

Conclusion

Abstract: By participating in the communal process of delimiting the public and manifesting their own understandings of publicness, Catholic Utrechters wielded a wider agency not only in their survival in the city and in Catholic revival in the Dutch Republic, but also in the making of a multi-religious society in the Northern Netherlands. Comparing the Utrecht case with others, the Conclusion seeks to identify the factors that determined the nature of the politico-religious majority's governing strategies and the politico-religious minorities' survival tactics. Delimitation of the public is proposed as a new analytic framework for the early modern history of religious coexistence, allowing us to shed brighter light on minorities and their agency.

Keywords: coexistence, Catholic, minority, public/private distinction, agency, early modern

In the preface to his ecclesiastical history of the Netherlands, Heribertus Rosweyde (1569–1629), a Jesuit exile in the Southern Netherlands, recalled his youth in the north, especially his 'fatherland' of Utrecht:

Oh God, grant that you, Holland, my close neighbour, and that you, *Sticht* of Utrecht, my fatherland, which had once been of the Lord and connected to Rome, but are now divided into diverse sects by [Jacobus] Arminius, [Franciscus] Gomarus, [Conrad] Vorstius, and the like, might derive some fruit from this Church History. When I was young, I saw you flourishing in Religion, zealous, and burning with the Devotion which you had been taught by Willibrord, Boniface, Gregory, and other Bishops of Utrecht and preachers of the Roman Faith. In your Churches stood altars, on the altars images were displayed; people heard the Mass, they venerated the Saints; from the beginning of your conversion up to my time, you have excelled in the Roman Faith.¹

¹ Rosweyde, 'Voor-redene aen den goetd-willighen leser [...]', [**vi r°*]: 'O oft Godt gave dat ghy Hollandt mijn naeste ghebuere, dat ghy Sticht van Wtrecht, mijn vaderlandt, eertijts een deel

When Rosweyde imagined the state of religious affairs in his fatherland in 1623, he saw a decisive break with the glorious medieval past when Catholicism had been publicly, officially, and openly embraced. Had Rosweyde actually returned to his fatherland, however, he would have been surprised to see how vigorously Utrechters, including our storyteller Johannes Wachtelaer and other known and unknown clerics, *klopjes*, laymen, and laywomen, were managing to live there as devout Catholics and respectable citizens or residents.

By the 1620s, or, at the very latest, the mid-1630s, the city of Utrecht had assumed a central position within both the Reformed Church and the Catholic Church of the Dutch Republic. Throughout the seventeenth century, the two confessional parties competed in population size. Such an environment of religious coexistence led to conviviality, but also elicited conflict between the two groups. In order to regulate this precarious environment of coexistence, Utrecht's magistrates deployed two governing strategies: repression and toleration. The deployment of these political practices in principle matched the politico-religious circumstances in and around Utrecht – although even the strict Calvinist or Voetian magistrates adopted toleration between 1618 and 1650, and, conversely, moderate Republicans resorted to repression between 1651 and 1672. Through the governing strategies of repression and toleration, Utrecht's political authorities drew and redrew the border of the public, thereby contributing to the maintenance of Reformed dominance, while also trying to preserve the public order of the *corpus christianum*, whose unity was to collapse in the wake of the Protestant Reformation and the Dutch Revolt. Repression and toleration sustained and even bolstered the asymmetrical politico-religious power relationship between the Reformed repressing and tolerating party and the Catholic repressed and tolerated party, perpetuating the discrimination of the latter and tarnishing their honour and credibility in the public sphere.

At the same time, religious coexistence cannot be understood from the top-down perspective of the Reformed governing strategies alone. The

des Heeren, ende met Roomen aen-ghespannen; maer nu onder Arminius, Gommarus, Vorstius deirlijck in verscheyden secten verdeylt, eenighe vruchte mocht rapen uyt dese Kerckelijcke Historie. Ick hebbe eertijts jonck zijnde u sien bloeyen in Godtsdiensticheyt, yverich ende brandich in Godtvruchticheydt, die u Willibrordus, Bonifacius, Gregorius, ende andere Bisschoppen van Wtrecht, vercondighers van het Roomsche Gheloove, hadden gheleert. In uwe Kercken stonden Autaren, op de Autaren stonden Beelden; men dede Misse, men dede eerbiedinge aen de Heyligen; ghy waert van het beginsel van uwe bekeeringe tot mijnen tijt toe uytschijnende in het Roomsche Gheloove'. *Sticht* was the territory where the bishop of Utrecht had exercised his secular jurisdiction during medieval times. See also Pollmann, *Catholic Identity*, pp. 178–79.

analysis of Foucauldian strategies of social discipline must be supplemented with Certeauian tactics of appropriation in everyday life.² In this monograph, we have therefore sought to restore the bottom-up perspective of Catholic survival tactics to its rightful place, characterized as these tactics were by continuity with the medieval legacy and adjustment to post-Reformation religious plurality. In that light, Catholics proved to constitute a powerful pressure group within Utrecht. Backed by its prominent co-religionists, the Catholic community situated itself not on the margins, but in the very centre of the urban social life. Catholics' numerical and historical presence within Utrecht, along with their social status and networks, laid a firm foundation for their survival. Through their continued use and new appropriation of the shared urban space in pursuit of their Catholic way of life, Catholic Utrechters participated in the process of delimiting the public within the multi-religious civic community in its spatial dimension. Claiming their liberties through discourses of self-representation on the basis of traditional and new ideas, including jurisdiction and freedom of conscience, they also took part in the process of delimiting the public in the post-Reformation city in its rhetorical dimension. Advancing their own visions of the public, Catholic Utrechters moreover demarcated the lines for how the magistracy, the public church, and the Reformed majority could and should deal with them. Given Utrecht's central position for the re-Catholicization movement of the Northern Netherlands headed by the Holland Mission, Catholic survival in this former episcopal city significantly contributed to Catholic revival in the Dutch Republic at large.

Even in adversity, Utrecht's Catholics, both as individuals and a community, therefore manifested considerable agency. They were not a passive entity, mere recipients of a toleration bestowed on them by Erasman regents or victims of a coerced Protestantization. Rather, Catholic Utrechters featured as actors alongside the political authorities and the Reformed Church in the shared process of delimiting the public within the multi-religious civic community, conceived of as the *corpus christianum*. They did not always submit to the existing norm and definition of the public/private distinction, which the political authorities and the Reformed majority had strategically attempted to control. Instead, they not only developed their own sub-culture within their private sphere, but also challenged the politico-religious authorities and the formal hegemony of Reformed religious culture in the urban public sphere by tactically shifting the border

2 Frijhoff, 'Foucault Reformed by Certeau', especially pp. 96–99. See also idem, *Embodied Belief*, pp. 284–86; Idem, 'Toeëigening'.

of the physical and abstract public. Actively participating in the communal process of delimiting the public and mobilizing their own interpretations of publicness, Catholic Utrechters wielded a wider agency not only with regard to their survival as pious Catholics and honourable citizens in the city as well as the Catholic revival in the Dutch Republic, but also the making of a multi-religious society in the Northern Netherlands.

Governing Strategies

As such, the Utrecht case offers us a gateway to future comparative studies on religious coexistence in the early modern world beyond the boundaries of national and confessional historiographies. It has enabled us to identify several factors that shaped the governing strategies of the majority and the survival tactics of the minorities. For the former, these factors included the politico-religious structure, legal schemes, and the dynamic socio-economic and other circumstances.

Politico-Religious Structures

There is no doubt that the politico-religious constitution played a defining role in outlining the governing strategies of the majority. The Dutch Republic had a unique constitution in the form of a de-centralized federation of sovereign provinces without a shared overlord. Although the stadholders exerted political influence at the national and provincial levels, they wielded far less symbolical, financial, and legislative power in the public sphere than monarchs did in, for instance, England, France, and Spain. From 1651 to 1672, the Republic even went through its First Stadholderless Period. Moreover, each sovereign province had its own political composition, and urban particularism prevailed throughout the Northern Netherlands. While the Provincial States of Holland and Zeeland were dominated by the cities, the States of Utrecht as well as Gelderland and Groningen featured fierce rivalry between representatives of the cities and the countryside.³ The lengthy conflict between the city of Utrecht and the Provincial States of Utrecht occasionally paralysed the strict enforcement of anti-Catholic edicts in the city. Furthermore, several provincial institutions in Utrecht, including the Knighthood, the chapters, and the provincial court, sometimes proved sympathetic to Catholics.

3 Onnekink, 'The Body Politic', pp. 110–12.

The legal status of the official church was another crucial factor behind the governing strategies. Whereas many other European confessional states had their state church with which their subjects were obliged to affiliate, the Dutch Reformed Church assumed responsibility as a public church, meaning that it had to serve everyone irrespective of his or her confessional conviction. The Reformed Church continued to be a voluntary community of believers, even though its members alone qualified for many privileges in the public sphere, including the right to the public practice of their faith and the right to an increasing number of public offices. As for the public religion, the only exception in the Dutch Republic was Maastricht in the Generality Lands, as this city was subject to both the Protestant States General (as a substitute of the duke of Brabant) and the Catholic prince-bishop of Liège. Although Catholics there continued to outnumber Reformed by a ratio of no less than five to one, the 1632 capitulation treaty accorded both confessional groups equal rights in the public sphere, including the right to assume political offices and the right to use public church buildings, just as in German parity cities such as Augsburg.⁴ As a result, it remains remarkable that, despite the constant pressure from the strict Calvinist or Voetian consistory, a number of Catholics were in practice still publicly recognized or non-publicly connived as public office holders in Utrecht, especially for offices at the provincial level and in social welfare.

The Republic's politico-religious structure exhibits a sharp contrast with that of many other early modern confessional states in Europe. While the king and the church did not always see eye to eye, post-Reformation England displayed a clear tendency towards sacralization of the monarchy and confessionalization of the state. Upholding the ideal of a national church, the English throne identified fidelity to the Church of England with loyalty to the monarchy and the state. The so-called recusants, who refused to attend services of the Church of England, were deemed criminal and were subject to fines and banishment.⁵ Legal status was therefore one of the fundamental differences between early modern Dutch and English Catholics.⁶ In the kingdom of France under the Edict of Nantes, the king played a critical role in creating and controlling sacred boundaries between Catholics and Huguenots for the management of religious coexistence.⁷ In the Holy

4 Kaplan, 'In Equality', pp. 119–20; Ubachs, *Twee heren*, pp. 124–70.

5 Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*, pp. 49–66, 85, 89–92. See also Cogan, *Catholic Social Networks*, pp. 220–21.

6 Kaplan and Pollmann, 'Conclusion', p. 251.

7 Luria, *Sacred Boundaries*, passim, especially pp. xxi–xxii, xxvii–xxxii.

Roman Empire, where the famous principle of *cuius regio, eius religio* (whose realm, his religion) had been established by the Peace of Augsburg, rulers of the constituent estates could establish one of the two lawful faiths (i.e., Catholic or Lutheran) as the official religion of their territories and impose their decision on their subjects. While several types of regimes of religious coexistence flourished under the Peace of Augsburg, the *cuius regio, eius religio* principle did push many rulers to promote confessionalization and repression of dissenters in their territories during the Thirty Years' War.⁸

Legal Schemes

Legal schemes determined the possibilities and limits of the governing strategies which local magistrates could adopt against politico-religious minorities. From the 1580s and throughout the seventeenth century, Dutch political authorities repeatedly issued anti-Catholic edicts at the national and provincial levels, whose enforcement was entrusted to local officers. These edicts did prescribe corporal punishment, but rarely called for capital punishment of transgressors, apart from the 1621 case of Jacob Mom, who was decapitated due to his failed coups against the Protestant government. Aldermen had the responsibility, as juries, to judge Catholics in Dutch city courts, independently from the sheriff and the public church. Moreover, the strict moral discipline of the Dutch Reformed Church was never applied to those outside its confessional community. In England, in contrast, the presence of the king, the central, national judicial institutions, and the Church of England played crucial roles in the legal prosecution of dissenters, especially Catholics. Although in both England and the Dutch Republic Catholics were represented as potential political traitors and public enemies, English Catholics who were questioned about their political inclinations faced severer punishment than their Dutch counterparts did. As they sometimes exposed Catholic plots to overthrow the Protestant monarch, the English politico-judicial authorities not only banished and financially exploited Catholics, but even went so far as to execute them publicly, sending priests to the gallows alongside thieves, coiners, and murderers so as to discredit Catholics as a group in public, just like the Roman authorities did to Jesus.⁹ Likewise, compared to the legal procedures

8 E.g., Luebke, *Hometown Religion*, pp. 39–44, 193–99.

9 Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*, pp. 56–92, here especially p. 79. Yet, as shown in the present study, it should be noted that Dutch Catholics also concocted plots to overturn the Protestant government, as a result of which Mom was led to the scaffold.

which the Habsburg monarchy applied against Netherlandish Protestants or the Japanese government against *Kirishitans* (Christians), the legal proceedings in Utrecht and elsewhere in the Dutch Republic seem rather modest as regards the degree of physical violence they involved. Christian persecution in Japan was so relentless that it produced the first officially recognized Catholic martyrs outside Europe, the Twenty-Six Martyrs killed in Nagasaki in 1597, beatified in 1627, and canonized in 1862 by Rome.¹⁰ Apart from those killed in Gorkum in 1572 (and beatified in 1675 and canonized in 1867) and other places at the beginning of the Eighty Years' War, Dutch Catholics rarely included actual martyrs.

Post-Reformation European states codified not only the laws by which they repressed dissenters, but also the laws by which they tolerated them.¹¹ One such legal measure was introduced by the Union of Utrecht (1579), which we will compare here with other early modern treaties or ordinances in two respects: the establishing process and legal status of the texts, and the target of and provisions for protection.

The Union of Utrecht was a mutual agreement between rebels against the Habsburg monarchy during the very first phase of the Dutch Revolt. Article thirteen of the Union advocated freedom of conscience, while reserving the right of the States of each sovereign province to adopt its own religious policies. Yet the Union had no supervisory body to enforce due observance of its clauses. As such, the Union's freedom of conscience clause had no legally binding force and indeed failed to prevent the outlawing of Catholicism. In this regard, the Union stands in remarkable contrast with the French edicts of pacification, including the Edict of Nantes (1598), which aimed to bring an end to the religious wars. The French king issued these edicts to maintain the dominant position of Catholics, while reserving limited rights for Huguenots. He dispatched royal commissioners for the edicts and set up the bipartisan legal courts to enforce their observance and to settle religious disputes.¹² The Peace of Augsburg (1555) was an agreement forged among the rulers in the Holy Roman Empire, acknowledging their right to regulate religion in the area under their jurisdiction (the *jus reformandi*), provided that they

10 Oka, 'The Catholic Missionaries', pp. 11–24; Omata Rappo, 'History and Historiography'; Idem, *Des Indes lointaines*.

11 For a helpful survey comparing the freedom of conscience laws in the Dutch Republic, France, and the Holy Roman Empire, see Kaplan, 'Quietly in His Own Home'. I would like to thank Benjamin Kaplan for sharing a draft of this paper with me prior to publication.

12 Diefendorf, 'Religious Conflict'; Foa, 'Making Peace'; Kang, 'Coexisting in Intolerance'; Luria, *Sacred Boundaries*, pp. 3–10, 16–22. I would like to thank Sukhwan Kang for making an early version of his article available to me prior to publication.

chose one of the two legally recognized faiths in the Empire. Concluding the Thirty Years' War, in which German princes attempted to confessionalize their territories, the Peace of Westphalia (1648) was intended to curb the princes' power to repress dissenters. The Peace authorized Calvinism as the empire's third lawful religion, legally confirming the religious diversity of the empire and sharpening confessional boundaries.¹³ In the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, freedom of conscience was legally assured by the Warsaw Confederation (1573). This Confederation had been established by the nobility (*szlachta*), who were trying to secure their privileges during the period of political vacuum following the extinction of the Jagiellonian dynasty the year before. It sought to offer legal confirmation to the region's existing religious diversity, extending from Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox Christians to Jews and Muslims. The articles of the Confederation were incorporated into the Henrician Articles (1573), a permanent contract between the nobility and a newly elected king, and thus formed a constitutional basis for the Commonwealth of the elective monarchy.¹⁴

As for the target of protection, the Union of Utrecht promised freedom of conscience, not to certain religious groups but to every individual in the Dutch Republic irrespective of their faith. While all the legal texts under consideration here were open to different interpretations, those of the Union were particularly vague, not clarifying what it meant for a person to 'remain free in his Religion', nor specifying what behaviours ought to be tolerated under what circumstances. Consequently, as the Utrecht case vividly shows, the Union's normative discourse continued to be understood differently, thereby arousing conflicts and eliciting negotiations over the delimitation of the public among various stakeholders. The Edict of Nantes, in contrast, bestowed relatively more clearly articulated corporate privileges on a specific confessional group (i.e., the Huguenots), advocating *de jure* bi-confessionalism. Huguenots were, for instance, allowed to assume public offices, including political, judicial, and military offices, and their ministers received salaries from the king. The places where Huguenots were allowed public worship included urban suburbs and the places where they had regularly practised their faith in the normative years of 1596 and 1597. Furthermore, several nobles who held high justice were permitted to host public Reformed services for their families and locals, while other

13 Asch, 'Religious Toleration', pp. 82–83, 86–88; Luebke, *Hometown Religion*, pp. 39–44, 130, 189–93, 193–99, 213–18.

14 Koyama, *Warushawa renmei kyōyaku*, pp. 17–51; Kriegseisen, *Between State and Church*, pp. 405–13.

Huguenot nobles were allowed to organize private worship for their families in gatherings of no more than thirty participants.¹⁵ The Peace of Augsburg granted rulers the right to choose a lawful faith and gave individual subjects the right to emigrate (*jus emigrandi*), although Catholics and Protestants interpreted that right differently. A century later, the Peace of Westphalia formulated clearer rules by classifying dissenters of the three lawful faiths into three categories. The first category was composed of those who had conducted the 'public exercise of faith' (*exercitium religionis publicum*) in the normative year of 1624. The second group consisted of those who had practised the 'private exercise of faith' (*exercitium religionis privatum*) in 1624, that is, worship presided over by clergy, not in public church buildings but in private houses. The Peace allowed these first and second groups to practise their faith publicly and privately, respectively. The third and final category was composed of those who had worshiped neither publicly nor privately in the normative year. People who fell into this category were permitted to practise 'domestic devotion' (*devotio domestica*) with their own families, but without the involvement of clergy or other co-religionists.¹⁶ Like the Union of Utrecht, the Warsaw Confederation guaranteed religious peace without addressing any specific religious groups. The Confederation intentionally left the wording ambiguous, making two interpretations of religious freedom possible: as the right for feudal lords to establish an official faith of the territories (*jus reformandi*), and as the right for individual commoners to choose their own religion.¹⁷

Politico-Religious and Socio-Economic Circumstances

It is no less striking that international, national, and local politico-religious circumstances determined the intensity of repression and toleration. Previous studies have focussed on extrajudicial aspects of Dutch religious coexistence, such as the ecumenicity of everyday life, connivance, and fictions of privacy. While acknowledging the importance of these practices, which people exercised non-publicly, this study has also discussed legal prosecution and limited recognition, both of which were publicly performed by the political authorities, examining repression and toleration not only

15 Kang, 'Coexisting in Intolerance'; Luria, *Sacred Boundaries*, pp. 4–7.

16 Asch, 'Religious Toleration'; Kaplan, 'Quietly in His Own Home'; Luebke, *Hometown Religion*, pp. 39–44, 130, 189–93, 213–18.

17 Koyama, *Warushawa renmei kyōyaku*, pp. 8–16; Kriegseisen, *Between State and Church*, pp. 405–7.

qualitatively but also quantitatively. In the cities of Holland, legal prosecution is said to have 'tapered off' after hitting its zenith in the 1640s and 1650s,¹⁸ and Utrecht exhibits a similar pattern at least until 1672: the vigour and frequency of both the legislation of anti-Catholicism and the prosecution against Catholics grew from the 1620s before reaching their height during the 1640s and the 1650s, while the 1660s saw relative tranquillity. The ebb and flow of repression was affected by international affairs as well as national and local events. The Utrecht magistrates' practices of toleration, however, seem not to have followed the same chronological pattern. They publicly bestowed limited recognition on a large number of priests who sought permission to reside or stay in the city, on women to freely bequeath their property, and on citizenship applicants not only in the 1660s but even in the 1640s and the 1650s, while also constantly exercising non-public connivance in regard to the illegal activities of clerics and women as well as the illegal appointment of Catholic public office holders. Although the composition of the city magistracy and the appointment of sheriffs were a significant factor in the practices of repression and toleration in local settings, in Utrecht even the strict Calvinists or Voetians at times practised toleration, while the moderate Republicans promoted repression.

Due to the absence of studies with a similar quantitative approach, it is as yet difficult to compare the statistics of repression and toleration in Utrecht with other Dutch cases. The one exception, a case study of Catholics in Groningen, shows that the city court filed forty-two legal procedures against Catholics from 1606 to 1731, including twenty-eight cases between 1620 and 1672, while its counterpart in Utrecht prosecuted Catholics in 105 cases during the same half century. In both cities, the central target of anti-Catholic legislation and legal proceedings shifted over time from the clergy to the laity. Apart from clerical activities, Catholics of both cities were charged frequently with participating in or hosting religious assemblies and sometimes with insulting the Reformed religion. They were likewise sentenced to fines, the confiscation of property, and banishment. Although Catholic Utrechters were also accused of harbouring loyalty to or maintaining connections with the Habsburg monarch, in Groningen Catholics never faced charges relating to their political inclination. The city court of Groningen accused *klopjes* of running elementary schools, and other Catholics of allowing children issuing from religiously mixed marriages to be baptized in the Catholic faith, but such charges were not pressed against Catholics by the Utrecht city court between 1620 and 1672.

18 Kooi, *Calvinists and Catholics*, pp. 90–129, here especially p. 125.

More than a few Catholic priests are said to have been publicly recognized for residence or stay in Groningen despite existing official prohibitions, although the specific numbers for such tolerated priests are unknown. In Utrecht, the sojourn or residence of sixty-four priests is known to have been publicly tolerated between 1630 and 1672. Nevertheless, it is certain that several of the recognized clerics in Groningen, like their counterparts in Utrecht, asked their family members to petition the city government on their behalf. In both cities, some priests managed to obtain a permit to stay even after being sentenced to banishment.¹⁹

The local socio-economic situation also had an enormous effect on the governing strategies. Politico-judicial authorities of the Dutch Republic are famously known to have demanded a so-called recognition fee from Catholics in order to non-publicly connive at their illegal activities or presence. In more than a few Dutch cities, the Catholic community was required to pay such a recognition fee annually, the exact amount of which was in some cases documented.²⁰ Although Wachtelaer hinted that the payment of such a recognition fee was conventional practice among Utrecht's Catholics, we have not been able to determine how much they were in practice forced to pay. In any case, many Catholics in Utrecht failed to avoid legal prosecution, being sentenced to the payment of a fine or having to post bail. Similarly, economic considerations were crucial for the governing strategies in relation to citizenship. Catholics came to be deprived of their right to acquire citizenship in the cities of the inland provinces, including Utrecht, whose economy relied on local or regional markets and, unlike the coastal provinces of Holland and Zeeland, did not profit much from the international trade of the Dutch Golden Age. Despite existing prohibitions, the Utrecht magistracy publicly recognized eighty-six Catholics as new citizens from 1656 to 1672, while the number for Zwolle was 393 for the period from 1670 to 1784 and for Nijmegen fifty-five from 1623 to 1794.²¹ While Amsterdam was famous for the toleration of Sephardic Jews, premodern Utrecht showed itself antisemitic, as the city prohibited Jews from acquiring citizenship or even residing within the city walls between 1444 and 1788. In this severe Jewish repression, the economic calculations of the city government seem to have played a certain role. The Jews who came to Utrecht hailed mostly not from wealthy Sephardic Jews from the Iberian Peninsula but from poor Ashkenazi Jews

19 Vos-Schoonbeek, 'Hinderpalen'; Idem, 'Roomsgezinden voor de rechter'.

20 E.g., Kooi, 'Paying off the Sheriff'; Parker, *Faith on the Margins*, pp. 48, 50–54, 57–58, 234; Idem, 'Paying for the Privilege', pp. 291–93, 295–96.

21 Prak, 'The Policies of Intolerance', pp. 166–67; Schimmel, *Burgerrecht te Nijmegen*, pp. 131–317.

from Germany. In the 1720s, the Utrecht magistracy softened restrictions on well-to-do Sephardic Jews, while continuing to regard Ashkenazi Jews as possible criminals or as potential burdens on the civic economy.²²

Local pragmatism prevailed not only in the Dutch Republic but almost everywhere. It has recently been argued that the Northern and Southern Netherlands shared a similar connivant system of coexistence, in which local magistrates exercised *de facto* toleration, conniving at dissenters' illegal practices in spite of *de jure* regulations.²³ If we adopt the framework of the civic community as a *corpus christianum*, we inevitably encounter city magistrates who promoted a supra-confessional civic culture so as to achieve civic concord.²⁴ This is evident in Westphalian cities, where magistrates adopted pragmatic attitudes towards Lutheran inhabitants and attempted to preserve their public rights guaranteed by the Peace of Augsburg, defending the civic autonomy against the attempt at Catholic confessionalization by their overlord, the bishop of Münster.²⁵ Wesel's magistrates tried to secure civic autonomy from the Catholic emperor and the Catholic duke of Cleves by introducing Lutheranism into the city. They pragmatically repressed radical Lutherans and tolerated moderate Calvinists in their attempt to preserve the peace of their Christian social community (*corpus christianum*).²⁶ Although the English government promulgated a number of persecuting edicts on paper, in practice local officers did not always strictly enforce them. For the English politico-judicial authorities, like their Dutch counterparts, it was common to receive bribes from dissenters. Moreover, while they initially imposed special taxes and tariffs on recusants to get rid of them, later they ended up regarding those fines as an important source of revenue for the state.²⁷ The early modern authorities therefore sought opportunities to exploit the dissenters financially.

Alongside repression, the magistracy thus exercised toleration to preserve asymmetrical power relationships between those who repressed and tolerated

22 Faber and Rommes, 'Op weg naar stabiliteit', pp. 305, 308. For pre-modern Jews in Utrecht, see Boon and Lettinck, *Joods Utrecht*, pp. 13–60.

23 Roobroeck, 'Confessional Coexistence', especially, pp. 11–13, 17–18. See also Corens, 'Seasonal Coexistence'. In contrast, for a recent account of the decisive divergence between the multi-confessional North and the Catholic South after 1620, see Kooi, *Reformation*, pp. 141–81.

24 E.g., Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*; Kooi, *Liberty and Religion*; Parker, *The Reformation of Community*; Spaans, *Haarlem na de Reformatie*. See also Forclaz, *Catholiques*.

25 Luebke, *Hometown Religion*, pp. 169–70, 187–93, 205–6.

26 Spohnholz, *Tactics of Toleration*, pp. 34–35, 65. Similar political practices of pragmatism can be found in the cities in Upper Lusatia. Christ, *Biographies of a Reformation*.

27 Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*, pp. 85–86, 90, 258–59. See also Cogan, *Catholic Social Networks*, p. 232.

and those who were repressed and tolerated. The Utrecht case sheds light on a discriminatory aspect of toleration which has been noted by Ernst Kossmann, for instance, who claimed that '[i]n the strict definition of the word, toleration is discriminatory, and thus hostile towards the [Dutch] constitution [which prohibits discrimination]'.²⁸ Herbert Marcuse similarly offered a critical argument for understanding tolerance as 'repressive tolerance', which forces minorities to conform to a majority by suppressing their own opinions, while the majority is free from any such restrictions. Through repressive tolerance, the majority makes the problems of inequality vaguer, and this may serve the *status quo* of the asymmetrical power relationship, as we have seen in such attempts by the political authorities in Utrecht, but also elsewhere.²⁹ Furthermore, early modernists should take account of Wendy Brown's argument on modern tolerance as 'a political discourse and practice of *governmentality*', elaborated on Marcuse's repressive tolerance. Using Michel Foucault's concept of governmentality, Brown defines 'governmentality of tolerance' as 'a particular mode of depoliticizing and organizing the social'. According to her, tolerance depoliticizes the political problems of the asymmetrical power relationship between the (repressing and) tolerating party and the (repressed and) tolerated party, reproducing obedient subjects, 'reinscribing the marginalization of the already marginal by reifying and opposing their difference to the normal, the secular, or the neutral'. Thus, tolerance serves Foucault's notion of biopower, which 'involves the subjugation of bodies and control of population through the regulation of life rather than the threat of death'.³⁰ The Utrecht case attests such a disciplinary function among political practices not only of repression but also of toleration, which should be further examined in other parts of the early modern world as well.

Survival Tactics

The Utrecht case furthermore reveals the factors that determined the survival tactics of the politico-religious minorities in the early modern world, including their numerical, socio-economic, and historical presence within the local society, as well as their religious infrastructures and the legal resources at their disposal.

28 Kossmann, *Politieke theorie*, p. 49: 'In de strikte betekenis van het woord is tolerantie discriminerend en dus vijandig aan de grondwet'.

29 Marcuse, 'Repressive Tolerance'.

30 Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, pp. 4, 8, 13, 26, 45.

Numerical, Socio-Economic, and Historical Presence

The politico-religious minorities were by definition deprived of their politico-religious rights in the public sphere, but they did not always constitute a numerical minority in local settings. Catholics are reported to have been able to express their religiosity more boldly and aggressively, for instance through processions or pilgrimages, in the public spaces of the Dutch Generality Lands than in other parts of the Republic. In these colonies under the States General, Catholics continued to form the numerical majority, with the exception of seventeenth-century Bergen op Zoom, where they became a numerical minority before regaining their status as the numerical majority in the eighteenth century.³¹ The situation of Catholics in the Dutch Generality Lands and their co-religionists in Ireland is comparable in the sense that both formed the numerical majority in most parts of the regions that had experienced the triumphant Catholic/Counter-Reformation, before being annexed by a Protestant state.³² It is remarkable that Utrecht's Catholics acted very provocatively in the urban space, where they did not enjoy majority status in the urban population though they did represent a third of the total population. In France, Huguenots were relatively few in number and isolated in the north, including Rouen, near Paris, while numerous co-religionists could be found in the southern belt known as the 'Huguenot crescent'.³³ Montpellier, one such southern city, was split evenly between Protestants and Catholics. Experiencing the period of both Protestant and Catholic ascendancy, this city saw one of the most prolonged and destructive battles over public sacred space in France.³⁴ Numerical presence dictated the intensity and aggressiveness of spatial practices of the politico-religious minorities.

In places like most Dutch cities, including Utrecht, where the political power of the dissenters was largely curtailed, elite members with significant socio-economic capital were indispensable for the survival of the dissenting groups. Besides clerics and *klopjes*, the Utrecht case identifies such socio-economic elite members as noblemen, noblewomen, canons,

31 Lenarduzzi, *De belevingswereld*, pp. 247–92; Idem, 'Subcultuur en tegencultuur', pp. 287–346, especially pp. 310–14. For Catholics in the Dutch Generality Lands, see Mooij, 'Second-Class'; Ubachs, *Twee heren*; Vos, *Burgers*. For Bergen op Zoom in particular, see Mooij, *Geloof*, here especially pp. 131–35.

32 Lotz-Heumann, 'Between Conflict and Coexistence'; Mooij, 'Second-Class'; Ó hAnnracháin, *Catholic Europe*, pp. 43–59.

33 Kang, 'Coexisting in Intolerance'.

34 Diefendorf, 'Religious Conflict'.

and lawyers as the core of the reviving Catholic community. To date we have not been able to determine the extent to which people in Utrecht and elsewhere in the Dutch Republic disguised themselves as Reformed believers to qualify for public office. In order to assure the continued presence of public office holders within their clans, several elite families seem to have deliberately chosen to raise their daughters in the Catholic faith and their sons in the Reformed faith – it being uncertain whether those sons were actually crypto-Catholics. Early modern England saw a number of so-called church papists who regularly or occasionally conformed to the state church in their outward appearance or activities. By doing so, some of them managed to secure public offices. As in Utrecht, Catholics in England were sometimes tolerated so as to be able to continue assuming public offices since they were needed practically by the locals for the preservation of public order. Just like their counterparts in Utrecht and the Dutch Republic more broadly, English Catholic members of the socio-economic elite played indispensable roles for the survival of their confessional community.³⁵

In other places, minorities could rely on their elite members who not only retained their elevated socio-economic status but also continued to enjoy more direct access to political power. In Japan, before the 1612 ban on Christianity, Japanese *Kirishitans* and foreign missionaries, among them Jesuits, could count on protection from political figures. The Jesuits adopted 'accommodation' as their missionary policy in Japan, first seeking patronage under the political elite and then propagating the gospel among the locals. Those patrons included Nobunaga Oda (1534–1582), one of the leading *daimyos* (magnates) at that time, who attempted to reduce the political influence of Buddhist monks by allowing Catholic missionaries to spread Christianity among the Japanese, as well as the so-called *Kirishitan daimyos*, who converted to Christianity and tried to revitalize the local economy by engaging in international trade through the mediation of the foreign missionaries.³⁶ In France, the Edict of Nantes allowed Huguenots to assume political, military, and legal public offices.³⁷ For a limited period of time, Montpellier had a bi-partisan city government composed of three

35 Bossy, *The English Catholic Community*, passim, here especially pp. 149–81; Cogan, *Catholic Social Networks*, passim, here especially pp. 161–74; Questier, *Catholicism and Community*; Walsham, *Church Papists*.

36 Boxer, *The Christian Century*, pp. 41–90, 148–52; Oka, 'The Catholic Missionaries', pp. 1–9; Idem, 'Domesticating Christianity'. I would like to thank Mihoko Oka for sharing her draft paper with me prior to publication.

37 Luria, *Sacred Boundaries*, pp. 6–7.

consuls from each confessional group.³⁸ In the Norman city of Caen, where Huguenots found less political support than in the south, they could still stress their socio-economic contribution to the city in order to win toleration, just like Utrecht's Catholics did in their petitions.³⁹

Politico-religious minorities tried to remind the majority of their historical presence, appealing to the public good or communal values. The Reformations created a massive wave of religious refugees in Europe and beyond, expanding Catholic and Protestant networks internationally.⁴⁰ In the wake of the Dutch Revolt, many Catholic priests, nuns, nobles, and patricians fled from the Northern Netherlands, in some cases forming a catalyst for the radicalization of confessionalism in their host society.⁴¹ However, more than a few elite members of the Catholic community, both ecclesiastics and laypeople, continued to live in Utrecht or newly arrived there from without even after the outlawing of their religion. The Utrecht case and others, including those of English dissenters, demonstrate that social outsiders were more prone to repression, while others could utilize their historical connection to the local community.⁴² In general, cities in the Low Countries upheld a robust tradition of urban communalism. During the early years of the Dutch Revolt, Jan de Pottre (1525–1601), a merchant in Brussels, and Willem Weijds (c. 1545–after 1618), a tailor in Bruges, both Catholics, criticized the Calvinist regimes by invoking the traditional language of urban communal values, which Calvinists also sought to appropriate.⁴³ When resisting repression, not only Catholic Utrechters but also dissenters in other seventeenth-century Dutch cities rhetorically emphasized their continuous presence and enduring significance in the local urban society. In 1653, for instance, two prominent Catholics in Dordrecht protested to the city council about the way the sheriff had forced his way into the houses of Catholic notables. Apart from the freedom of conscience guaranteed by the Union of Utrecht, they emphasized their historical contribution to the civic community.⁴⁴ Likewise, when the Remonstrant widow Willemken

38 Diefendorf, 'Religious Conflict', p. 78.

39 Kang, 'Coexisting in Intolerance'.

40 E.g., Corens, *Confessional Mobility*; Terpstra, *Religious Refugees*. For the Dutch Republic as the 'Republic of the refugees', see Boer and Janssen, *De vluchtelingenrepubliek*; Janssen, 'Republic of the Refugees'.

41 Fagel and Spaans, *Nonnen*; Janssen, *The Dutch Revolt*; Pollmann, *Catholic Identity*; Rogier, *Geschiedenis*, I, p. 482.

42 E.g., Cogan, *Catholic Social Networks*, pp. 69–127; Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*, pp. 141–42.

43 Pollmann, *Catholic Identity*, pp. 105–24.

44 Kooi, *Calvinists and Catholics*, pp. 118–19.

van Wanray (c. 1573–1647) was accused of hosting an illegal Remonstrant assembly in her house in Nijmegen, she highlighted her and her family's longstanding elevated social status in and historical connection to the civic community.⁴⁵

These factors can be used to account for the stark contrast between the provocative survival tactics deployed by Utrecht's Catholics and the practices of conformity with regard to the public/private distinction exercised by politico-religious minorities in late sixteenth-century Wesel, a refugee centre under Lutheran rule in north-western Germany. The minorities in Wesel included Reformed and Anabaptist refugees, who lacked historical ties with the city, but also Catholic locals, who had long lived in the city even though they only represented a small part of the population there.⁴⁶ In contrast, Utrecht's Catholics exploited their numerical, socio-economic, and historical importance within the civic community in order to deploy bold tactics, which, in turn, safeguarded their survival as a vigorous, self-conscious confessional community in the face of anti-Catholic legislation and prosecution. The causal relationship between their continued vitality and aggressive survival tactics seems to have worked both ways.

Religious Infrastructure

The clergy and the laity cooperated to develop a religious infrastructure that was necessary for the survival of politico-religious minorities. In order to rebuild their ecclesiastical system, Catholic priests under the Protestant 'yoke' needed international connections with Catholic Europe. Leading the Holland Mission established by the pope in 1592, the apostolic vicars erected their bastion in Utrecht and established seminaries in Cologne and Leuven. Alongside Utrecht, the other centre of outlawed Dutch Catholicism was Haarlem, where the chapter continued its Catholic pastoral work following the Protestant Reformation. After the Haarlem chapter finally recognized the apostolic vicar's authority in 1616, thus settling the jurisdictional conflict between them, the chapter and the Utrecht *Vicariaat* (established in 1633) came to be important advisory councils for the apostolic vicar.⁴⁷ As the medieval system of ecclesiastical patronage was necessarily disrupted

45 Janssen, *Om den gelove*, pp. 22, 27, 118–23, 126–29, 132–35, 138–39. See also Poppe, 'The Shaping of an Innocent Martyr'.

46 Spohnholz, *The Tactics of Toleration*, pp. 161–62, 174.

47 Agten, *The Catholic Church*, p. 25; Parker, *Faith on the Margins*, pp. 33, 37–38; Rogier, *Geschiedenis*, II, pp. 31–32, 356–60; Spaans, *Haarlem na de Reformatie*, pp. 71–79, 91–92.

by the Protestant Reformation, new church leaders, such as the Dutch apostolic vicars and Irish resident bishops (first appointed in 1618), could promote Tridentine Catholicism without facing much resistance from conservative clerics of older generations and consolidate local secular priests, while sometimes opposing (foreign) missionary religious. Despite the institutional discontinuity, the clergy continued to provide pastoral care for their flock in the Dutch Republic and Ireland. In England, in contrast, Catholics experienced a more decisive break from the past. There the Jesuits asserted greater influence than the secular priests, who long experienced weak leadership, until the appointment of their first apostolic vicar in 1685. Although the English Catholic Church is said to have failed to secure a fair distribution of priests throughout the country, the Holland Mission intentionally dispatched more priests to places with dense Catholic populations, such as Utrecht.⁴⁸ By contrast, some secular and regular priests of Groningen only stayed in the province for a short time, while others moved around frequently within the province in order to escape apprehension. One Augustinian friar ended up being arrested even though he had changed his place of residence once every three days. Petrus Codde visited Groningen for the first time as apostolic vicar as late as 1696.⁴⁹ In that light, Utrecht's situation is striking since Catholic Utrechters regularly had around forty priests, who resided there and worked at fixed places of worship in and around the city, and frequently welcomed the apostolic vicars. In this former episcopal city, Catholic priests always far outnumbered Reformed ministers by three or four to one. This firm ecclesiastical foundation facilitated vigorous Catholic survival in Utrecht, ultimately contributing to the Catholic revival in the Dutch Republic as a whole.

As in other parts of Protestant Europe and missionary fields around the globe, Catholic survival in Utrecht and the Dutch Republic, where priests hardly expected any backing from the local secular government, could not have been achieved without vital support from the laity, especially elite members.⁵⁰ One such crucial contribution from the lay elite was the establishment and maintenance of clandestine churches, that is, chapels constructed inside private houses or barns and, at least on paper, owned by individuals. The phenomenon of such house chapels was not exclusive to the Dutch Republic, but could be found in post-Reformation Europe more

48 Ó hAnnracháin, *Catholic Europe*, pp. 38–39, 52–53, 62–64, 70.

49 Vos-Schoonbeek, 'Hinderpalen', pp. 82, 84, 86–87, 89.

50 Parker, 'Heretics at Home', pp. 99–103.

widely.⁵¹ Likewise, in Japan after the outlawing of Christianity (1612), *Kakure Kirishitans* (clandestine Christians) adapted their private houses to create their new ritual spaces and safeguard material objects from confiscation, preserving their underground, syncretistic faith.⁵² The geographical locations of the clandestine churches reflected the minorities' socio-economic position in the local society. Utrecht's fourteen clandestine churches were distributed throughout the city, and their locations reflected the elevated socio-economic status of the Catholic community. In these areas Catholics lived together in spontaneous ghettos around the social elite, publicly and openly manifesting their presence in the city. In Gouda, Catholics likewise formed distinctively Catholic areas in the city, living together around their clandestine churches.⁵³ Catholics in Groningen were long restricted to ad hoc meeting places alone. During that period, the local Catholic community at large, rather than specific lay individuals, incurred the risk of legal prosecution. It was only after 1686 that Catholic Groningers could establish their fixed stations around seven clandestine churches⁵⁴ In Leiden, Catholic clandestine churches were located on the peripheries of the walled city.⁵⁵ Under the Edict of Nantes, in many places in France, Huguenots were likewise banished from the city centres and relegated to the urban suburbs, where they were allowed to maintain public, open, and official places for worship. This peripheral location of Huguenot churches was a public reflection of their lower socio-economic capital and of the socio-economic inequality between Catholics and Huguenots.⁵⁶ Other Huguenots, who did have churches inside walled cities, were pressed to disassociate their cemeteries from their *temples*, relocating them outside the city walls. This geographical relocation of their burial grounds symbolized the elimination of their own and their ancestors' presence in the shared public life of the civic community.⁵⁷

In places of *de jure* bi-confessionalism, such as France under the Edict of Nantes and Maastricht in the Dutch Generality Lands, the two lawful confessional groups held ownership of their public church buildings. Catholics in early modern Utrecht only temporarily owned their public church buildings

51 Kaplan, *Divided by Faith*, pp. 183–88; Idem, 'Fictions of Privacy', pp. 1050–54; Idem, *Reformation*, pp. 185–92.

52 Turnbull, *The Kakure Kirishitan*, pp. 61–72.

53 Abels, 'Beter slaafs', pp. 194–95.

54 Vos-Schoonbeek, 'Hinderpalen', pp. 77, 89.

55 Haitsma, *De rooms-katholieken*, pp. 5–6.

56 Foa, 'An Unequal Apportionment', p. 374.

57 Luria, *Sacred Boundaries*, pp. 136–40.

during the religious peace from 1579 to 1580 and the French occupation from 1672 to 1673.⁵⁸ In Germany, Poland, the Land of Overmaas, and the Meierij van 's-Hertogenbosch (the region around the city), people shared public church buildings, in some cases during only a limited period of time, allotting specific places inside the buildings or different times of worship to different confessional groups. This arrangement, known as *simultaneum*, was never introduced in Utrecht or in most parts of the Dutch Republic.⁵⁹ Before the outlawing of Christianity, Japanese *Kirishitans* appropriated native sacred spaces, including Buddhist temples, for their churches.⁶⁰ After experiencing severe persecution and repression, Dutch and British Catholics as well as Japanese *Kakure Kirishitans* came to regard the ruins of their destroyed churches, prisons, and places of martyrdom as sacred spaces, *lieux de mémoire* and pilgrimage sites (including Heiloo near Alkmaar for Dutch Catholics). British and Dutch Catholics are said to have removed their sacred spaces from urban landscapes to rural areas, trying to resacralize the natural landscape in order to bolster their religion's continuous presence, repossessing the medieval past.⁶¹

Given these general patterns, it is worth noting that Utrecht's Catholics continued to regard public facilities, including public church buildings, monasteries, convents, and hospices, as their own sacred spaces, practising or (re)visualizing their faith openly in the full view of people of other faiths. For them, those public spaces were still lived spaces of an outlawed early modern Catholicism. Although the Catholic spatial practices were less aggressive than in Utrecht, the similar tenacious presence of Catholic materials can be found in public facilities in other parts of the Dutch Republic.⁶² While Catholics in Amsterdam and Gouda are known to have continued to conduct discreet and silent processions through the cities on specific holy

58 E.g., Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 181–225; Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, pp. 262–64; Vanhaelen, *The Wake of Iconoclasm*, pp. 130–58; Yasuhira, 'Confessional Coexistence', pp. 11–15; Idem, 'Shūhakankankei'.

59 Christ, *Biographies of a Reformation*, pp. 157–64; Esser, 'Contested Space', p. 52; Kaplan, *Divided by Faith*, pp. 198–234; Idem, 'In Equality', pp. 120–22; Koyama, *Warushawa renmei kyōyaku*, pp. 52–67; Luebke, *Hometown Religion*, pp. 212–13, 215; Munier, *Het simultaneum*; Spohnholz, *Tactics of Toleration*, pp. 16–17.

60 Arimura, 'The Adaptation'; Oka, 'Domesticating Christianity'.

61 Lenarduzzi, *De belevingswereld*, pp. 101–11; Idem, 'Grensoverschrijdende katholieke claims', pp. 114–25; Idem, 'Subcultuur en tegencultuur', pp. 137–45; Margry and Caspers, *Bedevoertplaatsen*; McClain, 'Without Church'; Turnbull, *The Kakure Kirishitan*, pp. 111–37; Walsham, *Catholic Reformation*, pp. 177–204; Idem, *The Reformation of the Landscape*, especially pp. 153–232.

62 Abels, 'Beter slaafs', pp. 187–88, 199–201; Kroesen, 'Accommodating Calvinism'; Idem, 'Na de Beeldenstorm'; Idem, 'De storm'; Lenarduzzi, *De belevingswereld*, pp. 95, 111–21; Idem, 'Subcultuur en tegencultuur', pp. 145–50; Spaans, 'Een herinnerd religieus landschap'; Idem, 'Stad van vele geloven', pp. 402–5.

days, Utrecht's Catholics on a daily basis were more assertive in the urban space.⁶³ On public streets, *klopjes* in Utrecht and other Dutch cities openly expressed their religiosity by wearing their 'uniform', while priests tried to disguise their appearance. Catholics sometimes carried small devotional objects, such as rosaries, on the public street so as to be able to touch their faith whenever they wanted.⁶⁴ Visibility and audibility were all the more critical for religious coexistence in the city than in rural settings, since urban dwellers could not avoid seeing and hearing adherents of other confessions every day again. The urban architecture in Utrecht with its population of 30,000 certainly fuelled confessional conflicts among people living in close proximity inside the city walls. Yet Catholics mobilized this urban architectural setting in order to devise their creative spatial practices, characterized by adjustment, such as the making of escape routes through newly installed doorways. Catholics in Gouda and Groningen are similarly known to have used the doors of their houses to gain time to escape judicial investigators or to offer them bribes.⁶⁵

Where the masculine power of the clergy and the laity of Catholicism was constrained in the public sphere, women and semi-religious figures played indispensable roles for rehabilitating their community. Given the persistent shortage of priests, *klopjes* and other Catholic women were vital to Catholic survival in the Dutch Republic, composing an integral part of their religious infrastructure. The important roles of *klopjes* for Dutch Catholic revival have been exemplified in, for instance, the ego-documents of Roermond's *klopjes*, as well as a collection of biographies from their Haarlem counterparts.⁶⁶ While no ego-documents or biographies survive for Utrecht's *klopjes*, Catholic women in Utrecht were shown to have been active in assisting and hosting religious services, educating children, and supporting their co-religionists financially. Utrecht's *klopjes* were also important for the production of liturgical garments.⁶⁷ Like Dutch Catholic women, their English counter-

63 Abels, 'Beter slaafs', p. 187; Caspers and Margry, *Identiteit en spiritualiteit*; Lenarduzzi, *De belevingswereld*, p. 95; Idem, 'Grensoverschrijdende katholieke claims', p. 118; Idem, 'Subcultuur en tegencultuur', p. 132.

64 Idem, *De belevingswereld*, pp. 150–71; Idem, 'Grensoverschrijdende katholieke claims', pp. 115–18; Idem, 'Subcultuur en tegencultuur', pp. 182–206.

65 Abels, 'Beter slaafs', p. 194; Vos-Schoonbeek, 'Hinderpalen', p. 86.

66 Monteiro, *Geestelijke maagden*; Spaans, *Levens der Maechden*. For a recent study on a well-to-do Catholic woman (non-*klopje*) who, according to her diary (lit. 'memory book'), was active in supporting the Catholic community in Alkmaar, see Noorman and Maal, *Het unieke memorieboek*, pp. 168–203.

67 I would like to thank Richard de Boer for sharing the unpublished findings of his PhD research titled 'Katholieke kerkgewaden in de verdrukking. Paramenten in de Republiek als

parts were crucial for their confessional community under the Protestant regime.⁶⁸ Semi-religious figures, like *klopjes*, had an ambiguous legal status in the Catholic Church. Yet they were essential for their co-religionists in enduring the persecution and repression in places that lacked the direct supervision of the pope and other Catholic ecclesiastical authorities. This was also the case in Japan before the outlawing of Christianity. Although only a few European missionaries were working on location, at the time of the ban there were approximately 109 Japanese lay brothers (*irmãos*) as well as 320 *dojukus*, who assisted the lay brothers and regular priests. Unlike the lay brothers, *doujukus* had no legal status in the Catholic Church in Europe and were ambiguously considered apprentices in the Society of Jesus in Japan. The ranks of these lay brothers and *doujukus* included many converted Buddhist monks. In his accommodation policy for the Society's mission to Japan, the Jesuit Alessandro Valignano (1539–1606) urged his colleagues to disguise Catholicism as a Buddhist sect in order to attract the locals. Japanese lay brothers and *doujukus* proved indispensable for the Jesuits' mission campaign since they negotiated with local politicians and translated Catholic teachings into the local vernacular, also drawing on Buddhist terms familiar to the Japanese.⁶⁹

Legal Resources

Dissenters were well acquainted with the existing legal system, exploiting legal resources for their survival. As the Utrecht case clearly shows, defenders were of the utmost importance not only for prosecuted individuals, but also for their confessional community at large. Similarly, in Groningen the defenders negotiated with the city court on behalf of prosecuted Catholics, sometimes succeeding in having the levied fines lowered.⁷⁰ By their petitioning, an everyday, bottom-up practice in the early modern world, Catholic nobles and gentry in post-Reformation England attempted to rebuild their relationships with the crown, the state, and their patrons. Some of them succeeded, like the Catholics in Utrecht, in persuading the political authorities to acknowledge that they formed a legitimate part of the multi-confessional society.⁷¹ In some cases, prosecuted and tolerated Catholics

draggers van identiteit, 1580–1650' with me.

68 Rowlands, 'Harbourers and Housekeepers'.

69 Oka, 'The Catholic Missionaries', pp. 9–10; Idem, 'Domesticating Christianity'.

70 Vos-Schoonbeek, 'Hinderpalen', p. 79.

71 Cogan, *Catholic Social Networks*, pp. 185–96. For a recently concluded research project on early modern petitioning, entitled 'The Power of Petitioning in Seventeenth-Century England',

in Utrecht brought their pleas to higher authorities, such as the provincial court and the prince of Orange, and occasionally they managed to have the decisions of the local authorities overturned. Likewise, when Gouda's bailiff tried to raise the annual recognition fee, Catholics petitioned Stadholder Frederick Henry and the provincial court of Holland to intervene in the local negotiations. Through their mediation, they prevented an increase in the recognition fee, winning a reduction instead.⁷²

As these cases indicate, jurisdiction mattered significantly in the survival tactics of politico-religious minorities. Being well aware of the long-standing dispute over jurisdiction between the city and the province dating back to the medieval regime under Utrecht's prince-bishop, Catholic Utrechters in the seventeenth century sometimes questioned the legal competence of the city court and the sheriff, and at other times appealed to the provincial court and the Provincial States, which seemed more favourable to them. For such Westphalian cities as Münster and Warendorf, the free election of magistrates was an integral part of their autonomous jurisdiction, which they had managed to secure from the bishop of Münster in the course of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The magistrates of these cities, Catholics included, therefore fiercely resisted the bishop's confessionalizing attempt to exclude non-Catholics from public offices, advocating religious coexistence as a consequence, even though they did not cherish religious diversity per se.⁷³ Jurisdiction also played a role in the matter of clandestine churches. Apart from the chapels created in homes owned by individual commoners inside cities, early modern Europe saw three other types of house chapels: manorial chapels, court chapels, and embassy chapels. Manorial and court chapels were publicly, officially offered legal protection in France under the Edict of Nantes and in the Holy Roman Empire under the Peace of Westphalia, while in England and the Dutch Republic these chapels were publicly, officially outlawed and only non-publicly, unofficially shown connivance.⁷⁴ Even though clandestine churches were illegal under existing early modern anti-Catholic edicts, the Dutch and English nobility established and safeguarded such churches on their country and urban

led by Brodie Waddell and funded by an AHRC Research Grant from 2019 to 2021, see <https://petitioning.history.ac.uk/> consulted on 7 September 2022.

72 Abels, 'Beter slaafs', p. 197.

73 Luebke, *Hometown Religion*, pp. 187–91.

74 Kaplan, *Divided by Faith*, pp. 183–88; Idem, 'Fictions of Privacy', pp. 1050–54; Idem, *Reformation*, pp. 185–92. On embassy chapels, see also Allen, 'London Catholicism'; Kaplan, 'Diplomacy and Domestic Devotion'; Linden, 'Unholy Territory', pp. 534–35, 538–40, 542, 547. I would like to thank Mark Allen for making a draft of his article available to me prior to publication.

estates, opening them not only to family members and servants but also to neighbouring co-religionists, relying on their traditional seigneurial rights and jurisdiction.⁷⁵ While civic jurisdiction within the city of Utrecht was in the hands of the Reformed, the Catholic notables, including canons, jurists, and the nobility, still managed to protect the sacred spaces for their co-religionists within the walled city. Dissenters living in border regions could exploit the jurisdictional boundaries, crossing the borders to participate in the public, open practice of their faith abroad on a daily basis. This spatial practice, known as *Auslaufen*, was a survival tactic by means of which dissenters could practise their faith publicly and openly outside their overlord's jurisdiction, while outwardly conforming to his authority.⁷⁶

In their petitions, Catholic Utrechters represented themselves as 'obedient citizens', 'trustful subjects', and 'good patriots', in an effort to defend their legitimate rights. Unlike Dutch cities where everyone, irrespective of their confessional affiliation, could be buried in public church buildings and churchyards, in France and the Holy Roman Empire the right to be buried in urban communal spaces constituted an essential part of dissenters' citizenship. Despite Calvinist misgivings about 'superstitious' Catholic funeral tradition, French Huguenots with an elevated socio-economic status sought sophisticated funeral practices, which earned them hard-won social distinction.⁷⁷ Likewise, Westphalian Protestants pursued burial in parish churchyards where their ancestors rested. For them, burial in urban public spaces represented a non-confessional, civic honour.⁷⁸ Politico-religious minorities retained other important citizen rights in the public sphere, including property rights. Despite the severe repression of their spatial practices, the clandestine churches of Utrecht's Catholics were immune from total destruction thanks to their owners' legitimate property rights, which the politico-judicial authorities could not contest. In contrast, many properties that were transferred to new owners during the first turbulent period of post-Reformation Montpellier would never be returned to the original owners, provoking further violent clashes over sacred spaces between the two confessional groups.⁷⁹

75 E.g., Bossy, *The English Catholic Community*; Cogan, *Catholic Social Networks*; Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility'; Idem, *Patrons*; Questier, *Catholicism and Community*.

76 Kaplan, *Cunegonde's Kidnapping*, passim; Idem, *Divided by Faith*, pp. 144–71; Idem, *Reformation*, pp. 279–97; Idem, 'Religious Encounters'; Luebke, *Hometown Religion*, pp. 122–32; Spohnholz, 'Confessional Coexistence', pp. 62–68.

77 Luria, *Sacred Boundaries*, pp. 118–29.

78 Luebke, *Hometown Religion*, pp. 177–87.

79 Diefendorf, 'Religious Conflict', pp. 58–59.

Not only the Catholics in Utrecht, but also other politico-religious minorities throughout early modern Europe had recourse to the developing concept of freedom of conscience. For instance, the crypto-Jew Isaac de Castro Tartas (1626–1647), who was convicted of ‘judaizing’ and was burned at the stake in Lisbon, argued for his release on the ground of freedom of conscience. In his discourse, two different concepts of freedom of conscience were operative: corporative freedom for politico-religious minorities from external persecution, and individual freedom of autonomous religious choice.⁸⁰ The former freedom was partly guaranteed but clearly articulated in the Edict of Nantes, the Peace of Augsburg, and the Peace of Westphalia, while the latter was ambiguously advocated by the Warsaw Confederation and the Union of Utrecht. In France and the Holy Roman Empire, thanks to these ordinances and treaties, religious disputes are said to have been ‘judicialized’ and settled in legal proceedings, but in England and the Dutch Republic they are alleged to have been resolved largely pragmatically, along extrajudicial lines.⁸¹ However, the Utrecht case shows that this account is only partly accurate, as Catholic Utrechters were denounced by the law as potential criminals and indeed prosecuted in many lawsuits. In such legal proceedings, they fought legal battles for their rights, claiming freedom of conscience.

There is no doubt that the Edict of Nantes transformed France, in terms of its confessional struggles, into a ‘legalized society’, as the French king established royal commissioners and bipartisan legal courts for the Edict. Drawing on their respective interpretations of the Edict, French Catholics and Huguenots each criticized the other in legal cases, arguing that the opposing party had violated the Edict and was disturbing the public tranquillity.⁸² Under the Peace of Augsburg, Protestants identified the right to emigrate (*jus emigrandi*) as a matter of freedom of conscience, allowing people not only to move elsewhere for religious reasons but also to practise their faith privately, even though their faith differed from that of their rulers. Catholics, on the other hand, were firm in their refusal to recognize the *jus emigrandi* as freedom of conscience. Before the outbreak of the Thirty Years’ War, several German cities invested large sums of money in fighting lawsuits over religious matters, resisting the confessionalizing agenda promoted by their overlord. Taking these legal disputes

80 Bodian, ‘The Geography of Conscience’.

81 Asch, ‘Religious Toleration’, pp. 87–88.

82 Diefendorf, ‘Religious Conflict’; Kang, ‘Coexisting in Intolerance’; Luria, *Sacred Boundaries*, passim.

into account, the Peace of Westphalia clearly defined three categories: public exercise of faith, private exercise of faith, and domestic devotion.⁸³ While the Warsaw Confederation offered a vaguer definition of freedom of conscience, it is remarkable that the non-Catholic nobility at the general *Sejm* (parliament) of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth tried to defy religious persecution by relying on the Confederation in their discourses.⁸⁴ In contrast, Dutch Catholics, who lacked political representatives, could not directly assert their own interpretations of the Union of Utrecht in any parliament. However, as the Utrecht case vividly shows, in their petitions to the politico-judicial authorities, Catholic Utrechters did manage to mobilize their own interpretations of the freedom of conscience guaranteed by the Union in order to survive as pious Catholics and respected residents or citizens. Even though the Union did not stipulate clear provisions for protection, some Catholics in Utrecht adopted their own criteria concerning visibility and audibility, and defined 'silent', 'modest', and 'non-public' assemblies, establishing the boundary separating tolerable from intolerable gatherings somewhere between ten and forty participants, similar to the legislation of the Edict of Nantes and the Peace of Westphalia.⁸⁵ Catholic understandings of conscience were not monolithic, but it must still be emphasized that some Dutch Catholics, including Wachtelaer and Vreeman, utilized freedom of conscience in their discourses to extend their rights and liberties in the public sphere, even mobilizing the discourses and examples of Protestant and Jewish dissenters at home and abroad. Here we can detect the voice of Dirk Volkertsz Coornhert (1522–1590), a champion of religious toleration, who defined freedom of conscience as 'freedom for each to believe and practice his religion'. He reminded his readers that, in the Dutch context, it was 'the Reformed themselves' who had once asked King Philip II 'for permission to exercise [their religion] publicly'. Coornhert even argued that 'we can only have solid concord when all inhabitants enjoy common and equal rights, and this especially in religion'.⁸⁶

83 Asch, 'Religious Toleration'; Kaplan, 'Quietly in His Own Home'; Luebke, *Hometown Religion*, pp. 39–44, 118–19, 130, 189–93, 193–99, 213–18.

84 Koyama, *Warushawa renmei kyoyaku*, pp. 52–67; Kriegseisen, *Between State and Church*, pp. 454–55, 467–71, 478–93, 504–38, 541–44.

85 In England, people tried to define tolerable gatherings as those that elaborated the Clarendon Code (1661–1665), claiming that a dissenting assembly of fewer than five family members should be immune from public, official intervention by the state. Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*, pp. 63, 261.

86 Coornhert and Voogt, *Synod on the Freedom of Conscience*, pp. 133, 189.

Delimitation of the Public

For the past three decades, historians have regarded the public/private distinction as key to understanding religious coexistence in the Dutch Republic and beyond in the early modern world. Through the analysis of coexistence in the city of Utrecht from the bottom-up perspective of Catholics, I have argued that the delimitation of the public may function as a new analytic framework for future studies. If we focus primarily on the private sphere, we tend to discuss how politico-religious minorities attempted to retreat into their own private sphere, passively conforming to the existing public/private distinction, while foregrounding the politico-religious majority that strategically tried to control the distinction in order to govern the precarious environment of coexistence. If, by contrast, we pay more attention to the public sphere, we can shed brighter light on the way politico-religious minorities tactically managed to carve out a position of their own in the shared public sphere, actively participating in the cooperative process of delimiting the public in order to survive the precarious environment of coexistence. Alongside the magistracy, the public church, and the politico-religious majority, dissenters too defined what the 'public' was, drew the borders of the public, and created norms for how they could and should behave in public. Manifesting their own visions of publicness, which could compete with those advocated by the authorities and the majority, politico-religious minorities tried to impose limits on the authorities and the majority, creating new norms for how the authorities and the majority could and should treat them. To date, historians of early modern religious coexistence have been inclined to focus on the private as represented by the physical space of the family home and by the abstract realm of conscience, to which dissenters are said to have withdrawn. In contrast, by examining the delimitation of the public, we may discover how early modern people perceived and discussed family home and conscience in relation to the public, whose physical and abstract contours dissenters also attempted to establish in order to facilitate their survival.

The Utrecht case, and many other studies, verify the importance of the physical thresholds of houses and perceptibility by the human senses (visibility and audibility) in the attempts of early modern men and women to physically distinguish public and private. Existing accounts have argued that Dutch Catholics were tolerated as long as they retreated from the physical public sphere and restricted their religiosity to the confines of

their private homes.⁸⁷ Yet politico-judicial authorities sometimes proved more aggressive, going so far as to pursue dissenters during worship inside their family homes. Utrecht's authorities denounced Catholic assemblies behind the physical threshold of their private homes as public, claiming that Catholics were communally performing idolatry there, open to others, under the leadership of clergy controlled by foreign public, official enemies, thus representing a danger to Reformed consciences and the public order. Likewise, in London politico-religious minorities' homes were regarded as hotbeds of behaviours and ideas threatening politico-social stability in public.⁸⁸ Regardless of where it took place, including embassy chapels, the practice of the Catholic faith in London was considered to have a public character, causing political anxiety among the Protestant majority.⁸⁹ Just like Catholics in Utrecht and other parts of the Northern Netherlands, Reformed in the Habsburg Netherlands were subject to prosecution even though they practised their faith inside their houses. Their worship was considered scandalous by the Catholic majority, not only because they opened the doors of their houses, but also because male participants, in conformity with the Reformed habit, kept their hats on inside.⁹⁰ When a Protestant sitting at a window on the ground floor of a tavern in Spa in the Habsburg Netherlands mocked a public procession of the Blessed Sacrament as it passed, he was accused of displaying his Protestantism and insulting Catholicism, on the grounds that his behaviour was publicly, openly visible and audible.⁹¹ Given their emphasis on inner beliefs rather than external rituals, Protestants seem at first glance to have been ready to confine their religious practices to their private homes. Yet not only Utrecht's Catholics, but also French Huguenots found it shameful that their worship was restricted to behind the threshold of their private houses.⁹² Despite official prohibitions under the Edict of Nantes, French Catholics and Huguenots wished to conquer and reconquer the urban public sphere, giving rise to protracted destructive struggles over sacred spaces.⁹³ Through their creative spatial practices, Utrecht's Catholics were similarly, albeit less fiercely, seeking opportunities to express their

87 E.g., Frijhoff, 'Dimensions', passim; Idem, *Embodied Belief*, pp. 39–65; Kaplan, *Divided by Faith*, pp. 172–97; Idem, 'Fictions of Privacy', passim; Idem, *Reformation*, pp. 164–203.

88 Vine, 'Those Enemies of Christ', p. 15.

89 Allen, 'London Catholicism'.

90 Roobroeck, 'Confessional Coexistence', pp. 21–23.

91 Corens, 'Seasonable Coexistence', pp. 146–49.

92 Foa, 'An Unequal Appointment', p. 381.

93 Diefendorf, 'Religious Conflict'; Luria, *Sacred Boundaries*, pp. 30–31, 36–41, 84, 88, 95.

religiosity in a more public, communal, and external fashion and they utilized the shared public architectural settings of the urban space to defend their new sacred spaces inside their houses, thereby delimiting the physical public in the city. Ultimately, in early modern Europe, private devotion was not entirely detached from the public, communal worship to which both Catholics and Protestants attached even greater value.⁹⁴ Internalized beliefs or religious practices behind the physical thresholds of private homes alone could not compensate for the deep loss of public, communal worship and the open, external expression of their faith, which were intrinsically connected with honour and fame – components of the abstract public – as observant believers and respected citizens in the early modern era.

Freedom of conscience was a product of post-Reformation Europe. Under the Edict of Nantes, for instance, Huguenots time and again resorted to freedom of conscience to secure their position, while Catholics, as the majority, mostly considered this notion to be a danger to public order. But when Catholics found themselves under the Protestant threat in local society, they too mobilized the notion of freedom of conscience in their defence.⁹⁵ However, as the Utrecht case vividly demonstrates, different meanings could be ascribed to 'conscience'. In sixteenth-century England, the subjectivity of conscience was still rarely acknowledged. Controversies provoked by moral problems deriving from the multi-confessional society contributed unwittingly to 'relativising and internalising the concept of conscience' among Protestant and Catholic thinkers alike.⁹⁶ While the 'public conscience' was examined by the English government through the use of official oaths as an indicator of its subjects' political loyalties, it was only subsequently that 'private conscience' came to be defended by such philosophers as John Locke (1632–1704) and mid-eighteenth-century jurists.⁹⁷ Likewise, post-Reformation Utrecht saw multiple interpretations of conscience, including the Catholic conception which insisted on priests and sacraments as necessary public and external resources for the salvation of souls. Other interpretations emphasized the political element of 'public conscience' or advocated the patriarchal right of religious education, while yet others confirmed the new idea of the individual right of autonomous religious choice. It is evident that Wachtelaer's and Vreeman's interpretations,

94 Longfellow, 'Public, Private', pp. 319, 321–22.

95 Kang, 'Coexisting in Intolerance'; Luria, *Sacred Boundaries*, p. 246.

96 Walsham, *Catholic Reformation*, p. 104; Idem, 'Ordeals of Conscience', p. 33.

97 Spurr, 'The Strongest Bond', especially pp. 158, 162.

in particular, did not fit with the modernization – that is, relativization and internalization – of conscience, as they justified the freedom of the public practice of faith, drawing on the concept of freedom of conscience. Although Reinhart Koselleck and others locate early modern conscience in the private sphere as people's inner, mental world,⁹⁸ early modern men and women themselves still discussed conscience in relation to the public as well. Like many other parts of seventeenth-century Europe, Utrecht did not witness any signs of Jürgen Habermas's modern rational public sphere, which formed the basis for deliberative democracy. Rather, the Utrecht case shows that symbolical and abstract 'representative publicness', by which Habermas has characterized the pre-modern era, still wielded a strong influence.⁹⁹ Whereas representative publicness is conceptualized as an authoritative and linearly top-down phenomenon, the Utrecht case demonstrates that Catholic politico-religious minorities also took part in the communal process of delimiting the abstract public. The early modern abstract public was not only authoritative and top-down, but also negotiable and bottom-up.

All in all, the early modern physical and abstract public should be understood in the contexts of both continuity and a break with medieval times, but certainly not in a linear development towards modernity. The public/private distinction has been a central preoccupation in the history of Western ideas, and we have seen several ways in which the distinction between public and private has been formulated.¹⁰⁰ It was only after the late nineteenth century, in the context of industrialization, that privacy came to be conceptualized positively and defined primarily as a fundamental human right guaranteeing control of information.¹⁰¹ The present study does not deny the existence of the concept of the private in the early modern era.¹⁰² Nevertheless, faced with problems deriving from the multi-religious reality in post-Reformation Europe, people attempted not to conceptualize

98 Kooi, *Calvinists and Catholics*, pp. 95–96; Koselleck, *Critique and Crisis*.

99 Habermas, *The Structural Transformation*. As for the assessment of Habermas's thesis in early modern Dutch religious history, I agree with Kaplan, *Divided by Faith*, pp. 196–97; Idem, 'Fictions of Privacy', pp. 1061–64; Idem, *Reformation*, pp. 200–3; Kooi, *Calvinists and Catholics*, pp. 95–96. See also Jürgens, 'Habermas for Historians', pp. 7–11; Mah, 'Phantasies of the Public Sphere', especially, pp. 158–68.

100 E.g., Weintraub and Kumar, *Public and Private*.

101 Longfellow, 'Public, Private', pp. 315–17; Saito, *Kōkyōsei*, p. 12; Solove, *Understanding Privacy*, pp. 4, 12–38, 41, 50–67.

102 Led by the Centre for Privacy Studies at the University of Copenhagen, scholars have come to argue the early modern private and privacy from various transdisciplinary perspectives. Green, Nørgaard, and Bruun, *Early Modern Privacy*.

the modern notion of privacy as a legal right for autonomous individuals, but rather to delimit the public. In early modern Europe, the private was not automatically identified with either the physical space of the family home or the abstract realm of conscience. Rather, both family home and conscience were inseparable from and discussed in relation to the physical and abstract public. In order to make religious coexistence possible in the early modern world, in which the communal, collective, and material facets of life carried indispensable meaning, people of different faiths attempted to define publicness, and not primarily the privacy per se that we so value. When it comes to the public/private distinction in the context of religious coexistence, the seventeenth century should therefore arguably better be considered in relation to the (late) medieval period, rather than as an earlier stage of modernity.

For a better understanding of the pre-modern public/private distinction, where the public outweighed the private, historians would do well to revisit Hannah Arendt, despite the nostalgic simplifications of which she has been criticized.¹⁰³ She maintained that in the pre-modern world, 'private life means above all to be deprived of things essential to a truly human life: to be deprived of the reality that comes from being seen and heard by others, [...] to be deprived of the possibility of achieving something more permanent than life itself'. According to her, it was 'public appearance', 'being seen and heard by others as well as ourselves', that 'constitutes reality'.¹⁰⁴ Likewise, 'for seventeenth-century individuals [in England], private and privacy are more simply the negative of public: secrecy or separation from that which is open, available, or pertaining to the community or nation as a whole'.¹⁰⁵ In post-Reformation Europe, where religious diversity threatened the politico-social cohesion of the *corpus christianum*, it was important for the semblance of religious unity in the public sphere to be preserved.¹⁰⁶ The judicialization of religious conflicts, which occurred not only in France and the Holy Roman Empire but also – albeit to a lesser extent – in the

103 Arendt, *The Human Condition*. Contributors to the volumes Wilson and Yachnin, *Making Publics*; Vanhaelen and Ward, *Making Space Public*; and Yachnin and Everhardt, *Forms of Association*, also urge early modernists to pay attention to Arendt's argument on the public/private distinction. For criticism of Arendt's simplified understanding of ancient Athens, see Tsao, 'Arendt against Athens'.

104 Arendt, *The Human Condition*, pp. 50, 58. Eli Zaretsky argues that '*The Human Condition* can be understood [...] as at least implying a critique of the liberal version of the "public/private" dichotomy'. Zaretsky, 'Hannah Arendt', p. 214.

105 Longfellow, 'Public, Private', p. 315.

106 Kaplan also used the phrase 'semblance of religious unity'. Kaplan, *Divided by Faith*, pp. 11, 171, 176, 183; Idem, 'Fictions of Privacy', pp. 1036, 1048, 1061; Idem, *Reformation*, pp. 171, 185.

Dutch Republic, ended up institutionalizing discrimination against politico-religious minorities as a group and thus preventing the privatization of religion and the secularization of the public sphere since people's faith, especially that of minorities, was expected to be open always to public, official scrutiny initiated by the politico-religious majority.¹⁰⁷ Observing the actions and discourses of Catholic Utrechters during the French occupation from 1672 to 1673, a period when they were allowed to practise their faith publicly, it is evident how desperately they desired to restore their public appearance in the civic community.¹⁰⁸

Here we must be careful not to attribute different understandings of the public and private to the different religiosities of Protestants and Catholics in an essentialist manner, equating Protestantization with modernization in the form of privatization of beliefs. Since the private sphere was still perceived negatively as a privation in the early modern era, even French Huguenots opposed their confinement to the private sphere and the loss of their presence in the shared public sphere. The restriction of their religious practices to the secluded private sphere 'fitted neither with traditional sociability nor with traditional religiosity', to which the Huguenots continued to attach greater importance.¹⁰⁹ Instead of simply applying stereotypical assumptions to the everyday life of ordinary early modern Protestants and Catholics, we need to probe their self-other scheme as well as the asymmetrical power relationships between the repressing and tolerating party and the repressed and tolerated party. In Japan, for instance, from 1641 onwards, VOC traders were confined to Dejima, a small artificial island constructed in Nagasaki as a trading post, where the public, open practice of Christianity was strictly prohibited. The Voetian theologian Johannes Hoornbeeck (1617–1666), professor at the universities of Utrecht and Leiden, found this treatment of his co-religionists unbearable: 'Certainly no Christian is allowed to follow these instructions, mindful of what Christ said'. Likewise, Utrecht's Reformed classis complained about the religious situation of the Dutch Reformed in Japan, where 'no external assembly, prayers either before or after the meal, or any other similar Christian exercise [...] could be practised' and where they served God only with 'holy internal thoughts'.¹¹⁰ Hoornbeeck and his colleagues

107 Asch, 'Religious Toleration', pp. 87–88; Luebke, *Hometown Religion*, p. 217.

108 E.g., Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 181–225; Vanhaelen, *The Wake of Iconoclasm*, pp. 130–58; Yasuhira, 'Confessional Coexistence', pp. 11–15; Idem, 'Shūhakankankei'.

109 Foa, 'An Unequal Appointment', pp. 381, 385.

110 HUA, *Nederlandse Hervormde classis Utrecht*, 3, 9/10 August 1653: 'geene uiterlicke bi-jeenkomste, gebeden so voor als na de maaltijt, nochte eenige andere diergelijke Christelicke

claimed that it was shameful and intolerable for 'us', the 'true' Christians of the Reformed faith, to live only with these 'internal thoughts' and without 'external assemblies' under the rule of the idolatrous 'others', in this case the Buddhist Japanese authorities. At the same time, they also argued that the idolatrous 'others', that is, Dutch Catholics, should be content to live just with their 'internal thoughts' and without 'external assemblies' under 'our' Dutch Reformed government. It was therefore not only Catholics but also Protestants who wished to practise their 'true' religion in the open public sphere and to confine the 'false' religion of others to the secret private sphere. For both confessional groups, not the private but the public mattered.

The Utrecht case highlights a hitherto underestimated agency exercised by politico-religious minorities in the making of religious coexistence through their participation in the process of delimiting the physical and abstract public. The political authorities were not the only agent in distinguishing between public and private, and Catholics were not just passive victims of repression or placid recipients of toleration.¹¹¹ Under constant pressure from the public church, Utrecht's political authorities strategically drew the border of the public with a view to retaining Reformed ascendancy in the public sphere, trying to deprive Catholic Utrechters of their, in Arendt's words, public appearance as devout Catholics and honourable citizens or residents. But even in such a discriminatory situation, which they indeed found shameful, Utrecht's Catholics did not always conform to the existing norm of the public/private distinction, playing the role assigned to them as obedient beneficiaries of toleration in the cultural fiction of privacy. Rather, through their spatial practices and in their discourses of self-representation, Catholics tactically delimited the physical and abstract public and even shifted its border on their own initiative, continuing their adherence to the medieval legacy and newly adjusting themselves to the early modern environment of religious diversity. Throughout the seventeenth century, Reformed and Catholic Utrechters struggled constantly to define the public, to draw the boundary of the

exercitie [...] sullen vermogen te plegen' and 'heilige innerlicke gedachten'; Loots and Spaans, *On the Conversion*, p. 405. I would like to thank Joke Spaans for drawing my attention to this primary source.

¹¹¹ See Christine Kooi's studies, which foreground 'tolerationist' magistrates in the province of Holland, who distinguished public and private so as to realize coexistence. Kooi, *Calvinists and Catholics*, especially, pp. 90–129; Idem, *Liberty and Religion*, especially, p. 193. Cf. Jérémie Foa's study, which claims that the king alone could distinguish public and private in France. Foa, 'An Unequal Appointment', pp. 385–86.

public, and to create norms for how the members of society could and should behave in public. There were multiple, competing visions of publicness. The public was not a static concept which the repressing and tolerating party alone could strategically colour and shape. It was a dynamic concept that the repressed and tolerated party, including Catholic Utrechters, also tactically appropriated and to which it attributed its own meanings, despite its strategic exclusion from what the authorities and the majority had defined as public. Taking part in the communal process of delimiting the public and mobilizing their own interpretations of publicness, which could challenge those of the majority, the minorities also wielded agency in fashioning a religiously diverse society.

On the basis of the Utrecht case, I maintain that the agency of politico-religious minorities in coexistence can only be properly understood if their survival tactics and their engagement in the delimitation of the public are positioned social-historically in concrete, local settings, and not just with isolated attention to the majority's governing strategies or the intellectual-historical and cultural-historical abstraction of the private or of privacy. If we prudently reflect on the specific factors that facilitated or thwarted certain types of governing strategies of the majority and survival tactics of the minorities, we can apply the analytic viewpoint of this monograph to studies on religious coexistence in the early modern world more broadly, beyond the boundaries of national and confessional historiographies. Only by accumulating such local empirical studies from a bottom-up perspective, can we begin to move firmly beyond such modernization models as the secularization thesis, the rise of toleration, and the privatization of beliefs, and to historicize our ongoing problem of coexistence.

Abbreviations

HUA Het Utrechts Archief, Utrecht

Bibliography

Archival Primary Sources

HUA, Nederlandse Hervormde classis Utrecht (24-1)
 3. Minutes of the Reformed consistory, 1644–1659

Published Primary Sources

- Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz, and Gerrit Voogt, *Synod on the Freedom of Conscience: A Thorough Examination during the Gathering Held in the Year 1582 in the City of Freetown*. Amsterdam, 2008.
- Loots, Ineke, and Joke Spaans, eds. *Johannes Hoornbeeck (1617–1666), On the Conversion of Indians and Heathens: An Annotated Translation of De Conversione Indorum et gentilium (1669)*. Leiden, 2018.
- Rosweyde, Heribertus. 'Voor-redene aen den goedt-willighen leser [...]'. In *Generale kerckelycke historie van de gheboorte onses H. Iesu Christi tot het iaer M.DC.XXIV [...]*, by Caesar Baronius. Antwerp, 1623.

Secondary Literature

- Abels, Paul H. A. M. "Beter slaafs in Algiers, dan Roomsch in Gouda". Overlevingsstrategieën van rooms-katholieken in Gouda (1570–1818). In *Terug naar Gouda. Religieus leven in de maalstroom van de tijd*, edited by Paul H. A. M. Abels, Jan Jacobs, and Mirjam van Veen. Zoetermeer, 2014, pp. 183–206.
- Agten, Els. *The Catholic Church and the Dutch Bible: From the Council of Trent to the Jansenist Controversy*. Leiden, 2020.
- Allen, Mark. 'London Catholicism, Embassy Chapels, and Religious Tolerance in Late Jacobean Polemic'. *British Catholic History* 36, no. 2 (2022), pp. 153–81.
- Arendt, Hanna. *The Human Condition*. Chicago, 1958.
- Arimura, Rie. 'The Adaptation of Vernacular Sacred Spaces in the Catholic Architecture of Early Modern Japan'. In *Interactions between Rivals: The Christian Mission and Buddhist Sects in Japan (c.1549–1647)*, edited by Alexandra Curvelo and Angelo Cattaneo. Bern, 2021, pp. 191–210.
- Asch, Ronald G. 'Religious Toleration, the Peace of Westphalia and the German Territorial Estates'. *Parliaments, Estates and Representation* 20 (2000), pp. 75–89.
- Bodian, Miriam. 'The Geography of Conscience: A Seventeenth-Century Atlantic Jew and the Inquisition'. *The Journal of Modern History* 89 (2017), pp. 247–81.
- Boer, David de, and Geert H. Janssen, eds. *De vluchtelingenrepubliek. Een migratiegeschiedenis van Nederland*. Amsterdam, 2023.
- Boon, Els, and Han Lettinck, *Joods Utrecht*. Utrecht, 2021.
- Bossy, John. *The English Catholic Community, 1570–1850*. London, 1975.
- Boxer, Charles Ralph. *The Christian Century in Japan, 1549–1650*. Berkeley, 1951.
- Brown, Wendy. *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire*. Princeton, 2006.
- Caspers, Charles, and Peter Jan Margry. *Identiteit en spiritualiteit van de Amsterdamse Stille Omgang*. Hilversum, 2006.

- Christ, Martin. *Biographies of a Reformation: Religious Change and Confessional Coexistence in Upper Lusatia, 1520-1635*. Oxford, 2021.
- Cogan, Susan M. *Catholic Social Networks in Early Modern England: Kinship, Gender, and Coexistence*. Amsterdam, 2021.
- Corens, Liesbeth. *Confessional Mobility and English Catholics in Counter-Reformation Europe*. Oxford, 2019.
- Corens, Liesbeth. 'Seasonable Coexistence: Temporality, Health Care and Confessional Relations in Spa, c. 1648–1740'. *Past and Present* 256 (2022), pp. 129–64.
- Diefendorf, Barbara. 'Religious Conflict and Civic Identity: Battles over the Sacred Landscape of Montpellier'. *Past and Present* 237 (2017), pp. 53–91.
- Esser, Raingard. 'Contested Space in a Contested Border Area: The Sint Jan in 's Hertogenbosch'. *Entangled Religions: Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Religious Contact and Transfer* 7 (2018), pp. 46–77.
- Faber, Dirk, and Ronald Rommes. 'Op weg naar stabiliteit'. In *Een paradijs vol weelde. Geschiedenis van der stad Utrecht*, edited by Renger de Bruin, P. D. 't Hart, A. J. van den Hoven van Genderen, A. Pietersen, and J. E. A. L. Struick. Utrecht, 2000, pp. 251–313.
- Fagel, Raymond, and Joke Spaans. *Nonnen verdreven door geuzen. Catharina del Spiritu Sancto's verhaal over de vlucht van Nederlandse clarissen naar Lissabon*. Hilversum, 2019.
- Foa, Jérémie. 'Making Peace: The Commissions for Enforcing the Pacification Edicts in the Reign of Charles IX (1560–1574)'. *French History* 18, no. 3 (2004), pp. 256–74.
- Foa, Jérémie. 'An Unequal Apportionment: The Conflict over Space Between Protestants and Catholics at the Beginning of the Wars of Religion'. *French History* 20, no. 4 (2006), pp. 369–86.
- Forclaz, Bertrand. *Catholiques au défi de la Réforme. La coexistence confessionnelle à Utrecht au XVIIe siècle*. Paris, 2014.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Toeëigening: van bezitsdrang naar betekenisgeving'. *Trajecta* 6 (1997), pp. 99–118.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Foucault Reformed by Certeau: Historical Strategies of Discipline and Everyday Tactics of Appropriation'. In *Cultural History after Foucault*, edited by John Neubauer. New York, 1999, pp. 83–99.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Dimensions de la coexistence confessionnelle'. In *The Emergence of Tolerance in the Dutch Republic*, edited by Christiane Berkvens-Stevelinck, Jonathan I. Israel, and G. H. M. Posthumus Meyes. Leiden, 1997, pp. 213–37.
- Frijhoff, Willem. *Embodied Belief: Ten Essays on Religious Culture in Dutch History*. Hilversum, 2002.
- Geraerts, Jaap. 'The Catholic Nobility in Utrecht and Guelders, c. 1580–1702'. PhD diss., University College London, 2015.

- Geraerts, Jaap. *Patrons of the Old Faith: The Catholic Nobility in Utrecht and Guelders, c. 1580–1702*. Leiden, 2018.
- Green, Michaël, Lars Cyril Nørgaard, and Mette Birkedal Bruun, eds. *Early Modern Privacy: Sources and Approaches*. Leiden, 2022.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, translated by Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge, MA 1989.
- Haitsma, M. A. *De rooms-katholieken te Leiden van ongeveer 1650 tot de tweede helft van de achttiende eeuw*. Amersfoort, 1977.
- Janssen, A. E. M. *Om den gelove. Wederwaardigheden van Willemken van Wanray als remonstrantse weduwe in 1619 en 1622 te Nijmegen doorstaan en vervolgens eigenhandig opgetekend*. Nijmegen, 2003.
- Janssen, Geert H. *The Dutch Revolt and Catholic Exile in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge 2014).
- Janssen, Geert H. 'The Republic of the Refugees: Early Modern Migrations and the Dutch Experience'. *Historical Journal* 60, no. 1 (2017), pp. 1–20.
- Jürgens, Hanco. 'Habermas for Historians: Four Approaches to his Works'. *Forschungsberichte aus dem Duitsland Insituut Amsterdam* 5 (2009), pp. 1–13.
- Kang, Sukhwan. 'Coexisting in Intolerance under the Edict of Pacification: The Legal Battle over the Articles of the Edict of Nantes in Normandy, 1650–85'. *French Historical Studies* 46 (2023) pp. 361–92.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J. *Calvinists and Libertines: Confession and Community in Utrecht, 1578–1620*. Oxford, 1995.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J. 'Diplomacy and Domestic Devotion: Embassy Chapels and the Toleration of Religious Dissent in Early Modern Europe'. *Journal of Early Modern Europe* 6, no. 4 (2002), pp. 341–61.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J. 'Fictions of Privacy: House Chapels and the Spatial Accommodation of Religious Dissent in Early Modern Europe'. *American Historical Review* 107 (2002), pp. 1031–64.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J. *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflicts and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge, MA and London, 2007.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J. "'In Equality and Enjoying the Same Favor": Biconfessionalism in the Low Countries'. In *A Companion to Multiconfessionalism in the Early Modern World*, edited by Thomas M. Safley. Leiden, 2011, pp. 99–126.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J. 'Religious Encounters in the Borderlands of Early Modern Europe: The Case of Vaals'. *Dutch Crossing* 37, no. 1 (2013), pp. 4–19.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J. *Cunegonde's Kidnapping: A Story of Religious Conflict in the Age of Enlightenment*. London, 2014.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J. *Reformation and the Practice of Toleration: Dutch Religious History in the Early Modern Era*. Leiden, 2019.

- Kaplan, Benjamin J. "‘Quietly in His Own Home’: The Language of Privacy in Early Modern Freedom of Conscience Laws". In *Handbook of Early Modern Privacy*, edited by Mette Birkedal Bruun and Sari Nauman. Forthcoming.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J., and Judith Pollmann. 'Conclusion'. In *Catholic Communities in Protestant States: Britain and the Netherlands, c. 1570–1720*, edited by Benjamin Kaplan, Bob Moore, Henk van Nierop, and Judith Pollmann. Manchester, 2009, pp. 249–64.
- Kooi, Christine. *Liberty and Religion: Church and State in Leiden's Reformation, 1572–1620*. Leiden, 2000.
- Kooi, Christine. 'Paying off the Sheriff: Strategies of Catholic Toleration in Golden Age Holland'. In *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, edited by Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia and Henk van Nierop. Cambridge, 2002, pp. 87–101.
- Kooi, Christine. *Calvinists and Catholics during Holland's Golden Age: Heretics and Idolaters*. Cambridge, 2012.
- Kooi, Christine. *Reformation in the Low Countries, 1500–1620*. Cambridge, 2022.
- Koselleck, Reinhart. *Critique and Crisis: Enlightenment and the Pathogenesis of Modern Society*. Cambridge, MA, 1988.
- Kossmann, Ernst H. *Politieke theorie en geschiedenis*. Amsterdam, 1987.
- Koyama, Satoshi. *Warushawa renmei kyōyaku, 1573 nen (Warsaw Confederation, 1573)*. Tokyo, 2013.
- Kriegseisen, Wojciech. *Between State and Church: Confessional Relations from Reformation to Enlightenment: Poland – Lithuania – Germany – Netherland*. Frankfurt and New York, 2016.
- Kroesen, Justin E. A. 'Na de Beeldenstorm. Continuïteit en verandering in het gebruik van middeleeuwse kerkruimten in Nederland na de Reformatie, met bijzondere aandacht voor het koor'. *Jaarboek voor Liturgieonderzoek* 30 (2014), pp. 137–63.
- Kroesen, Justin E. A. 'Accommodating Calvinism: The Appropriation of Medieval Church Interiors for Protestant Worship in the Netherlands after the Reformation'. In *Protestantischer Kirchenbau der frühen Neuzeit in Europa. Grundlagen und neue Forschungskonzepte*, edited by Jan Harasimowicz. Regensburg, 2015, pp. 81–98.
- Kroesen, Justin E. A. 'De storm doorstaan. Continuïteit en verandering in de protestantse inrichting van middeleeuwse kerken ten tijde van de Republiek'. In *Sacrale ruimte in de vroegmoderne Nederlanden*, edited by Liesbeth Geevers and Violet Soen. Leuven, 2017, pp. 87–104.
- Lenarduzzi, Carolina. 'Grensoverschrijdende katholieke claims. De grenzen tussen publieke en private ruimte voor sacrale doeleinden in de zeventiende-eeuwse Republiek'. In *Sacrale ruimte in de vroegmoderne Nederlanden*, edited by Liesbeth Geevers and Violet Soen. Leuven, 2017, pp. 105–28.
- Lenarduzzi, Carolina. 'Katholiek in de Republiek. Subcultuur en tegencultuur in Nederland, 1570–1750'. PhD diss., Leiden University, 2018.

- Lenarduzzi, Carolina. *Katholiek in de Republiek. De belevingswereld van een religieuze minderheid 1570–1750*. Nijmegen, 2019.
- Linden, David van der. 'Unholy Territory: French Missionaries, Huguenot Refugees, and Religious Conflict in the Dutch Republic'. *Church History and Religious Culture* 100 (2020), pp. 526–49.
- Longfellow, Erica. 'Public, Private, and the Household in Early Seventeenth-Century England'. *Journal of British Studies* 45 (2006), pp. 313–34.
- Lotz-Heumann, Ute. 'Between Conflict and Coexistence: The Catholic Community in Ireland as a "Visible Underground Church" in the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries'. In *Catholic Communities in Protestant States: Britain and the Netherlands, c. 1570–1720*, edited by Benjamin Kaplan, Bob Moore, Henk van Nierop, and Judith Pollmann. Manchester, 2009, pp. 168–82.
- Luebke, David M. *Hometown Religion: Regimes of Coexistence in Early Modern Westphalia*. Charlottesville and London, 2016.
- Luria, Keith. *Sacred Boundaries: Religious Coexistence and Conflict in Early-Modern France*. Washington DC, 2005.
- Mah, Harold. 'Phantasies of the Public Sphere: Rethinking the Habermas of Historians'. *Journal of Modern History* 72 (2000), 153–82.
- Marcuse, Herbert. 'Repressive Tolerance'. In *A Critique of Pure Tolerance*, edited by Robert Paul Wolff, Barrington Moore Jr., and Herbert Marcuse. Boston, 1965, pp. 81–123.
- Margry, Peter Jan, and Charles Caspers, eds. *Bedevaartplaatsen in Nederland*, 4 vols. Amsterdam, 1997–2000.
- McClain, Lisa. 'Without Church, Cathedral, or Shrine: The Search for Religious Space among Catholics in England, 1559–1625'. *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 33, no. 2 (2002), pp. 381–99.
- Monteiro, Marit. *Geestelijke maagden. Leven tussen klooster en wereld in Noord-Nederland gedurende de zeventiende eeuw*. Hilversum, 1996.
- Mooij, Charles de. *Geloof kan Bergen verzetten. Reformatie en katholieke herleving te Bergen op Zoom, 1577–1795*. Hilversum, 1998.
- Mooij, Charles de. 'Second-Class yet Self-Confident: Catholics in the Dutch Generality Lands'. In *Catholic Communities in Protestant States: Britain and the Netherlands, c. 1570–1720*, edited by Benjamin Kaplan, Bob Moore, Henk van Nierop, and Judith Pollmann. Manchester, 2009, pp. 156–67.
- Munier, W. A. J. *Het simultaneum in de landen van Overmaas. Een uniek instituut in de Nederlandse kerkgeschiedenis (1632–1878)*. Leeuwarden, 1998.
- Noorman, Judith, and Robbert Jan van der Maal, *Het unieke memorieboek van Maria van Nesse (1588–1650). Nieuwe perspectieven op huishoudelijke consumptie*. Amsterdam, 2022.
- Ó hAnnracháin, Tadhg. *Catholic Europe, 1592–1648: Centre and Peripheries*. Oxford, 2015.

- Oka, Mihoko. 'The Catholic Missionaries and the Unified Regime in Japan'. In *The Palgrave Handbook of the Catholic Church in East Asia*, edited by Cindy Yik-yu Chu and Beatrice Leung. Singapore, 2021, pp. 1–35.
- Oka, Mihoko. 'Domesticating Christianity in Japan: Kirishitan and Buddhism'. In *Cambridge History of Japan*, vol. 1, *Premodern Japan in East Asia, c.500–1600*. 3 vols. edited by Hitomi Tonomura. Cambridge, Forthcoming.
- Omata Rappo, Hitomi. *Des Indes lointaines aux scènes des collèges. Les reflets des martyrs de la mission japonaise en Europe (XVIe – XVIIIe siècle)*. Münster, 2020.
- Omata Rappo, Hitomi. 'History and Historiography of Martyrdom in Japan'. In *The Palgrave Handbook of the Catholic Church in East Asia*, edited by Cindy Yik-yu Chu and Beatrice Leung. Singapore, 2021, pp. 1–38.
- Onnekink, David. 'The Body Politic'. In *The Cambridge Companion to the Dutch Golden Age*, edited by Helmer J. Helmers and Geert H. Janssen. Cambridge, 2018, pp. 107–23.
- Parker, Charles H. *The Reformation of Community: Social Welfare and Calvinist Charity in Holland, 1572–1620*. Cambridge, 1998.
- Parker, Charles H. 'Paying for the Privilege: The Management of Public Order and Religious Pluralism in Two Early Modern Societies'. *Journal of World History* 17, no. 3 (2006), pp. 267–96.
- Parker, Charles H. *Faith on the Margins: Catholics and Catholicism in the Dutch Golden Age*. Cambridge, MA and London, 2008.
- Parker, Charles H. 'Heretics at Home, Heathens Abroad: The Revival of Dutch Catholicism as Global Mission'. *Trajecta* 26 (2017), pp. 89–106.
- Pollmann, Judith. *Catholic Identity and the Revolt of the Netherlands, 1520–1635*. Oxford, 2011.
- Poppe, Cora van de. 'The Shaping of an Innocent Martyr: The Linguistic Strategies of the Remonstrant Widow Willemken van Wanray (ca. 1573–1647)'. *Early Modern Low Countries* 2, no. 2 (2018), pp. 226–43.
- Prak, Maarten. 'The Politics of Intolerance: Citizenship and Religion in the Dutch Republic (Seventeenth to Eighteenth Centuries)'. In *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, edited by Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia and Henk van Nierop. Cambridge, 2002, pp. 159–75.
- Questier, Michael. *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England: Politics, Aristocratic Patronage and Religion, c. 1550–1640*. Cambridge, 2006.
- Rogier, Lodewijk J. *Geschiedenis van het katholicisme in Noord-Nederland in de 16e en de 17e eeuw*, 3 vols. Amsterdam, 1945–1947.
- Roobroeck, Roman. 'Confessional Coexistence in the Habsburg Netherlands: The Case of Geuzenhoek (1680–1730)'. *BMGN – Low Countries Historical Review* 136, no. 4 (2021), pp. 3–26.

- Rowlands, Marie B. 'Harbourers and Housekeepers: Catholic Women in England 1570–1720'. In *Catholic Communities in Protestant States: Britain and the Netherlands, c. 1570–1720*, edited by Benjamin Kaplan, Bob Moore, Henk van Nierop, and Judith Pollmann. Manchester, 2009, pp. 200–15.
- Saito, Junichi. *Kōkyōsei (Publicness)*. Tokyo, 2000.
- Schimmel, J. A. *Burgerrecht te Nijmegen 1592–1810. Geschiedenis van de verlening en burgerlijst*. Tilburg, 1966.
- Solove, Daniel J. *Understanding Privacy*. Cambridge, MA and London, 2008.
- Spaans, Joke. *Haarlem na de Reformatie: Stedelijke cultuur en kerkelijk leven, 1577–1620*. The Hague, 1989.
- Spaans, Joke. 'Stad van vele geloven 1578–1795'. In *Geschiedenis van Amsterdam*, vol. II-1, *Centrum van de wereld 1578–1650*, 4 vols. edited by Willem Frijhoff and Maarten Prak. Nijmegen, 2004, pp. 385–467.
- Spaans, Joke. *De Levens der Maechden. Het verhaal van een religieuze vrouwen-gemeenschap in de eerste helft van de zeventiende eeuw*. Hilversum, 2012.
- Spaans, Joke. 'Een herinnerd religieus landschap. Vroegmodern Amsterdam'. In *Sacrale ruimte in de vroegmoderne Nederlanden*, edited by Liesbeth Geevers and Violet Soen. Leuven, 2017, pp. 129–54.
- Spohnholz, Jesse. 'Confessional Coexistence in the Early Modern Low Countries'. In *A Companion to Multiconfessionalism in the Early Modern World*, edited by Thomas M. Safley. Leiden, 2011, pp. 47–73.
- Spohnholz, Jesse. *The Tactics of Toleration: A Refugee Community in the Age of Religious Wars*. Newark, 2011.
- Spurr, John. "'The Strongest Bond of Conscience': Oaths and the Limits of Tolerance in Early Modern England'. In *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500–1700*, edited by Harald Braun and Edward Vallance. New York, 2004, pp. 151–65.
- Terpstra, Nicholas. *Religious Refugees in the Early Modern World: An Alternative History of the Reformation*. Cambridge, 2015.
- Tsao, Roy. 'Arendt against Athens: Rereading the Human Condition'. *Political Theory* 30, no. 1 (2002), pp. 97–123.
- Turnbull, Stephen. *The Kakure Kirishitan of Japan: A Study of Their Development, Beliefs and Rituals to the Present Day*. London, 1998.
- Ubachs, P. J. H. *Twee heren twee confessies. De verhouding van staat en kerk te Maastricht 1632–1673*. Assen, 1975.
- Vanhaelen, Angela. *The Wake of Iconoclasm: Painting the Church in the Dutch Republic*. University Park, PA, 2012.
- Vanhaelen, Angela, and Joseph Ward, eds. *Making Space Public in Early Modern Europe: Performance, Geography, Privacy*. London, 2013.

- Vine, Emily. "Those Enemies of Christ, if They are Suffered to Live among Us": Locating Religious Minority Homes and Private Space in Early Modern London'. *The London Journal* 43 (2018), pp. 1–18.
- Vos, Aart. *Burgers, broeders en bazen. Het maatschappelijk middenveld van 's-Hertogenbosch in de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw*. Hilversum, 2007.
- Vos-Schoonbeek, Martha. 'Roomsgezinden voor de rechter. Gerechtelijke vervolging van Katholieke godsdienstuitoefening in de provincie Groningen van 1594 tot 1731'. MA thesis, University of Groningen, 1987.
- Vos-Schoonbeek, Martha. 'Hinderpalen voor katholieke geloofsuitoefening in Groningen in de 17de en het begin van de 18de eeuw'. *Groningse volksalmanak. Historisch jaarboek voor Groningen* (1990), pp. 68–96.
- Walsham, Alexandra. *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England*. London, 1993.
- Walsham, Alexandra. 'Ordeals of Conscience: Casuistry, Conformity and Confessional Identity in Post-Reformation England'. In *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500–1700*, edited by Harald Braun and Edward Vallance. New York, 2004, pp. 32–48.
- Walsham, Alexandra. *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500–1700*. Manchester, 2006.
- Walsham, Alexandra. *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland*. Oxford, 2011.
- Walsham, Alexandra. *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain*. London, 2014.
- Weintraub, Jeff, and Krishan Kumar, eds. *Public and Private in Thought and Practice: Perspectives on a Grand Dichotomy*. Chicago, 1997.
- Wilson, Bronwen, and Paul Yachnin, eds. *Making Publics in Early Modern Europe: People, Things, Forms of Knowledge*. London, 2009.
- Yachnin, Paul, and Marlene Eberhart, eds. *Forms of Association: Making Publics in Early Modern Europe*. Amherst, 2015.
- Yasuhira, Genji. 'Shūhakankankei to kanyou no kinou: 1670 nendai Yutorehito ni okeru shinkoujissen wo meguru tousou (Interconfessional Relations and the Function of Toleration: The Struggle for the Practice of Faith in Utrecht during the 1670s)'. *The Shirin or the Journal of History* 98, no. 2 (2015), pp. 1–35.
- Yasuhira, Genji. 'Confessional Coexistence and Perceptions of the "Public": Catholics' Agency in Negotiations on Poverty and Charity in Utrecht, 1620s–1670s'. *BMGN – Low Countries Historical Review* 132, no. 4 (2017), pp. 3–24.
- Zaretsky, Eli. 'Hannah Arendt and the Meaning of the Public/Private Distinction'. In *Hannah Arendt and the Meaning of Politics*, edited by Craig Calhoun and John McGowan. London, 1997, pp. 207–31.