying and weeping was so pitiful’, they were forced to depart. On Christmas Eve a large convoy of people left for Bruges.\textsuperscript{260}

The lore of the Ypres banishments traveled northwards with the fugitives and quickly spread among the exile communities in the Republic. Pretending to be ignorant of the events, as the author of Het loon van den Brouwer (‘The reward of De Brauwer’) had tried to do, did not prove adequate to counter the charges. A second strategy seemed more successful: in another pamphlet from 1618, the Vrevghden-ghesanck over de schoone veranderinghen in’t vrye Nederlandt (‘Joyful song on the changes in the free Netherlands’) De Brauwer’s accusations were not denied but just turned around. Apparently the Counter-Reformation pamphleteer did know much more than De Brauwer or any other author suggested: the Ypres banishments were directly targeted at Anabaptists. The town magistrates had no choice other than to expel these dissenters. Had they only been as rebellious as ‘their brothers’, the Anabaptists of Munster, Ypres could at least have been defended, but now they refused to take up arms against the besiegers. Expelling them was therefore a necessary measure:

\begin{quote}
The king [John of Leyden] wanted to recklessly reestablish the New Jerusalem, but consider how unworthy your brothers were behaving there in Ypres, when there was an order that each
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{258} Briels, Zuidnederlands in de Republiek, p. 35.
\textsuperscript{259} F. van de Putte (ed.), Nederlandsche Historie door Augustijn van Hermelghen 1, Gent 1864, p. 89. I am aware of the many shortcomings of this edition, but was not able to consult the original manuscript. For a brief discussion of Van de Putte’s edition, see: Pollmann, Catholic Identity, p. 204.
\textsuperscript{260} Ibid., pp. 272, 275.
should keep watch and be ready
to withstand the enemy bravely.
But those who refused to do so
were forced to leave the town,
Which was a just measure for the sake of its defense
and which warns and exhorts us today,
when we plainly write this down.
Your wealth incites you and thus you become reckless'.

Instead of a defensive approach here the Reformed pamphleteer chooses the frontal
attack against the Mennonite who had charged Calvinists with persecuting members
of other confessions – the magistrat of Ypres was right to expel the Mennonites, he
proclaims. The radicalism of the Calvinist Flemish cities in the early 1580s remained
an issue that could not be ignored. Its memory stirred up fear of Reformed
confessionalism and threatened to undermine the self-perception of the Calvinists
who prided themselves on their suffering for their faith’s sake under the Catholic
Habsburg regime. Since any efforts to deny the Flemish past did not prove effective,
the pamphleteer chose a counter-attack – it was the disloyalty of the Mennonite
heretics that made confessional cleansing necessary.

Rich or poor immigrants?
The last lines of the Vrevghden-ghesanck ‘De weelde steeckt u selfs, dies wordt ghy
dertelmoedich’ (‘Your wealth incites you and thus you become reckless’) echo the
refrain of De Brauwer’s pamphlet: ‘Wat stercke benen zijn’t, die weelde connen
draghen.’ (‘It takes strong legs to carry wealth’).262 The Mennonite pamphleteer
referred not only to the past in Flanders to reinforce his argument but also to the

261 Vrevghden-ghesanck over de schoone veranderinghen in’t vrye Nederlandt, door het kloeck beleyt der
Staten Generael, met het edele huys van Nassovwe, Amsterdam 1618, B3r:

‘Den Coninck wilde ’t nieu Jerusalem lichtveerdich
Weder op rechten gaen, ghedenckt hoe oock onweerdich
U broeders hielden haer, als ’t Yper wert ghedaen,
Een ghebodt dat elck sou in wacht en rondt volheerdich
Zijn, om den vyandt soo kloeck’lijck te wederstaen,
Die sulcks niet wilde doen moeste ter Stadt uyt gaen,
’Twelck was ooc billijck recht tot Stadts verstercking spoedich
Ons die d’ eenvuldich schrijft waerschuwingh of vermaen,
De weelde steeckt u selfs, dies wordt ghy dertelmoedich.’

262 De Brauwer, Eenvuldighe waerschouwinghe aen de gevluchte vreemdelinghen, fol. A1r. De Brauwer’s
motto ‘Wat stercke benen zijn’t, die weelde connen draghen’ was later also used in the painting Allegory
of Wealth by Brabant refugee Adriaen van de Venne (Laurens J. Bol, Adriaen Pietersz. van de Venne,
Painter and Draughtsman, Doornspijk 1989, p. 95).
situation in Haarlem ‘thirty-eight years ago’ when the great numbers of refugees from the South had arrived:

You strange nation of Flemings and Brabanders who spread an evil rumor among the Hollanders, how glad were you then, when you found such supporters, when you were frightened and terrified of the murderers and executioners? Penniless, robbed and naked have you fled your homeland to the garden of Holland, where you have lived free from threat for a long time, and without any reason to complain. The good magistrates, whom you owe so much, have tolerated you for thirty-eight years now. You were able to gather with an untroubled mind, in your churches and your homes, and no one took offense. And when first you came here, I have to add, you were in a miserable state, but found comfort in your need: You were brought up like child in his mother’s bosom. You have no reason to complain about the magistrate, and your complaints grew out of haughtiness rather than of poverty, it takes strong legs to carry wealth. 263

According to De Brauwer, the Calvinist strangers owed everything to the native Haarlemmers and the city’s magistrate. When they arrived, they had nothing and were nurtured by the city ‘like a child by its mother’. Apparently the image of the first Calvinist immigrants from the South as destitute poor was commonly recognizable in Haarlem. Before 1594, when the Reformed deacons began to look after Flemings and Brabanders, the Southerners had to rely on their own social

263 Ibid.: ‘Ghy vreemde nacy, van Vlamingen en Brabanders Die nu by de Hollanders, maken een quaet gerucht, Hoe blyde waert gy doen, gy vont sulcke voorstanders Als gy verschricht verbaest, voor die moorders en branders Beroyt, berooft, en naeckt, zit uyt u Lant ghevlucht In den hollantschen Thuyn, aldaer ghy sonder ducht Langhe tijdt hebt gewoont, sonder eenich bezwaren: Die goede Magistraet, ghy wel bedancken meucht, Ghy sijt by haer gedult, wel achtentertich Jaren: Ghy hebt met vry gemoedt, by een mogen vergaren, In Kercken, en in Huys, sonder eenich aenstoot. En doen ghy hier eerst quaemt, dit mot ick noch verclare Miserabel ghesteldt, vondt ghy troost inden noot: Ghy sijt hier op gevoed, als ’t Kint in’s Moeders schoot: Over de Magistraet, hebt ghy geen kaus om klagen, Dit wert meer uyt hoochmoet, dan door armoede groot Wat stercke beenen zijn’t, die weelde connen draghen.’
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welfare networks. These were dominated by Mennonites, among whom were numerous rich merchants willing to support their Southern compatriots regardless of their confession. The Reformed must have been embarrassed by the fact that their coreligionists were dependent on the charity of those whom they regarded as heretical sectarians.264 This situation that had lasted until 1594 lived on in the common image of the Southern Calvinists – in the pamphlets from the troubles of 1618 they were always referred to as descendants of paupers and riffraff.265

References to the social status of the various denominations were not unimportant in the image formation of the different groups. To identify one party as consisting of paupers could make them suspect of harboring radical tendencies and religious Schwärmerei. In addition, the poor migrants needed to know their place and behave as grateful guests instead of meddling in local affairs. The Counter-Remonstrant pamphleteers were therefore eager to rebut the common image of poor Calvinists and rich Mennonites: not only had there been great numbers of poor Anabaptists, they averred, but also numerous wealthy Reformed.266 Against the dominant image the author of Het loon van den Brouwer pictured the Mennonites as nouveaux riches who had forgotten their own past poverty and haughtily turned against their own compatriots:

But now that you become wealthy,
you display much hate and envy,
You scandalize and scold and blame your own people
with outrage and brutality [...].

The motive of unfaithfulness against one’s ‘own people’ is also adopted in the Vrevghden-ghesanck, where De Brauwer’s attack is presented as evidence of disloyalty against his fellow migrants, unparalleled in all creation: among all animals there is none that attacks his own kind; such behavior is possible only in the

264 Spaans, Haarlem na de reformatie, p. 174.
265 See also: Copye van den lasterlijcken brief van Verlaen : in den Haerlemschen Harminiaen ghementioneer, met korte Annotation ghelastert: ghelijck mede van den Brieff aen de H. Burgheemeesteren, van den selfden ter selfder tijd gheschreven, tot blick der waerheit ghepubliceeret, Haarlem 1618; Gerard Brandt, Historie der Reformatie, en andre kerkelyke geschiedenissen, in en ontrent de Nederlanden, Rotterdam 1704, vol. 4, 639.
266 Het loon van den Brouwer, fol. 4.
267 Ibid., fol. 3: ‘Maer nu gy weeldich wort, toont gy veel haet en nyt,
Gy lastert, schelt, blameert, schand’lijck met violency,
U eyghen volck [...]’
corrupted hearts of men. The equation of the Calvinists with the underclass of the Southern newcomers was perceived as a severe attack. In a society in which poverty was associated with susceptibility to radical ideas the Reformed could not ignore such claims. The evidence that there had also been rich Calvinists and poor Anabaptists among the first exiles was considered important, and the Reformed pamphleteers did their best to refute the accusations of the Mennonites by turning them around.

Memory as ‘a salutary warning’
One of the political victims of the 1618 coup that led to the purge of the Haarlem magistrate was council member and former burgomaster Gerrit van der Laen. Although a member of the Reformed congregation, van der Laen had always sided with the ‘libertine’ faction in church and magistrate and had later gained notoriety as a defender of the Remonstrant cause. In 1618 anonymous Counter-Remonstrant authors published a letter that Van der Laen had written in 1615 to Amsterdam minister Hendrik Gesteranus in which he had complained about the influence of Counter-Remonstrant Southerners who ‘agitated against the States and tried to create a Flemish state of affairs’. In the same year two Haarlem citizens, Abraham de Block and Elias Christiaensen, were banished from the city for spreading vicious rumors about Van der Laen. The burgomaster, they reported, had been seen in the vicinity of the ‘Red House’, a local brothel, accompanied by two prostitutes. His sexual misbehavior, anonymous pamphleteers concluded, was the direct outcome of his ‘libertine’ religious views and had left him with various venereal diseases. Van der Laen’s position became more and more insecure – in Haarlem he was mocked as ‘droncken Claesjen’, an allusion to the former bishop of Haarlem, Nicolaas de Castro, who had been referred to with the same nickname. To suggest secret Catholic sympathies his enemies called Van der Laen ‘bishop of Haarlem’ and ‘Don Gerrit’ after Don Juan of Austria. In 1618, his opponents felt safe enough to publish a number of pamphlets against him. In the most notable one, Den

268 Vrevghden-ghesanck over de schoone veranderinghen in’t vrye Nederlandt, fol. B2r.
269 Publicatie der stadt Haerlem. Afghelesen den xxv. O ctobris anno 1618, Haarlem 1618, fol. 2r.
270 Copye van den lasterlijcken brief van Verlaen, p. 8.
271 Gabrielle Dorren, Eenheid en verscheidenheid. De burgers van Haarlem in de Gouden Eeuw, Amsterdam 2001, p. 188.
272 Copye van den lasterlijcken brief van Verlaen, pp. 5, 9.
Haerlemschen Harminiaen ('The Haarlem Arminian') the 1615 banishments were presented as the work of ‘the Spanish tyranny under a new name, threatening to take over the land and letting the tyrannical spirit triumph’.  

In a notorious letter from 1615 that was discovered by his enemies Van der Laen had accused the Southerners of trying to overrule the natives and reestablish ‘what they had tried to bring about in the days of the Earl of Leicester’. If they were not stopped, they would repeat what they had done in Flanders, Brabant and Wallonia. The Southern Calvinists could be resisted only if the Hollanders awoke from their amnesia and remembered the past:

These people want our memory concerning these things [the radicalism of the Southern Calvinists] to be like the memory of flies, who have escaped the knife five or six times, only to sit down again and be cut in pieces. No, these things will eternally remain in the memory of the Hollanders and they serve the magistrate as a salutary warning, because it is their duty to keep special watch over the religion and the welfare of the country [...].

Memory is presented here a remedy against the threat of the radicals. The ‘eternal commemoration’ of the Flemish Calvinist danger serves ‘as a salutary warning’ to the Hollanders and their magistrates. In 1618, Counter-Remonstrant pamphleteers included Van der Laen’s letters and added a comment in which his argument was turned around:

I also think that the memory of the Hispaniolized league shall remain forever in the memory of the Hollanders, and that they do not let themselves be fooled again under the pretext of reforming the true religion and the need to maintain the government’s authority, as unfortunately has happened now.  

---

273 Den Haerlemschen Harminiaen. Dat is: Verhael van de vreetheyt der Heeren van Haerlem, Haarlem 1618.
274 Copye van den lasterlijcken brief van Verlaen, 7. For the role of southern Calvinists during the stay of Leicester in the Netherlands, see: F. G. Oosterhoff, Leicester and the Netherlands, 1586-1587, Utrecht 1988.
275 Copye van den lasterlijcken brief van Verlaen, p.12: Dese luyden menen, dat men op dese saecke behoort te hebben de memorie van vlieghen, die vijf of ses malen achter malkanderen, den slagh van’t mes ontgaen sijnde, terstont ter selfder plaetse wederkeren om aen stucken gheslaghen te worden. Neen het dient den Hollanders ter eeuwigher memorie, ter een heylsame waerschouwinghe van de Magistraet, dat hen lieden insonderheyt toekomt te waken voor de Religie ende de welstant vant Lant [...].
276 Ibid.: ‘Ick meen oock dat by den Hollanders in eeuwigher memorie sal blijven de ghedachtenis van de ghehispanioliseerde Liga, ende datsz haer andermael met den deck-mantel van de ware Religie beter te Reformeren, ende d’authoriteit van d’Overheyt te maintineren also niet en sullen laeten verblijden, als nu leyder gheschiet is.’
The ‘Hispaniolized league’ of the Remonstrants is tagged here with attributes recognizable in collective memory: what the Arminians do is nothing but the renewal of the ‘Spaensch placcaet’ (‘Spanish proclamation’), and their tyranny is worse than the rule of Don Juan of Austria in the Netherlands and of John of Leyden in Munster.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 6, 27.} Fortunately, the anonymous author remarks, these historical examples have not been forgotten by the Hollanders so they can easily recognize and counter the threat of the ‘new tyranny’.

Modern authors on the migration of Southerners to Haarlem have uttered their astonishment about Van der Laen’s writings against the town’s exile community.\footnote{See for example: Pieter Biesboer, ‘De Vlaamse immigranten in Haarlem 1578 in Haarlem en hun nakomelingen’, in: Pieter Biesboer, Gerrit Kolthof et al., Vlamingen in Haarlem, Haarlem 1996, p. 41.} Despite his agitation against the strangers his daughter Beatrix married the wealthy Antwerp merchant Isaac Massa in 1622, and Van der Laen seems to have been on good terms with son-in-law. Massa was not only an immigrant but also a Calvinist and thereby belonged exactly to the faction of his father-in-law’s enemies. Even more surprising is the fact that Van der Laen himself had family bonds in the Southern Netherlands that dated back to the late Middle Ages.\footnote{M. Thierry de Bye Döllemann and O. Schutte, ‘Het Haarlemse geslacht Van der Laen’, in: De Nederlandsche Leeuw 86 (1969), p. 326.} Apparently the North Holland branch of the family had always remained in contact with their Southern relatives, and as a youth Gerrit van der Laen had studied in Louvain. This case illustrates once more that the stereotypical image of Flemish religious zealots altercating with native xenophobic Hollanders has its origin in contemporary polemics rather than in reality.

Like De Brauwer’s *Eenvuldighe waerschouwinghe aen de gevluchte vreemdelingen*, Van der Laen’s anti-immigrant rhetoric needs to be understood primarily as an argument within a discourse in which the logic of ‘strangers’ vs. ‘natives’ could be employed to disqualify one’s. By referring to a stereotype he was able to graphically depict his vision of a rule of strict Calvinism. Van der Laen’s position in theological and political questions was obvious: he preferred a rather Erastian model of the relations between church and government. To the Haarlem elders who wished to discuss these matters with him he stated that the church should be strictly subordinated to the magistrate ‘as is common practice in the Palatine and

\footnote{Ibid., pp. 6, 27.}
other Reformed principalities’. The authorities had to appoint ‘trustees, superintendents or bishops, committed to the magistrate by oath’. These overseers should control the ministers whose only task was to study the scriptures and preach the Gospel – their interference in political issues had to be prevented. In his long-lasting conflict with the Reformed consistory, the former Haarlem burgomaster had always maintained the position that as a public officer he had to commit himself to the public religion. In Haarlem this turned out to be the Reformed faith, but ‘if the Augsburg Confession had been public and authorized, he would have converted’ since he was an admirer of Melanchthon. For him, the only authority in religion was Scripture itself, and he had become Reformed only when Delft Minister Arnoldus Cornelisz. had convinced him that adherents of the Reformed Religion held no authority higher than the Bible.

In fact, Van der Laen’s position has to be situated in a conflict that can be traced back to the ‘wonder year’ in Antwerp that was long to be remembered in the Republic. During his studies in Louvain in the late 1560s Van der Laen had become a Protestant but was more drawn towards Lutheranism and became involved in the conflict between Calvinists and adherents of the Augsburg Confession, which arose in Antwerp in 1567. Confronted with religious suppression, the two groups had disagreed on how to respond. The Lutherans refused to participate in any resistance or rebellion and were blamed by the Reformed for being unwilling to defend the common ‘Christian freedom’. The phraseology of the Antwerp Lutherans, accusing their fellow Protestants of rioting and unruliness, clearly resembles Van der Laen’s letters from 1615: ‘vous, Calvinistes, vous auctorises icy par force et violence, et nous y sommes avec le consentiment du magistrat.’ For Van der Laen obedience to the magistrate was, besides moral conduct, the only check to be observed in the appointment of ministers: the main problem with Calvinist ministers

---

281 Noord-Hollands Archief, Acta van de kerkeraad van de Hervormde Kerk te Haarlem, December 20, 1622.
282 Spaans, Haarlem na de reformatie, p. 193.
284 J. W. Pont, Geschiedenis van het Lutheranisme in de Nederlanden tot 1618, Haarlem 1911, p. 89.
was ‘that they descend from the dregs and the scum of the unhewn and rude people
who nourish a natural hatred against the magistrate’.  

The dispute between Lutherans and Calvinists in Antwerp festered on in the
Republic for a long time. When the Northern cities were confronted with the
immigration of Lutheran fugitives from Antwerp in 1585, Amsterdam Reformed
minister Petrus Plancius accused them of sympathy with Catholicism and recalled
the events of the wonder year in the Scheldt city. As late as 1602 and 1604,
Lutherans in Amsterdam and Rotterdam were again reminded of the Antwerp
dispute and denounced as traitors who had collaborated with the Catholics in
persecuting the Reformed. The quarrel around the Antwerp events of 1566 even
spread across the borders of the Republic: when the States-General sent a letter to
Philipp Nicolai, Lutheran minister in Hamburg, with an appeal for more tolerance
towards the Calvinists in the Hanseatic City, the wonder year was once again a
disputed matter. Not the Lutherans, Nicolai replied, but the Calvinists were to blame
for the hardships in Antwerp: with their rebellious attitude and adamant intolerance
they resembled more an Islamic sect than a Christian Church and thereby provoked
persecution. Van der Laen’s resentment was thus not exceptional – the Antwerp
past lived on and, according to J.W. Pont, was a main factor of the irreconcilability
between the two confessions in the Republic: Lutherans were regarded as ‘strangers
in the State, as those, who let down (the Reformed) in the struggle for religious
freedom’. The ever-increasing tendency of the Calvinists to identify the Revolt
with their own confessional cause aimed at the exclusion of other confessional
parties who were identified as consisting of ‘strangers’. In their eyes
Netherlandishness was not so much determined by birth as by religion and loyalty to
the Revolt. This new semantics could be turned around by referring to the Calvinist
party as ‘the strangers’ since their majority did indeed consist of Southern exiles.
The same strategy could be applied by the various religious minorities in the
Northern cities: the agitation against ‘strangers’ and ‘outlanders’ does not reflect a
general tendency of xenophobia - many of the authors were Southerners themselves

---

286 ‘[G]esproten uitet schuim ende gespuis van’t gemeene obesnoeit ende onwetent volk, die van naturen
alle overheit haten.’ (Dorren, Eenheid en verscheidenheid, p. 136.)
287 Pont, Geschiedenis van het Lutheranisme, p. 89; C.Ch.G. Visser, De Lutheranen in Nederland. Tussen
katholiekse en calvinisme. 1566 tot heden, Dieren 1983, p. 44.
288 Ibid., p. 45.
289 Pont, Geschiedenis van het Lutheranisme, p. 89.
- but a reestablishment of the traditional semantics of ‘natives’ and ‘strangers’.
Thereby memories of the Calvinist past in the South as well as the first phase of immigration to the Republic were important. They warned of Calvinist intolerance and radicalism and put the newcomers in their place: the refugees inhabited the country thanks only to the goodwill and the charity of the natives. As strangers they had to show their gratitude and stop interfering in political issues.

The case of Van der Laen was no exception. Not only sympathizers of Lutheranism but also moderate Reformed regents who sympathized with Erastian ideas employed an explicit anti-immigrant rhetoric while at the same time having Flemish and Brabant migrants among their personal friends and contacts.

Amsterdam burgomaster Cornelis Pietersz. Hooft, for example, father to the famous poet Pieter Cornelisz. Hooft, is often cited as a typical example of a Holland regent with an explicit anti-immigrant stance. However, Hooft was on friendly terms with Southern migrants and was even praised for his personal engagement in the admittance and accommodation of refugees in Holland. Joost van den Vondel, who was born of exiled Southern Netherlandish parents in Cologne, dedicated his play ‘Hierusalem verwoest’ to him and explicitly praised him as a generous host of Southern exiles:

The most dignified fruit of this [Hooft’s] work is that many thousands of exiled people were friendly nourished and accommodated in the bosom and the territory of the Serene Lords, the States. Resting under their protecting shadows, [the exiles] did no longer have to fear the rage of the Spanish Alecto, who arose from the limbo of hell and, having shaken her snake-wig thrice, kindled the fire with her torch in the faggots and the firewood of the stakes to which many pious Christians were attached, who sung for Jesus Christ in the midst of the flames and offered their body and soul as an odor, sweet and pleasant to God. 

---

When Hooft died in 1626, Vondel again wrote a poem about the burgomaster and praised him as a protector of the persecuted exiles from the South.\(^{292}\) Like Van der Laen, Hooft should thus not simply be categorized as a fervent anti-immigrant regent. His remarks on Southern migrants were rather based on his views on the relationship between church and government, and he opposed the Calvinist struggle for independence from government control. Like Van der Laen, he can be characterized as an Erastian, who feared that the dominance of Southern Calvinists would disturb local power relations. Despite his reservations against Calvinism, he refers to the situation in Geneva where all foreign ministers had to swear an oath of loyalty to the city’s magistrate.\(^{293}\) By contrast, he felt that in his hometown Amsterdam the church had fallen under a foreign yoke and that the strangers were unwilling to accept the local customs and traditions. All this did not prevent friendly contacts with Southern migrants, and his concerns about the present state in the church, for which he held the Calvinists responsible, were less fundamental than has often been assumed.

*Managing counter-memory*

The question of how the bitter memories about the Calvinist past could be countered had been discussed by ministers and consistory since the first accusations of complicity in the executions of the London Mennonites. In 1576, the Antwerp consistory sent a letter to Austin Friars and asked for information about the case.\(^{294}\) The first reactions were sedate: to be slandered and falsely accused was the fate of the Christians in this world, the Londoners answered. Countering the charges was useless – the rumors would be silenced by time.\(^{295}\) For a short period this strategy seemed to work, but when Reformed ministers reported renewed accusations in the 1580s, the London consistory had to change its approach. When Dordrecht minister Hendrik van den Corput asked for more information, his London colleague Godfried van Wingen sent him a detailed account of the events plus a copy of the printed testimony of those Mennonites who had converted to the Reformed Church.\(^{296}\) To

\(^{292}\) Ibid., vol. 2 (1620-1627), p. 760.
\(^{294}\) *Ecclesiae Londino-Batavum archivum*, II, pp. 552f.
\(^{295}\) Ibid., II, p 557.
defend the reputation of the Reformed Church, which explicitly did not define itself in local and congregational terms but as the universal and united corpus Christi, the Mennonites’ memories had to be countered. The London congregation was prepared to respond to all accusations with an elaborate program of memory management. When the descendants of the London martyrs caused unease in Haarlem, the London Reformed congregation only had to send to Haarlem another copy of the 1581 letter to Van den Corput and the declaration of the converts.297

Managing counter-memory had to be done with caution, a fact the Reformed ministers and elders understood very well. Of course, they could not address the disputed issues themselves since thereby new accusations could easily arise and the contested issues could get out of their control. As long as their opponents remained silent, they had to hope that ‘time consume(d) everything, including the tongues of the backbiters’.298 But as soon as amnesia failed to do its work, they had to be well prepared. In Haarlem the Calvinist pamphleteers were clearly able to anticipate the actions and reactions of their Mennonite and Remonstrant opponents. Therefore they chose another strategy to silence their opponents than that used by the Haarlem magistrate before 1618. As we have seen in the case of de Block and Christiaensen, propaganda against the magistrate was not without risk – most pamphlets were published anonymously, but if authors opposing the magistrate were identified, severe measures could be taken. It is therefore striking that authors like Marijn de Brauwer published their work under their own name at a time when the quarrels reached their climax and the Counter-Remonstrant regime change was imminent.

However, there is no evidence that De Brauwer was punished for attacking the Calvinists. Obviously, De Brauwer’s pamphlet was published before the conflict was decided. Both the new magistrate and the Reformed forces chose an approach that did not aim at reconciliation but rather at amnesia: things done and said in the past should no longer be remembered or punished. The Calvinists had particular reasons to be reluctant to take any measures against critics and slanderers from

297 Ibid., pp. 314ff.
298 Duke, Martyrs with a Difference, p. 214.
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outside their own congregation. Since the first days of their existence the Dutch Reformed Church had shaped its self-image by referring to its position as the persecuted and afflicted flock. Its identity as the ‘true Church’, recognizable by suffering and being persecuted, was deeply internalized by its members as well as by its institutional organization. Printed sermons like Het cleyn mostert-zaet, originally preached by Ysbrand Balck in 1567 and 1585 in Antwerp when the Protestants were expelled from the city, served as a model of identification for the Calvinists.

Having been planted like a minuscule mustard-seed in a situation of hardship and suffering, their endurance would eventually be rewarded by becoming a majestic plant. Obviously the self-image of the Reformed as the true, persecuted Christians was threatened when they were accused of being persecutors themselves. Their opponents understood very well that the Calvinists could not deal with these accusations. In a similar case, the classis of Edam decided in 1608 not to take any steps against Mennonites slanderers since these measures would only give their opponents more reasons for backbiting. The Reformed ministers had already been called ‘inquisitors,’ and the classis did not want to make things worse.

In 1618, the memory of the London martyrs could be silenced, and it is unclear whether the London testimony did actually have to be used. Nevertheless, the request to the London congregation for evidence shows how delicate the memory of the tragic events of forty-three years earlier remained. The difficult balancing act the Calvinists had to perform can be appreciated in the town chronicle of Haarlem by Counter-Remonstrant minister Samuel Ampzing. When he gives an account of the persecution of the first Protestants, he hesitates to say anything about Anabaptist victims. The danger of stirring up collective memories of Mennonite martyrdom forces him to keep silent about any details or names lest Mennonite authors then make use of Ampzing’s work for their martyrologies:

---

299 This was clearly not the case when church members attacked and criticized the congregation. People like van der Laen were repeatedly called to account for their role in the conflict after the quarrels had ended (See for example: Acta van de kerkeraad van de Hervormde Kerk te Haarlem, October 2, 1619; December 20, 1622.).
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At this point I must not remain silent and I cannot conceal that among the people who suffered under the Spanish and Papist persecution, there were some, who have suffered and even died for the Anabaptist faith. However, I do not want to mention their names, for if they were unknown until now, the members of their sect could use my work to fill their ‘victim-books’ and to praise and glorify their so-called ‘martyrs’. But to God only the cause and not the punishment makes the true martyr, and those who die for heretical opinions, are miserable twice.  

Ampzing is aware that any information he gives could be used to remind the Mennonites of their own past and provide them with a further account about their own heroes as had been the case with the Reformed sources in the Haarlem martyrrology. On the other hand, Ampzing’s opponents during the struggle between Calvinists and Remonstrants are mentioned with great diligence. Burgomaster Gerrit van der Laen, who helped to defend Haarlem during the siege as a young man, is mentioned only euphemistically and sometimes even obliquely as ‘the son of Klaes Verlaen’.  

Ampzing barely mentions him, only noting that he fled from a strategic place that he and his company had to defend while those who stayed and fought against the besiegers perished. The past had to remain under control since everything could be used in ways other than those originally intended by the author who delivered the historical account. In their efforts to keep control of collective memory the Reformed developed the most elaborate and deliberate strategies. Although counter-voices could not always be silenced – in their position as the public church, they were able to shape a coherent idea of the past that could successfully be defended against critics and dissidents.

Disseminating inclusive exile identities

While confessional identities were stabilized and fed by memories of persecution and refuge, there was another form of identity formation among Haarlem exiles that

---
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did not emerge outside and separate from confessional circles but was shaped rather in a non-confessional pattern. Most notably, those exiles who belonged to non-public but tolerated confessional groups began to shape their own identity in a way that did not accentuate any specific confession. This pattern of identification emerged in particular among the groups of Mennonite linen weavers and yarn bleachers from West Flanders who had fled to Haarlem.

The numerous sources addressing the past in West Flanders and the flight to Haarlem of the Mennonite linen workers suggest that a living memory culture persisted until the first half of the seventeenth century. As late as 1646 yarn bleacher Pieter van Hulle was able to give a vivid account of the flight of his ancestors in 1578. Apparently the knowledge of the circumstances in Flanders was passed down to succeeding generations in such detail that Van Hulle could not only provide an account of the past in the South but also give the names (even nicknames) and birth places of no fewer than forty bleachers who had left the region around Menen with their wives and children. In Haarlem, which ‘by God’s grace and the wise government’ had become ‘one of the most powerful cities in Holland’, they were ‘welcomed in a friendly manner and treated like indigenous citizens’.

The anonymous preface of the *Schilderboek* by the famous painter and author Karel van Mander from Meulebeke in Flanders who had migrated to Haarlem offers a similar account. The anonymous author presents Van Mander’s life including a great number of intimate details about the youth and early travels of the artist. Apparently, the memory of the Flemish past was preserved in stories and amusing anecdotes in the circles of Van Mander’s family and friends. Long passages of the text depict the innocent tomfooleries of the young painter: Karel, who is smarter and wittier than his contemporaries, likes to play all kinds of tricks on them.

---

305 This does, of course, not imply that they did not conform themselves to a clearly defined religious confession. As Piet Visser has shown, not only the rather liberal Mennonites but also the strictest ‘Old Flemings’, who advocated a severe version of church discipline, seem to have been culturally active in Haarlem’s literary and artistic circles. (Piet Visser, ‘Doopsgezinde rederijkersactiviteiten in de eerste helft van de zeventiende eeuw in Hoorn, De Rijp en Rotterdam’, in: *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen* 16 [1990], p. 38). One of them was Karel van Mander, who seems to have developed ‘from a spiritual libertine into an ultra-orthodox Old Fleming’. (Hessel Miedema, *Een schilderij van Karel van Mander de Oude*, in: *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen* 16 [1990], p. 118.)


On an extremely cold day he talks one of his father’s servants into licking an iron water pump. The servant, as expected, remains stuck on the cold pump and can free himself only at the cost of a piece of his tongue skin. Altogether, the artist’s youth in Flanders is presented in the form of a rural idyll and told as a sequence of comical and picaresque anecdotes. Suddenly the mood darkens and the idyllic countryside of West Flanders turns into a battle zone when marauding Walloon malcontents pillage the area around Kortrijk, plunder the houses and molest women and young girls. Van Mander’s family is harassed and robbed, and they have to leave Meulebeke: ‘Since then the whole landscape has turned into a scene of ruin and destruction’. After having fled to Bruges, they decide to settle in ‘the old and famous town of Haarlem’.  

A similar narrative of the same events can be found in the songbook *Haerlem Soetendal* (‘Haarlem, sweet valley’) probably written in 1614. The events are told in almost the same pattern: the inhabitants of the beautiful town of Kortrijk are joyously celebrating the feast of Corpus Christi when suddenly the Walloon malcontents invade the town, molesting and killing the unfortunate citizens.  

Although Van Hulle, Van Mander and the author of *Haerlem Soetendal*, a rhetorician operating under the pen name Botten Bloeyen hooghe (‘Dog roses in bloom’) were all Mennonites, none of the texts mention any religious issues. The events in Flanders are presented as a human catastrophe, not as the suffering of the elect few, persevering through hardship. Behind the narrative of these authors lies a new idea of what it means to be a Haarlemmer: They do not belong to the city by descent, nor are they predestined to inherit the land by belonging to the ‘true Religion’. Their bond with Haarlem is one of choice and commitment: they were welcomed as refugees like ‘children into their mother’s bosom’ and helped to make the town flourish after the siege. As Pieter van Hulle made clear, the contribution of the Southerners to the economic success of the town was immense, and the new technologies brought by the refugees made it ‘famous in the whole world, so that all foreign merchants are eager to buy Haarlem products.’

---

309 *Liedekens ende Refereynen, gheneckt by Haerlem Soetendal, van zijen Avonturen ofte wedervarenthyt, sitz zijn vertrek ynt Haerlem, in ’t Jaer ons Heeren 1599, Haarlem 16XX, fol. D3r.  
310 *Der Wit-Angieren Eeren-Krans, gesproten uyt de Vlaem. Natie*, Haarlem 1630, Voorrede, fol. 2r.  
311 *Memoriael van de overkomste der Vlaemingen*, p. 483.
Poet and painter Van Mander, the most prolific cultural role model of Haarlem’s Flemish community, employed a remarkable strategy to disseminate the new identity of the ‘Haarlemmers by choice’. Around 1600 he composed two anthems on his new home town. In one of the songs, he clearly referred to a fifteenth-century song by Dirc Mathijszen, also a ‘New Haarlemmer’, born in South Holland or Flanders. Like Van Mander, Mathijszen emphasizes his love for Haarlem, which he finds more beautiful and pleasant than all other cities he has ever visited.  

Van Mander rewrites Mathijszen’s song and thereby tries to point to a tradition, in which Haarlem local identity is defined not by birth but by commitment to the new home:

I have travelled, wandered, sailed,
In my young years, in many directions,
in countries and empires with beautiful towns,
of which I will not mention all the names,
for the sake of time –
But I did not find a town so pleasant and fairly situated
as Haarlem in Holland.
It might be that this fondness lies in my nature,
since affection can also cause a lack of judgment.

Here Van Mander presents himself in the direct tradition of Mathijszen:

In the years of my youth
I have travelled and sailed many miles.
From here to there,
From East to West and South to North:
That’s how I know a lot of towns,
but I never came to one, in which I found more joy
(as many will know)
than Haarlem in Holland.

---

313 Ibid., p. 19: ‘Ick hebbe gereijst, gelooopen, gevaren,
Mijn jonge jaren, meest alder wegen
In landen in rijcken, daer schoon steden waren,
Die ick haer namen hier te verklaren,
Om tijt te sparen, late verswegen –
Maer soo lustighen stadt, noch soo wel gelegen
En vant ick als Haerlem in Hollant fijn,
Of naturere en drijft mijn sinnelijck geneegen:
Want door affectie kan wel onverstant sijn.’
314 Ibid., p. 13: ‘Ic heb in minen jonghen jaren
Throughout the song, and often literally, Van Mander follows his late-medieval predecessor in praising the beautiful and fertile farmlands and fishing grounds around his new home town. He once more repeats the commonplace of ‘mother’ Haarlem, ‘who sweetly welcomes the stranger like her own child in her bosom’.\(^{315}\)

His literary construction of a Haarlem identity, based not on birth but on choice, implies the existence of a long tradition, in which the poet inscribes himself.

Attempts to reconcile the various groups after the religious troubles of the Twelve Years’ Truce and to create a common Haarlem identity could tie in with the literary constructions of artists like Van Mander. Obviously Haarlem as one of the greatest and most important cities of the Northern Netherlands with immigrants accounting for about half its population could not afford to be divided into fervently antagonistic confessional and ethnic camps. The notion of a new Haarlem identity based on loyalty to the city without regards to confession offered a solution. In a 1619 history play about the siege of Haarlem by schoolmaster Govert van der Eembd the ‘New Haarlemmers’ have a historical role in the city: when Haarlem is destroyed, they are designated to rebuild it and to bring it to new glory. The ‘happy end’ in de ‘Treur-bly-eynde-spel’ (‘Happy-ending tragedy’) is the coming of the Southerners, who are named in a prophecy after the siege:

A people comes moving from the South, though strange in tongue, and neighbors to the tongue-bent outlandish Walloon, they seek to escape the hatred against God’s own chosen saints, and amongst you they desire to find a steady home to stay. More than a hundred arrive each day and live at your homes. The freedom of religion leads to the glory of God. The widely-famed Walloon, the Fleming and Brabander enter the ports in droves, one after the other. Like the busy bee, that’s driven out of its home,

\[
\text{Menich mijl ghelopen ende ghevaren} \\
\text{Vast wech, weder ende voert,} \\
\text{Oest west, zuden ende noert:} \\
\text{Soe dat mij menich stede is becant,} \\
\text{Mer ic en quam nie daer ic meer genuechten vant} \\
\text{(Als menich mensche is becant)} \\
\text{Dan te Haerlem in Hollant.‘}
\]

\(^{315}\) Ibid., p. 28.
Doesn’t rest until it finds a place to stay
and where everywhere can freely trade and live
without danger and fear for his life.
And those who found such a place bring tidings
to the wandering and exiled flock,
which then enters the ports with noise
and on the threshold they sing their native song.
Such is the doing of these folks: while still at the port,
their song to praise the Promised Land is heard. 316

Memory is focused here on the siege by the Spaniards – remembering the old enmity
is a duty for both old and new Haarlemmers. Both have suffered under the common
enemy and have to educate their children in the knowledge of the past: the
Haarlemmers have to make their children ‘read and re-read and tell and
commemorate’. The youth has to ‘imbibe from their infancy an avenging hatred for
their hereditary enemy and (…) a willingness to defend their precious freedom’. 317
The common cause of rebuilding the city after the destruction by the Spaniards
unites the newcomers with the natives – by committing themselves to their new
home, they are no longer strangers.

316 Govert van der Eembd, Haerlemse Belegeringhs Treur-blyeynde-spel, Haarlem 1619, fol. 2rf:
‘Uyt Zuyden komt een volck, hoewel vreemt van tael,
En na-geheuyrt met den krom-tongh-uyt-heemsen Wael,
Nochtans, uyt hatingh tot Gods af-ghestelde Santen,
Begheeren sy by u haer woon-plaets vast te planter.
s’Daeghs meer dan honderd komt; bewoont u huys en Hoff,
De vryheyd des gheloofs lijd al tot Godes loff,
De Wijd-beruchte Wael, den Vlamingh en Brabander
Ter Poorten indringt, ja met troppen d’een na d’ander.
Ghelijck de gaeuwe Bye, uyt woon-plaets gantsch verjaeght
Niet rust voor hy en heb een plaets die hem behaeght
Dat’s daer elck vry en vrancx onschreinnigh voor hun lyf
Sijn handel uytlerlijck mach openbaerlijck drijven:
De welck’hy hebbende ghevonden draeght de maer
Aen d’and’re doolende en uytghedreven Schaeer;
Die dan met een ghedruys ter poorten heen in-drinhen,
En op ’s poorts dorpel flucks tot loff hans huys-wards singhen
Soo gaet het met dit volck; noch zijnde voor de Poort,
Een Lied tot lof des Lands van Beloften wierd ghehoort.’

317 Ibid., Voorrede, fol. *3v.
Gable stone on the Beestenmarkt in Leiden (early seventeenth century): ‘In’t lant van belooften. In de nieuwe stad’ (In the Promised Land. In the new town’). The relief refers to the biblical story of the twelve spies who bring giant grapes from Canaan to convince the Israelites to invade the country (Numbers 13: 1-14).

Inscribing migrant memories into the local memory canon

The migrant authors who were active in the Flemish and Brabantine chambers of rhetoric disseminated new civic identities that inscribed the past of the exiles into the historical narrative of their host societies. While the chambers were explicitly identified as Southern institutions, they also fashioned pronounced civic identities and acted as representatives of their respective home towns at literary festivities in other cities. As immigrant institutions they had only individuals with a migrant background as their members but had contacts with native rhetorician societies and organized festivities and took part in competitions together with the other Holland chambers.

Not only in Haarlem but also in Leiden and Amsterdam, migrant rhetoricians incorporated their exile memories into the memory canon of their home

towns. In particular, the annual commemorations of the Leiden siege that ended with a triumphant victory over the Habsburg troops became occasions to inscribe migrant identity into local memories and identities. For these commemoration festivities the Leiden Flemish chamber annually contributed poems and songs about Leiden’s relief. As already mentioned, Jacob Duym had included his play on Leiden in his collection of plays about the Dutch Revolt and reserved a crucial role for the Flemish refugees who appeared in it. Like Duym, Amsterdam rhetorician Jan Siewertsz. Kolm, born to Southern refugee parents, included memories of flight and persecution in his historical play about the Revolt in the Northern Provinces. In his Nederlands treurspel (1616) he proclaimed that all Netherlanders - Southern refugees as well as local Hollanders - shared a common past.

In his play about the siege of Leiden Jacob van Zevecote expressed the gratitude of the refugees to their new home towns, to which they felt strong commitment and loyalty. Nostalgia for Flanders is combined with praise of Holland, which now became the true home of the refugees. Abraham de Koning of the Brabant rhetorician chamber of Amsterdam employed the same motif. After recalling the traumatic events many migrants had experienced he depicts their miserable state after arrival in the Holland safe havens. Only through the intervention of the Amsterdam magistrates had they been able to survive and build a future. One of the exiled characters from the Flemish town of Belle in De Koning’s play Tspel van Sinne (‘Allegoric morality play’) laments his fate and at the same time praises Amsterdam as follows:

My father (the good man), who refused to honor a stone statue of St Mary, which stood in front of our door. Therefore he was, alas, alas, imprisoned by that dog, whose blood council cruelly ruled our sweet Flanders. My father died at the Steen and my mother escaped with us.

to wealthy Holland, where they first held us in contempt,
but the noble magistrate decided wisely,
that no strangers should be worried nor sigh in poverty.
Oh, when I think of that day, oh when I speak of it
(Blessed be Amsterdam, oh wealthy town)
My eyes become wet with warm tears,
that renew my longing for the ever so beautiful Belle.\textsuperscript{322}

By recounting the traumatic aspects of the past and the steadfastness of the
protagonist’s father who was executed for his beliefs, De Koning distinguishes the
Flemish exiles from other migrants. The account of his refusal to honor the statue of
St Mary is a direct reference to the Old Testament narrative of the exiled Israelites
who did not kneel before the idols of the Babylonians and were therefore thrown
into the fiery furnace (Daniel 3:12). In De Koning’s play the Flemish refugees are
given a special status. According to the play, many other poor migrants, particularly
Germans, did indeed come to Holland for purely economic reasons. The Southern
Netherlandish refugees, on the other hand, suffered a martyr-like fate and had to flee
because of their convictions. Their commitment to religion and the common political
cause of the Revolt made them rightful inhabitants of the Northern Provinces.

Later in the seventeenth century other Flemish authors went even further to
justify the refugees’ position in their new homes and linked Holland’s very wealth
directly to the hard-working and skilled newcomers from the Southern Netherlands.
In 1659, Pieter de la Court, a descendant of migrants from Ypres who had made a
fortune in the textile business, wrote a treatise on the welfare of Leiden in which he
gave an account of the town’s economic development from the year 1300
onwards.\textsuperscript{323} In De la Court’s historical account medieval Leiden was an insignificant

\textsuperscript{322} Abraham de Koning, \textit{‘Tspel van Sinne vertoont op de Tweede Lotery van d’Arme Oude Mannen ende Vrouwen Gast-Huys}, Amsterdam 1616, fol. B2r.-v:

\begin{quote}
‘Mijn Vader (goeden Man) om dat hy niet en eerde
Een steenen Marien-beeld/ tgeen voor ons deure stont:
Witt hy helqaes/ helqaes/ gevangen van dien Hont/
Wiens bloet raet (al te wreet) ‘tzoet Vlaanderen regeerde/
Mijn Vader stirf op Steen. Mijn Moeder met ons vluchte
Nae ‘tBolle-Hollant toe/ daer m’ons int eerst veracht/
Maer d’Edel Magistraet en wilden wijs bedacht
Geen Vreemders moeyelijck zijn/ noch doen in Armoe zuchten.
O als ick dien dagh gedenck/ of maer verteller
(Gezegent Amsterdam, O neeringh rijke Stadt/)
Maecck ick mijn Ooghen noch met warme Tranen nat/
Vernieuwende den lust van ‘toverschoone Belle.’
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{323} De la Court, \textit{Het Welwaren Van Leiden}. 127
town in which everyone who asked for it was granted citizenship. According to the treatise, it was the migration from Flanders that made Leiden the city it had become. Before the arrival of the Southerners the town did not have its big canals and occupied only a small spot that was now the city centre. Since the Middle Ages as Flemish migrants settled in Leiden the city benefited from their arrival. In De la Court’s historical account Leiden’s wealth was dependent on the economic freedom it offered outsiders who brought capital and expertise into the town. The town’s history is presented in a narrative that relies on the opposition between conservative native regents who try to uphold a system of nepotism and the real economic agents who fought for economic liberty and against traditional monopolies and guild-restrictions. In the conclusion of his argument De la Court sums up: ‘Therefore the fact remains that Leiden has never prospered without liberty, and that even in peace time it declined through restrictions[…]’.

De la Court’s history of Leiden’s success is in fact a history of migration. Countering the argument that the local guilds had always been the motor of the local economy, De la Court offered an alternative explanation of the town’s welfare. From the medieval immigration of Flemings to Holland to the exodus during the Dutch Revolt and the influx of refugees from war-torn Germany after 1618 and from France, Brabant and Flanders in the 1630s, Leiden owed its economic success to strangers who were excluded from the local guilds. In order to strengthen its own position the town should diminish the influence of these organizations and liberalize the trade and production of its local merchandise. Strangers and new citizens should also be granted the same rights and privileges as the natives and old, established families.

It is significant that De la Court belonged to a different political camp than most other Southern exiles, especially those earlier in the seventeenth century. While the opposition between local natives who wanted to protect their traditional guilds and trade regulations and migrants who built new industries had earlier led to an affiliation of Flemings and Brabanders with the House of Orange that was powerful

---

De la Court, *Het Welvaren Van Leiden*, p. 10: ‘Het is oversulcks ende blyft waargtig dat Leyden nooit is toegenomen dan in Vryheid, ende dat hetzelven door dwand ook afgenomen is in volle Vreede[…]’.
Ibid., p. 9.
enough to oppose local and provincial interests in favor of the Union, De la Court belonged to the anti-Orange States faction. By the middle of the seventeenth century the situation had changed. The opposition between local regents and newcomers who sought influence was no longer automatically correlated to the struggle between provincial politicians of the local regent class with often Remonstrant or Libertine sympathies and centralist Orangists with a preference for Calvinism. De la Court combined aspects of both camps: he fought against the privileges of local families and organizations but at the same was a fierce critic of the House of Orange and of strict Calvinism.\textsuperscript{328}

In order to harmonize his political message with the history of the refugees in Holland he had to rearrange some crucial and well-remembered episodes in the relations between natives and newcomers. In his treatise on Leiden he recalls the period of the Earl of Leicester as Governor General of the Netherlands and his Flemish sympathizers. While this episode had become iconic in the collective memory of the Republic and shaped the image of Southern migrants as people inclined to centralist politics and radical Calvinism, De la Court presents the situation from a different perspective:

It is nonetheless true that in the year 1587 some Flemings have very imprudently collaborated with the Earl of Leicester to reform the government and thereby given occasion for a schism that cannot even be resolved in prosperous times and from which the magistrates of this town have more to gain than to lose. For this schism has served the regents as a pretext to keep the privilege to participate in the magistrate’s affairs reserved to a few descendants of old patrician families. However, since this exclusion is only factual and arbitrary, but not grounded in any excluding law, it is in all regards more tolerable and less scandalous.\textsuperscript{329}

\textsuperscript{328} See e.g.: Pieter de la Court, ‘Voor-reden’ to Vigilis van Ayta, ‘Grondig berigt van ’t Nederlands oproer zo onder de hertogin van Parma, als den hertog van Alba. Beschreven in ’t François’, in: Pieter de la Court (ed.), \textit{Historie der gravelijke regering in Holland}, Amsterdam(?1662, p. 209.

\textsuperscript{329} ‘Het is nochtans waaragtig, dat eenige Vlamingen i n den jaare 1587 seer onvoorsigtlik met den Grave van Leycester aanspannende om de regeering te hervo rmen, occasie hebben gegeven tot een scheuring, die niet ligt staat geheeld te sullen werden in voo rspoedige tyden, ende soo lange als deestere stede diensten meer voor, als nadeels geven: Want hetselven de Regeerders een genoegsaam pretext heeft gestekt, om de voordeelen van de Regeeringe dependerende, aan weynige nakomelingen der oude Borgers vast te maken. Maar vermits die seclusie is reëlik, daadelik, arbitrair, ende niet door krags van eenige secludeende Wet; soo is deselven in alle manieren drageliker ende min aanstootelik.’ (De la Court, \textit{Het Welvaren Van Leiden}, p. 6.)
In this narrative, the Flemings were not the agents behind the Leicester Coup but had only been imprudent (‘onvoorsigtlik’) and only a few of them (‘eemige Vlamingen’) had been involved at all. While the involvement with Leicester had been a difficult episode in the collective memory of many migrants, De la Court gives it another meaning and function. The message of this narrative does not concern the dangers of Flemish radicalism but serves to warn about local nepotism that used the involvement of some misguided migrants as a pretext to exclude the strangers from public offices. However, the rift between strangers and locals is at the same time rhetorically closed: Since there exists no formal law that excluded Flemings and the exclusion was the work of only a few influential local families and not based on an officially sanctioned act, Leiden is excused of anti-migrant sentiments. In De la Court’s account the opposition between Holland natives and Flemish newcomers is exposed as an outdated ideological construction – in reality, Flemings had played only a minor role in the Leicester Coup, and the families who had exploited the image of the rebellious Flemings to exclude strangers had also been few. Strangers and newcomers as well as locals belonged to the city and its history. The real antagonism in Leiden’s society is not between migrants and non-migrants but between a small corrupt elite and the rest of the population.

This inclusion of Southern migrants into new constructions of civic identity was accompanied by new ways of thinking about citizenship and belonging to the local community. It is therefore not surprising that the first theoretical and political treatises that reflected on citizenship in the towns of the Dutch Republic were written by Flemish migrants. The first one, *Het burgherlick leven* (‘Civic life’) written in 1590 by Simon Stevin, a first-generation migrant from Bruges, tried to define and describe citizens or burgers, including the behavior expected of them and the duties they owed to their hometowns. Instead of grounding citizenship in local civic lineages Stevin defines it in terms of ‘deliberate participation in civic life’. True *burghers* are not those descended from local citizens but those who commit themselves to their hometowns and show their loyalty towards the local community.

331 Ibid., p. 20.
To Stevin citizenship is a matter of free choice: when he discusses the relationship between city magistrates and inhabitants, he calls the latter those who ‘who have chosen this place’ as their home.\(^{332}\) This view is characteristic for Stevin’s outlook as a migrant who could not legitimize his position in the new society by referring to his lineage.

Both Stevin and De la Court, who treated the subject in his Consideratien van Staat, Ofte Politike Weeg-schaal (‘Considerations on the state, or: Political balance’) seventy years after Stevin’s treatise, aimed at a formalization of the rules and regulations around citizenship. The rights and privileges of citizens of towns in the Dutch Republic varied from city to city and depended mostly on customary law and local traditions. Newcomers like De la Court criticized these practices as arbitrary and non-transparent. In fact, they stimulated nepotism and maintained the positions of powerful networks and families who were not chosen according to their qualities but their birth. Like Stevin, he called for transparent and thoroughly considered regulations that did not define citizenship by birth but by the willingness to commit oneself to one’s (chosen) hometown. In Leiden, where De la Court lived, migrants could buy citizen’s rights but had to wait for seven years before they received full citizenship and were admitted to public offices. De la Court argued that ‘one should grant all foreigners who want to come to live in the Cities as much freedom as the other old inhabitants’.\(^{333}\) For De la Court those who were willing to commit themselves to their new hometowns were citizens as much as those whose ancestors had been citizens, and therefore the Holland towns should be considered the very own \textit{patria} of the migrated Flemings.\(^{334}\) The concept of ‘citizenship by choice’ already present in the literary texts of Flemish authors like Karel van Mander and other rhetoricians earlier in the seventeenth century was now proclaimed in political and legal contexts.

\textit{Fragmentary discourses}

That the discourses that identified Southerners in Holland as radical Calvinists and loyal supporters of the House of Orange and Hollanders as lukewarm Protestants

\(^{332}\) Stevin, \textit{Het burgheerlick leven}, p. 27.
\(^{334}\) Ibid., p. 160.
with more love for liberty than for religion were by no means consistent is shown by
the many uses of this rhetoric. In 1663, in reaction to Pieter de La Court’s writings,
the eminent orthodox-Calvinist theologian Gisbert Voetius wrote a pamphlet that
identified his opponent not only as a latter-day Oldenbarnevelt but also used strong
anti-immigrant language, by calling De la Court a ‘stinking and rotten Walloon’.335
Among the followers of Voetius, who was one of the main protagonists of the Dutch
‘Further Reformation’, were many descendants of Southern Netherlandish migrants
for whom the history of persecution and exile was a substantial part of their
Protestant identity. Voetius’ slander against De la Court should not be interpreted as
an expression of deep-rooted prejudices against Southern migrants but rather as a
rhetorical figure that could be used for his argument in this specific instance:

[…] see there appear a degenerate, stinking and rotten Walloon (deviating
from the good maxims of the old and loyal Walloons who left their
fatherland and everything else and proved themselves as keen supporters of
the Reformed religion and the prince) and overthrow the foundation of the
provinces’ government with his writings and his corruptive ideas against
the Union and (which even more important) Reformed religion.
Furthermore he dares to assert against the known truth and the histories,
that Prince Willem, the Elder, and the other Lords of the House of Nassau
have done hardly anything for our freedom and religion […].336

The ‘stinking and rotten Walloon’ is contrasted with his ancestors who had left their
homes and everything they had for the sake of religion and had always been loyal to
the Prince of Orange. Calling someone a stranger could obviously be used as an ad
hominem argument without being an expression of a principled anti-immigrant
stance. Flemish Mennonites like Marijn De Brauwer, Holland regents with Flemish
friends and family members like Gerrit van der Laen and Cornelis Pietersz. Hooft or
orthodox-Calvinists like Voetius, who made use of such language, show that
discourses of exclusion were still alive until far into the seventeenth century but also
that they were highly permeable and fragmentary. Despite occasional deployments
of such discourses, the migrants and their descendants had become more and more
rooted in their new homes, and their past was incorporated into the local and

335 Gisbert Voetius, Den Ver-lesen Barneveld, betebbert met alle sijne Politycke Maximen, Zierikzece
1663, fol. B3.
336 Ibid.
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national memory canons. Having fled for their faith and having chosen the Northern towns as a new homestead to which they were willing to commit themselves as loyal citizens made the migrants part of the local communities.
Chapter 4 - The reinvention of family history

Family memories and the change of generations
When John La Motte died in London in 1655 he was widely known and celebrated as an exemplary Christian whose life bore such a powerful testimony to his piety and godliness that the Puritan author Samuel Clarke included La Motte’s biography in his work on ‘The lives of sundry eminent persons in this later age’. La Motte had served the city of London as an alderman and the local Dutch Reformed Stranger Church as an elder and deacon. In this function he had organized relief funds for persecuted Calvinists in Bohemia and Piedmont and made vigorous efforts on behalf of his afflicted coreligionists on the continent. A crucial element in the hagiographical accounts of his life was his own heritage of religious exile and persecution: La Motte had been born in Colchester to Flemish parents who had left their hometown of Ypres for England during the persecution under the Duke of Alba in the late 1560s. According to his biographers, it was due to his parents’ uncompromising allegiance to their Reformed faith that their son grew up as a devout and pious man who did not ignore the fate of his persecuted coreligionists abroad. In his funeral sermon, preached by Fulk Bellers, La Motte was compared to the patriarch Abraham who had left his homeland of Chaldea to seek the land God had promised him. But even during his lifetime La Motte seems to have compared himself with biblical exiled heroes such as Moses and Abraham: on occasions like the coronation day of Elizabeth I or his own birthday he used to invite friends to meet at his home and as

he would often say, he had desired their company, to eat bread with him before the Lord (as Jethro and Moses did) in remembrance of such and such signal Mercies and Deliverances, whereof his memory was a living Chronicle, especially those grand Deliverances, both before and since the Reformation, from under the great sufferings and bloody Persecutions in France, and the Low Countries, whereof he would often discourse in so punctuall and feeling a manner, as if he had been an eye-witness, yea a sharer in them, taking many arguments thence of encouraging both himself and others, to be still mindful of them in bonds and miseries, as being

---

themselves in the body; saying, why, their case might have been ours, or may be yet, who knows?\textsuperscript{338}

The remembrance of his forefathers who had left Flanders for England evidently played a central role at these commemorative meetings. Obviously, La Motte, though born in England and participating in the local politics of London as an alderman of the city, strongly identified with his parents’ exile. His sense of belonging to a diaspora of Reformed refugees all over Europe seems to have been a cornerstone of his religious identity and personal devotion.

According to Peter Ole Grell, people like La Motte belonged to the last generation of the international Calvinist diaspora. In the next generation, Grell argues, the bond with the exile heritage of their forefathers became diluted, and individuals began to conceive of themselves primarily as Dutch, German or English rather than as exiled strangers in a foreign land. Grell’s observation seems to be accurate in general: the children of La Motte and his contemporaries did indeed marry into English, German or Dutch families and became absorbed in the host societies of their parents.\textsuperscript{339} However, as I will show in this chapter, even among these later generations memories of exile continued to be preserved and transmitted not only in the various stranger churches but also, and perhaps more prominently, in family circles. Intermarrying with locals and participating in the social and political life of their new host societies did not prevent migrants and their descendants from continuing to appropriate and refashion the diasporic identities of their forefathers. However, the exile memories of subsequent generations of migrants were, of course, not the same as those of their forebears and had to be translated into the specific context of each new generation and its living conditions in a changing society. In genealogical accounts, letters and other sources the children and grandchildren had to reinvent and reinterpret the past of their ancestors on their own terms. As I will demonstrate on the basis of a selection of family histories of migrant families from the Southern Netherlands, the same accounts were often rewritten generation after generation. By comparing the various hands and examining crossed-out passages in
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the text I was able to attribute the various changes to specific family members from later generations. As these additions and modifications of the chronicles show, the exile narrative was often blended with discourses and historical references that were shared with the native societies in which the migrants lived.

The topic of generational identities and memories was first addressed and studied in early twentieth-century German sociology. As Karl Mannheim postulated in 1928 in his influential *The Problem of Generations*, every generation understands itself in terms of shared experiences and a characteristic attitude towards past and present.\(^{340}\) Mannheim did not conceive of generations as unquestionable biological entities but rather as social constructions that were projected on cohorts of contemporaries by themselves or members of other generations. According to Mannheim, the formative experiences that shape the political and social consciousness of members of a distinct generation occur in late adolescence and early adulthood or between the ages of seventeen and twenty-five.\(^{341}\) While only knowledge acquired from personal first-hand experiences constitutes a genuine generational consciousness, he stated, events preceding the life of a generation are perceived and interpreted according to these formative experiences. An impressive empirical study from the late 1980s by Howard Schuman and Jacqueline Scott, through a survey of more than a thousand US-Americans about important events in their lives, confirmed Mannheim’s age categories. As Schuman and Scott were able to show, the consciousness of historical events as well as the meanings attached to them differed considerably between various generations.\(^{342}\) While for example individuals between the ages of thirty and thirty-nine associated World War II primarily with the triumph of liberty and justice against barbarism, which evoked patriotic feelings in them, older persons, who could recall the 1940s, remembered the war primarily in terms of the tragedy of the victims and fallen soldiers.\(^{343}\)

Considering these modern observations, we should be aware of the specific role of any new generation that reproduced and inscribed itself into its family

---


\(^{343}\) Ibid., p. 372.
histories and the memories that were handed over to them not only by their direct ancestors but also by the wider medial surroundings that merged various generational experiences. As the source material shows, memories of the family past became invested not only with new and different meanings by later generations, but sometimes they were also intentionally manipulated, especially when claims about someone’s family history could impact his social status and position. The life of one’s ancestors was, of course, much more important in early modern societies than it is today, and the need to present one’s ancestry in brighter terms was often strong. Because descending from a family identified as treacherous or poor could seriously affect one’s social status and, in the case of the elite, one’s political career, the past often needed to be handled with care. At the same time, not all change in perspective regarding the family past was the result of deliberate manipulation; much of it resulted from organic changes in collective memories and the impact of new experiences of specific generations. Even in cases where family memories meticulously tried to preserve the past ‘as it was’, for example by the material evidence of original historical documents, the sources were put into new contexts and charged with new meanings and reinterpreted in the light of contemporary experiences.

_Family memories between the diaspora and the host societies_

While studies on early modern refugees from the Netherlands have sought to determine at what point individuals ceased to identify themselves with their exile past and started to see themselves as German, English or Dutch, I suggest a change of focus. Instead of posing the question of when the identification with the diaspora ended, I want to ask how diasporic identities and memories of flight and persecution were translated into German, Dutch and English contexts. As the following cases show, neither political participation in the new society nor intermarrying with locals put an end to the memory cultures of the migrants. Migration sociologists such as Mary C. Waters and Herbert J. Gans have stressed the agency of the descendants of migrants regarding their ‘ethnic options’. As Waters shows, descent is not a self-

explanatory quality but needs to be appropriated by following generations who often reinvent their heritage. Such reinventions always add different meanings and functions to the identification with the migrant past. According to Gans, migrant identity in later generations often becomes manifest as ‘symbolic ethnicity and religiosity’. Belonging to a certain group does affect the lives of individuals in less immediate forms and, often, at lower costs. A problem of the application of this concept in an early modern context is that is almost impossible to define where ‘actual’ ethnicity ends ‘symbolic ethnicity’ begins. However, it allows us to think of migrants and their descendants as citizens of their new society and at the same time belonging to different imagined groups. While being fully ‘assimilated’, the descendants of Flemish refugees continued to refer to their forefathers’ past until the eighteenth century or even later. The preservation of the ancestors’ past did not necessarily produce isolated communities with memory cultures that were totally separated from the historical narratives of the host societies. Paradoxically, in many cases it was the very exile-narrative itself that allowed for participation and integration in local social systems and networks. When migrants were successful in claiming to have suffered much for the ‘true faith’, they could use such claims to gain a higher social status among their coreligionists in their new hometowns.

Virtually all the families studied in this chapter belonged to the higher social strata and some even to the economic and, finally, political elite of their host societies. As has been argued by scholars on early modern migration in the Netherlands, the social integration of Southern Netherlandish migrants in the Dutch Republic started in the lower social strata while migrants from the elite stayed relatively long within their own circles and intermarried with fellow Southerners. Niek Al and Clé Lesger have even postulated a process of ‘integration from below’.

Although there is much evidence that endogamy was practiced longer in the migrant elite circles than in the lower social strata, the rich and well-educated families were not less integrated because they often married within their own group for a longer period. In fact, the relationship between the practice of endogamy and

the preservation of the feeling of belonging to the diaspora is far from straightforward. As we will see, the practice of ex- or endogamy may actually not be a robust indicator of the degree of identification with the new host society or the lost homelands.  

**Reinventing family history**

In the first years after the migration from the Southern Netherlands few families recorded their past in written historical narratives. As the later writings of second- and third-generation migrants suggest, memories were handed down to them orally and often in fragmented and sometimes contradictory form. Such was the case in the family of playwright Joost van den Vondel. In the last years of his life he often talked to Remonstrant minister Geraardt Brandt, who would later, in 1682, three years after Vondel’s death, write the playwright’s biography. The account of his early life and the history of his persecuted parents from Antwerp were full of anecdotal details that suggest how the story was told within the family. According to Brandt, Peter Craanen, Vondel’s maternal grandfather, tried to flee Antwerp as a Mennonite but was betrayed and had to escape his persecutors in haste. His pregnant wife Clementia, however, did not manage to escape and was sentenced to death. In order to prevent her execution her cousin inquired ‘if she could not be saved by having one of her children baptized as a Catholic by a priest’. Brandt tells that Vondel’s mother, who was already living with Peter Craanen in Cologne, was sent back to Antwerp to receive Catholic baptism in 1571. Clementia was indeed pardoned on her word that she would live as a Catholic in Antwerp. Once free, she fled to her husband and children in Cologne. As J. de Valk showed, this story was generally accurate; however, it was not Vondel’s mother Sara who was brought to Antwerp to be baptized but his aunt Anna.

348 As Herbert J. Gans has remarked on sociological studies on religious acculturation of Jews in the United States: ‘Intermarriage, religious as well as ethnic, has generally been treated as an index of ethnic acculturation, in part because so little is yet known about what goes on in these marriages.’ (Gans, ‘Symbolic Ethnicity and Symbolic Religiosity’, p. 583.

349 Maar sedert uit den Markgrave verstaande, dat ze ten vuur was verwezen, en met zekeren Leerbaar zou sterven, vondt hy zich in d’uiterste verlegenheit, badt om uitstel, en vraagde “Of men, een haair kinderen van een’ Priester Katholykelyk laatende do open, haar niet zou konnen redden?” (Geraardt Brandt, Het leven van Joost van den Vondel, ed. by Marieke M. van Oostrom and Riet Schenkeveld van der Dussen, Amsterdam 1986, p. 8).

In the family history of the Vondels orally handed down to Geraardt Brandt Vondel’s father too was a refugee who had fled Antwerp to escape from his Catholic persecutors. In fact, Joost van den Vondel the Elder had left his hometown as late as 1582 at a time when the city was firmly in the hands of Calvinist rebels and Mennonites were no longer violently persecuted. In family memories like those of the Vondel family the history of the ancestors was preserved in the biblical imagery of flight and persecution and told in an anecdotal way. In Brandt’s account the young parents of Vondel left Cologne when Joost the Elder learned that Mennonites in Holland enjoyed a greater measure of toleration:

Following this advice, he, his wife and their children first went to Frankfurt and took a coach to Bremen, from where they went to Holland. They travelled in straightened circumstances, built a cradle between a few sticks and dried the diapers on the coach. Doing so, they displayed such modesty and demureness that their coachman, who carried this unassuming couple, said to someone: ‘It is as if I travel with Joseph and Mary’.

Obviously, many facts about the peregrinations of the family were changed in the course of time. Not only did the details of their flight from Antwerp shift over time but the route from Cologne to Holland sounds rather implausible. According to Brandt, Joost van den Vondel the Elder wanted to move to the Dutch Republic because of the tolerance for his religious confession. However, the route to Holland via Frankfurt and Bremen suggests that these places were either added to present the travel as a longer and more troublesome peregrination or the family travelled first southeast and then northwards for other reasons, most probably to look for work. While the facts about the migration of the Vondel family remain dubious, crucial interpretative details were preserved and retold, such as the story of the coachman who compared the young family to Mary and Joseph. The family history was not

---

352 ‘Dien raadt volgende toogh hy met zyn vrouwe en kinderen eerst naar Frankfoort, van daar met de waagen op Breemen en voorts op Hollandt, zich onderweegen armeelyk behelpende, maakende een wiegh tusschen eenige stokken, de luyeren droogende op den waaghen, met tekenen van zoodanige ingetoogenheit en zeeldigheit, dat de Voerman, dit eenvoudigh paar voerende, tegens iemand zeide; ’t is eveneens als of ik met Joseph en Maria over wegh reize.’ (Brandt, Het leven van Joost van den Vondel, p. 11.)
recorded in written form until the late seventeenth century and had become subject to reinterpretations and changes during its oral transmission.

Very few migrant families from the Southern Netherlands recorded their history in the first generation. Members of generations who had migrated themselves or with their parents sometimes produced autobiographical texts in which they occasionally included passages about their parents and other ancestors, such as for example in the autobiographies of the scholar Caspar Barlaeus or the ministers Willem Baudartius and Jan de Wallois, but they rarely made any mention of their migration or their lives in their former homes. Most of the written records and narratives of the past of the migrated families were produced by second and third generation migrants, often not until the mid-seventeenth century. As the cases of the Thijs and De Bacher families in chapter 2 of this book show, remembering was often a painful process once a return to the lost homeland became impossible. While memories of the past in Flanders and Brabant had originally served to fuel the hope for an early return, the failure of the military campaign to ‘liberate’ the Habsburg territories silenced their articulation. In many cases the next generations thus had to reconstruct a forgotten and fragmented family history and attempted to preserve what they could of the exile past of their forefathers. We can, for example, observe this phenomenon in the case of the Van der Muelen family. In the late seventeenth century, Willem van der Muelen, great-grandson of former Antwerp alderman Andries van der Meulen, who had left his hometown for Holland, recorded what he could remember of family stories. He also eagerly collected material evidence of his ancestor’s refugee past, such as a letter of recommendation by the rebel government of Antwerp, to which he added that his great-grandfather had always behaved as a good official and remained loyal to the rebel cause, which forced him to leave his hometown:

Certification by the magistrate of Antwerp that my great-grandfather Andries van der Meulen, Lord of Ranst and Millegem and member of the Council of Brabant, has been an alderman in this town and has always behaved as a good regent. He has requested this declaration when he left

---

Antwerp after the town had surrendered to the Duke of Parma. Date: August 13, 1585.\textsuperscript{354}

The Van der Muelen family also preserved a silver tazza that had been given to Andries van der Meulen in 1582 with an inscription in which his loyalty to the town and to the Reformed religion was praised.\textsuperscript{355} The family members’ engagement with their ancestors’ past had first become manifest in the second generation after the migration to the Dutch Republic: Andries van der Muelen the Younger, Willem’s grandfather, was deeply concerned with proving that the Van der Meulens were descendants of a Southern Netherlandish nobleman who had served the King of France in the eleventh century. In the 1640s he corresponded frequently with his relatives, particularly with his cousin Daniel de Hochepied, to gather more information about the assumed noble descent of his family and even changed his name from Van der Meulen to van der Muelen when his genealogical studies seemed to suggest that this spelling was more correct.\textsuperscript{356} In addition to this assumed connection to a noble family it was the family’s fate of having fled the South for the sake of the Reformed faith that interested him. In 1650 he asked Nicolas de Malapert, a friend of his parents from their time in Antwerp, to sign an affidavit that his parents had left Antwerp in 1585, immediately after the siege of Parma although the city’s Protestant inhabitants had been granted a four-year grace period in which to settle their affairs before the mandatory obligation to convert to Catholicism came into force.\textsuperscript{357} By doing so, he could prove that they had been uncompromising Protestants, unwilling to live under the new Habsburg Catholic regime. He also wrote down the story of his uncle Jan van der Meulen who had lost his life defending his hometown during the ‘Spanish Fury’, a devastating mutiny of Habsburg soldiers in 1576.\textsuperscript{358}

In the case the Martens family, also from Antwerp, the same pattern is recognizable. Within the circle of this family a wide range of sources was

\textsuperscript{354} ‘Certificatie van de Magistraet te Antwerpen dat mijn overgrootvader Andries van der Muelen Heere van Ranst en Millegem, Raet van Staete van Brabant is geweest schepen in derselver stadt, en zich altijd als een goet regent gedragen heeft, welke certificatie sijn Ed. versocht heeft toen sijn Ed. van Antwerpen is gaen woonen nadat die Stadt aen den Hertogh van Parma was overgegaen, van dato 13 Aug. 1585.’ (Het Utrechts Archief, 57, inv.nr. 27).

\textsuperscript{355} Het Utrechts Archief, 57, inv.nr. 58.

\textsuperscript{356} Het Utrechts Archief, 57, inv.nr. 59.

\textsuperscript{357} Ibid., 57, inv.nr. 58.

\textsuperscript{358} Ibid., 57, inv.nr. 3.
transmitted to future generations in which the family history was not only preserved but also frequently rewritten. The narrative of the family’s past was transmitted in various manuscripts and fragments that all heavily borrow from each other, and through a comparison of handwritings and textual structures it is possible to reconstruct how the family memories in the Martens family evolved over time and how the history of the family was rewritten by succeeding generations.  

Very much like Andries van der Meulen the Elder and Johan Thijs, Hans Martens did not leave much information about his flight from the South although later sources suggest that he sometimes talked to his children about their family’s past. The only notes he left were in tabular form and concerned his parents, the births of his children, as well as some notes on his marriage and business. Hans’s son Carel was an ambitious youth, who was so eager to enter the elite networks of Holland and Utrecht that he went to the Synod of Holland as a seventeen-year-old and asked everyone he thought important enough to write in his *album amicorum*. We can find Francis Gomarus, Gisbert Voetius and other famous Counter-Remonstrant theologians in the book but also various members of the Nassau family and poets and scholars like Daniel Heinsius. Carel Martens not only copied his father’s autobiographical notes but added a more detailed biographical description and tried to find out as much as he could about his family’s past. In 1633, he invited his uncle Jacques Martens to Utrecht to confer with his half-brother Hans and to write down everything they recalled about their ancestors. When Carel’s son Jacob married Aletta Pater, a girl from an influential Utrecht patrician family, Carel and his wife Jacoba Lampszins, also from a rich Southern family, commissioned four paintings by Ferdinand Bol, which, as art historian Margriet van Eikema-Hommes has argued persuasively, symbolically represented the entrance of an exiled family into the established elite of Utrecht. All four paintings show well-known biblical and classical foreigners and exiles, such as Aeneas, Moses, Abraham and the people.

\[359\] Het Utrechts Archief, 1002, inv. aars. 2; 3; 4; 99. The inventory numbers 2 and 4 contain various manuscripts and fragments, sometimes bound together. The inventory number 3 and 99 contain two final synoptic versions that are based on the earlier manuscripts. Numbers 4 and 99 are written by Jacob Martens while number 3 was probably written after his death.

\[360\] Ibid., 1002, inv. nr. 1.

\[361\] Ibid., 1002, inv. nr. 40.

\[362\] Ibid., 1002, inv. nr. 60.

of Israel in Babylonian captivity. In the paintings the depicted exiles are presented as victors, who despite the hardships of exile had been successful in creating a new genealogy. Like Aeneas, the Martens and Lampsins families had founded a New Troy, and like Abraham and Moses they were bound for the ‘promised land’ and fathered a new generation of godly people. Just as with the La Mottes in England, the dissemination of the exile narrative could improve their status in the elite circles of Reformed orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{364}

Ferdinand Bol, \textit{Aeneas ontvangt een nieuwe wapenuitrusting uit handen van Venus in de werkplaats van Vulcanus}, Rijksmuseum Amsterdam

Jacob, Hans Martens’ grandson, put his family’s history into a more structured narrative form and wrote it down in a ‘memorie boeck’ of which there are

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{364} Ibid., p. 165.}
still various copies and fragments extant. Starting in 1663, Jacob took the notes of his father and grandfather and complemented them with things he knew from family stories, such as the exact places in Antwerp where his great-grandparents were buried. The actual narrative ‘plot’ begins with the migration of Hans and his siblings in the period of the very early Revolt:

The children of Francoys Martens fled to Amsterdam for religion’s sake under the Spanish persecution and were separated from each other during the reign of the Princess of Parma as well as the persecution of the Duke of Alba.

Even though Hans Martens’ considerably older brothers were already young adults in the days of Margaret of Parma, Hans himself was born in 1555 and only twelve years old when Margaret resigned and was replaced by the Duke of Alba. His notes show that Jacob was in doubt about the date when his grandfather had left Antwerp:

Hans Martens fled Antwerp for religion’s sake during the troubles under the Duke of Alba in the year … (lacuna in all existing manuscripts) and left for Amsterdam with some of his brothers and sisters, where he settled down in silence as a merchant. Through the persecutions he had become a devout and godly man, who did not care about the grandeur of the world and because he wanted to avoid recognition, he refused to use his family’s coat of arms.

The lacuna in the text about the year of Hans Martens’ flight from Antwerp can be found in all existing copies of the manuscript. Obviously, the period of Alba and Margaret of Parma had left such a deep impression on the collective memory of the Dutch Republic that in the oral tradition the historical events of the 1560s and the

365 Het Utrechts Archief, 1002, inv.nrs. 2; 3; 4; 99. Inv.nr. 2 contains the original manuscripts of Carel Martens, which were written after his meeting with his uncle Jacques who provided him with information on the family’s past.

366 Het Utrechts Archief, 1002, inv.nr. 2: ‘De kindere n van Francoys Martens sijn onder vervolginge der Spaenjaerden om de religie, soo onder de princesse van Parma, als de vervolginge van Duc ’d Alva van den anderen gheraeckt.’

367 Ibid., inv.nr. 2: ‘Hans Martens is uijt Antwerpen om de religie ende troubele tijden van Duc ’d Alva in den jaer … naer Amsterdam gevlucht, met eenigen van sijn Broeders ende susters, alwaer Hans Martens sich stillekens heeft nedergeset, ende de negotie bijder handt genomen, ende een devot ende godtsalig man door de vervolgingen met de grootseht der werelt niet behept, als mede omdat hij niet bekent soude worden heeft syn eigen wapen noijt willen voeren maer heeft de twee ossenhoofden met een schaepshooft op een vergult velt aengenomen welck wagpen naderhandt bij sijne desententen altijt is gevoert […].’
1580s became mixed up. It is, however, rather unlikely that the young teenager Hans had indeed left his hometown as early as the 1560s when his parents still lived in Antwerp. The first records of his existence in Amsterdam date from 1581, a time when Antwerp was still in rebel hands.

By the time of Jacob’s marriage the Martens family had already entered the Reformed elite of Utrecht, and the story of the grandfather who ‘did not care about the grandeur and the haughtiness of the world’ and had become a ‘devout and godly man’ in and through exile fitted well into the circles of orthodox-Reformed Utrecht in the era of Gisbert Voetius, the prominent theologian of the Dutch ‘Further Reformation’. Nevertheless this narrative also had a problematic aspect. The earliest versions of the manuscripts read:

But [Hans Martens] has always said to his children that he descended from the best and finest families of Antwerp, but that he had learned through the persecution to hold in disdain the grandeur of old families and to keep himself quiet and humble and therefore refused to use his coat of arms which could be found everywhere among his popish family in Antwerp.368

At the time when the story was written down the members of the Martens family were themselves acting like an ‘old family’ and had become conscious of their family and dynastic identity. And, of course, Jacob himself already recognized the inconsistency of this narrative. In later manuscripts he changed the text and crossed out all the passages about Hans’s contempt ‘for old and famous families’. The phrase ‘he had learned through the persecution to hold in disdain the grandeur of old families’ was from then on erased and replaced with: ‘[…] the persecutions taught him to forget his ancestry.’369 The final manuscript that makes use of the older versions took over this adjustment and added explicitly that Hans Martens had been persecuted ‘for religion’s sake’ and that his estrangement from his family in the South was due to their Catholicism.370

368 Ibid.: ‘[…] doch heeft [Hans Martens] aan zijne kinderen altijd geseyt dat hij vande grootste ende fraaistste geslachten van Antwerpen was, maar dat door de vervolginge geleert was de grootsheyt van geslachten te verachten ende zich nederich ende still te houden, als mede dat onder zijn paepse vrienden zijn rechte wapen, ende geslacht boom altijd te vinden was.’
369 Ibid., 1002, inv.nr. 4; 99.
370 Ibid., 1002, inv.nr. 3.
The geographical re-imagination of the family past

While families like the La Mottes in England and the Martens family in the Dutch Republic represented their past in terms of godliness and confessional steadfastness when entering Puritan and orthodox-Reformed networks, others deployed discourses of patriotism and national consciousness to establish their position in their host societies. Some families also replaced the discourse of religious exile with one of geographical belonging and Netherlandish patriotism which they hoped could help their integration into the regent networks of Holland and Utrecht. The members of the wealthy Van Panhuys family, whose forefathers had also fled Antwerp, not only invented a noble lineage for their forefathers but also strongly emphasized the notion of their common Netherlandish ancestry that united them with their neighbors. While most of their ancestors originally came from Limburg and the region around Trier and Liège, they had established themselves in the elite merchant circles of Antwerp during the sixteenth century. The cousins Servaes and Bartholomeus van Panhuys collected many documents about their family from the Southern Netherlands and argued that they were compatriots to the Hollanders and Utrechters rather than ‘foreigners’. Their insistence on the family’s Netherlandish origin was successful: by the 1640s the first family members had become regents in several Holland and Utrecht towns. Bartholomeus, for example, became the highest bailiff of Amersfoort, and Servaes was made pensionary of Schoonhoven. Servaes also became a member of the States of Holland and called himself ‘Lord of Schoonhoven’, even though this title did not have any clearly defined meaning.371

Servaes’ and Bartholomeus’ ambitions, however, were even greater, and they tried to gain acceptance as members of the Holland and Utrecht nobilities. When in 1642 Bartholomeus presented a number of documents by which he wanted to prove his noble ancestry, the Utrecht ridderschap declared that they believed his claims on nobility but could not accept him because recognition of nobility was a provincial issue and descent from Southern Netherlandish nobles did not count in

---

The two cousins did not give up their attempts and continued to try to be recognized as nobles. In their family chronicle they stretched the unity of all Netherlandish provinces and even extended the historical realm of the Low Countries by presenting not only its actual inhabitants but also Germans and Frenchmen from the border regions as descendants of the ancient Batavians. They introduced the history of their bloodline with a lengthy account about the ancient Germanic tribe that populated the Low Countries and that had been praised by Tacitus for their virtues and bravery. The Batavian past was a popular motif in the historical discourse in the seventeenth-century Low Countries though the actual geographical origin of the Batavians was disputed by the various provinces of the Northern Netherlands, which claimed to be descendants of this legendary tribe.

These disputes are not mentioned in the Van Panhuys chronicle, and a common Netherlandish origin is evoked: the ancient Low Countries are portrayed as stretching from the Meuse region to Northern France and even the French noble house of Capet is included in the list of old Netherlandish noble families. While the Batavian myth had often been used to prove provincial superiority, in the Panhuyses’ account it was deployed to serve the notion of a bond between all Netherlanders and to create a notion of unity. By appealing to the patriotic feelings of the inhabitants of the Dutch Republic, the Panhuys family tried to evoke a connection between themselves as migrants and the elites in their new hometowns in Holland and Utrecht. The same discourses were used in the petition letters, in which they claimed their Netherlandish noble ancestry. While the Holland and Utrecht knighthoods were rather unimpressed, the various new hometowns of the family members accepted the family’s claims and granted them the privileges of nobles. In 1643 the magistrate of The Hague declared:

Following earnest and patient requests, the following act is granted: The burgomaster of The Hague, who has been presented some documents which prove Lord Servaes van Panhuys is of noble descent from within the

---

373 Regionaal Archief Leiden, LB 6331, Cort verhael van het oue ende adelijck geslachte van Panhuijs, afkomstich uut den lande ende vorstendom van Limburg, 1270-1817, fol.5r.
Netherlandish provinces and therefore granted exemption from all civic taxes.\textsuperscript{374}

In 1660, the family was recognized as of noble origin in Amsterdam.\textsuperscript{375} In both towns, the decision to grant them the privilege of civic tax exemptions was based not merely on their claims of nobility but explicitly on their assumed descent from a Netherlandish noble family.

Even though these claims were sometimes disputed during the seventeenth century, the family was able to enter the elite circles of the Dutch Republic. For centuries, the emphasis on their Netherlandishness and their ‘natural’ bonds with their neighbors in the North remained a crucial element of the tale they told about their own history. When the family was at last officially admitted to the nobility in the new Kingdom of the Netherlands in the nineteenth century, the family chronicles were extended and the Panhuyses presented as an old and well-established Netherlandish family.\textsuperscript{376}

While the first generation of migrants of the Panhuys family fashioned themselves as religious exiles on a pilgrimage, such language was replaced with references to their Netherlandish ancestry in the writings of their descendants later in the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{377} Servaes Panhuys and his cousin Bartholomeus were particularly concerned with the family past and made and collected many drawings of houses, tombs, coats of arms and monuments of their forefathers. They were particularly proud of a memorial pillar that had been raised by Pieter Panhuys in 1566 in the Ardennes highlands close to Jalhay. In 1670, Servaes Panhuys asked some younger family members to travel to the Southern Netherlands and look for the pillar. After they found it they made some drawings and requested an affidavit by a Maastricht notary confirming that their description corresponded to the real pillar.\textsuperscript{378}

While they noted that the monument, which was later reconstructed and still exists

\textsuperscript{374} Nationaal Archief Den Haag, 1.10.64, inv.nr. 8: ‘Op ‚t versouck ende lang ernstich aenhouden is verleent de volgende acte: Burgemeester van ‚s Gravenhage verthoont sijnde eenighe bescheyden daer by haer ghebleecken dat Jr. Servaes van Panhuijs is van adelijcken extractie uytten Nederlantsche Provincie, Hebben sijne Edt. vergunt ende vergunnen hem mits dese vrydommen van alle des stadtsaccijsen [sic].’

\textsuperscript{375} \textit{Cort verhael van het out ende adelijck geslachte van Panhuijs}, fol. 18r-v, 24r-v.

\textsuperscript{376} Ibid., fol. 5r.

\textsuperscript{377} When Pieter Panhuys died in 1585 in Amsterdam, his friend Johan Radermacher wrote a poem for his tombstone that depicted him as a religious pilgrim (Bostoen e.a. [eds], \textit{Album Joannis Rotarii}, fol. 169r.).

\textsuperscript{378} Nationaal Archief Den Haag, 1.10.64, inv.nr. 10. Other drawings of the pillar and other family monuments can be found in: Ibid, 1.10.64, inv.nr. 15, 16, 54 and in the \textit{Cort verhael van het out ende adelijck geslachte van Panhuijs}, fol. 41v-44r.
today, had been destroyed in a storm, Servaes could now prove the accounts of his ancestors and their fame in the Southern Netherlands. On the drawing the Panhuyses showed to the Maastricht notary who signed the affidavit the inscription on the pillar’s foot was depicted correctly. However, on later drawings the family made and preserved, they changed an inconspicuous but important detail: while the actual inscription identified Pieter Panhuys as ‘natif de Limborch’, his descendants replaced this part with ‘Burgemr. d’ Envers’. Pieter Panhuys the Elder had been an alderman of Antwerp but never a burgomaster; however, for the status of his ambitious descendants it was clearly important to give him a higher rank.

The ‘Colonne Panhaus’ (Nationaal Archief Den Haag, 1.10.64, inv.nr. 8)
While such obvious forgeries were rather exceptional, many migrated patrician families made dubious claims about their ancestors. A pronounced interest in their families’ genealogy was quite common among later generations of Southern Netherlandish migrants who sought to define their position among the Holland and Utrecht elites. The Van Panhuyses were related to a number of other Southern families in the Dutch Republic who all were concerned with their genealogy, which they tried to trace back to assumed noble ancestors. These included the Godin, Malapert, De la Faille and Vivien families as well as the Van der Muelens, who were also related to the Della Failles. For families with great ambitions a migration past could in fact be very attractive since their claims to nobility could not easily be refuted. Dutchmen whose parents came from the region where they currently resided could never make such claims since their ancestry could quickly be examined. But for those who sought social advancement a migration background could be a great opportunity.

How important the good reputation of their parents and grandparents was to newcomers who wanted to participate in the local elite circles of the Dutch Republic is also illustrated by their attempts to legally protect the status of their ancestors. Presenting affidavits and personal testimonies about the life of their forefathers was not uncommon among the elite of second- and third-generation Southern Netherlandish migrants in the middle of the seventeenth century. Not only the Van Panhuys family but also the Van der Muelens and De la Courts requested and preserved affidavits that proved that their ancestors were of respectable lineage and had served the right political causes. The reputation of their parents and grandparents was not only a question of personal pride and honor but could also be regarded as an indication of one’s qualification for public office. When fervent anti-Orangist Pieter de la Court, who was born of Ypres parents, was attacked by anonymous sympathizers of the House of Orange, his parents as well as he became targets of slander and suspicion. In 1648, an anonymous Orangist pamphlet appeared that depicted his father, Pieter De la Court the Elder as a pimp:

---

380 See for the genealogical records of these families, see: Het Utrechts Archief, 204, inv.nrs. 318, 319, 320, 321, 322 (De Malapert); Ibid., 57, inv.nrs. 6, 7 (Della Faille); Ibid., 57, inv.nr. 3 (Van der Muelen); Nationaal Archief Den Haag, 1.10.64, inv.nr. 88 (Godin).

381 See for the affidavits of the Van der Muelen family, see: Het Utrechts Archief, 57, inv.nrs. 27 and 59. For the De La Court family, see: Noordam, ‘Leiden als ideale stad’, p. 22.
That filthy bastard has filled
his shabby purse with gold,
through lying, cheating
and skimping on every penny.
Hypocrisy and falsehood
have made that odd rogue rich.
His father was a pimp,
How come he’s so well-off?²

De la Court took this attack very seriously and felt that he had to respond. De la Court asked his son-in-law, who was a professor at Leiden University, to write a declaration in the name of four witnesses who testified that they had known De la Court’s father and that he had been a wealthy farmer in the Ypres region who was known for his honesty. In addition to his farm Pieter the Elder had also kept a hostel, but his son now had it recorded that it was frequented by respectable burghers and nobles from Brussels and Ypres. Being called a descendant of an innkeeper with a dubious reputation was an intolerable slight that needed to be fended off. De la Court felt that this slander could not just be ignored but had to be answered with an official affidavit. Even if the defamation of De la Court was anonymous, it was serious enough to demand the response of a legal statement and the declaration of four witnesses. The good reputation of the ancestors was of crucial importance, especially for newcomers who wanted to establish themselves in the ranks of the local elite.

Permeable memories
Like the Van Panhuyses and Van der Muelens, the Coymans family from Flanders was also eager to prove its respectable descent and enter the regent circles of Holland. In 1624, Maria Coymans married the Amsterdam regent Joan

²‘Die goore rot-sack heeft met gout
Zyn schurfde sack ghevult:
Door lieghen ende bedrieghen,
En knibbelen op een deuyt.
Door deuchdens schyn, en als vals te zyn
Wiert ryck, een vreemde guyt.
Want vader was een hoere-weert
Hoe komt nu rjck die quant?’
(Cited in: Noordam, ‘Leiden als ideale stad’, p. 22.)
From then on, marriages with the well-established Huydecoper family and other Amsterdam regent dynasties became common, and the family was able to secure its influence on local politics. By the end of the seventeenth century, the Coymans family was related not only to old Amsterdam regent families but also to other influential newcomers like the famous merchants De Geer and Trip, who descended from Liège and Zaltbommel. Like these families, they undertook genealogical research and traced back their ancestry to lower nobles from the Southern Netherlands. Despite their established position in the Amsterdam elite, the Coymans family never tried to hide its Southern origin. Rather, the family members loudly proclaimed their Flemish ancestry and until the eighteenth century continued a family chronicle which described how and why their ancestors had moved to Holland. Obviously, they no longer had to choose between belonging to either the Amsterdam establishment or the Southern newcomers. Both their Flemish and their Holland family histories were integrated and did not conflict with each other.

The cases of the family histories of the Martenses, Van der Muelens, Coymanses and many other Southern families in the Republic show how memories were preserved long after the time that their descendants had married into local families and had begun to participate in local politics and cultural life. While exile narratives had initially emphasized the migrants’ status as strangers who hoped for a return to their homeland, from the second generation onwards their character and function changed: instead of stressing the differences between strangers and locals, the memory of an exile past could help the children of the refugees to build ties with the networks of the local host societies. Stories of exile and suffering served as a narrative of origin that legitimized the status of the migrant families as *hombres novi*. The mists that had settled over some family origins before the time of migration could be seized upon to claim a higher social status: since the family was not known in the host society, stories about noble descent could hardly be disproved. At the same time the assertion that the ancestors had been so godly and pious that they had avoided any identification with their popish relatives and therefore denied
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383 Het Utrechts Archief, 67, inv.nr. 28. On later marriages with members of the Huydecoper family, see e.g.: Ibid., 67, inv.nr. 49.
384 Ibid., 67, inv.nr. 11.
385 Ibid., 67, inv.nr. 10.
their ancestry could be also be appealing to the religious elites of their new hometowns.

Instead of forming exclusive ‘memory ghettos’, these migrant families therefore developed memory cultures that did not separate them from the discourses and narratives of their host societies but in fact proved highly permeable. Migrant families easily combined their own exile narratives with the religious and political discourses of their host societies, such as the hospitality towards their ancestors under Queen Elizabeth and her restoration of Protestantism in England or the narrative of the struggle against the Spanish oppressors in the Dutch Republic. The imagined diaspora of the numerous refugee families from the Southern Netherlands should therefore not be understood as constituting a dividing line between locals and strangers. It was not despite, but rather because of, the commemoration of their immigrant background that these families were able to enter local networks and attain a higher social status in their host society. Becoming Dutch, English or German did not imply oblivion of the diasporic past while the identification with the local society could perfectly be combined with the cultivation and reinvention of the exile narrative and identity.

These findings also carry some important methodological implications. While migrant diasporas are often understood as producing an exclusive form of identification with their own group, endogamy and the transmission of traditions and memories are often used as the most important indicators of the degree to which the diaspora remains extant. However, as I hope to have shown, the notion of a transnational diaspora does not have to be diminished by the strengthening ties of the individual migrants with their host societies. In migration studies, a diaspora should therefore not be conceived of as something which is extractable from a given set of data on marriage patterns or social and economic behavior but rather as a horizon of belonging and identification which needs to be expressed only occasionally and which does not have to conflict with the loyalties migrants feel towards the communities where they reside. As the cases of the La Motte, Martens or Van der Meulen families show, the opposite development could also occur:
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remembering exile strengthened their feeling of belonging to their host society.

Being Protestant, being English or Dutch and descending from an exiled family were identities so closely welded together that they were no longer separable.
Chapter 5: *The ancient landmarks of the fathers – maintaining old networks*

*In pursuit of a fleeing horseman*

On a loose paper covering personal notes and letters from his friends and relatives, Marcus Du Tour, lawyer and chamberlain of Stadholder William II, noted the following Latin poem:

The noble eagle begets soft doves  
But his soul does never settle, (it is like a) fleeing horseman.  
Oh, the noble father’s honesty, virtue and splendor,  
Are not inherited by birth, as has been proven many times.

He added to this poem a Bible verse (Proverbs 22. 28): ‘Remove not the ancient landmarks, which thy fathers have set’. Du Tour’s anxiety about the next generation can be read as a rather general lamentation about youth’s unsteadiness and decadence. His own progeny, however, could hardly be characterized as idle ‘soft doves’. His only son David was a man of great ambitions. Having acquired the title of baron he married into a wealthy Frisian family and made a career in provincial and, ultimately, national politics. After serving in the magistrature of his wife’s Frisian hometown Hindeloopen he became a deputy in the States-General in The Hague and commissioner in the Frisian Court of Auditors. Obviously, his father’s anxiety about his children’s steadfastness and ambition had resulted in a disciplined upbringing which aimed at their preparation for a successful career.

Besides preparing his children for a life in his footsteps, Marcus Du Tour’s eagerness to pass on old virtues had another dimension. Descending from French and Brabantine Protestant refugee families, he served as a member of the Council of
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387 ‘Aquila progenerat molles generousa columbas  
Atque animus residat nullus avertus Eques  
Ah! Patris et virtus probitas et candor honesti  
Non est in natis/ tempora dicta probant.

388 ‘En zet de oude Paalen niet te rugge, die uwe vaderen gemaakt hebben.’ (Ibid.)

389 Repertorium van ambtsdragers en ambtenaren 1482-18-61  
(http://www.historici.nl/Onderzoek/Projecten/Repertorium/app/personen/8309), consulted on 7 february 2013.
Even though he belonged to the elite of the Dutch Republic, his social networks remained firmly rooted in the family and friendship circles of Southern migrants. His marriage to Sara de l’Empereur in 1655 connected the Southern families Van der Meulen and Du Tour to that of the famous Leiden Hebraist Constantijn de l’Empereur van Oppijck, himself born of Antwerp refugees in Germany. With the exception of notable persons, such as Utrecht mayor Frederik Ruysch, the guest list to Du Tour’s wedding reads like a who’s who of the well-to-do Southern migrant families in Holland and Utrecht. He acted as a lawyer and legal advisor to many of his Southern Netherlandish contacts and friends. Important merchant families, such as the brothers Johan and Christoffel Thijs were represented by Du Tour in several lawsuits concerning their investments in Hamburg. These contacts with his fellow Southerners proved of crucial importance for Du Tour’s career and social life, and passing them on to his children seems to have been a major goal. The ‘ancient landmarks’ of the fathers had to be preserved and maintained, and the old networks that had mutually connected the old well-to-do Brabant families in the Dutch Republic for generations needed to be continued.

Many studies on migrant identities suggest that transferring memories of a distant ‘homeland’ to future generations is a difficult task. The bi- or multi-local ties to one or more places of origin are typically restricted to the first generation while the descendants of migrants do not share the interest in their parents’ birth countries or regions. However, in the case of the early modern Netherlandish exiles who left during the Dutch Revolt a different pattern appears: the translocal networks that were built by the first generation and held together by memories and the consciousness of a common homeland remained intact for many generations and were sometimes even extended and reinforced by the children and grandchildren of
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391 Marcus Du Tour’s mother was Justina van der Meulen, daughter of the successful Antwerp merchant Andries van der Meulen (Arch. Thys. 286: Stukken van David du Tour en zijn vrouw Justina van der Meulen, ca. 1630-1650).
392 Arch. Thys. 287.
393 Lucassen, ‘Is Transnationalism Compatible with Assimilation?’ , p. 21.
the newcomers, who could easily build upon the contacts of their ancestors. These networks had a social as well as a spatial component: not only did they connect families and individuals from the same regions, but they also bridged wide geographical spaces in which future generations could easily move from one place to another. Descendants of Dutch migrants did not forget about their forefathers’ former homes and were often able and willing to migrate between their birthplaces and other regions they could know only from their parents’ stories. Merchant families, in particular, had a broad geographical outlook and often proved very flexible when relocation from one city or country to another proved necessary.

Newer studies on transnationalism and migration often argue that after the heyday of the modern nation state transnational migration decisively changed in character. Whereas the model of migration as a one-directional and linear movement from one place to another is said to have characterized migration movements in earlier periods, new communication technologies and the increasing opportunities to travel between states are believed to have changed the living conditions of modern migrants enormously. Instead of leaving the ‘Old Country’ behind and starting a new life abroad, migrants live more and more ‘between’ their birth countries and their new homes. In particular, members of labor-migrant diasporas, such as the numerous Mexicans in the Southwest of the United States, often relocate several times in their life from one side of the border to the other. But even those who permanently settle down in the new host society often keep close ties to their former homelands. To describe this condition Nina Glick Schiller and others have coined the term ‘transmigrant’, which stresses the connectedness to various places and spaces and the multidirectional nature of contemporary migrants’ lives. As this chapter will show, ‘transmigration’ is not only a contemporary phenomenon but also one that preceded the modern nation state and shaped the situation of many early modern migrants as well. The early modern Netherlandish migration networks could
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be classified as typical examples of such transmigrant diasporas. Even if their members were well integrated in their new places of residence, most migrants and their descendants did not totally reorient their lives towards the host society they lived in but remained connected to their old ‘homes’ or to other regions where their parents had stayed after their flight and often easily relocated from one place to another.\footnote{Not all persons in the Netherlandish diaspora communities in England were refugees, but some also migrated to England or Germany after the period of persecutions and stayed there for some time for economic reasons. One of them was Gerard Schepens from Dordrecht who, at the age of sixteen, went to Norwich in 1573, where he later married Maria Mahiens, born of Flemish exiles. Around 1579, the couple moved to Dutch Republic and lived in various towns in Holland (GA Dordrecht, 85 Collectie Balen, inv. nr. 20).}

As we will see in this chapter, to move onwards or relocate to earlier ‘homes’ to which previous migrant generations had fled was, however, not self-evident. The condition for doing so was the survival of memories and the social networks that connected the various exile abodes of the Netherlandish migrants. The knowledge about the past and about other points of intersection within the diasporic networks was transmitted to future generations and offered them a broadening of their geographical outlook and a wider spectrum of economic decisions and career opportunities. Many, like Marcus Du Tour, preserved their migrant outlook and tried to keep the memory of the ancestors alive and to pass it on to their children. Even though the ‘fleeing horseman’ whose unpredictable course Du Tour lamented did not return, the knowledge about the forefathers was of crucial importance for the next generations and offered them valuable opportunities.

At home, here and abroad

While most of the descendants of Netherlandish migrants who had left their homes during the early Revolt were firmly rooted in their new homes, their families’ past also connected them to places and networks beyond their everyday social surroundings. Even after three or more generations people could easily move from one place to another if this proved necessary. While many families maintained a clearly defined geographical link between only two or three regions or towns, others kept moving through the entire geographical spectrum of the Netherlandish diaspora. The Balde family from the Ypres region, for instance, fled the Southern Netherlands around 1572 to Sandwich. In the 1580s, some family members migrated to Holland.
and Frankenthal. Jacob Balde, who was born in England, used his English contacts when he became an elder in the Dutch Reformed Church in Frankenthal. In 1624, when Spanish troops had occupied the Southern German town, he travelled to London to raise money for the Frankenthal Reformed congregation. Franz Balde, Jacob’s brother, moved on to Frankfurt in 1630, and Jacob himself went to Amsterdam in 1635. His son, Jacob Balde the Younger, became again a minister in Frankenthal but later moved to Thamen (now Uithoorn) in the classis of Utrecht where he died in 1653. The family remained spread over a wide range of places between England, the Dutch Republic and the Holy Roman Empire.

While the various branches of the Balde family became increasingly comfortable in their new hometowns, they still maintained a wider social and geographical orientation: although many family members intermarried with locals from Frankfurt or Utrecht, marriages to other Southern Netherlandish families were contracted until the eighteenth century while descendants with spouses from abroad also kept moving along the old migration routes of their forefathers. Jacob Balde the Younger himself had married Anna Behaghel, a descendant of the famous Flemish merchant family from Frankfurt, and their only daughter Susanna Maria married into the old migrant family Van de Walle from Hanau. The family ties between Utrecht, Holland and the family’s various German exile towns were renewed again when in 1710 Hermanus van de Walle, Susanna Maria’s son, married Sara Balde, his second cousin, in Amsterdam. The Van de Walle, Behaghel and Balde families would maintain their mutual connections for centuries, and around 1700 some of their members established the firm Behaghel & Van de Walle as a multinational trading company that operated in England, Frankfurt and Amsterdam. Others, such as Jacob Balde the Younger, Hermanus van de Walle and his son Jacob, known as the ‘Dordrecht pope,’ became famous preachers in

Grell, Brethren in Christ, pp. 246f.
The children of Franz Balde, the brother of Jacob the Younger, most of whom married into other Netherlandish migrant families, moved to London, Amsterdam and Mannheim (Dietz, Frankfurter Handelsgeschichte, vol. 4, part 1, p. 53).
Dietz, Frankfurter Handelsgeschichte, vol. 4, part 1, pp. 300f.
Even though they belonged to the economic elites of their various hometowns, they did not inhabit only one ‘home’ but rather a multiplicity of spaces that had been explored by previous generations and in which they had important contacts on which they could rely.

The same pattern can be observed in numerous other migrant families. In the case of merchants continuous remigration was more the rule than the exception. The families De Bary, Campoen, Bartels and others, who centered their enterprises around Frankfurt, continued to migrate between Holland and the Main and Rhine region until the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{402} Also the Boudaen Courten family, which descended from the textile merchant Guillaume Courten from Menen in Flanders, kept moving back and forth between London, Cologne, Hamburg, Middelburg and other towns for generations.\textsuperscript{406} During the persecution of heretics under the Duke of Alba, Guillaume Courten was incarcerated but managed to escape to England from where he built a trading network that would last for decades. His incarceration by the Habsburg authorities was commemorated in a silver tazza that depicted him as a prisoner behind bars and was preserved by his descendants for generations.\textsuperscript{407} After 1572, Courten relocated and settled down in Middelburg. His daughter Margarita, who lived in Rotterdam, went back to England after the death of her husband but sent her son Pieter to Middelburg to work in the Zeeland branch of the family business. Pieter’s wife, Catharina Fourmoenois, was born of Walloon refugees in Cologne. Apparently the family had not cut all its ties with the Southern Netherlands: at Pieter’s and Catharina’s wedding the invited guests came not only from Cologne and London but also from Antwerp.\textsuperscript{408} Even though many family members continued to move between England and the continent, they built close links with their new homes at the same time. Jacob Boudaen Courten became a
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\textsuperscript{404} NNWB, vol. 9, p. 1274.
\textsuperscript{405} Dietz, \textit{Frankfurter Handelsgeschichte}, vol. 4, part 1, pp. 116-122. See for the Lutheran Bartels family also: Lehmann, \textit{Historische Nachricht, Zuschrifft} (unpaginated introduction).
\textsuperscript{408} Wuestman, ‘Het familie boeckje van Pieter Boudaen Courten’, p. 53.
member of the Council of Brabant, and his second cousin married into an English noble family and settled in Bath.\textsuperscript{409}

\textbf{Tazza of the Courten family, Rijksmuseum Amsterdam}

While most of the merchant dynasties kept their transnational outlook and continued to migrate between the Netherlands, Britain and Germany for a long time, even those families which began to orient themselves towards their new dwelling places

\textsuperscript{409} Ibid., p. 57.
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kept in touch with their old networks abroad. In the case of the Frankfurt Walloon merchant house Du Fay, for example, most of the members of the family remained in Frankfurt at least until the late eighteenth century. But still they maintained their old links to Holland and England as well as to other Netherlandish families in Germany, especially to the Haarlem merchant house Wendel. In 1708, the connection between the two merchant families was reinforced through the marriage of Johann Martin du Fay and Rahel Wendel. The family also remained committed to the Walloon Reformed Church of Hanau and sent most of their sons to the Reformed Academy in Herborn that had been founded by the counts of Nassau after their conversion to Reformed Protestantism.

For merchants who operated in international and interregional trade, geographical mobility was, of course, a matter of economic survival, and the transnational merchant networks often preceded the persecution of Protestants in the second half of the sixteenth century. This observation has led some scholars to the conclusion that the religious and political aspects of the mass migration from the Netherlands should not be exaggerated and that in many cases leaving one’s hometown was a decision based purely on trade prospects. Those families and individuals who continued to move from one place to another, however, represented not only merchants but people of many other professions. While textile workers, brewers and comparable occupational groups indeed were more likely to settle down permanently after having migrated once, in some cases entire colonies of Southern Netherlandish workers also continued to relocate, such as the Flemish textile


workers who first fled to England and the Lower Rhine and later went to Holland.\footnote{See e.g.: Leo Lucassen and Boudien de Vries, ‘The Rise and Fall of a West European Textile-worker Migration System: Leiden, 1586-1700’, in: Gérard Gayot and Philippe Minard (eds), Les ouvriers qualifiés de l’industrie (XVIe-XXe siècle). Formation, emploi, migrations, Lille 2001, pp. 23-42; Leo Lucassen and Boudien de Vries, ‘Leiden als middelpunt van een Westeuropese textiel-migratiesysteem’, in: Tijdschrift voor sociale geschiedenis 22 (2), pp. 138-167. An argument against the notion that economic considerations outweighed religious motivations of emigration can be seen in the fact that many Antwerp merchants who fled to Frankfurt in the 1560s moved back to their hometown when the rebels took it over. After the fall of Antwerp in 1585, they immediately returned to Frankfurt. See: Van Roosbroeck, Emigranten, p. 184.}

We will see that among artisans, artists, clergymen or physicians continuous transmigration was almost as common as among merchants. In families and professional circles the networks of the previous generations were reproduced, and individuals kept moving along the old migration routes.

That these migration movements were not one-directional processes but rather took place in continuous loops is illustrated by the networks of painters and artisans between Frankenthal, Frankfurt and the Netherlands. Among the members of these networks the decision to relocate was often dictated by political and military events, such as the outbreak of the Thirty Years’ War, which affected Frankenthal at an early stage when the town was besieged by Spanish troops in 1621. The Ferein family, originally from the Southern Netherlands and active as silversmiths for generations, moved away from Frankenthal even before the Palatine was afflicted by the war. Immediately before Spinola’s Palatine campaign in 1620 Hans Ferein and his family left Frankenthal for The Hague.\footnote{Walter Jarosch, ‘Die Silberschmiede Ferein in Frankenthal, Worms und Hanau’, in: Edgar J. Hürkey (ed.), Kunst, Kommerz, Glaubenskampf. Frankenthal um 1600, Worms 1995, p. 187.} His son Hendrik, born in 1604, later re-migrated with his family to his birthplace and settled down there as an artisan in his father’s trade in 1652. His descendants continued to work as silversmiths in Worms, Hanau and Frankenthal until the eighteenth century. They remained active in their Dutch Reformed congregations and often chose spouses of Southern Netherlandish descent.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 190f. For other Netherlandish gold- and silversmiths in Fankenthal see: Walter Jarosch, ‘Frankenthaler Gold- und Silberschmiede des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts’, in: Hürkey (ed.), Kunst, Kommerz, Glaubenskampf, pp. 175-186.}

Other families that migrated between the Netherlands and the exile towns abroad for generations included the painter dynasties Van der Borcht and Steenwyck.\footnote{See on the Netherlandish artists in Frankenthal, see: Martin Papenbrock, Landschaften des Exils. Gillis van Coninxloo und die Frankenthaler Maler, Weimar 2001 and the critical discussion of this work by Van Roosbroeck, Emigranten, p. 184.} Three generations of the Van der Borcht family moved between
Brussels, Amsterdam and Frankenthal. While some of the descendants of the family became farmers in smaller Palatine villages, those who continued their fathers’ craft never found a steady home. Their continuous migration was not always the result of a free choice: in order to find employment Hendrik van der Borcht II went to London, but he returned to Holland and later to Frankenthal during the English Civil War. His son, Hendrik van der Borcht III, worked as a court painter for the Electors Palatine but was dismissed after the Calvinist branch of the dynasty died out in 1685. When he wanted to return to Frankenthal in 1698, the town had been plundered during the War of the Palatine Succession, and all six houses the various branches of the Van der Borcht family had possessed were burned down.\footnote{Gunther Zehl, ‘Die Frankenthaler Malerfamilie van der Borcht’, in: Hürkey (ed.), Kunst, Kommerz, Glaubenskampf, p. 147.} Unable to rebuild the family property he left for Friedrichsfeld to live with his daughter’s family until 1731.

Just like the Van der Borchts, the painter family Steenwyck continued to roam between Germany, England and the Netherlands for generations. Hendrick van Steenwyck was born in Kampen and had settled down in Antwerp before the Dutch Revolt, but he was forced to flee to Aachen in 1570. When Antwerp was taken over by the rebels, he went back but had to leave again after the Habsburg victory over the town in 1585. The family moved to Frankfurt where Hendrick died in 1603. His son, Hendrick van Steenwyck II, moved back to the Netherlands and worked in London for a while where he met his future wife Susanna Gaspoel, born to refugees from Louvain. After their marriage they settled down in The Hague and later in Leiden where Hendrick died in 1649. His wife Susanna, who was also active as a painter, lived in Amsterdam until 1662.\footnote{Jeremy Howarth, ‘The Steenwyck paintings, products of family enterprise’, in: Koenraad Brosens, Leen Kelchtermans e.a. (eds.), Family Ties. Art Production and Kinship Patterns in the Early Modern Low Countries, Turnhout 2012, pp. 144-158; Marloes Huiskamp, Gaspoel, Susanna, in: Digital Vrouwenlexicon van Nederland. (http://www.historici.nl/Onderzoek/Projecten/DVN/lemmata/data/Gaspoel, consulted on 5 April, 2013).}

The decisions to move on made seemingly so easily by all these families were almost invariably motivated by practical or economic considerations. Especially in the case of the merchant class but also among other professions, the
existence of old networks abroad was a valuable and often necessary key to economic success. As Oscar Gelderblom has shown, early modern merchants who participated in transnational trade were by definition ‘footloose’: Even before the Dutch Revolt many Netherlandish traders had often led highly mobile lives and easily migrated from one place to another. Gelderblom presents the decisions of individuals to migrate as purely motivated by economic interest and following a clear ‘cost-benefit calculus’. It is obvious that not only merchants but also individuals of other professions primarily moved hence and forth for economic reasons, once the war and the persecutions were over. Nevertheless, the high mobility that offered the descendants of the migrants invaluable career and trade opportunities depended on the knowledge and the memories of the previous generations that had been passed down to their children. The migration patterns of the aforementioned families clearly followed the migration routes of previous generations and benefitted from the networks that were built by the ancestors.

Maintaining ties

Of course, the opportunities the networks provided were dependent upon the maintenance of contacts. For many migrant families and individuals, especially those who do not seem to have been sure about where they would live in the future the attempts to keep in touch with old contacts and also to explore new networks were of crucial importance. The family of Antwerp physician Andreas de Bacher, for example, was eager to maintain their connections to friends and acquaintances abroad after they fled their hometown in the 1580s. De Bacher went to Halberstadt in the German Harz Mountains where he served as the medical attendant of the Duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel. In 1608 the family moved to Utrecht and later to Leiden, but the contacts with their German exile abodes remained. Andreas de Bacher encouraged his son Samuel to travel during his studies in Leiden and

421 Both Andreas and Samuel de Bacher frequently corresponded with Conrad Treffelinck from Halberstadt, Enghelhardt Adelphius and Johan Peparius from Wolfenbüttel, the chancellor of the Brunswick-Lüneburg court. Nicolaas van der Willigen from Hamburg as well as with several merchants in Holland. (Arch. Thys. 154: Brieven ontvangen door Samuel de Bacher 1594-1617; Arch. Thys. 137: Brieven ingekomen bij Andreas de Baccher van Enghelhardt Adelphis en Johan Peparius; Arch. Thys 134, A1-L1: Brieven ingekomen bij Andreas de Bacher van Nicolaas van der Willigen).
provided him with a list of people he should meet when he was in Germany and whose acquaintance could be useful in the future. Even though he studied in Padua for a while, the routes along which Samuel de Bacher was sent by his father did not bring him to the typical destinations of the early modern European grand tour. Instead, he mainly traveled through those places where his family and many other refugees from Antwerp had stayed during their flight: Bremen, Hamburg, Stade and Halberstadt.422

During his travels Samuel reported news and brought messages and good wishes from his family’s contacts back to Holland. The manner in which the acquaintance was maintained was amicable and signaled a certain intimacy, which often was nothing more than a gesture. Many of the people Samuel met were known to his family only by hearsay, which sometimes led to the embarrassing situation that his father had provided him with incorrect names and personal information. When Samuel was supposed to meet the physician Bartholomeus Verheij and his wife Dorijn in Bremen, for instance, he found out that his name was not Bartholomeus, but Balthasar Verheij and he is not married to Dorijn, but to Elisabeth Hedewig. Dorijn, however, is married to a bailiff, of whom they say he is a nobleman and she is also rich and well-off and they live together somewhere around Emberg. Even though I did not have much time to talk to them, they invited me as their guest and wanted to prove their friendship to me, but because I was in a hurry, I had to promise them to visit them again on my way back and have more conversations with them. Together they have had three children, of which two have died and one boy is still alive. They said that their brothers and sisters were all doing well. He [Balthasar Verheij] has his patients predominantly among the Netherlanders. The doctor also said that he thought about traveling to Holland shortly and if he would do so, he would also visit our father in Leiden. When I would return on my way back, he said he wanted to give me some messages for father to write him in more detail about everything […].423


423 Arch. Thys. 157: Brieven ontvangen door Philips de Bacher 1613-1649 (1615): ‘Hij heet niet Bartholomeus maar Balthasar Verheij en is getrouwd niet met Dorijn, maer met Elisabeth Hedewig ende Dorijn is getrouwt met eenen amptman, die sij seijden een edelman te zijn ende haer rijk ende wel ghestelt woonachtich omtrent Emberch, maar alsoo ick luttel off gheen tijt hadde, beslist geen langen discours met hun houden, zij wilden mij te gaste houden ende alle vriendtschap betoonen, maer overmits
Obviously, the De Bacher and the Verheijs families hardly knew each other; Andreas de Bacher did not even remember their names. Yet even though they had possibly never met, they freely invited each other to their homes and did their best to show their interest in keeping in touch. Balthasar Verheijs’s statement that he would visit the De Bachers in Leiden probably did not say much about his intended travels but was rather a gesture to affirm their friendly contact. Because of to the high rate of re- and transmigration of second- and third generation migrants, maintaining connections between the various local Netherlandish exile communities could be of vital interest.

Regular visits to friends and family abroad were no exception in the Netherlandish migrant networks. The most common occasions to see relatives who lived far away were marriages and, less happily, funerals. But those who could afford it also went abroad to visit their kinfolk without a specific occasion. The famous minister Johannes Elison, for example, was born in England and served the Netherlandish congregation in Norwich but continued to visit Holland and Zeeland. While most of his children stayed in England, and some married into English families; one son, Johannes the Younger, settled down as a merchant in Amsterdam and married Josina Backer in 1628. After that his parents had even more reasons to visit what was not exactly their homeland but a place they saw as their cultural point of reference. The famous portraits of him and his wife Maria Bockenolle by Rembrandt were made during such a visit to Amsterdam. The portraits were commissioned by their son in Amsterdam and kept at his house. After he and Josina Backer died childless, the paintings were taken to England by their brother-in-law Daniel Dover.

\[\text{ick zoon haestede, hebbe moeten beloven, int weder doorreijsen te passe kommende, niet te laeten, weder nader te spreecken, zij hebben t’ saemen drie kinderkens ghehadt, waeraff twee ghestorven, derde een soontje noch levendt, zijden mij met hun andere broeders ende susters noch al wel te zijn. Hij heeft hier zijn meeste praktijcke bij de Nederlanders. De doctor seijde oock dat hij cort ook eens naer Hollant soude moeten reijsen, dan soude hij vader te Leijden oock besoecken, ende thans dat ick hier verder doorquam, wilde mij berichten aen vader met geven, om hem van alles goet bescheet te schrijven […]}.’

\[\text{424 See e.g. on the marriage between Francoys Thijs and Hedewich de Bacher and the difficulties for the relatives to be there on time: Arch Thys. 133 A4 : Brieven ingekomen bij Andreas de Bacher., especially the letters from Johan Thijs from 11 November 1598 and 8 February 1599. On the difficulties to attend funerals of friends and family members while living in the diaspora, see: Gelderblom, \textit{Zuidnederlandse kooplieden}, p. 58.}
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The stranger churches and the continuation of diasporic networks

The continuation of the old exile networks took place not only in informal circles but also in official institutions, such as the numerous stranger churches in England and on the continent as well as at the Councils of Brabant and Flanders in The Hague and Middelburg and the numerous chambers of rhetoric. Although all of these institutions gradually opened to people without a migration background during the seventeenth century, they retained their Southern Netherlandish identity and functioned as pivots on which the old exile networks hinged. Particularly the various migrant churches of Reformed, Lutheran and Mennonite signature had maintained a decisively translocal outlook from their earliest origins onwards. While the significance of the Reformed presbyterial-synodal church model for the genesis of a genuine Protestant exile identity has often been exaggerated by church historians, this form of organization did preserve the strong ties between the various local congregations and their mutual dependence. While the various Mennonite subconfessions quickly broke up into a multitude of sectarian branches, and the Lutherans outside the German princely territories drafted a number of different confessions of faith, the Reformed Church in the Netherlands agreed on a number of widely accepted doctrinal statements at an early stage and developed a common confessional identity and culture.\(^{426}\) These Calvinist stranger churches connected the commercial and manufacturing towns of England and the European continent with each other and provided the Reformed Netherlandish diaspora with a firm institutional basis. The local congregations outside the Netherlands remained oriented towards the ‘motherland,’ and the various local consistories and ministers in the Holy Roman Empire, Britain and Holland closely kept in touch with each other.\(^{427}\) The stranger churches in England held their own synods where mostly practical and organizational matters were discussed.\(^{428}\)


\(^{428}\) London Metropolitan Archives, CLC/180/MS10055: *Kerckelie oeffeningen en instellingen der Nederlandscher Ghemeente tot Londen*, fol. 111ff.
The vast majority of the members of the stranger churches in England as well as in the German Empire were of Flemish and Brabantine descent, and there were only a few Hollanders among them. While people from the Southern Netherlands were also well represented in the Reformed Church in the Dutch Republic, the congregations in the ‘homeland’ gradually lost their old diasporic identity. Because of the close contacts with the stranger communities abroad and the communion with the Walloon churches at home, the Reformed Church in the Dutch Republic was, however, constantly reminded of its exile heritage. When we look at those individuals who were particularly sympathetic towards and concerned with the brothers abroad, it is hardly surprising that most of them had migrant backgrounds or had friends or spouses of Southern descent. While most of the ministers of the stranger churches in England were recruited from within the migrant communities, from the 1620s onwards it became more difficult to find able candidates. Those ministers in the Netherlands who were willing to leave for London and other towns were mostly descendants of migrants or had married into refugee families. Willem Thilenus, for example, who up grew in Zeeland but served as a minister at the London Austin Friars congregation for a while in the 1620s, was married to Maria de Fraeye from London, the granddaughter of Johan Radermacher. When a successor for Thilenus was sought in 1628, Franciscus Gomarus and some other Flemings in Holland recommended various candidates, and finally Timotheus van Vleteren, who was born in Sandwich but had grown up in Zeeland, was selected. While a few Hollanders also served the congregation in London during the seventeenth century, most of the ministers who were sent to England from the continent had links to the transnational Netherlandish diaspora. Only the church in Yarmouth had a traditional link with Zeeland and employed some young ministers from Walcheren and its neighboring islands.

Among the Reformed in Holland those church members who descended from migrant families were often more inclined to think in terms of an international Calvinist community than their native coreligionists. Persecuted Calvinists from other regions of Europe were regarded as brethren in the faith and were oftentimes

430 Grell, Calvinist Exiles in Tudor and Stuart England, pp. 59f.
431 Ibid., p. 126.
generously helped and financially assisted. When the Reformed communities in the Upper Palatine and the Duchy of Jülich came under severe pressure in the 1620s and had to flee, funds were raised by Calvinist congregations all over Europe. Besides the wealthy Austin Friars congregation, which was especially generous in helping their persecuted fellow believers, the Amsterdam church was very active in campaigning for the good cause and even convinced the Synod of South Holland and the magistrate of Amsterdam to help. The linchpins of these charity initiatives were all merchants from Southern Netherlandish families, such as Daniel van den Ende, Daniel Dorville and Martin Hooftman. Due to their excellent connections within the international Calvinist exile networks these men were also commissioned to transfer the money to the refugees.  

Memories of past persecutions played a crucial role in the rhetoric that called for a common solidarity within the Reformed diaspora. The refugees who had fled the Upper Palatine to Nuremberg reminded their coreligionists in Holland and London of the exile fate of their own parents and grandparents. Their petition letters suggest that Utenhove’s *Simplex et fidelis narratio* was still widely known as the hardships during the odyssey of the Netherlandish refugees along the North Sea coast in the winter of 1553/1554 were recalled. The exiled writers of the petition letters that were sent to the Netherlands seemed quite confident about the success of their cause. The fact that they lived far away from their benefactors and did not personally know them did not stop them from trusting the benevolence of the Dutch. As they saw it, they all belonged to the same family of godly brethren and were united by their common cause for which their forefathers had already suffered.

In the diaspora churches outside the ‘fatherland’, Netherlandish identities were preserved for a long time. Ole Peter Grell has argued that from the second half of the seventeenth century onwards the descendants of the exiles were so well
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433 Ibid., 199. The *Simplex et fidelis narratio* remained part of Reformed migrant memories until the eighteenth century and was for instance also extensively quoted in the chronicle of the Reformed church of Frankfurt (Institut für Stadtgeschichte Frankfurt am Main, Deutsch-Reformierte Gemeinde, inv.nr. 148: Mangon, Geschichte der beiden Gemeinden, fol. 45-90).
434 See also: *Copie van een sekeren Brief der Boven-Pfaltische ballinghen aan de E. E. Kercken-Raad der stad Leeuwarden*, Leeuwarden 1631; *Copye van een sekeren brief, geschreven door de vesdruckte ballingen, der Gereformeerde religie, in versatilen quartieren van Duyslandt; aan de E. E. Kercken-Raad der stad Leeuwarden; ende door haer aan de respective gemeenten van Friesland*, Leeuwarden 1642.
integrated that as early as the 1650s the stranger church at Austin Friars mainly consisted of ‘English people of Dutch origin,’ and proficiency in the Dutch language decreased rapidly among the members of the congregation. The records of the London strangers church do indeed confirm such a process of ‘anglicization’; however, this trend did not lead to a decline of ‘Netherlandishness’ in the local diaspora community but actually stimulated efforts to remain mindful about its past and identity. While apparently from the 1650s onwards not all of the younger members spoke Dutch properly, the consistory and also the synod of the stranger churches in England were uncompromising about maintaining the Netherlandish character of the congregation. At a synodal meeting in 1655 the question was brought up regarding how young persons without enough active knowledge of Dutch could publicly confess their faith to become full church members. The option to do so in English was not even mentioned, and the synod discussed only the question ‘under which circumstances and conditions prospective members who do not have the courage or do not speak the Dutch language can make confession only before the consistory’. The representatives who were sent from London, Colchester, Norwich, Maidstone and Yarmouth unanimously decided that such persons did not have to appear before the entire congregation, but that it would be sufficient if they made their confession only to the minister or at least two members of the consistory.

While there may have been quite a few cases of people who did not speak Dutch with confidence, virtually all of the church members must have understood their parents’ mother tongue well enough to at least follow the sermons which continued to be held in Dutch. Also many notes, letters and even large parts of the official records of the local congregation were still written in Dutch until far into the eighteenth century. Still, the increasing anglicization within the Netherlandish

436 London Metropolitan Archives, CLC/180/MS10055: Kerckelieke oeffeningen en instellingen, fol. 111r.: ‘Aencomende litmaten die de vrymoedicheit of de Nederlandsche tale niet en hebben, hoe en met wat bepalingen sullen mogen geexcuseert worden vand e publyke Belydenis, wort gelaten inde discretie vanden Kerkenraet.’
437 Ibid., fol. 111v.: ‘Wort gestelt in de discretie van den kerkenraet, de Belydenis van een persoon die niet wel bekent is met de Duytsche tale, aen te nemen of voor den predicant alleen of met bywesen van een of twee ouderlingen.’
438 See e.g.: Ibid., fol. 119v. or: Hessels, Archivum, III, ns. 4020ff. The official church records, however, had switched from Dutch to English by the mid-seventeenth century (Grell, Calvinist exiles in Tudor and Stuart England, p. 122.)
community was considered a problem. Already in the 1580s an Italian elder of the
congregation, who also spoke Dutch, was employed as a schoolmaster. While in the
late sixteenth century the main reason to employ a schoolmaster was that the
members of Austin Friars wanted their children to have a Reformed education and to
learn the catechism as well as important merchant skills such as arithmetic and
accounting, by the early seventeenth century the focus had shifted to a good
education in Dutch, something with which more and more children had difficulties.
When the Dutch schoolmaster of Austin Friars died in 1642, the consistory tried to
employ a schoolteacher from the ‘homeland’ and made some inquiries in
Middelburg and Flushing even though there was an English schoolmaster available
who was able to teach Dutch. In 1646, the consistory employed Andries Minet from
Middelburg, a decision that would later turn out to be a financial disaster when
Minet demanded vast amounts of money and even wanted the consistory to pay the
debts he had incurred in London.439 Even if Minet was a great disappointment, many
parents were willing to pay the high fees he asked to give their children good lessons
in Dutch. Following Minet’s departure the Dutch Church was therefore still willing
to employ a Dutch schoolmaster. In 1682, the consistory asked minister Gerard van
der Port, who was travelling to Holland, to look for a suitable candidate.440 Van der
Port suggested Jan Blas and praised his talents as a teacher, organ player and cantor,
and in 1683, Blas was called to London and employed as cantor-schoolmaster for
the children of the Dutch Church.441 Even if it was not always easy, the Austin
Friars community was thus willing to take much trouble to provide their children
with an education in the language of their forefathers, and the Netherlandish identity
of the congregation managed to be preserved for a long time.

In the stranger churches in the Holy Roman Empire the situation was
similar, but the preservation of the Dutch and French languages depended on the
local situation and also on the regional dialects that were spoken in the exile towns.
In Emden for example, where the Low-German dialect was so similar to Dutch and
where Calvinists dominated local politics, the immigrants were immediately

439 Ibid., pp. 155-158.
440 See: Hessels, Archivum, III, no. 3881,3882, 3883.
441 According to Ole Peter Grell, the Dutch Church gave up its attempts to find a suitable schoolmaster
after the disappointing experience with Andries Minet (Grell, Calvinist Exiles in Tudor and Stuart
England, p. 160.). While indeed the position of Dutch schoolmaster seems to have been vacant between
1654 and the 1680s, Jan Blas was employed in 1683 (Hessels, Archivum, III, no. 3888.).
incorporated into the local Reformed church and never formed a distinct stranger church.\footnote{Schilling, \textit{Niederländische Exulanten im 16. Jahrhundert}, p. 84.} In general, the French stranger congregations in Germany preserved their mother tongue longer than did their Dutch sister churches, in most cases as long as they existed. At least until the late eighteenth century the Netherlandish Lutheran congregation of Frankfurt financially assisted their members in order to provide their children with French language courses.\footnote{Institut für Stadtgeschichte Frankfurt am Main, Niederl. Gemeinde Augs. Confession I, inv.nr. 1026 (1797).} The Dutch language, by contrast, was so similar to German that it was often given up in the course of the seventeenth century. In a place like Frankenthal that was built up by migrants from the Netherlands, Dutch was spoken until the end of the seventeenth century, and the Reformed church records were kept in Dutch until 1689 when the town was pillaged by French soldiers and many church members left.\footnote{Alfred Hans Kuby, ‘Gründe, Wege und Folgen der Gegenreformation in Kurpfalz unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Frankenthal’, in: Edgar J. Hürkey, Kunst, Kommerz, Glaubenskampf. Frankenthal um 1600, Worms 1995, p. 25.} In the Reformed stranger church of Frankfurt, the congregational records were kept in German as early as 1636, while its French sister congregation remained Francophone until 1916, a situation attributable to the huge Huguenot influx after 1685.\footnote{Hermann Dechent, \textit{Kirchengeschichte von Frankfurt am Main seit der Reformation}, Leipzig/Frankfurt a. M. 1921, p. 46; Irene Dingel, \textit{Abraham Mangon: Kurze doch wahrhaftige Beschreibung der Geschichte der Reformierten in Frankfurt, 1554-1712}, Leipzig 2004, p. 8.}

In towns where the strangers had built strong religious and cultural links with their host society the Dutch language was sooner traded in for German than in cities where the migrants were not officially recognized. Such was the case in the Lutheran migrant church in Frankfurt, which was founded in 1566 by exiles from Antwerp. The foundation of this church owed much to the agency of a number of local Lutheran clerics, who wanted to help their coreligionists from Brabant. Already in the 1560s, minister Matthias Ritter asked the city council to engage Dutch- and French-speaking preachers not only to serve the Lutheran exiles but also to win the Reformed Netherlanders for the Augsburg confession. When the magistrate was unwilling to provide any financial support for this enterprise, Ritter himself, together with the converted Sephardi minister Cassiodorus da Reina from Antwerp, preached to the strangers, and the Ritter family would remain active as
ministers of the stranger church until the eighteenth century. While the
congregation had given up the Dutch language in the early seventeenth century and
the church records were kept in German from 1636 onwards, French sermons were
still held in the eighteenth century. And even without the mother tongue of the
ancestors, the Netherlandish identity of the church continued to be disseminated and
preserved for centuries, in certain aspects even until the present. Every year on a
Sunday when the new elders were elected the congregation held an annual
commemorative service in which the hardships of the forefathers were
commemorated. While we have seen that the congregation’s chronicler, Johannes
Lehnemann, asserted that most of the Netherlandish customs and traditions had been
given up and were forgotten, the exile past in fact retained a greater presence than
suggested in his Historische Nachricht.

The same complaint is found in the various historical writings of Austin
Friars, written and compiled by minister Symeon Ruytinck from the late sixteenth
century onwards and continued by his successor Caesar Calandrini after Ruytinck’s
death in 1621. Both authors complained that the members of the London church did
not remember its past and origin very well. Ruytinck opened his history of the
Netherlandish migrants in London with the following lines:

Histories are the living memory, for they remind the descendants of
memorable things, which might die or already lay dead and buried because
the length of time. Therefore I have desired to compile all things
concerning our congregation that I thought to be memorable in one great
book, lest they should be forgotten after all these years.

It belonged to the rhetoric of historiographers like Lehnemann or Ruytinck to lament
the oblivion that had befallen the past and the reasons that had brought the exiles
abroad. However, these warnings should not be read as factual statements but rather
as rhetorical exhortations to be mindful about the stranger churches’ historical

446 Van Roosbroeck, Emigranten, p. 169.
447 Lehnemann, Historische Nachricht, unpaginated introduction.
448 ‘Historien worden genoemt het leven van geheugenisse, omdat om datse de nacomelingen indarstig
maken, de gedenkweerdighe saecken, die door langheyd des tijds dood ende begraven sijn, ofte
versterven moghten. Hierom heb ik my verlustight in  een groot boeck alles by een te vergaderen,
aangaende onse Ghemeente, dat my docht wetens ende ghedenckweerdich, op dat sulex, door ’t verloop
van jaeren niet ganse vergeten en werde.’ (London Metropolitan Archives, CLC/180/MS10055:
Kerckeliche oeffeningen en instellingen, fol. 1r.).
identity. The migrants’ descendants growing accommodation to their places of residence does not imply a lack of consciousness of their historical identity. They had preserved many aspects of their forefathers’ religion and culture and still lived within the same networks they had inherited from their parents. The continuation of these networks did not take place automatically; it required the will of the church members to maintain them. Chronicles like Ruytinck’s and Lehnemann’s served the purpose of keeping the congregation members mindful of their past and committed to their community. While it is difficult to measure the direct impact of their writings on the historical consciousness of their coreligionists, the allegiance of the congregation members to their religious networks and circles remained stable.

Southern institutions in the Dutch Republic
Not only in the diaspora abroad but also in the Dutch Republic, old institutions preserved the networks of the exiled forefathers. The paradoxical situation that the Southerners were not really strangers in the Northern Netherlands gave the migrant organizations an ambiguous character. As we have seen in chapter 2, the Southern migrants contributed much to the patriotic discourses in the Republic, yet they differed in many respects from the ‘natives’ and were sometimes regarded as ‘foreigners’. At the same time the Northern Netherlands increasingly became the cultural and geographical point of reference of the international Netherlandish diaspora. This paradoxical situation is reflected in the two Northern legal institutions that were responsible for the regions under States authority, the councils of Brabant and Flanders. The councils in exile exercised power over an imaginary cultural-geographical space that existed only in the past and, as some hoped, would do so again in the future. Even though these institutions claimed to be responsible for the two big Southern Provinces as a whole, only a small part of Flanders and Brabant was conquered by the States Army. The hybrid character of a Brabant law court outside the province of Brabant led to the unique situation that the council maintained laws that were made by the Habsburg enemy, so that all the legal reforms of the Archdukes in the South were also introduced in the States territory.449 While these two councils were later opened to Hollanders and Zeelanders, their

449 Fruin, Geschiedenis der staatsinstellingen, pp. 268-269; Lindemann and Van Litsenburg, Raad van Brabant, deel 1, pp. 5-15.
officeholders were traditionally Southerners, and until the 1620s they were among the few political institutions that were easily available for migrants in the North. As such, they remained pivotal centers of Southern elite circles.450

While the courts of Brabant and Flanders were not purely symbolic institutions and had indeed practical decisions to make in States territories, it is significant that they were located outside the regions for which they were responsible: the Court of Flanders in Middelburg and the Court of Brabant in The Hague. As institutions they preserved the idea that the Brabant and Flanders continued to belong to the Union of the Utrecht and that the claims on the homelands of the numerous refugees had not yet been given up. They provided career opportunities for lawyers and politicians of Southern descent and were the centers of Brabantine and Flemish networks in Holland and Zeeland.

Other organizations in which Southern networks were maintained in the Northern Provinces were the numerous Flemish and Brabantine chambers of rhetoric.451 While in the first generation of refugees many rhetoricians from the South, including Joost van den Vondel and Frans Hals, had given up their alliances to the Southern chambers of rhetoric and joined local Holland rhetoricians, many exile Southern chambers continued to exist until the eighteenth century, be it with only a few members.452 The themes on which these chambers composed songs, poems and plays often related to the status of their members as Southerners in the North and to the exile past. Especially in the chambers of Leiden and Haarlem, Southern themes continued to prevail, for example in the works of Jacob Duym, Jacob Celosse and Jacob van Zevecote, which I discussed in chapter 3. Even though the chambers of rhetoric no longer played a significant cultural role after 1700, the Leiden Flemish chamber existed at least until 1777, and the Flemish rhetoricians in

450 Ibid.
451 On the culture of rhetorician poetry in the Northern and Southern Netherlands, see e.g.: Arjan van Dixhoorn, Lustige geesten. Rederijkers in de Noordelijke Nederlanden (1480-1650), Amsterdam 2009; Anne-Laure van Bruaene, Om beters wille. Rederijkerskamers en de stedelijke cultuur in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden (1400-1650), Amsterdam 2008.
Haarlem also preserved their past for a long time. An important family in these circles were the Van Elstlands, whose ancestors had fled Menen in West Flanders after the public execution of a family member as a heretic in 1561. Until the eighteenth century, descendants of this Mennonite family belonged to the Flemish rhetoricians’ chamber of Haarlem. In 1690 Jan van Elstland, who had moved to Batavia on Java, still wrote poems in which he mentioned Menen. While he often sentimentally referred to Haarlem as his home, he also depicted the West Flemish town as an idyllic place, and it serves as the rural setting of sometimes humorous plots. Even though the prestige of the rhetorician culture declined after 1650, it is telling that the Flemish and Brabant organizations continued to exist and served as places of conviviality where the notion of shared past united their members.

As we have seen in chapter 3, migrants were able to build ties to their new host societies quite easily and used collective memories to redefine their social position among their neighbors. As this chapter shows, the migrants’ participation and acculturation in their new homes did not necessarily inhibit their commitment to the old exile networks. The social contacts of the first generation were maintained and often actively reproduced by their children and grandchildren, be it in informal family, friendship or business networks or in official institutions. While a great number of descendants of migrants continued the transmigrant lives of their ancestors and constantly moved around through the various exile communities, others settled down after one or more generations. Through the close ties of the transnational Netherlandish diaspora or the local urban networks of Southerners in the Dutch Republic, however, those who did not migrate further continued to redeploy parts of the exile past.

453 Boheemen and Van der Heijden, Retoricaal memoriaal, p. 380.
456 Van Dixhoorn, Lustige geesten, pp. 139f.
Chapter 6 - Godly wanderers. Exile memories and the transnational culture of Pietism

_Pilgrims behind the fiery column_

The discourse of the true Christians as a small and persecuted flock living as strangers in this world did not lose its appeal when the actual persecutions retreated to a distant past. In the Dutch Republic and the exile towns abroad the past of persecution and displacement was remembered and cultivated throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In 1660, a century after the mass migration of Protestants and religious dissenters from the Low Countries, descendants of the migrants placed a memorial stone, the _Schepken Christy_ (‘Christ’s little ship’), at a new doorway of the _Große Kirche_ of Emden. The depiction of the church as Christ’s little ship on a wild and hostile ocean emblematically represented the self-image of the Emden Reformed Church that had housed the refugees from the Netherlands and reminded the congregation’s members of the status of the true Church as a flock of strangers in this world. The ship was accompanied by the text: ‘God’s church, persecuted and expelled, has received God’s consolation here’.  

While the exile past of the Dutch refugees had never totally fallen into oblivion during the seventeenth century, the identification with those who had fled and suffered for Christ’s sake reached a new dimension in the context of new cultures of devotion and piety that emerged in late-seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Protestantism. Remembering the suffering and hardships of previous generations corresponded to the religious logic of Post-Reformation piety movements that aimed for a further reform both of the church and of personal Christian life. As Lutheran theologian Gottfried Arnold noted in 1696, the times of persecution had been more beneficial to the believers than the present days of peace and security since the Christians now trusted more in their governments than in their God.  

Many felt that during the times of persecution and exile the boundaries
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between the ‘children of God’ and ‘the children of the world’ had been clear. As Ole
Peter Grell has argued, anxiety about belonging to the elect was alien to the
members of the transnational Reformed diaspora.⁴⁵⁹ Indeed there is virtually no
evidence that this topic played any role in the life of the refugees, but neither did it
do so among other Dutch Reformed in the mid-seventeenth century. According to
Grell, the doctrine of predestination served as an encouragement rather than a threat
to the believers because their experience of suffering and persecution confirmed
their election as God’s people who had to wander as strangers towards the Promised
Land. While this argument takes the doctrine of predestination as a theological
_a priori_ rather than as an outcome of the exile experience, Grell’s observation seems
accurate in general. The notion of having been persecuted for Christ’s sake could be
regarded as confirmation of God’s approval and a distinction of the small flock of
‘true Christians’ among a hostile massa damnata.

While the Netherlandish exile churches in England and the Holy Roman
Empire remained a minority and could easily be distinguished from the rest of
society, the situation of the Reformed Church in the Dutch Republic was different.
The position of the Calvinists there had in fact a highly ambiguous character. After
the rebel takeover of the Northern Provinces in the late sixteenth century the
Reformed Church became the ‘public church’ and its ministers were employed in
public functions, for example in foreign embassies, as military chaplains in the
States Army or as pastoral workers on the Dutch East India Company’s cargo ships.
Their salaries were paid by the government. However, this public character of the
Reformed Church did not make it a state church, and in many ways it was able to
fend off governmental interference more effectively than its Reformed sister
churches in Switzerland and the German territories. More important was the
freedom of conscience that was formally maintained in the Dutch Republic and gave
all inhabitants the choice to simply attend, formally join or never set foot in the
public church. Although the services were also frequented by many who did
officially become members of the church, the actual membership rates remained
very low for a long period. Even in the early seventeenth century only a small
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minority of the Dutch population made the final step to subscribe to the Reformed confession and join the church.\textsuperscript{460}

The status of the Reformed as a small but privileged group within a society of undecided or lukewarm believers and even of religious antagonists was not due only to the fact that they formed a minority of the Republic’s populace but also to the self-created exclusiveness that had become typical for the Dutch version of Calvinism. While Reformed Protestantism had been imposed on entire populations in Scotland, Switzerland and parts of the Holy Roman Empire, the Dutch model of voluntary church membership gave the Reformed a special status, which was, of course, not without a price. Associating oneself with the Reformed Church also implied submission to church discipline and thereby potential involvement of consistories in one’s personal life. By joining the church, godliness could be displayed and the identification with the minority of pilgrims progressing towards the Promised Land be confirmed.

In the course of the seventeenth century the minority position of the Reformed in the Dutch Republic became more and more blurred. Church membership became increasingly common, and the influence of the Reformed on public life grew. This decrease in exclusivity was experienced by many as a threat, which encouraged attempts to further reform the Church in order to clearly define true Christian life and to distinguish between the faithful believers, on the one hand, and the lukewarm ‘name-Christians,’ on the other. Programs for such a ‘Further Reformation’ were by no means typically Dutch but coincided and overlapped with similar religious movements in England and Germany. As Martin Brecht has argued, Pietism was a transnational as well as a transconfessional phenomenon that encompassed not only the various confessional and denominational brands of German Pietism but also the Dutch ‘Further Reformation’ and English Puritanism.\textsuperscript{461}

This view has been reinforced by findings on the interconnections and mutual dependencies between the various pietistic movements in the North Sea region and the German Protestant territories. Willem op’t Hof has even gone so far as to


\textsuperscript{461} Martin Brecht, Der Pietismus vom siebzehnten bis zum frühen achtzehnten Jahrhundert, (Geschichte des Pietismus, vol. 1), Göttingen 1993, pp. 8f.
postulate the existence of a common ‘North Sea piety’ that united English Puritanism with the experiential piety of later Dutch Calvinism.\textsuperscript{462} The two devotional branches became more and more interconnected not only via trade relations between England and the Dutch Republic but also through the migration movements of English and Scottish Puritans to the continent and the contacts which Dutch exiles in England maintained with their homeland. Both groups, British Puritans and the Calvinist proponents of the Dutch ‘Further Reformation,’ shared the same ideals: the purification of the True Church and the deepening of personal faith and piety.

The need to purify the church and to gather the true believers who lived among the name-Christians was felt sometimes even more strongly in England and those parts of the German Empire where the Reformation had imposed an official and government-backed state church on the population. As German Pietists and English Puritans sensed, the chaff and the wheat were put together in a vessel, which could become acceptable to God only if the two were, if not separated, at least clearly marked as such. The way in which the various new devotional movements in Northwestern Europe influenced each other have been the subject of much debate. While German scholarship since Albrecht Ritschl has long assumed a Dutch origin of Pietism in Germany, this view has lost many of its proponents.\textsuperscript{463} Instead, the various new Pietist movements along the North Sea and in Central Europe are thought to have influenced each other mutually rather than springing from a single point of origin from which the movement then expanded. In accordance with this view, this chapter shows how the two branches, German Pietism and English Puritanism, not only adopted ideas and practices from the Dutch Further Reformation, but, far more importantly, they embraced the identificatory models of the Netherlandish diaspora. Douglas H. Shantz has characterized the religious


culture of Pietism as informed by a ‘theology of homelessness’: the true believers were never totally part of their social surroundings but always on their way to the ‘Promised Land’. In this context, the memory culture of the Netherlandish diaspora underwent a revaluation. The position of the Netherlandish exiles as a small minority of strangers with a past of persecution for the sake of faith appealed to sympathizers of further Church reform and new practices of piety. The culture of exile and the memory of confessional persecution became a source of inspiration for Pietists in Germany and Puritans in Britain, which again led to cross-fertilizations between the migrant churches and the Pietist circles of their host societies.

Puritanism and the fashioning of transnational identities

The transnational character of seventeenth and eighteenth-century Pietism not only connected cultures of devotion from different countries, it also contributed to new transnational and translocal identities that dissociated the true Christians from their societal environment:

their true homeland was not any earthly country but the New Jerusalem. The rhetoric of strangeness and exile had played an important role in early Puritan discourses. Minister William Ames, who migrated to the Dutch Republic in 1610, wrote on the position of the Christians in this world:

How can the world loue them that hate it, and haue little acquaintance with it, and are on the earth as pilgrims, wayting every day for happie passage through the troublesome sea of this life, to their home, euen to the heauenly citie of Ierusalem.

According to Stephen Baskerville, English Puritanism increasingly became a ‘transnational ideology,’ and many Puritan believers felt that the ‘blood of Christ knows no nations’: to them, being a Christian meant belonging to the international community of elect rather than to their lukewarm Christian neighbors in the English
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parish churches.\textsuperscript{466} Obviously, many Puritans felt greater loyalty to the ‘Church of Christ in Geneva, in France, in Germany, in Scotland, etc: also in London the Italian Church, the French and the Dutch’ than to the form of worship and church hierarchy that was imposed on them by the Church England.\textsuperscript{467} Such words were more than mere rhetoric, and adherents of English Puritanism often did their best to help and financially assist their persecuted fellow Christians on the continent: during the ‘Thirty Years’ War, notable Puritans donated substantial amounts of money for Calvinist exiles from the Palatine and Bohemia as well as to the poor of the French Reformed Church in London.\textsuperscript{468} In their view, the confessing Christians of all nations belonged together and bore a responsibility to help each other. As Scottish minister Henry Hall of Haughhead put it, the true believers were called and singled out from all countries, which also resulted in alienation from their home societies:

\begin{quote}
Here they are but strangers and pilgrims out of their own country, but […] the saints which are members of the church, though they live in the earth, yet they are accounted in scripture the citizens and inhabitants of heaven.\textsuperscript{469}
\end{quote}

While many Puritans actually left their homeland and migrated to the Dutch Republic or North America, the discourse of being strangers and exiles in this world often preceded their actual migration. As Keith Sprunger has argued, the imagery of exile and pilgrimage was already available to English Puritans, and it could serve them as a source of comfort once they were abroad.\textsuperscript{470} While the memory of the Marian exiles on the continent lingered, the inspiration to embrace an exclusive exile identity drew for great a part on the memory of the persecution of Protestants in the Low Countries and France. Not only was the history of the hardships continental Calvinists had suffered recounted, but the pastoral literature that emerged from the experience of exile and persecution also found an enthusiastic readership among


\textsuperscript{469} Henry Hall of Haughhead, cited after: Baskerville, ‘Protestantism as a Transnational Ideology’, p. 904.

\textsuperscript{470} Sprunger, \textit{The Learned Doctor William Ames}, p. 27.
British Puritans. When Jean Taffin wrote his pastoral work *Of the markes of the children of God* in 1586, he dedicated it to Anne Russell, the countess of Warwick. Russell descended from one of the major Puritan families in England and was connected to the Calvinist Dudley family through her husband, Ambrose Dudley. She acted as a patroness of English Puritans, and more than twenty book titles were dedicated to her. In 1590, Taffin’s work was translated into English by Anne Locke Prowse, who had become a renowned author and translator of Puritan literature.

*Of the markes of the children of God* became an immediate success in England. While the French original and the Dutch translation were published only two or possibly three times each until the early seventeenth century, the English edition appeared at least eight times between 1590 and 1634. During its first two decades the book was particularly popular: various editions were published in 1590, 1591, 1595, 1597, 1599, 1608 and 1609. The explanation of that asymmetrical success must be sought in the work’s treatment of the question of who actually belonged to the children of God and how they could be recognized. For Taffin the topic of election served a pastoral purpose in first instance, and he tried to explain to the persecuted believers that being exiled and afflicted should be regarded as a sign of God’s adoption and not as a punishment. In the English context, however, where the Puritans found themselves a part of the mainstream religion that was imposed on all Englishmen by their State, the theme of predestination had a different significance. In a situation where everyone was to be considered a Christian, the need to distinguish the true children of God from the children of the world became more urgent. The imagery of exile was therefore especially appealing to the Puritan readers since the borders between the godly and the ungodly were drawn so sharply here. All English editions contained the foreword in which the ‘believers from the Low Countries’ were directly addressed. The notion of belonging to a transnational community of true Reformed believers that had permeated Puritan theology and identity stimulated the identification with the refugees from the Netherlands and the willingness to support not only the Calvinist strangers in England but also their persecuted brethren in the Netherlands and France.
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The transmission and distribution of Dutch pietistic works through the networks of the Netherlandish also took place in the Dutch Republic. While most of the leading theologians of the Further Reformation did not have a migration background themselves, their readers and publishers often did. Through Flemish exiles in England, the Dutch theologians maintained contacts with English Puritans, such as Arthur Hildersam, Thomas Gataker or Richard Blackerby. The distribution of devotional works from England was often also facilitated by publishers with contacts in the exile networks. Notable publishers of devotional works of the Further Reformation movement included the Van den Vivere family in Middelburg and Francois Boels in Dordrecht, all of whom descended from Flemish refugees and operated in Southern Netherlandish exile circles. The Van den Vivere family was famous for its publications of the Pietist theologian Willem Teellinck, who had also lived in England, while Boels published most of the work of Godfried Udemans, who was regarded as one of the founding fathers of the Dutch Further Reformation. Furthermore he also published Teellinck’s works and numerous translations of English pietistic tracts by Henry Ainsworth, Timothy Rogers, Joseph Hall, Thomas Goodwin and other notable Puritans. The publishing company of Boels consisted almost exclusively of people of Southern Netherlandish origin, who had sympathies for the Further Reformation, as did the relatives of his wife who were active in the printing and publishing business. This environment connected him with exiles in Britain as well as sympathizers of English Puritanism in the Dutch Republic who translated English works for him, such as Johan Sanderus, who was acquainted with notable exiled Puritans in Holland and Gelderland. Such networks were crucial for the interconnections of transnational Pietism and the exchange of ideas and styles of devotion.

475 W.J. op 't Hof, Bibliografische lijst van de geschreven van Godefridus Udemans (Rotterdam 1993), pp. 12-13; W.J. op 't Hof, Bibliografie van de werken van Eeuwout Teellinck (Kampen 1988), p. 11.
London: Cultivating the model church

From their early beginnings onwards the Reformed stranger churches in England had had a special position within the country’s religious landscape. The newly formed Church of England, especially after its re-establishment in 1559, combined a rather Reformed theology with a traditional church hierarchy and organization. After the Elizabethan religious settlement the foreign Reformed stranger churches were envisaged by Puritan circles within the Church of England as ‘model churches’ to promote a truly Protestant style of worship, theology and life. While they still remained under the supervision of the Church of England and their respective bishops, they retained a certain degree of independence and were for example allowed to form their own synods. During the Elizabethan era, when the reform-oriented Edmund Grindal became Bishop of London in 1559 and later, in 1575, Archbishop of Canterbury, the stranger churches’ subservience to the Church of England was in practice minimal. The more Calvinist-oriented elements within the Church of England looked with admiration at the stranger communities and were willing to adapt to the church model of the exiled Netherlanders. In 1580, two English ministers from Colchester praised the local Dutch Reformed community as a good example ‘both for liefe and religion generallie geeuen bie the strangers durynge their abode in Colchester haue been comfortable to all those that be godlie minded’.\(^{477}\) In London the stranger churches had traditionally attracted locals, especially individuals who been in exile during the reign of Mary Tudor.\(^{478}\) Influential Puritans, such as Elizabeth’s Secretary of State Sir Francis Walsingham or the wealthy merchant Thomas Myddelton, frequented the services of the stranger congregations rather than those of their local Anglican parish churches.\(^{479}\) In turn, the Dutch congregation became more and more aware of their status as a ‘model church’ that needed to behave as a worthy example to the English natives. When in 1615 English Puritans were offended by a church banquet they found too luxurious in a religious context, the consistory decided to celebrate such meals in a more sober fashion. Even if the celebration of collective banquets was not considered sinful in


\(^{478}\) Hessels, Archivum, vol. 2, p. 482.

itself, the church members were called to be mindful of the fact that ‘our congregations are meant to serve the locals as a role model and an example of piety.’

The Puritan sympathies for the Reformed strangers were often viewed with suspicion by circles within the Church of England who feared that Netherlandish Calvinists might kindle separatist tendencies among the Puritans who still belonged to the Church of England. After all, it was particularly the genuinely Reformed presbyterial-synodal church order of Dutch Calvinism that was appealing to many British Puritans. During the tenure of William Laud as Bishop of London and, from 1633 to 1641, as Archbishop of Canterbury, the relations between Puritans and Netherlandish Calvinists were increasingly supervised and regulated. Laudian circles suspected the stranger congregations of harboring Puritans and other non-conformists with the result that in 1635 Englishmen without Netherlandish or French ancestry were forbidden to attend services of the stranger churches, a regulation that had first been enforced in the 1560s. Laud even wanted to go further and tried to oblige all second-generation migrants to join ordinary English parish churches. This measure could never be fully implemented, but the intention shows how anxious Laudians were about the perceived Puritan and foreign Calvinist threat. In the course of the Civil War royalist pamphleteers asserted that notable Puritans had consulted the consistory of Austin Friars ‘to know of the state and government of their church, telling them that they would follow their pattern’. While the Netherlandish churches were not a direct target of royalist or Laudian attacks, they were often associated with the Puritan cause.

The alliances and influences between Puritans and Reformed immigrants were by no means one-directional. Not only did Puritans take inspiration from what they still perceived as model churches, but at the same time they exerted influence on the Reformed stranger communities. Ministers of the Dutch congregations
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maintained close contact with Puritan theologians such John Cotton, Arthur
Hildersam and Thomas Gataker. These English divines were held in high regard
and sometimes even acted as spiritual mentors to young Dutch clergymen who were
willing to take a post in the stranger churches. Thomas Gataker, for example,
welcomed young theologians to his house to prepare them for church service:

Of Forreigners that sojourned with him, and were as ambitious of being
entertained by him as if they had been admitted into a University; these
were some Mr. Theylein, who was afterwards a Reverend Pastor of the
Dutch Church in London (whose son was brought by his mother but a
fortnight before Mr. Gatakeres decease, in treating the same good office in
the behalf of him, which the Father had with much comfort enjoyed), Mr.
Peters, Mr. And.Demetrius, Mr. Hornbeck, Mr. Rich, Mr. Swerd, Mr.
Wittefrangel, Mr. Severinus Benzon, W. Georg de Mey, Dr. Treschovius,
etc. Another Puritan household academy was established by Richard Blackerby, who
educated and mentored Willem Thilenus and Jonas Proost, both of whom would
later serve the Dutch congregation in London. The students who attended the
seminars of Gataker, Blackerby or Herbert Palmer had already finished their studies
at the university and were preparing for the practical side of their profession under
the spiritual supervision of notable Puritans. Although Blackerby also gave his
students some lessons in Hebrew, the main emphasis of the meetings in his house
was put on his ‘excellent advice’ in matters of ‘doctrine and life’.

In such household seminars the Netherlandish students became acquainted with and were
trained in the devotional style of Puritan Pietism and its emphasis on holiness in
private and church life.
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While hardly any of the notable proponents of the Dutch Further Reformation had exile backgrounds themselves, the channels through which they were exposed to English Puritanism often went along the Netherlandish diasporic networks between Britain and the Netherlands. Many of the students in Puritan households mentioned above went back to the Dutch Republic and became ministers there. Puritan ideas also entered the Netherlands via translations made by migrants from the Low Countries. Among the notable translators of English Puritan texts was John La Motte from Ypres, father of the merchant and London alderman of the same name whom we met in chapter 4. La Motte the Elder translated twenty-four texts, mostly devotional treatises, into Dutch. Another important translator was Vincent Meusevoet, a refugee from the Flemish town of Eeklo, who translated more than thirty English pietistic tracts into Dutch. In his later life he became a minister in the North Holland village of Schagen. Later translators of Puritan writings included Timotheus van Vletteren, minister of the Dutch Church in London, Mattheus du Bois, who was born in Norwich in 1620 but went to Haarlem with his parents, the Johan Sanderus, to whom I already referred, and the famous brothers Teellinck.486

The fruits of the Puritan influence on the Netherlandish Reformed community in England became increasingly manifest in the church life of the stranger congregations, for instance in the sermons that were preached. As a preparation for homilies the ministers at the Austin Friars congregation made lists of *loci communes* on which they could preach. Besides theological works and biblical commentaries by church fathers, medieval theologians and Reformers like Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Luther, Calvin and Bucer, the references of the commonplaces included Puritan writings like the works of William Perkins, Thomas Hooker, John Jackson or Obadiah Sedgwick. In particular, Sedgwick’s *The shepherd of Israel* was frequently mentioned.487 In 1606 Symeon Ruytinck established a library for the London congregation which the ministers could use to study and prepare their sermons.488 While it is unknown when certain books were purchased, by the end of the seventeenth century the inventory of English Puritan works was so
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extensive that a new volume of loci communes was begun, containing references only to these volumes. 489

While most early modern sermons were not recorded, these loci communes of the Dutch Reformed Church in London offer us a unique insight into the homiletic culture of the stranger churches and the topics on which ministers could preach to their audiences. The volume with commonplaces taken from English Puritans is particularly full of references to topics like affliction, exile and persecution. Apparently the imagery of the faithful as the wandering strangers in a hostile world, which was shared by both English Puritans and exiles from the Netherlands, was a recurring theme in the services at Austin Friars. Under the entry ‘affliction’ the compiler treated the question of how ‘the sufferings of God’s servants tend to the Churches advantage’: with references to Thomas Hooker he echoed the concept of God’s twofold punishment, which we have already seen in Taffin’s and Balck’s works in chapter 1: ‘Every follower of Christ hath Affliction allotted to him as a child’s part.’ While these afflictions only served to purify and comfort the believers, they caused ‘terror to the wicked whose portion is destruction at last’. 490 Under the entry ‘persecution’ the compiler collected references to Puritan works on God’s purposes behind the persecution of the godly and how the faithful were comforted in times of affliction. Also the extensive entry ‘stranger’ reflected the typical Puritan notions on this topic. Being a stranger was once again presented as the natural state of the Christians in this world: ‘We should call ourselves strangers on earth’. The faithful needed to be reminded that they were only on a long ‘voyage’ to their eternal home. On earth they were homeless pilgrims who ‘desire(d) their true house’. 491

The imagery of pilgrimage and exile was not an exclusive feature of diasporic Calvinism or of English Puritanism, but it was cultivated in a post-Reformation culture that sought religious exclusivity and a distinction between the ‘children of the world and the children of God’. In this situation, memories of exile served as markers of identity that redefined the true believers as a small group on

489 London Metropolitan Archives, CLC/180/MS20185/18. The title of the volume (‘Locus Communis Practicus ex Anglicis Autoribus’) refers only to English authors, but virtually all identifiable authors were well-known Puritans, such as William Perkins, Thomas Hooker, John Jackson or Obadiah Sedgwick.
490 Ibid., fol. 4. For the entry ‘persecution’, see: fol. 58.
491 Ibid., fol. 253.
their way to eternity. The commemorative meetings that were held by individual members such as John La Motte (see chapter 4 of this book) but also the *agape* or festive meals of the consistory that celebrated the brotherly concord and reminded the consistory members of their ancestors ’under the cross’ were manifestations of this mentality.492

Obviously, the striving for exclusivity was part of the religious logic of Post-Reformation piety movements and made the choice for sectarian alternatives to mainstream religion attractive. Yet even if the stranger churches maintained and cultivated their identity as independent minority communities, they had to compete with radicalizing dissenter groups. Particularly after the Civil War some members of the migrant churches felt that their congregations had drifted too much towards a mainstream course. In East Anglia, in particular, such sentiments became an increasing problem, and the Dutch congregations in Colchester and Norwich lost many souls to Separatist Puritan or Congregationalist groups.493 The struggle for exclusivity clearly had its ambiguities: while the consistories of the stranger churches did their best to dissuade their members from joining Separatists or Brownists, they were at the same time on friendly terms with English dissenter congregations in the Dutch Republic. The consistory of Austin Friars for instance had ties with the English Church of Delft, a congregation which never openly subscribed to the Separatist cause but was notorious for its refusal to accept any church government above its own consistory. In the 1640s, when confronted with the choice to submit either to the Dutch Reformed order or the Church of England, the consistory rejected both and somehow managed to evade interference from the Delft magistrate or the South Holland synod. Practically, this made the church a dissenter group, and some consistory members had such strong sympathies for Separatist Puritanism that they would walk out of church services whenever a minister preached against Brownists or other sectarians.494 In the late 1670s and early 1680s the consistories of the English Church in Delft and the Dutch Church in London were in frequent correspondence with each other and exchanged book and tract titles that they considered edifying for their churches. The Delft congregation

492 Grell, *Calvinist Exiles in Tudor and Stuart London*, p. 192. See also: Chapter 4 of this book (pp. 134 ff.)
recommended a number of Dutch Pietist works to the Netherlands in London, especially Johan van Bleijswijck’s *Bijbel-Balance, ende Harmonye-Boeck* (‘Bible balance and harmony book’) and *Schat-boek en Journaal van korte gebeden* (‘Treasury and journal of short prayers’). The works of Van Bleijswijck were concerned with practical devotion and personal holiness and called their readers to flee the ways of the ungodly *mont-christenen*, who confessed God with their mouths but did not live according to His will. This type of literature was particularly popular in both English and Dutch migrant networks. In terms of theology and devotion the two stranger churches had much in common and obviously felt connected through the notion of an international diaspora of true (Reformed) Christians. The bonds between the exile churches on both sides of the North Sea were so strong that sometimes even ministers were exchanged between English and Netherlandish stranger congregations. The last minister of the English Church in Delft before its dissolution in 1724 was Willem van Schie, who had served the Dutch stranger congregation in Norwich earlier and now traded one exile community for another.

*Frankfurt: trans-confessional Pietism and the diasporic networks*

The connections and mutual influences between the Netherlandish Reformed diaspora and English Puritans dated back to the period of emigration from the Low Countries and were strengthened by the notion of sharing the same theological convictions. In the German exile towns, however, the link between the exile networks and new cultures of piety developed in quite different ways. Not only did German pietistic movement flourish considerably later than English Puritanism, but the confessional affiliations of the individuals and groups partaking in it were much more diverse. While descendants of Netherlandish exiles were strongly involved in German Pietist circles, this was predominantly the case in those towns where the Dutch stranger churches were never conceived of as ‘model churches’ as in the English Puritan context. On the contrary, they were often not even recognized as minority churches but had to hold their services outside the city walls, as for
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example in Frankfurt, where both the Reformed and the Lutheran stranger congregations played an important role in local Pietist circles, while only the latter were allowed to worship within the city. Even if the culture of German Pietism was never totally de-confessionalized, both the Lutheran and the Reformed stranger congregation in this town played an active and influential role in devotional circles and networks that transcended denominational borders.

Frankfurt is usually regarded as the stage of the early beginnings of Lutheran Pietism in Germany. While this view is still prevalent among historians of Pietism, the role of this town as a breeding ground for new cultures of devotion has been revisited during the last decades. In the older scholarly literature on this movement, the iconic figure of Philipp Jakob Spener, who came to Frankfurt from Strasburg as senior pastor in 1666 and promoted the formation of spiritual conventicles from the 1670s onwards, is often considered the initiator of Frankfurt Pietism. This interpretation distanced Lutheran Pietism from earlier pietistic movements that could be suspected of heterodoxy and sectarianism. In the 1970s, Spener’s central role was put in greater perspective when Johannes Wallmann and others pointed at predecessors like the lawyer Johann Jakob Schütz, who represented a more radical form of Pietism with stronger separatist tendencies. Long before Spener’s arrival a vivid ‘radical religious subculture’ had emerged in Frankfurt in which members of both the Reformed and the Lutheran congregations were involved. As an important European trading town Frankfurt functioned as a pivot for various nonconformist religious networks. While Spener had tried to distance himself from these earlier pietistic subcultures, they would form the substrate of the Lutheran reform movement he sought to initiate. These subcultures were not confessionally determined but allowed believers of various confessions to participate.

It is striking how many of those who were active in the pre-Pietist circles of Frankfurt were descendants of migrants from the Low Countries. Many of the

500 Shantz, An Introduction to German Pietism, p. 73.
printers and publishers with a migrant background were specialized in publishing English Puritan or Dutch devotional literature. After the death of Levinus van Hulsen, who had fled Ghent to Middelburg and later to Frankfurt, his wife Maria Ruting took over the family publishing house in 1606 and specialized in translations of Puritan works by authors like Robert Abbot, Thomas Draxe, Arthur Dent and especially William Perkins.\textsuperscript{501} Their son, Friedrich van Hulsen, continued the business of his parents until 1641 when he sold it to Christoph Leblon, also a descendant of Reformed migrants. Johann Aubry, active in Hanau, published writings of notable theologians of the Dutch ‘Further Reformation’, such as Gisbert Voetius’ Von Eintzelner Versammlung der Christen (‘On the gathering of individual Christians’), which was translated into German by Johann Jakob Schütz and inspired Lutheran theologians to initiate spiritual conventicles in Frankfurt.\textsuperscript{502}

Another publisher who was active in the pietistic subculture of Frankfurt was Lucas Jennis, son of a goldsmith from Brussels. His profile as a publisher was more radical, and he specialized in spiritualist and alchemistic tracts and books.\textsuperscript{503} His business was also taken over by Leblon, who could now combine two important branches of spiritual literature that were popular in the Frankfurt religious subculture: pietistic and Puritan works and mystical and alchemistic tracts. In addition to the publishing houses of Van Hulsen and Jennis, Leblon also took over the business of his father-in-law Matthäus Merian and became an important supplier of pietistic and mystical literature to Germany and the Netherlands, and often operated in alliance with the Amsterdam merchant Hendrik Beets. Along with Lutheran pietistic authors like Johann Arndt, Puritans like William Perkins and late medieval mystics, they also published Rosicrucian works.\textsuperscript{504} In 1664 Leblon was accused of having published a German translation of the Remonstrant edition of the Greek New Testament by the antitrinitarian Jeremias Felbinger, and the consistory of the Amsterdam Reformed Church sent a complaint to the Frankfurt magistrate. Unlike its Amsterdam sister congregation, the Reformed community in Frankfurt

\textsuperscript{504} Deppermann, Johann Jakob Schütz, p. 26.
seems have been a breeding ground for new radical ideas, and in 1639 the assembly of Lutheran pastors reported that among the Reformed they were many ‘Schwarmer’ who had formed secret conventicles.\textsuperscript{505}

Many of the books published by Leblon employed the imagery of exile and exodus in a strongly allegorized and spiritualized form, for example Johann Arndt’s sermons on the ten Egyptian plagues that were signs to the believers to leave Egypt for the Promised Land, or the anonymous \textit{Geistliche Schöpfung und Reise des wahren Israels aus Egypten} (‘Spiritual creation und the journey of the true Israel out of Egypt’).\textsuperscript{506} In the preface to this work Leblon asserted that it was based on a Dutch manuscript of unknown authorship and origin, which he had inherited from his dead brother. While some passages show similarities to the works of Coornhert, especially the chapter on Abraham’s exodus from Ur, there is no evidence for the existence of such a manuscript or another printed edition of the text, and it is therefore not impossible that Leblon himself wrote or rewrote large passages of the text.\textsuperscript{507} The \textit{Geistliche Schöpfung und Reise des wahren Israels aus Egypten} narrates biblical history as an allegory for the internal spiritual development of the Christian. From the history of the creation and the fall of mankind to the life of the patriarchs, the exile motif is strongly pronounced throughout the entire book, and the life of a Christian is presented as a pilgrimage ‘of the True Israel out of Egypt’. From Abraham, who had to leave his hometown Ur, to Moses, Aaron and Joshua, who had to lead Israel through the desert towards the Promised Land, the heroes of the Old Testament had to be understood as spiritual role models who exemplified obedience to God and who wanted to gather the true believers. The \textit{Geistliche Schöpfung} sharply distinguishes between Egypt and the True Israel, which signify two antagonistic spiritual principles, the bondage to the world and the orientation towards godly things respectively:

While the land of Egypt signifies this world, it is very common that man begins to love this earthly time beyond any measure, when he lives in joy

\textsuperscript{505} Ibid., pp. 20, 28.
\textsuperscript{506} Johannes Arndt, \textit{Zehen schöne lehr- und geistreiche Predigten von de n zehen grausammen und schrecklichen egipischen Plagen}, Frankfurt 1657; \textit{Geistliche Schöpfung und Reise des wahren Israels aus Egypten}, Frankfurt 1664.
\textsuperscript{507} See Ibid., pp. 17-18 (chapter 7, ‘Von Abrahams Außganck, nach dem geistlichen gelobten Land, und seiner Berufung’) and Coornhert, \textit{Abrahams Uytgangh}. 196
and happiness to which he is so attached that he does not desire eternity and so dazzled that he longs for nothing but temporal goods in Egypt all of his days [...].

In order to spur on the Christian to leave Egypt and move on to the Promised Land God often has to use afflictions to convince believers of the vanity of all worldly things. Even the elect often remain obstinate and need to be brought to redemption:

Man is not earlier released from this world, if he is not aggrieved before. Yea, before he is released from the Egypt of this world, he must carry away the great penances and the filth, for he must learn to withstand all evil and wicked deeds, that are opposed to nature and in which man is tried, before he can leave the Egypt of this world.

Such theological interpretations of the exodus narrative aimed to guide and reflect the spiritual development of individual believers. In addition to this allegorical individual application the idea of a separation of the ‘true Israel’ from unholy Egypt could at the same time be read in an ecclesiological sense. Moving out of Egypt could also mean leaving the institutional church to search for more purity or spiritual enlightenment. Spiritual conventicles outside the church that aspired to be a gathering of the ‘True Israel’ that had to leave ‘Babylon’ played an essential part in the culture of Pietism that would emerge from the 1670s onwards in Frankfurt. Spener himself, as an important initiator of the so-called *collegiae pietatis*, did not envisage these conventicles as entities separate from the Church but rather as gatherings of the *ecclesiola in ecclesia* or the small (true) Church within the larger (institutional) Church. However, separatist tendencies would become a strong undertow in the culture of the Pietist conventicles and informal spiritual circles.

Among the members of the stranger churches in Frankfurt and Hanau who were involved in the earlier pietistic circles, such as Christoph Leblon, Lucas Jennis

---

508 ‘Dieweil durch das Land Egypten diese Welt verstanden wird, so geschichts nur allzuviel, daß dem Menschen diese Zeit über alle massen lieb und angenehm wird, dieweil er in Freud und Wollust lebet, und ist demselben so sehr geneigt, daß er nach der Ewigkeit kein Verlangen trägt, und wird also sehr verblendet, daß er nichts anders dann alle Tage zeitliche Sachen in Egypten begehret [...]’ (*Geistliche Schöpfung*, p. 14.)

509 ‘Der Mensch kommt auch nicht eher auß dieser Welt, er werde dann zuvor also eher getrucket, ja ehe er auß dem Egypten dieser Welt kommt, so muß er die grossen Bußen und den Unflath wegragen, dann alle schlechte schnöde Wercke, die der Natur zuwider sind, in welchen der Mensch probieret wird, muß er lernen ausdauren, eher auß dem Egypten dieser Welt heraus kommet.’ (Ibid.)

or the Van Hulsen, Neefen and Merian families, openly separatist tendencies were rare before the 1670s when the culture of Pietism began to take root in Frankfurt. The Reformed Church, which still consisted predominantly of descendants of migrants from the Low Countries, increasingly became a center of Pietist ideas and in 1663 tried to employ Theodor Undereyck, the ‘founding father’ of German Reformed Pietism who had studied under Gisbert Voetius and was eager to introduce the theological program of the Dutch Further Reformation in Germany. In the following years, the consistory of the congregation was dominated by a number of merchants who had clear Pietist sympathies, such as Jacob van de Walle, Daniel Behaghel, Abraham Herff, Frans Balde, Simon Leblon or Peter de Neufville. In the 1670s, some of those influential consistory members developed increasingly radical inclinations and established contacts with mystics like Pierre Poiret and Antoinette Bourignon and separatists like Jean Labadie and the Frankfurt lawyer Johann Jakob Schütz. Daniel Behaghel and Jacob van de Walle even joined the circle of the so-called Saalhof Pietists, named after the medieval building where they held their gatherings. While the Saalhof group did not initially have an explicitly separatist outlook but was rather set up as a conventicle alongside the regular Lutheran and Reformed church services, many participants, like the aforementioned Schütz, felt that they could no longer be part of the institutional church but had to ‘flee Babel’ to join the community of the ‘true believers’. They also took communion in the Saalhof and even refused to receive it elsewhere.

While Schütz, who had been a Lutheran, cut all ties to the institutional church and began to see the Saalhof as his new spiritual home, the Reformed members of the conventicle did not feel the need to do so. Because of the position of the Reformed congregation as a minority church that was not even officially recognized and had to be located outside the town walls, they already were separated from Frankfurt’s mainstream Lutheranism against which Schütz rebelled.

---

511 Undereyck, however, refused the call to Frankfurt and went to Mülheim. (Deppermann, Johann Jakob Schütz, p. 29.)
512 Ibid., p. 154, 152. Jacob van de Walle, in particular, had many contacts in spiritual circles abroad. According to Deppermann, he was the only Frankfurter who personally knew Bourignon.
514 Shantz, An Introduction to German Pietism, p. 83.
Schütz increasingly saw himself as a religious outcast and sometimes suggested that he expected to be exiled and even was prepared to be martyred for his beliefs, the members of the Reformed Church were already dissidents in Frankfurt, and they did not feel the need to distance themselves from the ‘Babylonian’ state church as fiercely as Schütz did. The same tendencies can also be found among the Pietist members of the Netherlandish Lutheran church. Katharina Elisabeth Bartels, Johann Jakob Schütz’s wife, for example, who descended from Antwerp refugees and belonged to the Netherlandish congregation of the Augsburg Confession, distanced herself much later from the institutional Lutheran Church than her husband did. This was certainly not due to her more conciliatory character – on the contrary, she was characterized by visiting Lutheran ministers as ‘far more stubborn’ than her husband. While Johann Jakob Schütz refused to take communion in the Lutheran Church as early as 1676, there is no evidence that his wife had any conflicts with her congregation until the 1690s, after the death of her husband. In 1700, Katharina Elisabeth Bartels finally decided to distance herself from the Lutheran Church and did not allow her daughters to be catechized by a Lutheran minister. Apparently, for a long time her Netherlandish congregation was still more appealing to her than the Lutheran Church had been to her husband, and despite her separatist sympathies she did not leave it until the late 1690s.

In Schütz’s writings, in which he argued that true Christians had to leave the institutional churches, he presented the present state of the godly as one of dispersion. Between the various organized churches the followers of Christ lived in a virtual diaspora and needed to be gathered in conventicles, where they were free from the yoke of church authorities. Conversely, this language of exile that was part of Pietist discourse gave the minority churches of Frankfurt, who had a past of exile and persecution, a special appeal. Many of their leading members were engaged in Pietist circles but did not leave their stranger churches. Although Pietist separatism prospered in the surroundings of the diasporic networks, it had a different effect on the minority congregations than on established Lutheranism: instead of

515 On Schütz’s references to exile and martyrdom, see: Deppermann, *Johann Jakob Schütz*, pp. 185f.
517 Taege-Bizer, ‘Katharina Elisabeth Schütz, eine streitbare Pietistin’, p. 183.
competing with alternative cultures of devotion and piety, the stranger churches attracted members with Pietist inclinations. While Lutheranism had to compete with the separatists, the Frankfurt Reformed Church became itself a hotbed for radical Pietist ideas: in 1689, the congregation went so far as to elect the notorious Heinrich Horche as its minister. Horche, who also became professor at the Reformed Academy of Herborn in 1690, was a Pietist with strong millenarian inclinations. In his later life he claimed to have visions and was even incarcerated after suffering long periods of mental illness. In 1698, the Frankfurt congregation saw itself forced to dismiss Horche. However, he had had a long-lasting impact on the congregation’s life through introducing the catechizations and *exercitiae pietatis* that would remain a tradition among Frankfurt’s Reformed.  

*Building the New Jerusalem – Frankfurt and the ‘Holy Experiment’*

The language of exile and the ‘theology of homelessness’ cultivated in Frankfurt’s Pietist circles had spiritual as well as concrete practical implications. Johann Jakob Schütz’s daughter Maria Katharina left all her possessions to the ‘persecuted children of God’, by which she referred to fellow Pietists who considered themselves as persecuted outcasts of society. The self-perception of her father as a stranger and outsider in his hometown resulted in a reinforcement of translocal relations to other Pietists outside Frankfurt. Through the network of Jacob van de Walle, with whom he attended the conventicle meetings at the Saalhof, he established contacts with many Reformed Pietists, Labadists and also Quakers in Northern Germany and the Dutch Republic. Among his contacts were Reformed minister Cornelis de Hase in Bremen, John Dury in Kassel, Antoine Greslot in the Palatine, Pierre Poiret in Hamburg, Rainer Copper in Wieuwerd (Frisia) and Benjamin Furley in Rotterdam. All those men belonged to dissident diasporic networks: De Hase was a descendant of Netherlandish exiles, Greslot and Poiret were Huguenots, Rainer Copper had left Germany for a Labadist community in Frisia, Furley was a British Quaker in Holland and John Dury a Scottish Calvinist

---

519 Ibid., pp. 156f.
521 Ibid., p. 152
with millenarian leanings. Even though Schütz did not leave his hometown, he
operated in a social environment where geographical mobility was the norm rather
than the exception, and migration was part of one’s religious identity.

Schütz’s many contacts in the various diasporic networks in and outside
Frankfurt included Anna Maria van Schurman, the famous ‘learned maiden of
Utrecht’, who had studied under Gisbert Voetius but then become a follower of the
notorious separatist Pietist Jean de Labadie. Van Schurman, who was born in
Cologne to exiled Calvinists from Antwerp in 1610, grew up in Utrecht but later
followed Labadie on his peregrinations through Northern Germany where he and his
followers sought to establish a godly community in the countryside. Having grown
up in a diasporic milieu, Van Schurman depicted her departure from Amsterdam
with Labadie in terms of the biblical narratives of exile and exodus. In Van
Schurman’s perception, the small group around Labadie represented the few True
Christians who lived in dispersion among the ungodly:

But God has taught us through the outcome of the things themselves, that
there, as in a desert, he had intended to use the service of his most faithful
servants in order to gather and found a church of Noah out of few faithful
members.

As in the days of the deluge, when the only righteous people were Noah and his
family, the Labadists had to dwell among hostile sinners, but as Israel had been led
out of Egypt, God had prepared a place for them in the desert where they rightly
worship Him. On their trek through Germany they were welcomed at the Herford
court of Elisabeth of the Palatine, the daughter of Frederick V, the Winter King,
where they were allowed to lodge on a country estate:

We were taught through this experience that God had elected Himself this
place to separate our church from all those in Amsterdam who put together
God and the world, Christ and Belial, God and Mammon and all other things that are different from God, and who were able to mingle godly things with greed, vanity and other things that are poison to the spiritual life. In this place, however, there was no absolutely commercial profit, worldly honor or luxury that one could expect for himself or his descendants. 524

The realization of such a godly community where the true believers lived separated from the ‘sinful world’ was ultimately not accomplished in Herford but in the Frisian village of Wieuwerd where Labadie and his followers settled and were joined by sympathizers from Germany like the aforementioned Rainer Copper. In this place, unaffected by the temptations of earthly gains, Van Schurman and the Labadists hoped to establish an environment where true Christian life was possible. As exiles from a sinful society they worshipped their God in the desert, remote from the world that used his name in vain and tried to combine the love of Christ with the love of Mammon.

An even more ambitious project to build a godly community was envisaged by others in Schütz’s Pietist network: in 1677 William Penn, who also corresponded with Elisabeth of the Palatine, visited Frankfurt and became acquainted with Schütz and the Saalhof Pietists. The contacts between Schütz, Jacob van de Walle, Daniel Behaghel and Penn were immediately warm. As Penn noted in his journal:

The persons who resorted thither were generally people of considerable note, both of Calvinists and Lutherans; and we can say, they received us with gladness of heart, and embraced our testimony with a broken and reverent spirit, thanking God for our coming amongst them, and praying that He would prosper his work in our hands. 525

With the Quaker Penn, the Frankfurters shared their vision that the true believers should leave the European ‘Babylon’ and seek a place where they could live and worship without interference from the sinful society where they now lived. Penn’s

524 ‘Wy waren nu door de ondervindinge geleerd, dat God hem deze plaatze verkoren had, om onze Kerck van al die gene af te zonderen, die God en de werelt, Christus en Belial, of God en den Mammon, en alle andere dingen die van God verscheiden zijn, tot Amsterdam hadden konnen t’zamenvoegen, en van die in staat waren om de gierigheid, de hovaardije, en ander vergift van het geestelijke leven, onder de Goddelijke dingen te vermengen; nadien men in die plaats geheel geen gewin uit koopmanschap, en geheel geen eere en gemak, of voor zig of zijn nakomelingen te verwachten had.’ (Ibid., p. 303.)

plan was to buy land in North America and to build a community of marginalized Christians from Europe. The ideas of his ‘Holy Experiment’ were received with enthusiasm by his new Frankfurt friends. To support Penn’s vision, Schütz, Behaghel, Van de Walle and Caspar Merian established the ‘Frankfurt Company’ to buy land in what would later be called Pennsylvania. Through their translocal network they could attract more investors, such as the Dutch merchants Johan Laurens and Abraham Hasenvoet, Thomas von Wylich and Johann Le Brun from Wesel and Gerhard van Maastricht from Cologne. The agent they sent to America was Francis Daniel Pastorius, who in letters to his family revealed explicit chiliast ideas. As Pastorius feared, God would very soon punish Europe for its sins, and emigration to the New World was the only way to evade His wrath. While not all participants in the ‘Holy Experiment’ might have shared Pastorius’ apocalyptic fears, the idea of fleeing Babylon and building a ‘New Jerusalem’ abroad attracted the Pietist believers around Schütz.

The numerous descendants of Netherlandish migrants thus preserved the translocal outlook of their ancestors. Without their networks and contacts a project like the Frankfurt Company would not have been possible. Even if persecution and exile belonged to the remote past, these descendants preserved a diasporic mentality and were often more willing to migrate than individuals without a migration background. It was not only the founders and investors of the Frankfurt Company who had a diaspora background but most of the first actual migrants to Pennsylvania as well. The first settlers who followed the Frankfurt Company to Germantown, the famous ‘Original Thirteen’, were all Germans from Krefeld who had descended from Mennonite and Reformed exiles from the Netherlands: Abraham, Dirck and Herman op den Graeff, Wilhelm Strepers, Lenerd Arets, Reynier Tison (Thyssen), Jan Lensen, Jan Seimens, Abraham Tunes Klinken, Peter Keurlis, Johann Luycken, Teunis Coenen and Johannes Bleickers. The Dutch-German Pietist networks in

---


528 Ibid., p. 332.

529 John Palmer Garber, Naaman Henry Keyser e.a., History of Old Germantown. With a Description of Its Settlement and Some Account of Its Important Persons, Buildings and Places Connected with Its
Pennsylvania remained important for the preservation of memories of persecution in the Low Countries. When in 1748 the first complete German translation of Tieleman van Braght’s Mennonite martyrology was published, the work did not appear in Germany or Switzerland, but in Ephrata, Pennsylvania.\footnote{Development, vol. 1 Philadelphia 1907, pp. 29, 91; Friedrich Nieper, Die ersten deutschen Auswanderer von Krefeld nach Pennsylvanien. Ein Bild aus der religiösen Ideengeschichte des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts, Moers 1940, pp. 16f., 90.}

*‘The trying fires of persecution’*

The eschatological interpretation of the present as a conflict between Israel and Babylon was often directly linked to the commemoration of the persecutions of the sixteenth century. In foreword of his history of the Netherlandish Lutheran congregation of Frankfurt, Johannes Lehnemann makes clear that the commemoration of the past served a didactic purpose: to show the present believers the true nature of Babylon, which was as dangerous nowadays as in the days of the martyrs. After the account of the death of his ancestor Schobland Bartels, who had been burned at the stake in Antwerp in 1568, he switches to the present. While the situation of the believers seemed to be secure now, Satan was still raging against them, and the only force keeping persecution at bay was the hand of God.\footnote{Tieleman Jansz. van Braght, Der blutige Schau-Platz oder Martyren Spiegel der Tauffs Gesinnten oder Wehrlosen-Christer, Ephrata 1748. The agents behind this translation were Johann Conrad Beissel and Johann Peter Müller (John Peter Miller).} This eschatological reality needed to be kept in mind, and it was therefore necessary that the fate of the ancestors be commemorated. During the annual commemoration service, during which the new elders and deacons were elected, the congregation was reminded of the fact that the battle between Christ and the Antichrist was not yet over, and that the believers had to run to their savior to flee future persecution:

The honorable minister Starck, whom our Netherlandish congregation considers its spiritual father, has reminded us of this in his annual sermon. We have to follow his faithful exhortations to arm ourselves with the mentality that was displayed by our devout ancestors in their trials of faith. None of us shall ever regret this Christian resolution, and having written this tract on their (the congregation’s) demand has been a special pleasure to me.\footnote{Lehnemann, *Historische Nachricht*, ‘Zuschrift’ (unpaginated foreword).}
In order to understand more of their ancestors’ fate the members of the Netherlandish Lutheran Church should read more about their past and also study the original sources, which Lehnemann thought essential for their understanding of their past as well as their religious identity in the present.\(^{533}\)

While there is no evidence that Lehnemann was involved in any of the Frankfurt conventicles, his Pietist sympathies were obvious, and in crucial passages of his *Historische Nachricht* he repeatedly quotes Spener as an authority.\(^{534}\) In addition to Lehnemann himself the entire congregation was influenced by Pietist culture, probably through its ‘spiritual father’, minister Johann Friedrich Starck, who often preached in the Netherlandish church. Starck, who was a fervent Pietist, nevertheless remained strongly opposed to the separatism of radical Pietist circles.\(^{535}\) In his writings he defended the Lutheran Church and called on the separatists to return. While he admitted that the Church was full of sinners and needed further purification and correction, he regarded separation and the need for exclusivity a sin against Christ’s commandment of brotherly love. The Netherlandish congregation of the Augsburg Confession, which was in full alliance with the Lutheran Church of Frankfurt, represented a model that attracted him. In the Pietist culture that prized exclusivity the congregation’s past of exile and persecution proved a trump. Though in full accordance with Lutheran orthodoxy and free of separatist tendencies, its exile background gave the congregation a special status within the religious landscape of Frankfurt. Its roots lay in a time when confessing the faith was still dangerous and demanded sacrifices. Unlike many of their German coreligionists, the exiles had not become Lutherans for opportunistic reasons but by choice and in the face of severe threat. These exiled ancestors could serve as examples of piety, and in an elaborate discourse Lehnemann argues that even those who had not become actual martyrs but had fled their homes for the sake of faith deserved the martyr-like

\[^{533}\] Ib\id., p. 121.

\[^{534}\] Ib\id., pp. 27, 38, 134 and in the unpaginated foreword.

\[^{535}\] See e.g.: Johann Friedrich Starck, *Ungriind der Absonderung der so genannten Separatisten, von der öffentlichen Kirchen-Versammlung und vom Heil. Abendmahl*, Frankfurt 1733.
status of *confessors* and needed to be commemorated and honored as well.\(^{536}\) In the eyes of Lehnemann and Starck, it was their exile experience that had made the refugees from the Low Countries so pious, and they served the native population as an example of godliness. According to Sturck, the pursuit of godliness meant an imitation of ‘the mentality that has been displayed by our devout ancestors in their trials of faith.’\(^{537}\) Lehnemann even compares the forefathers to the first church in Jerusalem:

> These laudable and Christian deeds made the Netherlanders so loved by the inhabitants of this town, that one could say of them what St Luke said of the first Christian congregation in Jerusalem: ‘They had favor with all the people. And the Lord added to them day by day /Acts V, 47/.’\(^{538}\)

Having suffered exile had humbled and cleansed them of all earthly vanities. Instead of priding themselves on their social status, the exiles valued religious steadfastness more than wealth or noble ancestry:

> Many among them descended from old and respectable families in the Netherlands, whose coats of arms are nowadays still carried in Flanders and Brabant, and they would have had reason enough to boast about their descent according to the worldly manners of the flesh and look down upon people of lower descent. However, none of all that could be found among them, because they had been cleansed in the trying fire of persecution from the cinder of vain pride and honored those as members of their community and brotherhood who were allowed by Christ to suffer in His name. Therefore they did not only grant alms to their poor and persecuted fellow countrymen, but made them full members of their congregation with the same vote in election of elders and deacons as the church members of respectable ancestry.\(^{539}\)

\(^{536}\) Lehnemann, *Historische Nachricht*, ‘Zuschrift’ (unpaginated foreword).

\(^{537}\) Ibid., ‘Zuschrift’ (unpaginated foreword).

\(^{538}\) ‘Nun diese löbliche und Christliche Anstalten machten die Niederländer sehr beliebt bey den Einwohnern der hiesigen Stadt, also daß man in gewisser Maß von ihnen sagen konnte was Lucas von der ersten Christlichen Gemeinde in Jerusalem schrieb: Sie hatten Gnade bey dem ganzen Volck. Der Herr aber tat hinzu täglich zu der Gemeinde / Act. V, 47/.’ (Ibid., ‘Zuschrift’ [unpaginated foreword], p. 121). The quote from Acts does in fact refer to chapter 5, but to chapter 2 (verse 47).

\(^{539}\) ‘Denn obgleich unterschiedene von ihnen aus alten und guten Familien in den Niederlanden entsprossen waren, wie man noch heutzutag ihre Wappen in Antorff, und sonsthin hin und wider in Flandern und Brabant antrifft, daß sie also wohl nach der Welt-Manier Fleisches sich hätten rühmen und über arme und geringer Condition Leute sich erheben mögen: allein man findet dergleichen nicht, diweil sie indem Prüfungs-Feuer der Verfolgung von den Schlacken der etlichen Ehre waren gereinigt worden, und hielten die zur Admission ihrer Gemeins- und Brüderschaft vornehm genug zu seyn, welche Christus gewürdigt hatte um seines Namen Willen etwas zu leiden. Darum nahmen sie ihre arme, verfolgte Lands Leute nicht nur allein zu den Almosen an, sondern hielten sie auch vor Glieder der
The ‘trying fires of persecution’ had purified them and made them exemplary Christians. Like the members of the Martens family (chapter 5) in Utrecht’s Pietist milieu, who claimed that their ancestor Carel Martens had been taught to forget his social status in exile, Lehnemann depicts the exile experience as the constitutive element of his forefathers’ Christian humility.

It is interesting that the idea that the experience of exile was a stimulus for exemplary piety seems to have survived until today and has even informed modern scholarly accounts of the nexus between early modern diasporas and the culture of Pietism. According to the Reformed church historian Willem op’t Hof, who attempts to explain why so many refugees from the Netherlands participated in the culture of Pietism, their pietistic tendencies needed to be understood in the light of their exile experience:

Religious refugees were by definition highly serious people in their religious conviction. By their escape they not only cut the tie with their past but also forfeited all their securities, while many of them suffered a financial drain as well. They were willing to sacrifice all that for their religion. This religious seriousness was intensified by the traumatic experiences of the hardships suffered during and after the escape, the general feeling of dislocation and the many insecurities in the new situation.540

This explanation might not be inaccurate for the first generation of migrants although many refugees in the mercantile business did not only sacrifice but also gained much by their choice to leave their home. However, this argument does not take into account the fact that pietistic tendencies were much stronger among the second and third generations of migrants. These descendants of Netherlandish exiles did not share the experience of hardship and persecution but often grew up in great wealth. As the cases in this chapter show, the Pietist inclinations of many diaspora members of later generations can better be explained by the appreciation of their minority status in the context of pietistic cultures. As exiled communities of faithful Christians they became role models for dissenters and separatists. Ancestors who had fled and suffered for their faith could improve their status. At the same time they

were often brought up in a social milieu where high geographical mobility was the norm, and they could serve as brokers in translocal Pietist networks. In emigration projects like Penn’s ‘Holy Experiment’ in America or the Labadist establishment of a godly community in Frisia descendants of refugees often took the lead. Even after two and more generations they preserved the broader geographical outlook of their ancestors and were often willing to migrate again.

The culture of the early modern religious diaspora has commonly been described in terms of confessional allegiances, and it is true that until the first half of the seventeenth century confessionalism played an important role in keeping the translocal diaspora ties close. In the religious culture of Puritan and Pietist Separatism, however, confessionalism became less important. Pietist believers of all confessions participated in the same networks, and William Penn’s emigration projects attracted not only Quakers but also Pietists of Lutheran, Reformed and Mennonite signature. Penn’s Quakers as well as the Frankfurt Separatists around Schütz and the followers of Labadie felt that the various confessions created ungodly obstacles between the true believers. These boundaries needed to be overcome if the faithful were to be united at last. As Anna Maria van Schurman saw it, only those who were spiritually blind thought in terms of ‘popish, Lutheran and Reformed’ while the Labadist community she belonged to was in fact a ‘gathering’ of true believers. This aggregation of the true Christians relied on their separation from the sinful world in which they lived as strangers and wanderers. While such exile metaphors played a decisive role in the formation of Pietist groups, their identification with a wider diaspora also had practical implications, and they formed transnational networks that connected them with believers abroad with whom they felt they had more in common than with their ungodly neighbors.

---

541 See e.g.: Grell, Brethren in Christ; Grell, ‘The Creation of a Transnational, Calvinist network’.
542 Van Schurman, Eucleria, p. 301.
Conclusion – Permeable memories

In 1755, the Protestant churches of Frankfurt celebrated the two-hundredth anniversary of the Peace of Augsburg with a commemorative service. In addition to Johann Friedrich Starck, who was celebrated as the ‘spiritual father’ of the Netherlandish congregation of the Augsburg Confession, as well as other Lutheran clergymen the minister of the Reformed Church of Frankfurt, Dietrich Pörtner, also preached a sermon about the history of Protestantism in Frankfurt and the Empire.\(^{543}\) Although the Reformed migrants and their descendants had been excluded from citizenship and were forced to hold their church services outside the town’s borders for a long time, Pörtner did not directly mention the often problematic history of Lutheran-Reformed relations in Frankfurt. In Pörtner’s account of the past there had only been one Protestant Church, and, like many Reformed Germans, he implicitly claimed that his confessional current had been included in the Peace of Augsburg, even though the agreement was in fact limited to those who subscribed to the Augsburg Confession.\(^{544}\) After the great achievement of Augsburg, Pörtner lamented, the unity of Protestants had oftentimes been disturbed by harsh theological discussions between people of the same faith, who attacked each other as if they had forgotten Christ’s commandment of brotherly love.\(^{545}\) While he did not conceal the tensions between Lutherans and Calvinists, Pörtner put them in a different context. The antagonisms within the Protestant confessions did not constitute enmity between adherents of different faiths but in fact between coreligionists since all Protestants shared the same religious heritage. Their quarrels did not have their origins in the Reformation itself but were of later date and did not concern fundamental matters of faith. In Pörtner’s account the period of the Peace of Augsburg is depicted as a time when Protestants were still united by the same cause.


\(^{544}\) This interpretation was also defended by many earlier Reformed Germans, such as the Elector Palatine Fredrick III, who asserted that he and other Reformed nobles in the Empire were in full agreement with the Augsburg Confession (in its *Variata* version) and that the Heidelberg Catechism was in accordance with its doctrines. See: Matthias Pohl, ‘Wahrheit als Lüge – oder: Schloss der Augsburger Religionsfrieden den Calvinismus aus?’, in: Andreas Pietsch and Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger, *Konfessionelle Ambiguität. Uneindeutigkeit und Verstellung als religiöse Praxis in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Heidelberg 2013, pp. 142-169.

\(^{545}\) Dechent, *Kirchengeschichte von Frankfurt am Main*, vol. 2, p. 186.
The celebration of the Peace of Augsburg’s anniversary and the participation of Reformed and Lutheran clergymen who belonged to or were at least dedicated to one of the stranger churches illustrate the flexible uses of the past in the context of early modern religious diversity. The two Reformed stranger congregations of Frankfurt always found themselves in a considerably less friendly environment than most Netherlandish stranger churches in England or Germany. Yet the descendants of the migrants did not retreat into their own ‘memory ghetto’ but were able to fuse their own past with the memory canons of their neighbors. This does not mean that contested and painful events were easily forgotten: the two chronicles of the Reformed congregation of Frankfurt contain long passages on Lutheran hostilities against Reformed refugees, and Utenhove’s account of the odyssey of his coreligionists who were chased away from Lutheran towns along the North Sea coast in 1553/54 is extensively quoted and paraphrased.\textsuperscript{546} Abraham Mangon’s chronicle, which emphasized this episode most strongly and dedicated no fewer than forty-five pages to these events, was written less than three decades before Pörtner’s sermon, probably between 1728 and 1730, and preserved and copied in various manuscripts throughout the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{547} Obviously, the painful past was still present and continued to be retold in the mid-eighteenth century. Within their own congregation the Reformed of Frankfurt spoke in a different tone about the past than in public when they sought to incorporate their past into the historical narratives of the Lutheran majority. Yet both versions of their history were part of their identity, which was disseminated in various ways according to different situations and contexts.

This study demonstrates that while memories of persecution and exile connected diaspora groups all over Europe, they were at the same time incorporated into and fused with the existing memory canons of the migrants’ new host societies. Even in towns like Frankfurt, where the social position of the Reformed strangers

\textsuperscript{546} Institut für Stadtgeschichte Frankfurt am Main, Deutsch-Reformierte Gemeinde, inv.nr. 148: Mangon, Geschichte der beiden Gemeinden, fol. 45-90, and inv.nr. 149, Chronik der beiden Gemeinden.

\textsuperscript{547} Irene Dingel assumes that Mangon’s chronicle was written ‘1712 post quem’, but inv.nr.148 is continued until 1728 (Dingel, Abraham Mangon: Kurze doch wahrhaftige Beschreibung, p. 22). This manuscript, which displays only one handwriting, is not mentioned by Dingel. There is no evidence that the manuscript is a later copy by another writer who continued the chronicle until 1728 when Mangon was still alive. Therefore I assume that the work was completed by Mangon between 1728 and his death in 1734.
had been difficult for a long time, the cultivation of their exile identity did not totally exclude them from religious and social life in Frankfurt. To be sure, the degree to which exile memories and the history canons of the host societies could be fused depended on the local situation and the relations between strangers and natives. Studies on the integration of Southern Netherlandish refugees, especially those in the Dutch Republic often tended to emphasize the antagonisms between newcomers and natives and assumed a subsequent process of integration of the migrants into their host societies, which put an end to the identification with the lost homeland and the diaspora community. From the earliest period of migration from the Low Countries the identification with both the lost homes and the new host towns turns out to have been much more hybrid in nature. The geographical outlook of the exiles can best described as ‘translocal’ – while they were firmly rooted in their host societies, they still maintained links to other refugee towns and remained part of wider diasporic networks. Until the eighteenth century, and sometimes even later, family contacts and networks were maintained while these same descendants of Netherlandish migrants simultaneously participated in the social and political life of their new hometowns.

In order to get a better understanding of these hybrid migrant identities and memories this study has chosen a new approach to early modern diasporic networks. Instead of treating diaspora groups as collectives of individuals to which one either did or did not belong I have focused on the underlying narratives that allowed for the socialization of individuals in the diasporic networks. The notion of belonging to a diaspora relied on the commemoration of the exile past and on a meaningful narrative about the migrants’ position and identity. The Netherlandish diaspora did not shape all aspects of an individual’s life, and it was by no means self-evident who actually belonged to it. People like Daniel Rogers, born to an English father and a Flemish mother, or Johannes Lehnemann, who had only one grandmother who descended from Antwerp refugees, strongly identified with their exiled ancestors. Intermarrying with non-migrants also did not need to put an end to the identification with the diaspora and could even strengthen one’s consciousness of descending from migrants who had left homes for the sake of faith as we have seen in the case of the

548 See e.g.: Briels, Zuidnederlanders in de Republiek.
Martens family in Utrecht, who cultivated their exile past for generations while entering the local elites of their new hometown. The narrative of religious persecution legitimized their status as newcomers and their social position in Utrecht’s orthodox-Reformed circles. The same is true for the members of the Council of Brabant, like the Du Tour family whose members married into Northern regent families but at the same time cherished their old Brabant networks.

The notion of belonging to the Southern Netherlandish diaspora was not a self-evident necessity, and many migrants of the first generation cut the ties with their old networks. No fewer than one third of the first generation of Protestant Netherlandish migrants in London joined English parish churches instead of the Dutch or French-speaking stranger congregations.\(^{549}\) In the Dutch Republic where the refugees shared the language with the majority of the population and belonged to the privileged confession the identification with one’s Southern heritage was even less self-explanatory. We must not forget that the cases discussed in this book are not representative of the entire population of Southern Netherlandish refugees and that many migrants had few or no ties with the exile networks that connected them with their past. At the same time the stranger churches often attracted people without a migration background but who shared the same faith and identified with the narrative of the persecuted Christians. Such was for example the case in Frankfurt where the originally Dutch-speaking Reformed congregation traded its language for German at an early stage and soon included many German members, who intermarried with the refugees and their descendants.\(^{550}\) In London where the Reformed stranger churches attracted English Puritans the situation was comparable. Clearly, the diasporic networks were not primarily based on descent but foremost on a shared religious narrative about a past of suffering and persecution and the choice to embrace this narrative. The diaspora was not a merely socio-demographical given nor a static community that was continued as a self-evident fact but rather a horizon of belonging structured by narratives that people could choose to adopt or not. In this sense it consisted of memories that were transmitted so as to allow new generations to identify themselves with the handed-down tales of exile and persecution.

\(^{550}\) Dechent, *Kirchengeschichte von Frankfurt am Main*, p. 45.
This ‘narrativization’ of the concept of diaspora does, of course, not imply that social data like marriage patterns and family structures are irrelevant for the study of memory transmission and the continuation of the diaspora. To be sure, family bonds played a crucial role in this process, yet it was up to each new generation to measure the relevance of and to rediscover or reinvent the meaning of their diasporic identity. This continuation was not self-evident, and many descendants of migrants did not continue the networks of their families or participate in their memory cultures. Unexpectedly, individuals with only very few migrants among their ancestors could be very active in the refugee communities while persons of exclusively migrant background often displayed little interest in the past of their families. Collecting data on endogamy can tell us much about processes of assimilation or exclusion of the migrants, yet decisive aspects of the identification with the early modern Netherlandish diaspora remain hidden and the ‘ethnic options’ of the second generation-migrants remain unconsidered.\textsuperscript{551} Not only are the numerous individuals overlooked who saw themselves as part of a (former) refugee community even though their parents and grandparents had already intermarried with locals from their new homes, but the specific meanings of belonging to the diaspora also remain unclear. The examination of narrative constructions of the diaspora shows that the sense of belonging to the transnational exile networks was based on voluntary allegiance rather than on linear descent from and identification with a homogeneous, demographically defined group.

In areas where the confession of many refugees was privileged, as was the case in the case in the Dutch Republic, their exile background could give them a special and prestigious status. But also in exile towns abroad where their confession was tolerated or shared with local minorities, such as English Puritans or German Reformed, the cultivation of their migrant identity could be beneficial to them. Virtually all early modern religious confessions celebrated suffering for the sake of faith as proof of exemplary piety and discourses of exile as a sign of God’s election had already emerged during the first waves of migration from the Low Countries. As chapter 1 has shown, not only Calvinists but also Mennonites, Lutherans and Libertine spiritualists engaged in religious cultures that glorified exile and

\textsuperscript{551} Waters, \textit{Ethnic Options}, pp. 10ff.
homelessness and mirrored them with biblical narratives of exemplary believers like Abraham, Moses or the exiled prophets in the time of the Babylonian captivity. These discourses lived on throughout the seventeenth century and even later. Particularly in the context of English Puritanism and later in the circles of Dutch and German Pietism the identification with persecuted and afflicted believers in past and present became part of new religious discourses and identities. While exile and suffering had originally provided religious migrants with a meaningful narrative that affirmed their status as the new wandering Israel in a hostile wilderness, the growth of Calvinism in the Dutch Republic and the experience of living among a majority of coreligionists in the exile towns abroad undermined the exclusivity of the migrants’ position. Embracing the exile past of the afflicted ancestors was a way to regain an exclusive religious status. Non-migrant believers who felt that their societies were Christianized in name only and populated by a majority of lukewarm sympathizers of their faith were attracted by the strangers churches’ heritage. The dynamics of the identification with a translocal diaspora of staunch believers sometimes even blurred the boundaries between the English and the Dutch stranger churches, which on rare occasions went so far as to exchange their ministers. In Frankfurt the Netherlandish Lutheran congregation was so attractive to local coreligionists that by the mid-seventeenth century a majority of the members were in some way related to Germans, and by the end of the eighteenth century most of the names in the congregation’s member list were of German origin.552

This great degree of inclusivity of the stranger churches was, ironically, the result of a religious narrative of exclusivity: to join the diasporic churches and networks involved becoming part of a translocal community of ‘true’ believers who distinguished themselves from the lukewarm ‘name-Christians’. While in migration studies the tendency to maintain boundaries between migrant communities and local populations has often been stressed as an essential trait of diaspora groups, this study shows that in the case of the early modern Netherlandish diaspora boundary-maintenance primarily had a discursive function. By distinguishing the own networks and groups from the rest of the populace, a boundary was created that, paradoxically, allowed non-migrants to participate in a discourse that revolved

552 Institut für Stadtgeschichte Frankfurt am Main, Niederl. Gemeinde Augs. Confession I, inv.nr. 27.
around religious exclusivism. Thus, boundary-maintenance of diasporas does not have to be grounded in ethno-demographical group identities but rather in the culturally produced narratives of diasporic cultures. In the case of the early modern Netherlandish migrant networks and stranger churches it was precisely this notion of an exclusive boundary or distinction that attracted non-migrants and allowed them to participate in the diaspora’s culture. Whether the Netherlandish diaspora was typical or atypical in this respect remains to be seen in future research.

Historians of early modern religion have often seen the culture of exile as a typically or even exclusively Reformed phenomenon. While Calvinists indeed played the most important role in the cultivation of diasporic identities compared to other migrant groups from the early modern Netherlands, all other groups also developed and engaged in discourses of exile. While the experience of exile has often been linked to the formation and consolidation of confessional allegiances, the case of Libertine spiritualists discussed in chapter 1 shows that the ‘theology of exile’ did not necessarily imply a confessionalized narrative. On the contrary, the notion of the true church as a small flock dispersed between the various antagonistic confessional camps as proclaimed by Coornhert was a typically spiritualist idea, but it relied on the narrative of exile and persecution just as much as and perhaps even more than many characteristics of Calvinist ‘exile theology’ in the late sixteenth century. We should therefore be careful about postulating any inherent relationship between the cultivation of religious exile identities and the emerging cultures of confessionalism. Narratives and memories of exile migration could stimulate confessionalism, but this was not necessarily the case. Already in the first half of the seventeenth century when the Reformed churches in England and the Dutch Republic held collections for exiled coreligionists in the Holy Roman Empire the donations were given not only to Calvinists but sometimes also to Lutherans who had lost their homes during the Thirty Years’ War.553

While such occasions of transconfessional charity were, admittedly, rare in the early seventeenth century, the emerging culture of Pietism led to a cultivation of exile memories with few confessionalist implications. For believers who were attracted to the religious culture of Pietism confessional allegiance was no longer a

553 See e.g.: Hessels, Archivum, vol. 2, p. 1934 (1628).
proof of godliness since they sensed that among those who confessed Christ with words there were also many whose life was not lived in accordance with the gospel. Even if the Pietist movement, except in its most radical separatist currents, never totally undermined the culture of confessionalism, Reformed, Lutheran and other believers often engaged in the same Pietist networks. As the case of Frankfurt shows, the various stranger churches were a catalyst in this process: disappointed Lutherans who lamented the miserable state of the city’s mainstream churches turned towards the stranger congregations and joined Pietist networks in their surroundings. At the same time, the stranger churches functioned as an alternative and a counterpart to the newly emerging separatist conventicles. Instead of breaking with the institutional church in favor of a separatist group its members were able to distinguish themselves from what they saw as lukewarm mainstream religion and identify with an imagined exile community. Being part of an assembly that was grounded in a history of homelessness and affliction gave them the exclusive status that was so attractive to Pietist believers.

The identification with a transnational diaspora of exiles had political as well as religious implications, as I have argued in chapters 2 and 3. In the Dutch Republic where most of the Southern Netherlandish refugees ultimately found their new homes the exile past could be regarded as a proof of the migrants’ loyalty to the cause of the Revolt against the ‘Spanish’ enemy. Not only migrants themselves but also many Hollanders felt that the Southern refugees had made major sacrifices for the common cause that united all true patriots. Gisbert Voetius for example, who attacked his political antagonist Pieter de la Court, son of Flemish refugees, in a polemical pamphlet, at the same time praised the Southern migrants ‘who left their fatherland and everything else and proved themselves as keen supporters of the Reformed religion and the prince’.554 From the mass migration of the 1580s onwards, Southern exiles engaged in discourses of patriotism and fervently propagated the unity of all Netherlandish provinces, which needed to stand strong against the Habsburg oppressors. In doing so, they tried to overcome the old sentiments of provincial particularism and unite all Netherlandish patriots in one cause. This discourse of a united ‘fatherland’ against a foreign power served two

554 Voetius, Den Ver-resenen Barnevelt, fol. B3. See also chapter 3 of this study.
216
ends: firstly, the continuation of the war against the ‘Spaniard’ in order to liberate the lost homeland and secondly, legitimization of the migrants’ position in the new society. The first aim not only turned out to be unattainable, but it also had the quite opposite effect; the appeal to a unity of all provinces contributed to the irreversible separation between the two new Netherlandish states. After 1609, when a Twelve Years’ Truce between the Habsburg Netherlands and the Dutch Republic was signed, most refugees gave up their hopes of ever returning to their former homes in the South. The ‘hot memory’ that had served to encourage a military solution of what they saw as foreign occupation of their homeland died away, and many of the first generation of migrants became silent about the past. They lived in a society they saw as the home of all true patriots, yet they felt that at the same time they were strangers.

It was in later generations that a new ‘cold’ form of memory without a direct call for political action evolved in the Dutch Republic. As chapter 4 has shown, many migrant families consolidated narratives about their history only in later periods when their memories were no longer immediately painful. Once the hope for a return to Flanders and Brabant was abandoned, memories of exile and persecution primarily served to provide a meaningful narrative of the migrants’ past and identity and to define their position in their host society. While strangers could be targets of anti-migrant rhetoric, they countered accusations of religious radicalism or economic opportunism by referring to their loyalty to the ‘common fatherland’ and the cause of the Revolt or the ‘true faith’. Descendants of migrants also readily engaged in discourses about the loyalty to one’s hometown and the implications of being a reliable burgher and citizen. Authors like Simon Stevin or Pieter de la Court countered notions of ancestry and lineage as criteria for in- or exclusion and criticized local claims to special privileges by old-established families or guilds. Simultaneously, they promoted new concepts of citizenship in which voluntary allegiance to a (new) hometown rather than local descent defined who was an acceptable citizen. The same motifs were also deployed in other contexts, such as civic rhetoric festivities or literary texts, in which a voluntary choice to commit oneself to the new local society was regarded as the main criterion of truly belonging to the civic community. In this context, the exile heritage could provide migrants with a convincing narrative: in the past they, or their ancestors, had
suffered for the right cause while in the present they committed themselves to the
towns of their choice and thereby proved to be even more loyal than many who
happened to have been born in their current place of residence but did not behave as
true citizens.

The notion of voluntariness that was promoted by many migrants in the
first half of the seventeenth century should not be overlooked. Despite its ideological
implications at the time, it reveals important aspects of diasporic group formation,
which have long been overlooked in historical and sociological research. While
chapter 5 showed that exile networks were sometimes preserved for centuries,
chapter 6 demonstrated that new religious cultures also allowed people without a
migrant-background to participate in such networks and their memory cultures. We
have seen that the Netherlandish diaspora was not a self-evident demographical
given but rather an imagined discursive entity that depended on the agency of
individuals, families and networks and their will to continue its traditions. Being
born to migrant parents did not automatically imply belonging to the diaspora. The
same is also true for the participation in local affairs of the new host towns of the
migrants. As the present study shows, most migrants did not limit their participation
to a single discourse, either that of the diaspora or the local host society, but engaged
in both. In the case of the migrants in the Dutch Republic these two discourses were
actually inseparable: the notion of belonging to the imagined Southern migrant
community was intrinsically imbedded into the memory cultures and historical
narratives of the rest of the population. Instead of implying the maintenance of clear
boundaries between the diaspora and the host society migrant identity had
immediate consequences for the relationship with the local population and created
obligations towards the new homeland. Nevertheless, the migrants’ incorporation
into local social systems did not lead to an end of the diaspora but allowed for a
continuation of exile identities and memories in new contexts. In the territories
outside the Low Countries where the migrants could not refer to any unifying
‘national’ bond between newcomers and locals the situation was different. However,
also in England or Germany, the diasporic networks did not create separated
‘memory ghettos’ but integrated their perception of the past into local contexts.

Thus, the memory cultures of the Southern Netherlandish diaspora were
permeable towards other narratives and discourses than rather exclusively closed
and static. Besides their permeability towards the memory cultures of their host societies, which allowed for discursive exchanges, the exile memories were also permeable between generations. Each generation had to reinvent and incorporate the historical identity constructions of their parents and grandparents into their own situation in order to continue them. As the examples in chapter 4 show, the meanings that were attached to the ancestors’ past could vary substantially in each new generation. Descendants of refugees could often benefit from their family past by re-telling it according to the expectations of their social environment, for example by proclaiming their ancestors’ religious convictions or the assumed noble Southern Netherlands descent, which could be combined with references to the unity of all provinces of the Low Countries. This refashioning of the past could sometimes help patrician families to enter local regent circles. Migrant memories were thus highly flexible and could be used in multiple ways and were open to reinterpretations in various religious and political contexts.

The memories of the Netherlands migrants travelled with them through Europe and produced diverse and heterogeneous links and acculturations in their various Dutch, German and English host societies. While deploying the same handed-down motifs, the uses of memories of exile and persecution were multiform and were incorporated into various settings. As such, they became part of religious cultures that absorbed the heroic past of suffering and struggle in a hostile environment into their historical narratives and contrasted the comfortable present with memories of hardship and affliction that demanded sacrifices and reminded the contemporaries of the costs of Christian life. Both migrants and non-migrants participated and contributed to these cultures, and instead of implying strict boundaries between strangers and locals, exile memories allowed individuals, often regardless of their ancestral heritage, to engage in discourses of religious heroism. That the rhetoric of these discourses had an intrinsically exclusivist logic did, paradoxically, not inhibit the inclusivity and permeability of an imagined diaspora and attracted individuals with and without a migrant background.
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Nederlandse samenvatting
De Nederlandse Opstand (ca. 1566 - 1648) leidde tot een ongekende migratiegolf en zorgde ervoor dat meer dan 100.000 mensen hun thuis verlieten en zich elders in de Nederlanden of in Duitsland of Engeland vestigden. Dit proefschrift brengt de herinneringscultuur van de Nederlandse migranten en hun nakomelingen in beeld en onderzoekt hoe het oorlogs- en vluchtverleden herdacht en gecultiveerd werd. Zoals dit onderzoek laat zien, bleven deze herinneringen langer bewaard dan tot nu toe gedacht en speelden zij vaak nog een rol toen zelfs de tweede en derde migrantengeneratie al overleden was. Dit gegeven vraagt om een verklaring en het onderhavige proefschrift laat zien waarom het verleden levendig gehouden werd en welke betekenis en functies de herinnering aan voorgaande generaties had.

Het migratieproces zelf is sinds de studies van Jan Briels en anderen grondig bestudeerd en met name de eerste generatie van vluchtelingen is goed in beeld gebracht. Het bestaande beeld van de grootschalige migratie heeft echter nog steeds beslissende beperkingen. Ten eerste heeft met name de Nederlandse historiografie de vluchtelingen voornamelijk onderzocht met betrekking tot hun invloed op de Noord-Nederlandse economie en de cultuur. Daarbij werd vaak impliciet uitgegaan van een eenzijdig transfer van cultureel en economisch kapitaal naar een nieuwe leefomgeving. Ten tweede werd de vluchtelingenpopulatie vaak als een statische en homogene groep opgevat die zich duidelijk van de inheemse bevolking onderscheidde en zo vaak voor onbehagen zorgde. Terwijl er tijdens politieke en religieuze conflictmomenten inderdaad sprake was van een uitgesproken anti-immigrantenretoriek is het beeld van de verhoudingen tussen nieuwkomers en gevestigden in de Nederlandse historiografie eenzijdig bepaald door tijdelijke conflicten zoals de onlusten tijdens het Twaalfjarig Bestand (1609-1621). Het is vooral de verdienste van buitenlandse historici geweest, de interactie tussen migranten en de inheemse populatie in beeld te brengen. Met name Heinz Schilling en Jesse Spohnholz hebben de positie van Nederlandse migranten in Duitsland en Engeland systematisch onderzocht en de soms moeilijke relaties tussen gevestigden en nieuwelingen in hun concrete sociale en politieke contexten geplaatst.

In de internationale historiografie over vroegmoderne migranten valt op dat deze vaak eenzijdig de nadruk legde op religieuze en confessionele aspecten. Theologen en historici als Heiko Oberman en Heinz Schilling meenden zelfs een
gereformeerde ‘Exulantentheologie’ te kunnen herkennen die een duidelijke scheidslijn werd tussen katholieken en Lutheranen aan de ene en Calvinisten aan de andere kanten. Terwijl de eerste twee veel meer op lokale parochiale gemeenschap georiënteerd geweest zouden zijn en als gevolg daarvan vreemdelingen - en vreemdelingschap op zichzelf - met argusogen bekeken zouden hebben, zouden gereformeerden door hun vluchtvaringen in Frankrijk en de Nederlanden Oudtestamentische duidingmodellen voor ballingschap omarmd hebben. Als gevolg daarvan zouden zij veel meer op internationale netwerken gericht geweest zijn en balling- en vreemdelingschap vanuit theologisch perspectief positief beoordeeld hebben (Oberman gaat zelfs zo ver te zeggen dat Calvinisten hierdoor leerden het vroegmoderne christelijke antisemitisme achter zich te laten). Al een eerste verkenning laat zien dat dit beeld eenzijdig is: Zo werd Nederlandse vluchtelingenidentiteit door Lutheranen in Frankfurt even lang en intensief gekoesterd als door gereformeerden in Amsterdam of London.

Daarnaast dringt zich de vraag op in hoeverre vroegmoderne ‘Exulantentheologie’, of theologische duidingen van ballingschap in het algemeen, een confessioneel verschijnsel waren. Hoofdstuk 1 van dit proefschrift onderzoekt daarom hoe religieuze en culturele discoursen over ballingschap tot stand kwamen en hoe zij later de herinnering bepaalden. Daarbij wordt duidelijk dat alle confessies een vergelijkbare manier van spreken over ballingschap ontwikkelden. Opvallender is echter dat juist a-confessionele individuen als Coornhert zich in bijzondere mate als vreemdelingen zagen. Het besef tussen de verschillende godsdienstige kampen te zitten versterkte juist hun gevoel van vreemdheid en de identificatie met thuisloze helden uit het Oude Testament, met name Abraham die uit Chaldea vertrok om op zoek te gaan naar het hem door God beloofde land. Zowel binnen confessioneel gedefinieerde netwerken en groepen als ook daarbuiten kwamen nieuwe discoursen over ballingschap op die de kaders van de toekomstige herinnering zouden bepalen.

In de eerste decennia na de migratie was de herinnering aan het verloren thuisland vooral op de toekomst gericht. Veel migranten zagen hun ballingschap vooral als een tijdelijk afscheid van thuis en verwachtten terug te kunnen komen als het politieke tij zou keren. Met name in het laatste decennium van de zestiende eeuw, toen het Staatsleger grote successen boekte, werd de hoop aangewakkerd dat het verloren Zuiden terugveroverd zou worden en een thuiskomst naar ‘het beloofde
land’ nabij zou zijn. Zoals uit de correspondentie van verschillende koopmansfamilies blijkt werden herinneringen aan Vlaanderen en Brabant bewaard met het oog op een toekomst in het Zuiden. Toen aan de vooravond van het Twaalfjarig Bestand (1609-1621) definitief bleek dat een herovering onmogelijk zou zijn veranderde de herinnering. Exemplarisch hiervoor is de uitspraak van koopman Johan Thijs die in 1601 verklaarde zich nu definitief in Holland te willen vestigen en Antwerpen te willen vergeten. Inderdaad schrijft hij in zijn latere brieven nauwelijks meer over zijn oude thuisstad, terwijl zijn correspondentie van voor 1601 vol is van referenties naar ‘thuis’ en ‘het beloofde land’. Zoals hoofdstuk 2 van dit proefschrift betoogt waren veel Zuid-Nederlandse publicisten zich bewust van dit verband tussen herinnering en toekomstverwachting. Auteurs die de publieke opinie wilden beïnvloeden om een bestand met het Zuiden te voorkomen wilden de herinnering aan het verloren thuis wakker houden om er zo voor te zorgen dat dit gebied van het ‘Spaanse juk’ bevrijd zou worden. Toen dit uitzichtloos bleef kwam daarmee ook een einde aan de ‘hot memory’ die tot directe politieke actie noopte. Pas in de volgende generaties zou een nieuwe vorm van ‘cold memory’ opkomen die met het verlies van het Zuiden verzoend was.

Hoofdstuk 3 belicht de in de literatuur vaak aangehaalde conflicten tussen migranten en de lokale bevolking. Zoals blijkt werden herinneringen aan het opstandsverleden in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden vaak ook tegen migranten gebruikt. De vaak expliciet anti-Calvinistische strekking van veel verwijten tegen Vlaamse en Brabants migranten schetste een beeld waarin de orthodoxe gereformeerden vooral ‘vreemdelingen’ waren die de traditionele samenleving probeerden te ondermijnen. Dergelijke propaganda zegt echter meer over de directe politieke conflictmomenten, zoals bijvoorbeeld de Bestandtwisten, dan over de algemene verhoudingen tussen nieuwkomers en ingezetenen. De uitsluiting van Zuiderlingen uit politieke ambten werd voor een relatief korte tijd consequent gehandhaafd en van een langdurige scheiding tussen migranten en gevestigde poorters kan in de meeste steden geen sprake zijn. Het cliché van Vlaamse radicale Calvinisten en Hollandse gematigden dat in het moderne onderzoek vaak stilzwijgend is overgenomen uit de toenmalige propaganda moet dan ook genuanceerd worden. De reactie van veel zuiderlingen op dergelijke clichés bestond er dan ook in, een nieuwe vorm van identificatie met hun nieuwe thuis te propageren. Terwijl de ‘Hollanders’ er gewoon geboren waren
hadden de migranten bewust gekozen voor de nieuwe stad. Zij waren burgers uit overtuiging en daarmee in bijzondere mate loyaal tegenover de nieuwe samenleving, zo verkondigden Karel van Mander, Pieter van Hulle en anderen. Herinneringen aan het verloren Zuiden werden steeds meer geïntegreerd in de locale herinneringscanons en vluchtelingenidentiteit kon vaak relatief onproblematisch samengaan met nieuwe stedelijke identiteiten.

Ondanks de toenemende oriëntatie van vluchtelingen op hun nieuwe thuissteden, met name in de Nederlandse Republiek, bleven oude netwerken tussen Duitsland, Nederland en Engeland lang bestaan. Met name kooplieden, maar ook kunstenaars, handwerkers en soms zelfs textielarbeiders hielden de contacten van hun ouders in stand en verhuisden en trouwden langs de oude migratieroutes. Voor veel beroepsgroepen had dit directe economische voordelen. Ballingschapsherinneringen konden dus juist ook een heel praktisch nut hebben en het koesteren ervan voor een bredere geografische oriëntatie zorgen, die nieuwe economische mogelijkheden met zich mee bracht. Terwijl veel kooplieden ook al eerder grote translokale netwerken hadden hadden dat voor de andere bovengenoemde beroepsgroepen meestal niet.

De hoofdstukken 4 en 5 brengen in beeld hoe vluchtelingenherinneringen in familiekringen bewaard en vaak juist in de tweede en derde generatie opnieuw heruitgevonden werden. Terwijl de eerste generatie vaak gezwegen had over het verleden zodra de terugkeer onmogelijk bleek deden kinderen en kleinkinderen hun best om hun familiegeschiedenis te reconstrueren. Met name in welgestelde kringen waar migranten ambities hadden om tot de lokale elites door te dringen was hun afkomst heel belangrijk en herschreven zij deze ook vaak om daarmee indruk te maken. Veel families claimden een adelsstamboom, niet zelden met succes. Het is opvallend dat vreemdelingschap in de familieverhalen bijzonder benadrukt werd, terwijl men juist probeerde om in lokale netwerken door te dringen. De keuze van voorouders voor het vreemdelingschap werd vaak met heroïsche verhalen opgesmukt en hun oprechtheid in religieuze en politieke zaken sterk benadrukt. In sommige gevallen is het mogelijk om de verschillende generaties die de familieverhalen opschreven te identificeren. Wat daarbij opvalt is dat dezelfde verhalen door verschillende generaties van een andere duiding werden voorzien en aan de toenmalige behoeften en verwachtingen werden aangepast.
In de loop van de zeventiende eeuw kreeg vreemdelingschap onder invloed van piëtistische en puriteinse discoursen meer waardering. Nieuwe religieuze bewegingen probeerden zich van de grote massa ‘naamchristenen’ te onderscheiden en zochten naar een exclusievering van het christelijke leven. In een maatschappij die volgens de piëtisten alleen aan de oppervlakte gekerstend was juist een deugd en soms zelfs een teken van uitverkiezing. Net als de geloofsvoorbeelden uit het Oude Testament waren de ware gelovigen vreemdelingen in de wereld en op weg naar het beloofde land. Zowel in Engelse als in de Duitse context hebben historici al vaak geconstateerd dat er nauwe banden tussen piëtistische netwerken en de verschillende vluchtelingenkerken bestonden, maar een overtuigende verklaring voor dit feit is de historiografie tot nu toe schuldig gebleven. Volgens W. Op ‘t Hof zorgde de ballingschapservaring van de vluchtelingen voor een geloofsverdieping en openheid voor nieuwe vormen van vroomheid. Hierbij wordt echter vergeten dat de banden tussen piëtisten en vluchtelingen pas in latere generaties ontstonden. Het causale verband moet mijns inziens daarom omgedraaid worden: Nakomelingen van vluchtelingen die tot op zekere hoogte nog steeds als nieuwkomers gold en ervoeren plotseling een statusverhoging door hun situatie als vreemdelingen. Via de transnationale culturen van het piëtisme werden ballingschapsgerinneringen nieuw gecontextualiseerd en verder doorgegeven – vaak tot in het heden, waar veel van de Nederlandse vluchtelingenkerken nog steeds bestaan.

Herinneringen aan ballingschap konden heel uiteenlopende verschijningsvormen en functies hebben. Ballingenidentiteit werd in verschillende confessionele richtingen gecultiveerd, maar de logica van deze cultivering was doorgaans bepaald door een drang naar exclusiviteit. Gevluchte voorouders te hebben die voor de juiste religieuze of politieke overtuigingen hadden moeten lijden werd meer en meer een bron van status. Zoals deze studie laat zien is ballingenidentiteit geen gegeven dat uit demografische cijfers of systematisch onderzoek naar partnerkeuze uitgedestilleerd kan worden. De Zuid-Nederlandse migranten die naar Duitsland, Engeland en de Nederlandse Republiek gingen waren geen ‘etnische’ groep die tegenover homogene lokale bevolkingen stonden: wie ‘buitenlander’ was en wie ‘Nederlander’, wat ‘zuidelijk’ was en wat ‘Hollands’, werd in verschillende situaties verschillend beoordeeld en geherdefinieerd. Of en in
welke mate individuen en families zich met het migratieverleden bleven
identificeren hing er niet altijd van af of zij rechtstreeks en in volle lijn van
migranten afstamden en personen die hun ballingenidentiteit fervent uitdroegen
hadden soms maar weinig gevluchte voorouders. De vroegmoderne Nederlandse
diaspora was daarom geen stabiel demografisch gegeven, maar eerder een
‘voorgestelde gemeenschap’ die enkelingen de keuze liet om zich ermee te
identificeren of niet. Dat de meeste mensen dat uiteindelijk niet deden was te
verwachten geweest, maar dat velen er wel voor kozen om zich met hun Zuid-
Nederlandse afkomst te identificeren en zodoende de vele Nederlandse kerken in
Duitsland en Engeland tot op het heden te laten voortbestaan, laat zien dat de
interpretatiekaders voor een ver verleden steeds vernieuwd werden en oude verhalen
op deze manier levendig bleven.
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