

Catholic Survival in the Dutch Republic

Studies in Early Modernity in the Netherlands

This book series, formerly known as Amsterdam Studies in the Dutch Golden Age, is published by Amsterdam University Press in collaboration with the Amsterdam Centre for Studies in Early Modernity. It aims to explore the history and culture of the Dutch Republic during the 'long' seventeenth century (c. 1560-1720).

The publications provide insight into the lively diversity and continuing relevance of the Early Modern period in the Netherlands. They offer original studies on a wide variety of topics, ranging from Rembrandt to Vondel, from Beeldenstorm (iconoclastic fury) to Ware Vrijheid (True Freedom) and from Batavia to New Amsterdam. Politics, religion, culture, economics, expansion and warfare all come together in the Centre's interdisciplinary setting.

Series editors

Judith Noorman, University of Amsterdam

Editorial Board

Frans Blom, University of Amsterdam

Michiel van Groesen, Leiden University

Nelleke Moser, VU University Amsterdam

Emile Schrijver, University of Amsterdam

Thijs Weststeijn, Utrecht University

Catholic Survival in the Dutch Republic

*Agency in Coexistence and the
Public Sphere in Utrecht, 1620–1672*

Genji Yasuhira

Amsterdam University Press

The publication of this book is made possible by a grant from the Stichting Adrianus Fonds, the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, the Stichting Dr Hendrik Muller's Vaderlandsch Fonds, the Stichting Het Nuyensfonds, and the Stichting Sormani Fonds.

Studies in Early Modernity in the Netherlands is the continuation of *Amsterdam Studies in the Dutch Golden Age*.

Cover illustration: Johannes Steffelaar, Interior of the Clandestine Church of St Gertrudis in Utrecht, 1896, oil on canvas, 64.5 × 52 cm, photograph by Museum Catharijneconvent (currently displayed at the Driehoek in Utrecht)

Cover design: Coördesign, Leiden

Lay-out: Crius Group, Hulshout

ISBN 978 90 4855 845 2

e-ISBN 978 90 4855 845 2

DOI 10.5117/9789048558452

NUR 685



creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0

© G. Yasuhira / Amsterdam University Press B.V., Amsterdam 2024

Some rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, any part of this book may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise).

Every effort has been made to obtain permission to use all copyrighted illustrations reproduced in this book. nonetheless, whosoever believes to have rights to this material is advised to contact the publisher.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	9
Abbreviations	13
List of Figures and Tables	15
Introduction	17
Utrecht as the Stage of Religious Coexistence	21
Historiography: Early Modern Dutch Catholics and the Public/Private Distinction	28
Research Design: Catholic Agency in Coexistence and the Public Sphere	35
Abbreviations	43
Bibliography	44
Published Primary Sources	44
Secondary Literature	44
Part I. Reformed Governing Strategies	
1. Repression: Dynamics of Anti-Catholicism	55
1.1. The Politico-Judicial Structure of Post-Reformation Utrecht	57
1.2. Legislation of and Pressure for Anti-Catholicism	61
1.2.1. The Resumption of War against the Habsburg Monarchy, 1620–1638	61
1.2.2. The Last Phase of the Dutch Revolt, 1639–1648	65
1.2.3. After the Peace of Münster and the Great Assembly, 1648–1659	69
1.2.4. Under the Republican Regime, 1660–1672	72
1.3. Legal Proceedings against Catholics	76
1.3.1. Chronological Developments	76
1.3.2. Charges	82
1.3.3. Sentences	88
1.4. Conclusion	92
Abbreviations	94
Bibliography	95
Archival Primary Sources	95

Published Primary Sources	96
Secondary Literature	97
2. Toleration: Limited Recognition and Connivance	101
2.1. Priests	103
2.2. Women	115
2.3. Public Office Holders	125
2.4. Applicants for Citizenship	136
2.5. Conclusion	142
Abbreviations	144
Bibliography	144
Archival Primary Sources	144
Published Primary Sources	146
Secondary Literature	146

Part II. Catholic Survival Tactics

3. Foundational Infrastructure: Social Status and Networks	153
3.1. Defenders of the Prosecuted Catholics	155
3.2. Nobles and Canons	160
3.3. Jurists	169
3.4. Those with Close Ties to the Reformed Elite	176
3.5. Conclusion	187
Abbreviations	189
Bibliography	190
Archival Primary Sources	190
Published Primary Sources	191
Secondary Literature	192
4. Spatial Practices: The Making of the Urban Landscape of Coexistence	197
4.1. Chronological Developments in Catholic Spatial Practices	199
4.2. Public Facilities	203
4.2.1. Public Church Buildings	203
4.2.2. Monasteries and Convents	206
4.2.3. Hospices	208
4.3. Houses and Public Streets	213
4.3.1. Open Clashes	213
4.3.2. Outside the City Walls	217

4.3.3. Around Nieuwegracht	220
4.3.4. Around Mariahoek	223
4.4. Conclusion	228
Abbreviations	230
Bibliography	231
Archival Primary Sources	231
Published Primary Sources	231
Secondary Literature	232
5. Discourses of Self-Representation: Public, Private, and Conscience	235
5.1. Four Rhetorical Elements	237
5.1.1. Denial and Deceit	237
5.1.2. Jurisdiction	240
5.1.3. Social Status and Contribution to the Common Good	246
5.1.4. Conscience	254
5.2. Two Examples	264
5.2.1. Grietgen Janssen, an Immigrant Woman	264
5.2.2. Johannes Wachtelaer, a Native Priest	267
5.3. Conclusion	274
Abbreviations	277
Bibliography	277
Archival Primary Sources	277
Published Primary Sources	278
Secondary Literature	279
Conclusion	283
Governing Strategies	286
Politico-Religious Structures	286
Legal Schemes	288
Politico-Religious and Socio-Economic Circumstances	291
Survival Tactics	295
Numerical, Socio-Economic, and Historical Presence	296
Religious Infrastructure	299
Legal Resources	304
Delimitation of the Public	309
Abbreviations	316
Bibliography	316
Archival Primary Sources	316
Published Primary Sources	317
Secondary Literature	317

Appendices

Appendix 1. Details of Legal Proceedings against Catholics in Utrecht, 1620-1672	326
Appendix 2. Recognized priests in Utrecht, 1620-1672	354
Appendix 3. Connived priests in Utrecht, 1620-1672	366
Appendix 4. Defenders of prosecuted Catholics in Utrecht, 1620-1672	370

Bibliography

Archival Primary Sources	379
Published Primary Sources	381
Secondary Literature	383

Index

413

Acknowledgements

This is a book written by a secular Japanese living in the early twenty-first century, who happily came across early modern Dutch religious history. My general interest in the Dutch Republic was first stirred by lectures on world history in high school in Japan. I confess that it was the modernization narratives (such as Immanuel Wallerstein's world-systems theory, whose influence could be felt in our textbook) and the peculiar position which the Republic held in those stories of world history, including that of Japan, that caught my heart as a high school student. At the same time, I was – and still am – interested in coexistence, toleration and the survival of minorities in this globalizing, post-modern, and post-colonial world. After becoming a university student, I developed a fascination for early modern Dutch religious history. It seemed the best research theme for combining my historical interest in the Dutch Republic with my politico-philosophical concerns for toleration, while gradually developing critical perspectives on the triumphant narratives of Western modernization. After beginning to study early modern Dutch religious history on my own initiative while still in Japan, I came to be attracted to Dutch Catholics. Given that our – or, at least, my – textbook images of early modern Dutch religious history were characterized by either Reformed Protestantism or religious toleration, the history of the survival of Dutch Catholics, who now constitute the largest religious group in the contemporary, secular Netherlands, seemed a research theme worth delving into. How did Catholics manage to survive in the Dutch Republic? This question urged me to embark on an academic journey, stopping for some time to deliver the present monograph.

Along the way, I have been warmly supported by innumerable people across the planet within and outside academia. I express my deep gratitude to Yoshio Kajiyama and Akio Matsuura, from whom I learned how important it is to try to understand those of different world-views and beliefs. I am very grateful to Atsushi Egawa, who taught me how to approach the everyday life of people in pre-modern Europe. I am greatly indebted to Satoshi Koyama, from whom I have learned so much on what historians of early modern Europe should be. I extend my heartfelt thanks to Kenshi Fukumoto, with whom I have somehow managed to survive in academia. I would like to thank Tomoji Odori, whose enthusiasm for early modern religious history urged me to take a step forward. I wish to convey my special appreciation to Koji Yamamoto, who warmly encouraged me to speak to and reach a wider audience. For their guidance, kindness, and encouragement in the

past years, my warm thanks also go out to many other teachers, colleagues, and friends in Japan, including – in alphabetical order – Akira Hamabe, Yuta Hamasaki, Yoshihisa Hattori, Kosuke Hotta, Kentaro Inagaki, Shusaku Kanazawa, Yoshiyuki Kato, Atsushi Kawahara, Kazuo Kobayashi, Hannah Dongsun Lee, Sho Makino, Takashi Minamikawa, Kazufumi Murakami, Mizuki Nakashima, Haruka Oba, Hiroyuki Saito, Kyohei Sakeshima, Mitsuo Sakurada, Yusuke Sasaki, Yu Satouchi, Yu Takeda, Toru Takenaka, and the members of the Historians' Workshop, Tokyo.

Ever since I first set foot in the Netherlands in 2015, I received much helpful guidance on Dutch history from many brilliant specialists. My deepest thanks are reserved for Jo Spaans, who has guided me along the way as my 'companion' (*begeleider*) for the past years. She has been most enthusiastic in helping me to become a historian, has profoundly improved my historical argumentation and understanding, and has always been glad to share in the enthusiasm of my findings. I would also like to pay special tribute to my great motivator, Paul van Geest. I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Peter-Ben Smit, Dick Schoon, and Jan Hallebeek, who have kindly guided me into the world of Dutch Catholics, past and present. I am heavily indebted to Willem Frijhoff, who provided much warm encouragement along the way and taught me so much of what I know about religious history from bottom-up perspectives. My heartfelt thanks also go out to Judith Pollmann, who has always cheered me up and given me insightful suggestions. I would like to express my deep gratitude to Ben Kaplan, who was most generous in exchanging thoughts and ideas with me. His constructive criticism has enabled me to formulate a better argument. I extend my sincere appreciation to Charles Hal Parker and Geert Janssen, who encouraged me to write on Dutch Catholics. I likewise acknowledge the invaluable support I have received from Marten Jan Bok, who guided me deep into the history of seventeenth-century Utrecht as if he were living there. I am also greatly indebted to other specialists of Utrecht's history, such as Llewellyn Bogaers and Renger de Bruin, for their helpful guidance and suggestions. I would like to convey my deep gratitude to Jaap Geraerts and Carolina Lenarduzzi, who have generously shared their thoughts with me and improved my understanding of early modern Dutch Catholic history. My warm appreciation also goes out to Albert Gootjes for his kindness and professionalism in correcting my English throughout this monograph. For their constructive comments and cheering words, I wish to thank my many other colleagues and friends in the Netherlands and beyond, including Richard de Beer, Paul Begheyn, Agnes Berns, Jeannette Boere, Wim Boot, Henk Bos, Raymond Fagel, Xin Fan, Carla de Gloppe-Zuiderland, Harm

Goris, Sukhwan Kang, Anton ten Klooster, Christine Kooi, Jan Machielsen, Guido Marnef, Jack de Mooij, David Onnekink, Marcel Sarot, Jeff Shawn Jose, Pooyan Tamimi Arab, Jonas van Tol, Evelyne Verheggen, Wietse van der Velde, and Stan van Zon.

For someone writing a history of Catholics in Utrecht, it was a precious experience to live in that city, to walk the streets, to talk to residents, and to delve into the local archives. I would like to thank all the staff, especially Nettie Stoppelenburg, at Het Utrechts Archief, where all of the manuscript sources for the present study are stored, for the kind assistance they gave me during my archival research. I am sincerely grateful to people in and around the Nikola-kommuniteit (especially Aline Barnhoorn, Ronald Hermsen, H el ene Leijendekkers, Mieke van der Mooren, Claar de Roy, Paul de Roy, and Arthur van Wijk) for their hospitality and generosity, offering me a tranquil place to live while I was passing through a difficult time in Utrecht.

While doing the research and writing for this book, I was kindly received at Tilburg University, Musashi University, Utrecht University, and University College London, as well as Kyoto University, where I have recently started working as a senior lecturer. I would like to offer my sincere thanks to the colleagues, staff, and students of these universities for their gracious support. I am also greatly indebted to the Stichting Adrianus Fonds and the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (grant numbers: 19J00289 and 22KJ2841) for their generous grants, which have enabled me to complete this book project. To make this monograph available in open access, I received additional funds from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, the Stichting Adrianus Fonds, the Stichting Dr Hendrik Muller's Vaderlandsch Fonds, the Stichting Het Nuyensfonds, and the Stichting Sormani Fonds, for which I am most thankful.

I also wish to convey my warm appreciation to the series editor and the editorial board of the *Studies in Early Modernity in the Netherlands* for agreeing to publish my manuscript and to the anonymous referees for their valuable, constructive comments. I thank the editors, the gatekeeper, the copyeditor, and the typesetter at Amsterdam University Press for their careful work during the book production process. Earlier versions of parts of this monograph were included in my previous publications, all of which are available in open access: '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; 'Delimitation of the "Public" and Freedom of Conscience: Catholics' Survival Tactics in Legal Discourses in Utrecht, 1630–1659'. *Early Modern Low Countries* 3, no. 1 (2019), pp. 81–114; 'A Swarm of "Locusts": Pro/

Persecution and Toleration of Catholic Priests in Utrecht, 1620–1672'. *Church History and Religious Culture* 99, no. 2 (2019), pp. 183–227; '1592: Hollandse Zending en katholieke vernieuwing'. In *Nog meer wereldgeschiedenis van Nederland*, edited by Leo Lucassen, Lex Heerma van Voss, Marjolein 't Hart, Manon van der Heijden, and Nadia Bouras. Amsterdam, 2022, pp. 167–73; 'Transforming the Urban Space: Catholic Survival through Spatial Practices in Post-Reformation Utrecht'. *Past and Present* 255 (2022), pp. 39–86. For their helpful remarks on these and other parts of this monograph, I owe a special debt of gratitude to those scholars who read my manuscripts prior to publication, including especially Jo Spaans, Paul van Geest, Ben Kaplan, Renger de Bruin, Theo Clemens, and Joep van Gennip, as well as Llewellyn Bogaers, Marten Jan Bok, Jaap Geraerts, Albert Gootjes, Xiaolong Huang, Kentaro Inagaki, Satoshi Koyama, Peter Lake, Hannah Dongsun Lee, Carolina Lenarduzzi, Christine MacLeod, Sho Makino, Shinji Nohara, Tomoji Odori, Takuya Okada, Erik Sengers, Adam Takahashi, Takao Terui, Haruhisa Ueda, Hiroki Ueno, Shaun Yajima, Koji Yamamoto, and Hiroaki Yoshikawa. Needless to say, all the remaining mistakes and errors are solely my own.

Finally, and above all, I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to those closest to me. For their unwavering friendship, I wish to express my deep gratitude to Paul van Dijk and Emma Spijkerman, my extended family in Utrecht, who always stood by me through both joyful and difficult times. I am deeply indebted to my father Tatsuo Yasuhira and my mother Kumiko Yasuhira for their permanent, selfless, and sincere love, which has given me the confidence to live in accordance with my conscience. I am deeply thankful for my wife Miku Yasuhira, who has invaluable supported me all this time and made me the happier for it. Lastly, I wish to convey my warmest appreciation for my late grandfather Hiromu Enokura, who passed away in 2022. When I, as a high school student, declared before my family that I would become a historian, he calmly but decidedly approved my dream. Ever since, he was my most devoted supporter. I believe he will continue to be my guiding spirit along the way throughout the rest of my life. It is to him that I dedicate this book.

Abbreviations

- A.G.K.K.N.* *Archief voor de Geschiedenis van de Katholieke Kerk in Nederland.*
- A.A.U.* *Archief voor de geschiedenis van het aartsbisdom Utrecht.* Utrecht, 1875–1957.
- B.G.B.H.* *Bijdragen voor de geschiedenis van het bisdom van Haarlem.* Haarlem, 1873–1949.
- B.W.N.* Aa, A. J. van der. *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, 26 vols. Haarlem, 1852–1878.
- D.N.L.* *De Nederlandsche Leeuw.*
- G.P.U.* Water, Johan van de. *Groot Placaatboek vervattende alle de placaten [...] Staten 's lands van Utrecht*, 3 vols. Utrecht, 1729.
- J.O.U.* *Jaarboek Oud-Utrecht.*
- M.O.U.* *Maandblad Oud-Utrecht.*
- N.N.B.W.* Molhuysen, P. C., and P. J. Blok, eds. *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, 10 vols. Leiden, 1911–1937.
- R.B.* Cornelissen, J. D. M., R. R. Post, and P. Polman, eds. *Romeinsche bronnen voor den kerkelijken toestand der Nederlanden onder de apostolisch vicarissen, 1592–1727*, 4 vols. The Hague, 1932–1952.
-
- HUA Het Utrechts Archief, Utrecht
- BA Bewaarde archieven
- DTB Doop- Trouw- en Begraafboeken
- HVU Hof van Utrecht
- KR Nederlandse Hervormde gemeente Utrecht, kerkeraad
- MKOKN Metropolitaan Kapittel van de Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland
- NOT Notarieel archief
- OBC Apostolische vicarissen van de Hollandse Zending
- ORKA Oude rooms-katholieke aalmoezenierskamer te Utrecht
- SA Stadsarchief
- SVU Staten van Utrecht
- VBB Verzameling van Buchel-Booth
- VSOKN Verzamelde stukken van de oud-katholieke kerk in Nederland

List of Figures and Tables

Figures

- Cover Image Johannes Steffelaar, Interior of the Clandestine Church of St Gertrudis in Utrecht, 1896, oil on canvas, 64.5 x 52 cm, photograph by Museum Catharijneconvent (currently displayed at the Driehoek in Utrecht)
- Fig. 1 Cornelis Visscher (II), after Frederick Bloemaert, Portrait of Johannes Wachtelaer, c. 1653–1658, etching and engraving, 45.6 x 31.7 cm, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam 18
- Fig. 2 Jacob de Man, Portrait of a *klopje*, c. 1680, parchment, 11.1 x 7.7 cm, Museum Catharijneconvent, Utrecht, photograph by Ruben de Heer 117
- Fig. 3 Pieter Jansz Saenredam, St Marie Square and St Marie Church in Utrecht, 1662, oil on canvas, 109.5 x 139.5 cm, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam, photograph by Studio Tromp 224
- Fig. 4 Hendrick Bloemaert, The Annual Food Distribution to the Poor by Maria van Pallaes, 1657, oil on canvas, 90.7 x 178.8 cm, Centraal Museum, Utrecht (on loan from van Maria van Pallaes Foundation) 253

Map

- J. van Vianen, Map of Utrecht (*Urbis Traiecti ad Rhenum novissima et accuratissima delineatio*), 1695, brush on copperplate, 48 x 56.5 cm, Het Utrechts Archief, Utrecht (I would like to thank Joris van Dam for his help in the creation of this map) 27

Graphs

- Graph 1 Legal proceedings against Catholics in Utrecht by year, 1620–1672 78
- Graph 2 Charges of the legal proceedings in Utrecht, 1620–1672 83
- Graph 3 Sentences of the legal proceedings in Utrecht, 1620–1672 89
- Graph 4 Profession and social status of defenders in Utrecht, 1620–1672 159

Appendices

Appendix 1	Details of legal proceedings against Catholics in Utrecht, 1620–1672 (each case is marked {number})	326
Appendix 2	Recognized priests in Utrecht, 1620–1672 (their names are marked <number>)	354
Appendix 3	Connived priests in Utrecht, 1620–1672 (their names are marked <number>)	370
Appendix 4	Defenders of prosecuted Catholics in Utrecht, 1620–1672 (their names are marked [number])	370

Introduction

Abstract: Religious coexistence was an urgent problem facing post-Reformation Europe. This monograph aims to rethink early modern religious coexistence from the bottom-up perspective of Catholics in the Dutch Republic, in particular in the city of Utrecht during the seventeenth century, offering a theoretical reassessment of the public/private distinction. The Introduction articulates the main argument concerning Catholic agency in the process of delimiting the public. After describing how Utrecht developed into a stage of religious diversity, it offers a historiographical analysis of the early modern Dutch history of coexistence, focussing on Catholics and the public/private distinction. Finally, it introduces the methodology of this study within a civic community framework, and outlines its two-part structure on, respectively, Reformed governing strategies and Catholic survival tactics.

Keywords: coexistence, Catholic, the Dutch Republic, public/private distinction, agency, early modern

Throughout his entire life, Johannes Wachtelaer (1581–1653), a priest born into an elite Catholic family in the Dutch city of Utrecht (Fig. 1), would never see his faith publicly, officially, and openly embraced in his hometown, which had outlawed Catholicism the year before his birth. In spite of this, he grew up a devout Catholic citizen of the former episcopal city, and was to become one of the leading ecclesiastical figures of the Catholic Church in the Northern Netherlands, whose legitimacy had been denied by the Dutch Protestant government. In 1639 Wachtelaer was, in the end, prosecuted by the Utrecht city court for numerous crimes relating to his Catholicism. Facing severe repression and persecution, he did not, however, yield to his Protestant aggressors. Mobilizing his elevated social status and various networks, he began petitioning the politico-judicial authorities to prove his innocence, to defend the new sacred spaces inside private homes of Catholics, and to secure toleration and further liberties for his co-religionists in the Dutch




Fig. 1 Cornelis Visscher (II), after Frederick Bloemaert, Portrait of Johannes Wachtelaer, c. 1653–1658, etching and engraving, 45.6 x 31.7 cm, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam

public sphere. Wachtelaer was one of many Dutch Catholics struggling to survive in the multi-confessional Republic, resisting religious discrimination.

Religious coexistence was a serious challenge to be navigated in early modern Europe, where religious diversity was commonly seen as a major threat to public order and politico-social stability. Early modern Europe still embraced the medieval ideal of the *corpus christianum*. Based on the notion of the body of Christ (*corpus Christi*), this physical metaphor for the Christian social community represents an organic totality of a sacral society united by shared religious rituals. Backed by this ideal, the Protestant and Catholic/Counter-Reformations launched what might be called 'Europe's first grand project in social purification'.¹

Against this background, historians have traditionally represented the Dutch Republic as an exceptional case of religious coexistence. The 'Dutch Golden Age', a term used nearly synonymously for the seventeenth century, has thus been depicted as a herald of modernity,² in which Dutch religious toleration is understood to constitute a significant part.³ In such narratives, Dutch Catholics are commonly represented as a passive entity, as placid recipients of the toleration bestowed on them by Erasmian, pragmatic regents. As such, the history of coexistence has typically been portrayed from the top-down perspective of the repressing and tolerating party, echoing modernization models such as the secularization thesis, the rise of toleration, and the privatization of beliefs. In these models, commonly related to the Western-centric history of liberalism, the religious persecution, discrimination, and intolerance of 'infant' societies are believed to have been overcome by religious freedom, equality, and tolerance of 'mature' civilizations in the course of the modernization process.⁴ However, if we wish to

1 Terpstra, *Religious Refugees*, here especially pp. 1, 7, 21.

2 E.g., Frijhoff and Spies, *Bevochten eendracht*, especially p. 221; Israel, *Radical Enlightenment*; Vries and Woude, *The First Modern Economy*. Maarten Prak intentionally distances himself from these studies which argue the alleged modernity of the Dutch Republic, putting less emphasis on the Republic's 'relationship to the future (the Republic as precursor)' but more on 'the unique position of the Republic in the seventeenth century itself'. Prak, *The Dutch Republic*, pp. 1–4, especially p. 4; Idem, *Nederlands Gouden Eeuw*, pp. 7–11, especially p. 11.

3 For critical reviews on the national mythologization of Dutch toleration, see Gijswijt-Hofstra, 'Een schijn van verdraagzaamheid'; Kaplan, *Divided by Faith*, pp. 1–10; Idem, 'Dutch Religious Tolerance'; Idem, *Reformation*, pp. 204–22.

4 E.g., Forst, *Toleration in Conflict*; Kamen, *The Rise of Toleration*; Troeltsch, *Protestantism and Progress*; Weber, *The Protestant Ethic*; Zagorin, *How the Idea of Religious Toleration*. For a recent example of this narrative in early modern Dutch history, see Kooi, *Calvinists and Catholics*. For criticism of the modernization models, see, e.g., Clark, 'Secularization and Modernization'; Dixon, Freist, and Greengrass, *Living with Religious Diversity*; Grell and Scribner, *Tolerance and Intolerance*; Hsia and Nierop, *Calvinism and Religious Toleration*; Kaplan, *Divided by Faith*;

critically rethink the historical narrative on coexistence and, ultimately, the modernization models of Western liberalism themselves, it is the repressed and tolerated party that we must place in the foreground.

The present monograph therefore adopts the bottom-up perspective of the Catholic politico-religious minority in the Dutch Republic.⁵ These Catholics, including Wachtelaer, may themselves provide us with examples for deconstructing the triumphal narratives of modernization. To achieve its goal, the present study offers a theoretical reassessment of the public/private distinction, which has long been regarded as a core concept of modern Western liberalism⁶ and has recently attracted the attention of historians of early modern religious coexistence. It will seek to demonstrate that existing interpretations of the early modern public/private distinction have led us to underestimate the agency of such repressed and tolerated parties as Dutch Catholics in the history of coexistence. It will shed light on an alternative aspect of the early modern public/private distinction, that is, the 'delimitation of the public', defined as a constant, communal process in which people defined what the 'public' was, drew the border of the public, and created norms for how people could and should behave in public. I shall argue that Catholics, by participating in the process of delimiting the public and deploying their own understandings of publicness, not only actively enabled their survival in the Dutch Republic, but also played an indispensable role in fashioning a multi-religious society in the Northern Netherlands. Through the present study, I will seek to establish an analytic framework for the delimitation of the public for future comparative studies on religious coexistence in the early modern world, critically rethinking the teleological modernization thesis.

To better understand religious coexistence in the Dutch Republic, which acknowledged provincial sovereignty and embraced urban particularism, we must focus social-historically on a local community. For this study, we

Kaplan and Geraerts, *Early Modern Toleration*; Longfellow, 'Public, Private'; Plummer and Christman, *Topographies of Tolerance and Intolerance*; Safley, *A Companion to Multiconfessionalism*; Spohnholz, *The Tactics of Toleration*; Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*; Idem, 'The Reformation'.

5 Dutch Catholics as a community were deprived of many politico-religious rights in the public sphere, forming a politico-religious minority group in the Republic. I call their perspective 'bottom-up' with a view to their discriminated politico-religious status in the public sphere. As I will note in this monograph, this does not mean, however, that they represented a socio-economically monolithic entity or that they only included people of lower socio-economic capital. Rather, it was Catholic members of the socio-economic elite that played crucial roles in the bottom-up survival tactics deployed by the politico-religiously discriminated Catholic community.

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

have chosen to delve into the city of Utrecht, for the period from 1620 to 1672. Utrecht represents a suitable case study since by the early seventeenth century it had become a stronghold for the Reformed and Catholic Churches alike in the Dutch Republic. The resultant rivalry between the two confessional groups provoked numerous conflicts, which have left their traces in various primary sources, including legal records, allowing us to assess Catholics' agency in realizing religious coexistence in the urban public sphere.

Utrecht as the Stage of Religious Coexistence

From times of old, when St Willibrord (c. 658–739) came from the British Isles to Christianize the Low Countries, Utrecht was one of the region's major political and ecclesiastical centres. During medieval times, it enjoyed a position as the only episcopal city in the Northern Netherlands, with many churches, monasteries, convents, and hospices, all of which were regarded as sacred spaces.⁷ Yet the Protestant Reformation and the Dutch Revolt against the Habsburg monarchy drastically changed this medieval Catholic topography. While Utrecht was to develop into the bulwark of Dutch Reformed orthodoxy, the city remained the centre of – a now outlawed – Catholicism in the Northern Netherlands.

The Dutch Revolt broke out in the turbulent period of the Reformations. Despite fiery appeals from reformers, including Martin Luther (1483–1546), the Renaissance popes refused to convene an ecumenical council to inaugurate needed reforms. The Council of Trent, which was finally convened in 1545 and eventually concluded in 1563, aimed not only to launch the Church's reform programme, renewing the intermittent efforts of the Catholic Reformation, but also to frame theological answers to meet the Protestant challenge in what is now known as the Counter-Reformation.⁸ In the Low Countries, the Tridentine reform initially occurred hand in hand with the Habsburg monarchy's attempt at political centralization. In 1559 King Philip II of Spain (1527–1598) gained patronage rights from Pope Paul IV (1476–1559) over all the bishops in the Low Countries, and reorganized the bishoprics there. The diocese of Utrecht, which up to then had fallen under the authority of the archbishop of Cologne, was now elevated to the rank of an archdiocese with five suffragan dioceses covering the entire

7 Bogaers, *Aards*.

8 E.g., Hsia, *The World of Catholic Renewal*, pp. 10–12; O'Malley, *Trent and All That*, pp. 1–45.

Northern Netherlands. Philip II installed new, reform-minded bishops, expanded their ecclesiastical power and provided each diocese with Inquisitors to eliminate the heresy. As a devout Catholic, he tried to advance the Counter-Reformation cause through a hierarchical politico-religious system which included the harsh Inquisition. Yet, in the end, all these measures pushed the people of the Low Countries, including Catholics, to stand up for their local faith and liberties. The outbreak of the Dutch Revolt therefore represents a failure of top-down, state-sponsored Catholic renewal in the Low Countries.⁹

Protestants could be found in Utrecht as early as the 1520s, which, like other parts of the Low Countries, fell victim to iconoclasm in 1566. Then, in 1576, the Provincial States of Utrecht accepted the Treaty of Ghent, joining the States General in its battle against the King of Spain.¹⁰ In Utrecht the Protestant Reformation assumed a specific form, as those who supported the new evangelical ideas were divided into two different groups, the Libertines and the Calvinists, who both regarded themselves as Reformed Christians. Libertines, whose main proponents included Hubert Duifhuis (1531–1581), pastor to the parish church of St Jacob in Utrecht, upheld Erastianism, accepting secular authority over the church, and rejected the strict ecclesiastical discipline by which Calvinists, in their theocratic vision, attempted to maintain the public order. While Calvinists tried to form a radically disciplined religious community connected to the Dutch national Reformed Church, Duifhuis refused to impose strict oversight on his parishioners and sought to keep his St Jacob Church as an independent, local church.¹¹ On the national level, the Union of Utrecht, established in January 1579, affirmed what Libertines demanded, that is, the right for each sovereign province to carry out its religious policies independently.¹² Moreover, in reaction to the Habsburg Inquisition, article thirteen of the Union guaranteed freedom of conscience for anyone living in the rebel territories, stating that ‘every individual shall remain free in his religion, and no one should be singled out or interrogated because of his religion’.¹³ That same month the Utrecht

9 Janssen, *The Dutch Revolt*, pp. 17–19; Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, pp. 8–12; Parker, *Faith on the Margins*, pp. 24–27; Pollmann, *Catholic Identity*, pp. 74–78.

10 Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, pp. 20–25.

11 *Ibidem*, pp. 25–110. See also Spohnholz and Veen, ‘Calvinists vs. Libertines’.

12 Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, p. 77.

13 *G.P.U.*, I, p. 60 (29 January 1579); Groenveld and Leeuwenberg, *De Unie van Utrecht*, p. 35; Groenveld, Leeuwenberg, and Weel, *Unie – Bestand – Vrede*, p. 65: ‘yeder particulier in syn religie vry sal mogen blyven ende datmen nyemant ter cause vanden religie sal mogen achterhaelen ofte ondersoecken’.

magistrates, following a plan suggested by William I of Orange (1533–1584), had introduced ‘religious peace’ (*religievrede*) into the city. Under this bi-confessional system, public church buildings were distributed among Calvinists, Libertines, and Catholics alike. Besides, all public offices and benefices were assigned irrespective of confessional convictions.¹⁴

However, the religious peace was short-lived. While many Catholic individuals did support the Revolt, as a group Catholics came to be regarded as potential traitors to the rebels. As early as 1572 Catholic clerics had been martyred by the rebels in Gorkum, Alkmaar, and Roermond. For its part, the Catholic Church saw the rebels as traitors to the Roman cause, as Pope Gregory XIII (1502–1585) had threatened Catholics with excommunication in 1578 if they joined the Revolt.¹⁵ After the ‘treason’ of George de Lalaing (c. 1550–1581), Count of Rennenberg and Catholic stadholder of Friesland, Groningen, Drenthe, and Overijssel, in March 1580, anti-Catholic sentiment spread like wildfire throughout the United Provinces. Consequently, by 1581 Catholicism had been outlawed in all the rebel territories, including Utrecht (June 1580). From then on, Catholics were prohibited from practising their faith anywhere. Public church buildings and chapels inside hospices were allocated exclusively for the use of Reformed religious services, while monasteries and convents were secularized.¹⁶ Meanwhile, all five bishoprics in the Northern Netherlands fell vacant and the archbishop of Utrecht died in 1580, but the king of Spain refused to appoint replacements in the rebel provinces.¹⁷ All of this meant the disintegration of the official Catholic hierarchy in the Northern Netherlands.

At the same time, Utrecht was gradually turning into one of the headquarters of the strict Calvinists. The Calvinist-Libertine conflict in Utrecht ended in or around 1610, when Libertines realized that they too needed some form of the church discipline insisted on by Calvinists. However, the line of conflict was partly resumed in the Remonstrant controversy which troubled the Reformed Church during the 1610s. Once again, Utrecht was initially dominated by a disciplinarily moderate and Erastian group, the so-called Remonstrants or Arminians. This second controversy was brought to a political end in 1618, when Stadholder Maurice (1567–1625) completed a successful coup d’état against Johan van Oldenbarnevelt (1547–1619). The triumph of the

14 *G.P.U.*, III, pp. 4–12; Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, pp. 262–64. For bi-confessionalism in the Low Countries in general, see idem, ‘In Equality and Enjoying the Same Favor’; Idem, *Reformation*, pp. 254–78.

15 Rogier, *Geschiedenis*, I, pp. 76, 494–95, 503, 626, II, pp. 31–32.

16 *G.P.U.*, III, p. 466 (18 June 1580); Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, pp. 12, 264.

17 Parker, *Faith on the Margin*, pp. 30–31.

Contra-Remonstrants or Gomarists was confirmed at the national Synod of Dordrecht.¹⁸ Through the Calvinist-Libertine conflict and the Remonstrant controversy, Utrecht grew to become a stronghold for strict Calvinists, whose bulwark became the university of Utrecht, initially established as an *Illustre School* in 1634. The influential professor of theology, Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676), promoted his rigorous notion of Reformation in an authoritarian manner, even earning himself the moniker of the ‘pope of Utrecht’.¹⁹

Meanwhile, Dutch Catholics did not stand by passively, especially after Pope Clement VIII (1536–1605) established the Holland Mission (*Missio Hollandica*) in 1592 in response to their ardent appeals. For the Roman Curia, the period from the late sixteenth to the early seventeenth centuries was crucial for implementing the Tridentine reforms in different local contexts and promoting missions to regions controlled by European heretics and non-European heathens under its supervision, taking the lead from the Catholic secular authorities.²⁰ As part of this global campaign for Catholicization, the Curia licensed the Holland Mission to launch its operation for the re-Catholicization of the Northern Netherlands, promoting the Catholic Reformation or Counter-Reformation in the Protestant state.²¹ The Mission was an ecclesiastical organization led by the apostolic vicar, who was entrusted by the pope with ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the former church province of Utrecht and expected to head secular priests there. The apostolic vicar also received from the pope the title of archbishop *in partibus infidelium*, a titular see in a region in which Christians had once established bishoprics but which were now under Muslim control. The episcopal consecration that came with this nominal title made it possible for the apostolic vicar to administer such sacraments as ordination and confirmation that were reserved to bishops, although he was still not allowed to assume the official title of archbishopric of Utrecht. Under the apostolic vicar, each diocese (Utrecht, Haarlem, Middelburg, Leeuwarden, and Groningen) was served by a *provicaris* as vicar general, in the place of the former bishop. Initially, the Mission was placed under the guidance of the papal nuncio in Cologne, then, from 1596, the papal (inter)nuncio in Brussels and, finally, from 1622, the newly created Congregation of *Propaganda Fide* of the Curia in Rome which aimed to take over responsibility for missionary work around the world from the Spanish, Portuguese, and French empires.²²

18 Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, pp. 224–28, 257.

19 On Voetius and his followers, see, e.g., Duker, *Gisbertus Voetius*; Lieburg, *De Nadere Reformatie*.

20 Châtellier, *The Religion*, 12–36; Ó hAnnracháin, *Catholic Europe*, pp. 1–8, 21.

21 *Ibidem*, pp. 14, 62–63; Parker, ‘Heretics at Home’.

22 *Idem*, *Faith on the Margins*, pp. 29–33; Rogier, *Geschiedenis*, II, pp. 31–32.

By the early seventeenth century, Dutch Catholics had succeeded in largely restoring their pastoral infrastructure using their international networks. Although around 10,000 priests (both secular and regular) are said to have lived in the early sixteenth-century church province of Utrecht, the first apostolic vicar, Sasbout Vosmeer (1548–1614), reported in 1602 that he could only find seventy secular priests still active in their pastoral charges. Later on, the Holland Mission started sending its prospective secular priests to Catholic territories for their theological training, in the meantime receiving support from missionaries dispatched from religious orders abroad.²³ Although the apostolic vicars preferred quality over quantity, the number of secular priests did grow from seventy in 1602 to 360 in 1642, when the total number of clerics, including regular priests, working in the Northern Netherlands amounted to 500.²⁴ More than half of the secular clergy of the Holland Mission are estimated to have come from patrician or noble families, which could afford to send their sons to study abroad.²⁵ Despite numerous discriminatory edicts against them, Dutch Catholics constituted between a quarter and a third of the total population of the mid-seventeenth-century Republic (300,000 or 450,000), excluding the Generality Lands – that is, the southern area incorporated into the Republic from the Habsburg Netherlands – which had approximately 300,000 Catholic inhabitants, even though the confessional distribution among local populations differed significantly from province to province and from city to city.²⁶

Within this reviving Dutch Catholic community, Utrecht maintained a central position. The apostolic vicars regarded Utrecht as a bastion in their battle against the 'heretics'.²⁷ Indeed, they preferred to send secular priests to areas with dense Catholic populations, such as Utrecht, to fortify their strongholds. Although Catholics in other areas of the Republic, including the eastern and northern provinces, experienced discontinuity in pastoral care, for the Catholics in Utrecht religious services continued uninterrupted. Around forty Catholic priests, both secular and regular, lived in the city without interruption from the early seventeenth century onwards. In the second half of that century, Utrecht boasted 12.7 secular priests per 1,000 Catholics, while the ratio for Haarlem was 5.2 and for Amsterdam 3.7, even

23 Parker, *Faith on the Margins*, pp. 73–74.

24 Spiertz, 'De katholieke geestelijke leiders', p. 20.

25 Ackermans, *Herders en huurlingen*, pp. 54–55, 101.

26 Frijhoff and Spies, *Bevochten eendracht*, p. 354; Kaplan and Pollmann, 'Conclusion', pp. 251–52; Kok, *Nederland op de breuklijn*, p. 248; Parker, *Faith on the Margins*, p. 17. Cf. Faber, Woude, Roessingh, and Kok, 'Numerieke aspecten'.

27 Lommel, 'Verslag', p. 214.

though the latter two cities likewise had large Catholic populations.²⁸ Besides, more than half of the secular priests working in Utrecht in 1622 had university degrees, and this ratio rose to three-quarters by 1638.²⁹ In short, Utrecht's Catholics enjoyed an abundance of priests, most of whom were highly qualified and came from well-to-do families. In 1633, the second apostolic vicar, Philippus Rovenius (1573–1651), together with his vicar general, Johannes Wachtelaer, established a clerical council called the *Vicariaat* in Utrecht with communal funds to compensate for the loss of the ecclesiastical function of the chapters that had already been secularized.³⁰

By around 1620 or, at the very latest, the mid-1630s, Utrecht had thus developed into a stronghold for the Reformed and Catholic Churches in the Dutch Republic alike. The two confessional communities also competed in size. In the mid seventeenth century, Utrecht's total population of 30,000 is estimated to have had 12,000 Reformed full communicant members (40.0%), 10,000 Catholics (33.3%), 2,250 Lutherans (7.5%), 500 Anabaptists (1.7%), 200 Remonstrants (0.7%), and 5,000 undecided or 'sympathizers' (*liefhebbers*) of the Reformed Church (16.6%), that is, people who outwardly conformed to Reformed religious practices, but refrained from becoming full communicant members liable to the strict discipline of the church.³¹ Calvinists attracted independent guild craftsmen as communicant members, but farmers and unskilled workers seem on the whole not to have joined their communion. Many Calvinists lived in areas populated by craftsmen, shopkeepers, and the poor, but few could be found living in the city's suburbs. Judging by contemporary testimonies, the ratio of members from the social elite was higher among Libertines, Remonstrants, and Catholics.³² It should therefore be noted that Catholics did not form a numerical minority in Utrecht, and that a substantial number of them belonged to the higher social strata of the civic community.

During the period from 1572 to 1620, Utrecht's magistrates are said not to have been overly eager to repress Catholics, and, when they did repress them, they usually targeted priests, not laypeople.³³ Remarkably, until 1620,

28 Ackermans, *Herders*, p. 48; Rogier, *Geschiedenis*, II, pp. 386–95.


29 Kaplan, 'Confessionalism and Its Limits', p. 65.

30 Hallebeek, 'Godsdienst(on)vrijheid', pp. 127–28; Hewett and Hallebeek, 'The Prelate', pp. 130–31; Jong, 'Het Utrechtse vicariaat', pp. 161–69; Knuif and Jong, 'Philippus Rovenius', pp. 103–25; Ven, *Over den oorsprong*, pp. 89–115.

31 Forclaz, *Catholiques*, p. 87. On the 'sympathizers', see, e.g., Deursen, *Bavianen en slijkgeuzen*, pp. 13–33, 128–60.

32 Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, pp. 143–54.

33 *Ibidem*, pp. 223–24, 276.



J. van Vianen, Map of Utrecht (*Urbis Traiecti ad Rhenum novissima et accuratissima delineatio*), 1695, brush on copperplate, 48 x 56.5 cm, Het Utrechts Archief, Utrecht (I would like to thank Joris van Dam for his help in the creation of this map)

Public churches

(P1) Dom; (P2) St Pieter; (P3) St Jan; (P4) St Marie; (P5) Buur; (P6) St Jacob; (P7) Nicolaï; (P8) Geerte

Monasteries and convents

(M1) St Servaas; (M2) Wittevrouwen; (M3) Beguinage; (M4) St Nicolaas; (M5) Cecilia; (M6) Abraham Dole; (M7) Jeruzalem; (M8) Agnieten; (M9) Arkel

Hospices

(H1) St Barbara and St Laurens; (H2) St Bartholomew; (H3) Holy Cross; (H4) *Dolhuis*; (H5) St Job; (H6) Leeuwenberch; (H7) Apostle; (H8) St Anthony

Catholic clandestine churches

(C1) St Gertrudis (secular); (C2) Maria Minor Achter Clarenburg (secular); (C3) St Nicolaas Achter de Wal (secular); (C4) St Jacobus in Drakenburgersteeg (secular); (C5) St Marie Op de Kamp alias Soli Deo Gloria (secular); (C6) St Servaas Onder de Linden (secular); (C7) St Catharijne in Catharijnesteeg (Jesuit); (C8) St Martinus in Herenstraat (Jesuit); (C9) St Augustinus in Hieronymussteeg or Jeruzalemsteeg (Augustinian); (C10) Onze Lieve Vrouw Rozenkrans in Dorstige Hartsteeg (Dominican); (C11) St Dominicus in Walsteeg (Dominican); (C12) St Jacobus in the suburb of Buiten de Weerd (secular); (C13) St Martinus in the suburb of Abstede (secular); (C14) in the suburb of Wittevrouwen (secular)

Other buildings

(O1) City Hall; (O2) Provincial States (former Franciscan monastery); (O3) Provincial Court (former Paulus Abbey); (O4) Teutonic Order's House; (O5) Pope's House; (O6) House of Hendrica van Duivenvoorde

when the internal conflicts within the Reformed Church had finally subsided somewhat, the reviving Catholic community had never been looked upon as an urgent task for the magistrates, who ended up overlooking the crucial role which the laity played in the Catholic restoration. Like their counterparts who found themselves under the yoke of heretics or heathens abroad, Dutch Catholic priests depended on the generous patronage of lay elite families, who harboured priests and paid for their upkeep, negotiated with local magistrates on behalf of the confessional community, and even hosted Catholic assemblies in their houses.³⁴ Around 1620 Catholics in Utrecht, as in other Dutch cities, began renovating some of those houses, turning them into 'clandestine churches' (*schuilkerken*) or 'house churches' (*huiskerken*) equipped with altars, religious paintings, and liturgical objects.³⁵ By the second half of the seventeenth century, Utrecht had no fewer than fourteen clandestine churches, eleven within the city walls and three outside, around which crypto parishes called 'stations' (*staties*) were formed.³⁶

By 1620 the stage had therefore been set for religious coexistence in the city of Utrecht, where orthodox Calvinists were securing their political power, while Catholics worked strenuously to revive their confessional community (map). How, then, can coexistence in post-Reformation Utrecht be understood from the Catholic viewpoint?

Historiography: Early Modern Dutch Catholics and the Public/Private Distinction

Historians have shown themselves particularly fascinated by the apparent paradox involved in the religious situation of the Dutch Republic. On the one hand, during the Dutch Revolt, the Reformed Church became the only 'public church' (*publieke kerk*) – not a state church, since membership was voluntary. As the public church, the Reformed Church had to serve everyone regardless of their confessional affiliation. At the same time, as a Calvinist Church, it required communicant members to exercise discipline according to a high, Calvinist moral standard. Consequently, many remained 'sympathizers' of the Reformed Church, even though communicant members still comprised just less than half of the total

34 Parker, 'Cooperative Confessionalisation'; Idem, *Faith on the Margins*, passim.

35 Eck, *Clandestine Splendor*, pp. 23, 27. For the debate on the terms 'clandestine church' and 'house church', see Dudok van Heel, 'Amsterdamse schuil- of huiskerken?', especially, pp. 6–10.

36 Rogier, *Geschiedenis*, II, pp. 395–96.

seventeenth-century Dutch population.³⁷ In the background, the Union of Utrecht has been regarded as the constitutional basis for freedom of conscience, not for particular dissenting groups as privileged corporations but for everyone living in the Dutch Republic, irrespective of their faith, in marked departure from other parts of post-Reformation Europe, where this right was rarely guaranteed to individuals.³⁸ However, because the clause had no legally binding power, stipulating no clear provisions for protection and building up no politico-judicial systems for its practical enforcement, the Union could not prevent Calvinists from outlawing Catholicism throughout the United Provinces, meaning that Catholics were prohibited from practising their faith and excluded from a growing number of public offices.³⁹ Under pressure from the public church, magistrates began to issue anti-Catholic edicts, representing Catholics as potential traitors to the Protestant government and casting doubt on their political loyalty, although in practice they did not always strictly enforce the edicts.⁴⁰ The Dutch Republic was, therefore, a multi-confessional society characterized by both tolerance and discrimination.

The multi-confessional Republic has long been regarded as an exception within early modern confessional Europe and a precursor to modern liberal Europe. Following a long debate on the 'Protestantization' (*protestantisering*) of the Republic, scholars came to argue that the Dutch gradually accepted Reformed Protestantism, while Erasmian regents succeeded in reining in radical Calvinists.⁴¹ As such, historians showed themselves unwilling to apply the 'confessionalization' (*Konfessionalisierung*) thesis as defined by such German historians as Heinz Schilling and Wolfgang Reinhard to the Dutch Republic.⁴² According to this thesis, one of the most famous modernization models in early modern historiography of the past decades, confessional churches collaborated with secular authorities in Europe from around 1560 to 1650 to promote political centralization, the

37 E.g., Deursen, *Bavianen*; Pollmann, *Religious Choice*; Tracy, 'Public Church'; Woltjer, 'De plaats'.

38 Deursen, 'Tussen eenheid en zelfstandigheid'; Jong, 'Unie en religie'.

39 For the province of Utrecht, see *G.P.U.*, I, pp. 158–60, 350–51, III, pp. 466–67.

40 On anti-Catholic edicts in general, see, e.g., Enno van Gelder, *Getemperde vrijheid*, pp. 111–50; Knuttel, *De toestand*.

41 E.g., Duke, 'The Ambivalent Face'; Idem, *Reformation and Revolt*, pp. 269–93; Enno van Gelder, 'Nederland geprotestantiseerd?'; Kok, *Nederland op de breuklijn*. Cf. Geyl, *Verzamelde opstellen*, I, pp. 205–18; Rogier, *Geschiedenis*. For the discussion on Protestantization, see also Elliott, 'Protestantization', pp. 1–74.

42 E.g., Mörke, 'Konfessionalisierung'. See also, Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, pp. 5–8, 299–300; Idem, *Divided by Faith*, p. 369.

disciplining of ordinary people through confessional doctrines, and the formation of a homogeneous society unified in confession. In this, they connected the modernization process of state formation with 'confessional formation' (*Konfessionsbildung*), which was the term Ernst Walter Zeeden had coined to describe confessional identity construction within the various churches.⁴³

Early modern Dutch society was, therefore, not confessionalized in Schilling and Reinhard's sense. Studies on urban Reformation in the Republic have, for instance, detected a supra-confessional civic culture, which halted Reformed confessionalization almost everywhere in Dutch cities. The medieval idea of the *corpus christianum* was applied classically to an urban polity, physically and symbolically walled off from the surroundings, where civic and religious memberships were inextricably intertwined.⁴⁴ The Protestant Reformation seems to have brought harm to the medieval unity of civic communities. In her study of post-Reformation Haarlem from 1577 to 1620, however, Joke Spaans demonstrated that magistrates promoted a civic culture that could not exclusively be connected with any one of the confessional churches, including the Reformed. In order to accomplish their duty as Christian rulers, following the ideal of the *corpus christianum*, Haarlem's magistrates attempted to establish a confessionally neutral, civic culture. As long as dissenters respected this supra-confessional civic culture, the magistracy was content to allow them to construct their own sub-cultures.⁴⁵ As for Utrecht between 1578 and 1620, Benjamin Kaplan likewise emphasizes that the political authorities maintained traditional notions of community, making no sharp distinction between the civic and the sacral. It was those magistrates who defended the civic community from the Calvinists' attempt at confessionalization and made religious coexistence possible. They not only preserved the "conservative" intermingling of civic and sacral' but also created 'a new distinction between public and private, a distinction that many people now consider one of the hallmarks of modernity'.⁴⁶ In her studies on seventeenth-century cities in the province of Holland, Christine Kooi also claims that the 'tolerationist' magistrates had exclusive agency in metaphorically distinguishing between public and

43 Reinhard, 'Pressures'; Idem, 'Reformation'; Schilling, 'Confessional Europe'; Idem, *Early Modern European Civilization*, pp. 11–32.

44 Moeller, *Imperial Cities and the Reformation*.

45 Spaans, *Haarlem*, especially pp. 191–225, 232–34. For similar arguments on two different visions of the Christian community as a confessionalized community and as a non-confessional civic community, see Parker, *The Reformation of Community*, especially, pp. 155–97.

46 Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, pp. 266, 277, 294–95.

private in the civic space, positioning conscience in the abstract realm of one's internal private sphere, whose freedom they gradually came to be expected to protect. Even though the border between public and private had initially been vague, the magistrates clarified the division, allowing both Reformed and Catholics to promote 'internal confessionalization' (or Zeeden's confessional formation), while accomplishing 'peaceful coexistence' between the two. Kooi even describes this development in a progressive vision as the 'evolution of the Reformed-Catholic relationship from confusion [from 1572 to 1620] to conflict [from 1620 to 1660] to coexistence [after 1660]', ultimately reiterating the nineteenth-century understanding of Erasmian regents and the rise of toleration as advocated by W. P. C. Knuttel, despite her criticism of the Whiggish narrative on toleration.⁴⁷ In these studies of urban Reformation, Catholics are therefore depicted as passive recipients of toleration, whose survival depended solely on the goodwill of the magistrates.

Recently, scholars have come to argue that it was not confessionalization in the sense of Schilling/Reinhard but multi-confessionalism, whether *de jure* or *de facto*, that was 'the rule rather than the exception for most regions and polities that experienced Reformation'. As such, the Dutch Republic is regarded as representative of multi-confessional Europe.⁴⁸ In their attempt to decipher the cultural mechanisms of confessional coexistence in the Dutch Republic and beyond, historians now focus on the public/private distinction. Among them, Willem Frijhoff and Kaplan have offered theoretical models of coexistence through the public/private distinction as it materialized in the phenomenon of the clandestine church. Frijhoff has argued that in the private sphere, everyone could behave as they wished in their conscience, freely expressing their confessional identity. In the public sphere, however, confessional behaviour was in principle considered improper. In order to realize religious coexistence, the 'ecumenicity of everyday life' (*omgangsoecumene*) was therefore required in liminal – i.e., semi-public, semi-private – spaces marked by the thresholds of homes. Drawing on a historical-anthropological approach influenced by the French *Annales* school, Frijhoff exposes the structurally – even a-historically – remaining

47 Kooi, *Calvinists and Catholics*, pp. 46–47, 90–129, especially, 95–96, 128–29. See also idem, *Liberty and Religion*, p. 193. Kooi agrees with Koselleck's argument in *Critique and Crisis*, in which he equates early modern conscience with an abstract realm of people's internal mental world where they possessed autonomy. In her discussion of anti-Catholic edicts and the laxity of their enforcement, Kooi at times simply cites Knuttel's work without criticism. Knuttel, *De Toestand*, I, pp. 122, 130–31, 151, 155, 257–59; Kooi, *Calvinists and Catholics*, pp. 112, 114–15, 118, 125.

48 Safley, 'Multiconfessionalism', p. 7. See also Dixon, 'Introduction', especially pp. 16–17 Kaplan, *Divided by Faith*; Spohnholz, 'Confessional Coexistence'.

vagueness of the liminal space between public and private.⁴⁹ Together with Marijke Spies, Frijhoff even identifies the ecumenicity of everyday life as an integral part of early modern Dutch national culture.⁵⁰ Likewise, Kaplan has offered a theoretical elaboration of his argument on the public/private distinction, which already appeared in an earlier study on the urban Reformation in Utrecht. He too regards the physical threshold of the family home as the boundary between public and private, rightly noting that this border was not rigid but negotiable. As long as dissenters duly refrained from intervening in the public sphere dominated by the politico-religious majority, the political authorities connived at the dissenters' exercise of their free conscience through their worship in the invisible, private, and domestic space of clandestine churches situated behind the thresholds of their homes. Early modern toleration therefore worked through 'a new distinction between public and private worship', that is, a sensory, symbolic distinction rather than the legal distinction of the modern era. In Kaplan's account, 'privacy' emerged as a fiction in the early modern era, in which the politico-religious majority and minorities played their roles, pretending not to notice the religious diversity that could threaten the peace of their local communities. He argues that phenomena comparable to the Dutch clandestine churches, and thus fictions of privacy, can also be detected in post-Reformation Europe more broadly.⁵¹

Owing to the past two decades of historiography inspired by Frijhoff and Kaplan, early modern Dutch Catholics are now considered a group of men and women who maintained their own confessional identity and sub-culture in the private sphere, while largely retreating from the public sphere.⁵² In this historiographical development, Charles Parker's *Faith on the Margins* represents a pathbreaking work. Traditional Dutch national church historians dealt primarily with ecclesiastics, stressing the exceptional feature of Dutch Catholicism in the early modern era, which they located in an introspective piety characterized by a 'clandestine-church

49 Frijhoff, 'Dimensions', pp. 228–37; Idem, *Embodied Belief*, pp. 56–65. See also idem, 'Van "histoire de l'Eglise"'.
 50 Idem and Spies, *Bevochten eendracht*, pp. 28, 50–51, 68, 178–82, 211, 358–59, 384–85, 393, 429, 443, 605.

51 Kaplan, *Divided by Faith*, pp. 172–97, here especially p. 176; Idem, 'Fictions of Privacy', here especially p. 1036; Idem, *Reformation*, pp. 164–203, here especially p. 170.

52 E.g., Caspers and Margry, *Identiteit en spiritualiteit*; Eck, *Clandestine Splendor*; Idem, *Kunst*; Kaplan, Moore, Nierop, and Pollmann, *Catholic Communities*; Margry and Caspers, *Bedevaartplaatsen*; Monteiro, *Geestelijke maagden*; Mooij, *Geloof*; Mudde, 'Rouwen in de marge'; Spaans, *De Levens der Maechden*; Wingsens, *Over de grens*; Verheggen, *Beelden*.

mentality' (*schuilkerkenmentaliteit*). Parker, in contrast, emphasizes lay-clerical cooperation, positioning early modern Dutch Catholicism within the international context of the Counter-Reformation. To his mind, Catholic revival in the Protestant Republic demonstrates that the Catholic renewal in the Tridentine spirit could take place without top-down, state-sponsored confessionalization. Parker argues that a 'cooperative confessionalization' through lay-clerical collaboration created a new Dutch Catholic identity and sub-culture in the private sphere, not from above, nor from below, but from the middle, while Catholics on the whole withdrew from the public sphere.⁵³

Recent cultural-historical studies based on ego-documents of Catholic individuals, in particular laity, have attempted to distil a Dutch Catholic identity in support of Parker's argument regarding the importance of lay-clerical cooperation and lay agency vis-à-vis the clergy. Drawing on ego-documents of the Catholic laity, Judith Pollmann examines how Catholics in the Northern Netherlands failed to resist Calvinists, while their counterparts in the Southern Netherlands succeeding in reviving Catholicism there from 1520 to 1635. Through the daily experience of encountering people of other confessions, 'traditional Christians' were transformed into self-conscious 'Catholics' with their own confessional identity, which was constructed 'from the middle', that is, through cooperation between (lower-ranking) priests and laypeople.⁵⁴ Similarly, Geert Janssen draws on ego-documents of the laity and identifies refugees of both faiths as an essential catalyst of the religio-cultural division between the Protestant North and the Catholic South. Janssen maintains that the successful Counter-Reformation in the Habsburg Netherlands was promoted mainly 'from the middle', where the lobby group of returning refugees played an important role.⁵⁵ While Pollmann and Janssen deal with Catholics in the Low Countries in the context of the Dutch Revolt, Carolina Lenarduzzi has recently examined Catholics in the Dutch Republic from c. 1570 to 1750. Lenarduzzi claims that early modern Dutch Catholicism was displaced from its former position as the main culture in the public sphere and relegated to a sub-culture in the private sphere. She persuasively shows how Catholic individuals cultivated their new confessional habitus creatively, sharpening their confessional identity in contrast to that of the heretics. Lenarduzzi argues that for some Catholics in certain specific contexts, the sub-culture was converted into a counter-culture in which they challenged the Reformed main culture in

53 Parker, *Faith on the Margins*. Cf. Rogier, *Geschiedenis*.

54 Pollmann, *Catholic Identity*, especially pp. 6, 201–2.

55 Janssen, *The Dutch Revolt*.

the public sphere.⁵⁶ As Bertrand Forclaz and Jaap Geraerts have convincingly argued, Dutch Catholics possessed multi-layered identities, preferring to interact with their co-religionists in some aspects of their life, while cultivating supra-confessional relationships in others.⁵⁷

These influential accounts, and in particular the studies of the eminent historians Frijhoff and Kaplan, have fundamentally challenged the modernization narratives and the national-confessional historiographies of Dutch Protestantization, toleration, and Catholicism. However, they still have little to tell us about Catholics' agency in the realization of religious coexistence in the urban public sphere. Previous studies on the cultural history of coexistence do not adequately explore the tactics which politico-religious minorities employed to survive in the multi-confessional urban environment. Indeed, in his studies on Dutch Catholic utopian expectations and on local 'survival strategies' in Zutphen, Frijhoff depicts Catholics as a belligerent entity seeking an opportunity to overturn the public order.⁵⁸ His general survey of Dutch Catholics, however, indicates that they did not 'systematically oppose the surrounding Protestant context but used a consensus policy, asking for tacit accommodation and achieving an "ecumenicity of everyday life"'.⁵⁹ Kaplan rightly stresses that the boundaries between public and private were constantly negotiated and that the fluid and porous border caused constant struggles. However, he still maintains that 'dissenters participated in the fiction [of privacy] by refraining from challenging the monopoly over public religious life'.⁶⁰ His account unwittingly, and perhaps unwillingly, leaves us to embrace the narrative of the privatization of beliefs, equating the early modern new private sphere with the physical space of the family home, to which dissenters were forced to confine their religious beliefs so as to be tolerated.⁶¹

Moreover, in spite of their many virtues, a drawback of the recent cultural-historical studies on Dutch Catholic identity and sub-culture is that they are unable to pay sufficient attention to the social and judicial context

56 Lenarduzzi, *De belevingswereld*; Idem, 'Subcultuur en tegencultuur'.

57 Forclaz, *Catholiques*; Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility'; Idem, *Patrons*.

58 E.g., Frijhoff, 'Catholic Apocalyptic'; Idem, *Embodied Belief*, pp. 111–213, 235–73; Idem, 'La fonction du miracle'; Idem, 'Katholieke toekomstverwachting'; Idem, 'Overlevingsstrategieën'; Idem, 'De paniek'.

59 Idem, 'Shifting Identities', p. 7.

60 Kaplan, *Divided by Faith*, pp. 176, 195; Idem, 'Fictions of Privacy', pp. 1036, 1061; Idem, *Reformation*, pp. 170, 199. See also his earlier account, which saw greater agency among the political authorities who 'engineered a system of religious toleration' by 'drawing a distinction between public and private realms'. Idem, *Calvinists and Libertines*, pp. 277, 302.

61 Idem, 'Fictions of Privacy', p. 1062.

of Catholic individuals in local settings, which may well have affected their survival tactics in the decentralized Dutch Republic. Nor do they adequately explore Catholic activities in and perceptions of the urban public sphere of coexistence, as their primary concern was to examine the internal development of the Catholic community and Catholic identity construction inside the Catholic private sphere. Forclaz's monograph indeed succeeds in demonstrating the vigorous nature of the Catholic sub-culture in the specific local context of Utrecht in the seventeenth century, especially in the second half. However, it approaches the matter of coexistence from the top-down perspective of the political authorities who, by distinguishing public and private, promoted civic concord based on the ecumenicity of everyday life. According to Forclaz's account, although Utrecht's Catholics sometimes transgressed the border between public and private, they had to conform to the existing norm of the public/private distinction under the control of the magistracy if they wished to survive as Catholics.⁶²

To date, Dutch Catholics have thus been depicted as lacking agency in religious coexistence and the public sphere, with scholars showing themselves quick to highlight the private sphere, represented either by the physical space of the family home or the abstract realm of conscience, to which they are said to have withdrawn, developing their own confessional identity.⁶³ But were Dutch Catholics just obedient beneficiaries of the politico-cultural system of toleration engineered by magistrates through the public/private distinction? Did they, in order to survive the Reformed regime, duly withdraw from the urban public sphere and compliantly play their role in the cultural fiction assigned to them by the political authorities and the Reformed majority? I shall argue that this was not the case for Catholic Utrechters.

Research Design: Catholic Agency in Coexistence and the Public Sphere

In this study, I will demonstrate, on a local, social-historical level, how Catholics tactically created room for their survival and contributed to the realization of a multi-confessional society by participating in the communal process of

62 Forclaz, *Catholiques*, especially pp. 101–42, 361–62. Cf. Boukema, 'Geloven in het geloof'.

63 Recent studies on early modern privacy led by the Centre for Privacy Studies at the University of Copenhagen attest to this tendency in scholarship; see Green, Nørgaard, and Bruun, *Early Modern Privacy*. See also the special issue of the journal *TSEG – The Low Countries Journal of Social and Economic History* 18 (2021).

delimiting the public in the Dutch Republic, and Utrecht in particular, while contesting their strategic exclusion from the public sphere by the efforts of the political authorities and the Reformed majority. 'Coexistence' is employed as a neutral analytic term, indicating the environment where people of different beliefs co-existed, sharing physical and objective spaces.⁶⁴ Religious coexistence as an environment was precarious as it was susceptible to changing circumstances surrounding people of different faiths at the local, national, and international levels. Relationships between people of different faiths in such environments could easily change from conviviality to conflict, or vice versa. Therefore, the political authorities devised their 'governing strategies' to manage and regulate this unstable environment of coexistence, while Catholics deployed their 'survival tactics' to appropriate the same environment for their cause. The present study understands 'survival tactics' as Catholics' individual and collective adaptations to and counter-interventions in the existing environment of religious coexistence which the Reformed political authorities attempted to control through their 'governing strategies'.⁶⁵ I will invoke flesh and blood entities, such as Catholic Utrechters, as dynamic agents for the making of coexistence, instead of portraying a static system of coexistence.

Rather than tracing internal developments of the Catholic community such as identity construction in their private sphere, this monograph will uncover the shifting relationships and interactions in the urban public sphere among the three groups of actors in the city of Utrecht, namely the political authorities (of the Utrecht city council as well as the Provincial States of Utrecht), the public Reformed Church (represented by the provincial synod, the regional *classis*, and the local consistory), and the Catholics themselves (both as individuals and as a community). While urban Reformation studies have focused mainly on the interplay between the first two groups, the present study will position all three groups in their local, politico-social, and judicial context of the civic community, which is often absent from cultural-historical studies on religious coexistence through the public/private distinction and on Catholic identity/sub-culture.⁶⁶ As its primary

64 For Frijhoff's call to use the more neutral term 'coexistence' rather than the ideologically laden term 'toleration', see Frijhoff, 'Dimensions', p. 217; Idem, *Embodied Belief*, p. 48.

65 Here I take inspiration from Michel de Certeau, who defines 'place' as an unambiguous static order and 'space' as a dynamic, multivalent unity of practices. According to Certeau, while the majority regulates 'place' by using 'strategies' to maintain their dominant position, minorities can practically create their own 'space' by using 'tactics' in accordance with dynamic moments of chance. Certeau, *L'Invention du quotidien*.

66 For a similar approach to early modern religious coexistence, focussing not only on the magistrates but also on individuals of various confessional groups within the framework of the

source materials, it will make qualitative and, if applicable, quantitative use of sequentially recorded sources, such as the minutes of the city council, the minutes of the Reformed consistory, and legal documents, in addition to correspondence and mission reports from Catholic priests, as well as family archives. Quantitative analyses of these materials will enable us to trace chronological developments of religious coexistence at the local level. Among these primary sources, the present study attaches great significance to the legal records of criminal cases tried in the city court of Utrecht, such as sentences, indictments, testimonies, and defendants' petitions. Over the past several decades, microhistorians have viewed legal records as rich sources for recovering the voices of ordinary people and reconstructing the world of their everyday life.⁶⁷ To date, however, no systematic analysis of Dutch legal records has been conducted by scholars of early modern religious history. When they do refer to lawsuits, they tend simply to make anecdotal use of a selection of such sources, leaving us with an impressionistic understanding of Dutch toleration.⁶⁸ The state of scholarship may have been partly the result of these specialists focussing primarily on extrajudicial facets of Dutch religious coexistence, including the ecumenicity of everyday life, practices of connivance, and fictions of privacy. The choice of Utrecht as a case study is essential for interpreting religious coexistence from the bottom-up perspective of politico-religious minorities, since it offers a significant number of legal records for criminal cases involving such minorities as the Catholics.

In departure from previous studies on early modern religious coexistence, which have focused mainly on the private sphere represented by the family home or conscience, the present study examines the communal process of the delimitation of the public, where, as we shall see, the various actors distinguished public from private in different ways, primarily defining the public rather than the private per se. I will argue that the Utrecht case witnesses multiple, competing, and sometimes even mutually opposing understandings of publicness. In this monograph, the public or the public

civic community of the German city of Wesel, see Spohnholz, *Tactics of Toleration*.

67 Classic microhistorical studies based on legal records include Davis, *The Return of Martin Guerre*; Ginzburg, *The Cheese and the Worms*; Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou*. See also Kaplan's *Cunegonde's Kidnapping*.

68 There is only one study that deliberately analyses legal cases against Dutch Catholics (in the province of Groningen). Vos-Schoonbeek, 'Roomsgezinden voor de rechter'; Idem, 'Hinderpalen'. Cf. Nierop, 'Sewing the Bailiff', which makes anecdotal use of legal cases against Catholics, not aiming to discover Catholic survival tactics there but to present an overview of toleration of Catholics and the law in Holland.

sphere is understood to have entailed two aspects, namely physical and abstract. On the one hand, the physical public was associated with epistemology and demarcated by human perceptibility, which established the openness or secretness of things or people's actions through visibility and audibility, as Frijhoff and Kaplan among others argue. It is also related to the materiality of religion, external or internal expression of beliefs, and the collective or individual nature of religious practices. On the other hand, the abstract public was bound by one's contribution and commitment to the public order and the common good of a shared community, such as the civic community where people of different faiths coexisted. It is also intrinsically connected with one's honour or shame in society, obedience to or challenges of the government or official rules, and the symbolic self-representation of power and status, that is, what Jürgen Habermas has called pre-modern 'representative publicness'.⁶⁹ I shall argue that it was not the private but the public that early modern people were keener to define when faced with the pressing problem of religious diversity.

Part I of this book discusses the Reformed governing strategies. Under pressure from the Reformed Church, which justified anti-Catholicism and tried to advance Reformed confessionalization, the political authorities intervened strategically in the environment of coexistence through 'repression' (Chapter 1) and 'toleration' (Chapter 2) as two forms of 'social engineering', in their attempts to preserve the public order of the *corpus christianum*.⁷⁰ Here, religious coexistence is narrated from the perspective of those who repressed and tolerated. To avoid impressionism, Part I approaches repression and toleration not just qualitatively but also quantitatively so as to be able to grasp how, when, and in what politico-religious and socio-economic contexts the magistrates deployed the two political measures. By doing so, it sheds light on how the political authorities took part in the delimitation of the physical and abstract public.

Chapter 1 will examine the Reformed repression of Catholics by analysing not only how the magistrates chronologically developed anti-Catholic legislation in Utrecht from 1620 to 1672,⁷¹ but also, for the first time in a systematic manner, how those edicts were applied in practice to legal proceedings against Catholics. The Dutch word *vervolging* included and

69 Habermas, *The Structural Transformation*, ch. 1.

70 I borrow the term 'social engineering' from Spaans, 'De katholieken', p. 259.

71 For a general overview of legislation from 1528 to 1713 in Utrecht, see Bogaers, 'Een kwestie van macht?' For anti-Catholic legislation in seventeenth-century Utrecht, see also Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 101–42.

still includes the twofold sense of 'prosecution' and 'persecution'. When the politico-religious authorities spoke of the *vervolging* of Catholics, they referred to the legal prosecution of these criminals. When Catholics referred to their own *vervolging*, they meant their persecution as innocent men and women. This double meaning of the term *vervolging* is exploited with a view to different representations of the same phenomenon by various stakeholders. The present study focuses on criminal cases where the defendants' Catholic faith was explicitly mentioned. The choice for this restriction was inevitable, for two reasons. First, it is difficult or even impossible to determine the religious affiliations of the majority of those who lived in the Dutch Republic, since there are no systematic records that would enable us to determine who belonged to which church. Although Dutch Catholics were taught in their catechisms to profess their religious affiliation openly when they were legally required to do so,⁷² legal documents rarely refer to the faith of those who appeared in court, except for those being prosecuted for engaging in behaviour that was identifiably Catholic and as such constituted a punishable offence. Second, in order to grasp Reformed governing strategies vis-à-vis Catholic survival tactics, it is more effective only to analyse trials where defendants were accused of offences relating to Catholicism or where judicial officers felt obliged to note their loyalty to the Catholic Church in the legal records.

Chapter 2 will discuss not the degree of tolerance, but the strategic functions of the political practices of toleration. Historians need to offer a clear definition for their use of the term 'toleration', a core concept of modern liberalism, since they otherwise run the risk of unwittingly, but easily, reinforcing the teleological narrative of modernization as the rise of toleration, based as it is on the ideology and utopia of modern liberalism.⁷³ The present study defines toleration as a political practice of social engineering with two forms: 'limited recognition', which the political authorities bestowed publicly through official announcements; and 'connivance', which they exercised non-publicly without giving licence on paper. Previous studies have restricted themselves to connivance as the form toleration assumed in practice in Dutch history.⁷⁴ In our case, this form of toleration can only be detected on the basis of primary sources attesting to the illegal presence or

72 Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 87–88; Idem, *Patrons*, p. 103.

73 Kaplan, *Divided by Faith*, pp. 6–7, 25–26; Idem, 'Dutch Religious Tolerance', pp. 25–26; Idem, *Reformation*, pp. 221–22.

74 For such an understanding of 'Dutch' toleration as a passive practice of connivance, see, e.g., Frijhoff, *Embodied Belief*, p. 40.

actions of Catholics who had no official permit, but were nevertheless not subjected to legal prosecution. It is the very absence of official documentation of recognition which has allowed historians to speculate that political authorities in practice connived at their behaviour or presence, illegal as it was on the level of theory given the existing policies. If such practices of connivance alone are taken into consideration and no room is left for quantitative analyses, the most scholars can offer is a simple impression of tolerance, so that they in the end – wittingly or unwittingly – only contribute to the mythologization of Dutch toleration. The present study, in contrast, argues that limited recognition, as another form of toleration, can also be traced in official government documents, enabling historians to offer a quantitative assessment of the frequency of and trends in the political practice of toleration.

For a better understanding of religious coexistence, we must examine not only the governing strategies of the Reformed from their top-down perspective, but also the survival tactics of the Catholics from their bottom-up perspective. Part II of this book therefore addresses Catholic survival tactics, arguing that Catholics tactically intervened in the environment of coexistence through ‘spatial practices’ (Chapter 4) and in ‘discourses of self-representation’ (Chapter 5), which they could both deploy on the basis of their ‘social status and networks’ (Chapter 3), in order to live as Catholic Utrechters in the city’s shared Christian social community (*corpus christianum*). Here religious coexistence is discussed from the perspective of those who were repressed and tolerated. Part II shall uncover two features of their survival tactics, which framed their engagement in the delimitation of the physical and abstract public: continuity from the medieval past, and adjustment to the early modern, multi-confessional reality.

Chapter 3 focuses on the social status of the repressed and tolerated Catholics, defined here as their public profile in the civic community based on birth, family connections, citizenship, economic capital, profession, neighbourhood, and individual networks of sociability. Besides, it will, for the very first time, shed light on the defenders of prosecuted Catholics. We define ‘defenders’ as those who negotiated with the city court for the sake of the prosecuted, testified on their behalf, or assisted them as scribes in writing petitions, regardless of any official legal capacity they might have had. Networks of repressed and tolerated Catholics, including their connections with defenders of elevated social status, good judicial knowledge, and close connections with the Reformed elite, were vital for their survival in multi-confessional Utrecht. The present study will bring these individuals out of the shadows and position them in the social context of not only

the Dutch or urban Catholic community but also the multi-religious civic community of Utrecht and the Dutch Republic more broadly.

Chapter 4 understands 'spatial practices' as tactical productions of physical and perceived spaces, through which Utrecht's Catholics attempted to challenge and appropriate the concrete places strategically dominated by the politico-religious authorities and the Reformed majority.⁷⁵ In comparison with the next chapter, this chapter gives greater prominence to Catholics as a confessional community than to individual Catholics. Historians now contend not only that space has shaped human experience, but conversely that human beings have also delineated, given meanings to, and appropriated space.⁷⁶ Space is no longer understood as an absolute and rigid entity, as an *a priori* condition for social relations, or as a blank canvas waiting to be coloured in. Rather, space is now conceptualized as a contingent and fluid entity, or 'a (social) product'.⁷⁷ The cultural-historical studies on clandestine churches referenced above can be situated in this historiographical development. They succeeded in unveiling an essential aspect of the cultural mechanisms of early modern religious coexistence; that is, physicality and materiality in the public/private distinction. They regard the physical threshold of private homes as a crucial indicator of the boundary between public and private, and demonstrate that perceptibility by the human senses – visibility and audibility – played an indispensable role when people distinguished public and private in their attempt to realize coexistence.⁷⁸ However, they do not pay sufficient attention to the spaces outside the thresholds, including urban spaces such as public church buildings, monasteries, convents, hospices, spaces between houses, and public streets. The present study will discuss how Catholics participated in the process of transforming the urban space as a whole, uncovering the spatial dimension of the delimitation of the public.

As for 'discourses of self-representation', Chapter 5 will analyse how Catholic Utrechters attempted to defy persecution and win toleration by constructing their self-representations in their petitions to the politico-judicial authorities. It highlights the variety of discourses Catholic individuals mobilized, not depicting them as a monolithic group. Over the

75 Here I derive inspiration from Certeau, *L'Invention du quotidien* and, to a lesser degree, from Lefebvre, *The Production*.

76 See the contributions in Stock, *The Uses of Space*, especially Kümin, 'The Uses of Space', pp. 227–30; Stock, 'History', pp. 4–10.

77 Lefebvre, *The Production*, p. 26.

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

past several decades, studies in politico-social and criminal history have been utilizing legal and other petitions to assess the agency of ordinary people.⁷⁹ Through their petitioning activities, people could manage to make themselves heard in public. Plaintiffs and defendants in early modern Europe were well acquainted with the existing legal system, appropriating or exploiting it for their sake,⁸⁰ while discourses in petitions were crafted through the petitioners' self-representations.⁸¹ The narratives of petitions were not monophonic but polyphonic in nature, since 'the content of a petition was usually translated from oral dialect to written and formalized language by a scribe'. For this reason, petitions should in many cases not be read as ego-documents, since '[p]rofessional scribes combined textbook advice on how to write a petition with the recipients' horizon of norms and values'.⁸² In our case, we have to regard the survival tactics appearing in petitions as a hybrid, created cooperatively by the repressed or tolerated Catholics themselves together with their defenders, who included family members, neighbours, and professional lawyers. Moreover, the seventeenth century is said to have been the century of freedom of conscience, which developed in the context of religious diversity after the Reformations.⁸³ To avoid projecting our own notions and norms of public and private back onto the early modern era, I will adopt a terminological approach throughout the book, paying special attention to how seventeenth-century Utrechters utilized and gave meanings to the terms 'public' (in Dutch, *publiek*, *openbaar*, and *gemeen*) and 'private' (in Dutch, *privaat* and *particulier*).⁸⁴ Yet it is in this final chapter that I will conduct a discourse analysis, clarifying how Catholics understood and appropriated the concepts of 'public', 'private', and 'conscience' in their petitions for their tactical purposes, shedding light on the rhetorical dimension of the delimitation of the public.

Finally, the Conclusion will position the case of Catholic Utrechters within the history of religious coexistence in both the Dutch Republic and the wider early modern world. I will argue that the vigorous survival of

79 See the contributions in Heerma van Voss, *Petitions in Social History*, especially Heerma van Voss, 'Introduction' and Würigler, 'Voices'.

80 Dinges, 'The Uses of Justice'.

81 Natalie Zemon Davis pays attention to the 'fictional' aspects of petitions, which entailed 'the crafting of a narrative'. Davis, *Fiction in the Archive*, p. 3.

82 Würigler, 'Voices', p. 32.

83 Sorabji, *Moral Conscience*, p. 5.

84 As Mette Brikedal Bruun has reminded us, among the different ways of analysing early modern public and private, the terminological approach may be reductionist but is 'less exposed to anachronism'. Bruun, 'Towards an Approach', pp. 21–22. For a similar terminological approach to public and private in seventeenth-century England, see Longfellow, 'Public, Private'.

Utrecht's Catholics was crucial for the revival of the Catholic community in the Dutch Republic. Catholics manifested an untypically strong presence in seventeenth-century Utrecht compared to other early modern, politico-religious minorities. The Utrecht case is important for the wealth of primary sources it offers, among them legal records, thereby representing an unparalleled opportunity for reconstructing the body of Catholic survival tactics as an ideal basis for future comparative studies on coexistence from the bottom-up perspective of politico-religious minorities in early modern Dutch history and beyond. By comparing the Utrecht case with others in the early modern world, the Conclusion will identify the factors that determined the nature of the governing strategies of the majority and the survival tactics of the minorities. What mattered for the majority's strategies include their politico-religious structures, legal schemes as well as dynamic politico-religious and socio-economic circumstances. As for the minorities' tactics, those crucial factors pertain to their numerical, socio-economic, and historical presence within the local society, as well as the religious infrastructure at their disposal and the legal resources they could appropriate. Widening our scope from the previous focus on the private, the ecumenicity of everyday life, and the fictions of privacy so as to include the public and the delimitation of the public, I will argue that we can produce a more sophisticated critique of teleological narratives of modernization, allowing us to shed brighter light on politico-religious minorities and their agency in realizing religious coexistence through the public/private distinction. Delimiting the public and manifesting various, competing visions of publicness, early modern people, including Catholic Utrechters, wielded agency in creating a multi-religious society.

Each of the following five chapters will be introduced by the voice of Johannes Wachtelaer, a Catholic and native citizen of Utrecht who obtained a canonry of St Marie in 1593 and acted as vicar general in Utrecht from 1611. The vivid writings of this storyteller offer us hints for the governing strategies of the Reformed as well as the survival tactics of the Catholics, both of which shaped and coloured religious coexistence in post-Reformation Utrecht.

Abbreviations

- A.G.K.K.N.* *Archiefvoor de Geschiedenis van de Katholieke Kerk in Nederland.*
- A.A.U.* *Archiefvoor de geschiedenis van het aartsbisdom Utrecht. Utrecht, 1875–1957.*

- G.P.U. Water, Johan van de. *Groot Placaatboek vervattende alle de placaten [...]* Staten 's lands van Utrecht, 3 vols. Utrecht, 1729.
- J.O.U. *Jaarboek Oud-Utrecht*.

Bibliography

Published Primary Sources

- Lommel, Anthonius van, ed. 'Verslag van den toestand der Hollandsche Missie ten jare 1616'. *A.A.U.* 1 (1875), pp. 59–117.
- Water, Johan van de. *Groot Placaat-Boek vervattende all de placaten [...]* Staten 's lands van Utrecht. 3 vols. Utrecht, 1729. [G.P.U.]

Secondary Literature

- Ackermans, Gian. *Herders en huurlingen. Bisschoppen en priesters in de Republiek (1663–1705)*. Amsterdam, 2003.
- Bogaers, Lleywellyn. 'Een kwestie van macht? Onderzoek naar de trend in de wetgeving aangaande rituele en sociale ontmoetingen in de stad Utrecht in de periode 1528–1713'. MA thesis, Utrecht University, 1983.
- Bogaers, Lleywellyn. *Aards, betrokken, en zelfbewust. De verwevenheid van cultuur en religie in katholiek Utrecht, 1300–1600*. Utrecht, 2008.
- Boukema, Niek. 'Geloven in het geloof. Een onderzoek naar de positie van de katholieken en de katholieke seculiere zielzorg binnen de stad Utrecht gedurende de periode 1580–1672, met accent op de eerst helft van de 17e eeuw'. MA thesis, Utrecht University, 1982.
- Bruun, Mette Birkedal. 'Towards an Approach to Early Modern Privacy: The Retirement of the Great Condé'. In *Early Modern Privacy: Sources and Approaches*, edited by Michaël Green, Lars Cyril Nørgaard, and Mette Birkedal Bruun. Leiden, 2022, pp. 12–60.
- Caspers, Charles, and Peter Jan Margry. *Identiteit en spiritualiteit van de Amsterdamse Stille Omgang*. Hilversum, 2006.
- Certeau, Michel de. *L'Invention du quotidien, 1. Art de faire*. Paris, 1980.
- Châtellier, Louis. *The Religion of the Poor: Rural Missions in Europe and the Formation of Modern Catholicism, c.1500–c.1800*. Cambridge, 1997.
- Clark, J. C. D. 'Secularization and Modernization: The Failure of a 'Grand Narrative''. *Historical Journal* 55, no. 1 (2012), pp. 161–94.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. *The Return of Martin Guerre*. Cambridge, MA, 1984.

- Davis, Natalie Zemon. *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France*. Stanford, 1987.
- Deursen, Arie Th. van. *Bavianen en slijkgeuzen. Kerk en kerkvolk ten tijde van Maurits en Oldenbarnevelt*. Assen, 1974.
- Deursen, Arie Th. van. 'Tussen eenheid en zelfstandigheid. De toepassing van de Unie als fundamentele wet'. In *De Unie van Utrecht. Wording en werking van een verband en een verbondsacte*, edited by Simon Groenveld and H. L. Ph. Leeuwenberg. The Hague, 1979, pp. 136–54.
- Dinges, Martin. 'The Uses of Justice as a Form of Social Control in Early Modern Europe'. In *Social Control in Europe*, vol. I, 1500–1800, 2 vols. edited by Herman Roodenburg and Pieter Spierenburg. Columbus, 2004, pp. 159–75.
- Dixon, C. Scott. 'Introduction: Living with Religious Diversity in Early-Modern Europe'. In *Living with Religious Diversity in Early-Modern Europe*, edited by C. Scott Dixon, Dagmar Freist, and Mark Greengrass. Aldershot, 2009, pp. 1–20.
- Dixon, C. Scott, Dagmar Freist, and Mark Greengrass, eds. *Living with Religious Diversity in Early-Modern Europe*. Aldershot, 2009.
- Dudok van Heel, Sebastien A. C. 'De rol van de katholieke elite bij ontstaan der staties'. In *Putti en cherubijntjens. Het religieuze werk van Jacob de Wit (1695–1754)*, edited by Guus van den Hout and Robert Schillemans. Haarlem, 1995, pp. 35–53.
- Duke, Alastair. 'The Ambivalent Face of Calvinism in the Netherlands, 1561–1618'. In *International Calvinism 1541–1715*, edited by M. Prestwich. Oxford, 1985, pp. 109–34.
- Duke, Alastair. *Reformation and Revolt in the Low Countries*, London, 1990.
- Duker, Arnoldus. *Gisbertus Voetius*, 3 vols. Leiden, 1897–1914.
- Eck, Xander van. *Kunst, twist en devotie. Goudse katholieke schuilkerken 1572–1795*. Delft, 1994.
- Eck, Xander van. *Clandestine Splendor: Paintings for the Catholic Church in the Protestant Republic*. Zwolle, 2008.
- Elliott, J. P. 'Protestantization in the Northern Netherlands, a Case Study: The Classis of Dordrecht, 1572–1640'. PhD diss., Columbia University, 1990.
- Enno van Gelder, Herman A. 'Nederland geprotestantiseerd?' *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* 81 (1968), pp. 445–64.
- Enno van Gelder, Herman A. *Getemperde vrijheid. Een verhandeling over de verhouding van kerk en staat in de Republiek der Verenigde Nederlanden*. Groningen, 1972.
- Faber, J. A., A. M. van der Woude, H. K. Roessingh, and J. A. de Kok. 'Numerieke aspecten van de protestantisering in Noord-Nederland tussen 1656 en 1726'. *Afdeling Agrarische Geschiedenis. Bijdragen* 13 (1965), pp. 149–80.
- Forclaz, Bertrand. *Catholiques au défi de la Réforme. La coexistence confessionnelle à Utrecht au XVIIe siècle*. Paris, 2014.
- Forst, Rainer. *Toleration in Conflict: Past and Present*. Cambridge, 2013.

- Frijhoff, Willem. 'La fonction du miracle dans une minorité catholique. Les Provinces-Unies au XVII^e siècle'. *Revue d'histoire de la spiritualité* 48 (1972), pp. 151–77.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'De paniek van juni 1734'. *A.G.K.K.N.* 19 (1977), pp. 170–233.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'La coexistence confessionnelle. Complicités, méfiances et ruptures aux Provinces-Unies'. In *Histoire vécue du peuple chrétien*, 2 vols. edited by Jean Delumeau, II. Toulouse, 1979, pp. 229–57.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Van "histoire de l'Eglise" naar "histoire religieuse". De invloed van de 'Annales'-groep op de ontwikkeling van de kerkgeschiedenis in Frankrijk en de perspectieven daarvan voor Nederland'. *Nederlands Archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 61 (1981), pp. 113–53.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Katholieke toekomstverwachting ten tijde van de Republiek: structuur, en grondlijnen tot een interpretatie'. *Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden* 98, no. 3 (1983), pp. 430–59.
- 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.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Religious Toleration in the United Provinces: From "Case" to "Model"'. In *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, edited by Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia and Henk van Nierop. Cambridge, 2002, pp. 27–52.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Overlevingsstrategieën van rooms-katholieken in Zutphen na de Hervorming'. In *Lebuïnus en Walburgis bijeen. Deventer en Zutphen als historische centra van kerkelijk leven*, edited by E. H. Bary, C. M. Hogenstijn, H. J. Selderhuis, and J. D. Snel. Delft, 2006, pp. 203–19.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Catholic Apocalypitics in a Protestant Commonwealth? The Dutch Republic (1579–1630)'. In *Konfessioneller Fundamentalismus. Religion als politischer Faktor im europäischen Mächtesystem um 1600*, edited by Heinz Schilling. Munich, 2007, pp. 247–72.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Shifting Identities in Hostile Settings: Towards a Comparison of the Catholic Communities in Early Modern Britain and the Northern Netherlands'. 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. 1–17.
- Frijhoff, Willem, and Marijke Spies. *1650. Bevochten eendracht*. The Hague, 1999.
- Ginzburg, Carlo. *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller*. Translated by John Tedeschi and Anne Tedeschi. Baltimore, 1980.
- 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.
- Geyl, Pieter. *Verzamelde opstellen*, 4 vols. Utrecht, 1978.
- Gijswijt-Hofstra, Marijke. 'Een schijn van verdraagzaamheid. Proeven uit vijf eeuwen Nederlands verleden'. In *Een schijn van verdraagzaamheid. Afwijking en tolerantie in Nederland van de zestiende eeuw tot heden*, edited by Marijke Gijswijt-Hofstra. Hilversum, 1989, pp. 9–40.
- Green, Michaël, Lars Cyril Nørgaard, and Mette Birkedal Bruun, eds. *Early Modern Privacy: Sources and Approaches*. Leiden, 2022.
- Grell, Ole Peter, and Robert W. Scribner, eds. *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation*, Cambridge, 1996.
- Groenveld, Simon, and H. L. Ph. Leeuwenberg, eds. *De Unie van Utrecht. Wording en werking van een verband en een verbondsacte*. The Hague, 1979.
- Groenveld, Simon, H. L. Ph. Leeuwenberg, and H. B. van der Weel. *Unie – Bestand – Vrede. Drie fundamentele wetten van de Republiek der Verenigde Nederlanden*. Hilversum, 2009.
- 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.
- Hallebeek, Jan. 'Godsdienst(on)vrijheid in de Gouden Eeuw? Het proces tegen Johan Wachtelaer (1583–1652)'. *Trajecta* 23 (2014), pp. 123–44.
- Heerma van Voss, Lex. 'Introduction'. In *Petitions in Social History*, edited by Lex Heerma van Voss. Cambridge, 2001, pp. 1–10.
- Heerma van Voss, Lex, ed. *Petitions in Social History*. Cambridge, 2001.
- Hewett, Margaret, and Jan Hallebeek. 'The Prelate, the Praetor and the Professor: Antonius Matthaeus II and the *Crimen Laesae Majestatis*, Utrecht 1639–1640'. *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis* 66, no. 1 (1998), pp. 115–50.
- Hsia, Ronnie Po-Chia. *The World of Catholic Renewal 1540–1770*. Cambridge, 1998.
- Hsia, Ronnie Po-Chia, and Henk van Nierop, eds. *Cabvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*. Cambridge, 2002.
- Israel, Jonathan I. *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650–1750*. Oxford, 2002.
- Janssen, Geert H. *The Dutch Revolt and Catholic Exile in Reformation Europe*. Cambridge, 2014.
- Jong, Johannes de. 'Het Utrechtse vicariaat en de strijd over de hiërarchische orde in de 17e eeuw'. *De Katholiek* 164 (1923), pp. 73–104, 146–86.
- Jong, O. J. de. 'Unie en religie'. In *De Unie van Utrecht. Wording en werking van een verband en een verbondsacte*, edited by Simon Groenveld and H. L. Ph. Leeuwenberg. The Hague, 1979, pp. 155–81.
- Kamen, Henry. *The Rise of Toleration*. London, 1967.

- Kaplan, Benjamin J. *Calvinists and Libertines: Confession and Community in Utrecht, 1578–1620*. Oxford, 1995.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J. 'Confessionalism and Its Limits: Religion in Utrecht, 1600–1650'. In *Masters of Light: Dutch Painters in Utrecht during the Golden Age*, edited by Joaneath A. Spicer and Lynn Federle Orr. New Haven, 1997, pp. 60–71.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J. "'Dutch" Religious Tolerance: Celebration and Revision'. In *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, edited by Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia and Henk van Nierop. Cambridge, 2002, pp. 8–26.
- 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. *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., and Jaap Geraerts, eds. *Early Modern Toleration: New Approaches*. Abington and New York, 2024.
- Kaplan, Benjamin, Bob Moore, Henk van Nierop, and Judith Pollmann, eds. *Catholic Communities in Protestant States: Britain and the Netherlands, c. 1570–1720*. Manchester, 2009.
- 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.
- Knuif, W. L. S., and J. de Jong. 'Philippus Rovenius en zijn bestuur der Hollandsche Zending'. *A.A.U.* 50 (1925), pp. 1–425.
- Knuttel, Willem Pieter Cornelis. *De toestand der Nederlandsche Katholieken ten tijde der Republiek*, 2 vols. The Hague, 1892.
- Kok, J. A. de. *Nederland op de breuklijn Rome-Reformatie. Numerieke aspecten van protestantisering en katholieke herleving in de noordelijke Nederlanden, 1580–1880*. Assen, 1964.
- Kooi, Christine. *Liberty and Religion: Church and State in Leiden's Reformation, 1572–1620*. Leiden, 2000.
- Kooi, Christine. *Calvinists and Catholics during Holland's Golden Age: Heretics and Idolaters*. Cambridge, 2012.

- Koselleck, Reinhart. *Critique and Crisis: Enlightenment and the Pathogenesis of Modern Society*. Cambridge, MA, 1988.
- Kümin, Beat. 'The Uses of Space in Early Modern History – An Afterword'. In *The Uses of Space in Early Modern History*, edited by Paul Stock. Basingstoke, 2015, pp. 227–34.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*, translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford, 1991.
- 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.
- Le Roy Ladurie, Emmanuel. *Montaillou: The Promised Land of Error*, translated by Barbara Bray. New York, 1978.
- Lieburg van, Fred. *De Nadere Reformatie in Utrecht ten tijde van Voetius. Sporen in de gereformeerde kerkeeraadsacta*. Rotterdam, 1989.
- Longfellow, Erica. 'Public, Private, and the Household in Early Seventeenth-Century England'. *Journal of British Studies* 45 (2006), pp. 313–34.
- Margry, Peter Jan, and Charles Caspers, eds. *Bedeavaartplaatsen in Nederland*, 4 vols. Amsterdam, 1997–2000.
- Moeller, Bernd. *Imperial Cities and the Reformation: Three Essays*, translated and edited by H. C. Erik Midelfort and Mark U. Edwards. Minneapolis, 1972.
- 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.
- Mörke, Olaf. "Konfessionalisierung" als politisch-soziales Prinzip? Das Verhältnis von Religion und Staatsbildung in der Republik der Vereinigten Niederlande im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert'. *Tijdschrift voor sociale geschiedenis* 16, no. 1 (1990), pp. 31–60.
- Mudde, Caroline Jacomine. 'Rouwen in de marge. De materiële rouwcultuur van de katholieke geloofsgemeenschap in vroegmodern Nederland'. PhD diss., Utrecht University, 2018.
- Nierop, Henk van. 'Sewing the Bailiff in a Blanket: Catholics and the Law in Holland'. In *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, edited by Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia and Henk van Nierop. Cambridge, 2002, pp. 102–11.
- Ó hAnnracháin, Tadhg. *Catholic Europe, 1592–1648: Centre and Peripheries*. Oxford, 2015.
- O'Malley, J. W. *Trent and All That: Renaming Catholicism in the Early Modern Era*. Cambridge, 2000.
- Parker, Charles H. *The Reformation of Community: Social Welfare and Calvinist Charity in Holland, 1572–1620*. Cambridge, 1998.

- Parker, Charles H. *Faith on the Margins: Catholics and Catholicism in the Dutch Golden Age*. Cambridge, MA and London, 2008.
- Parker, Charles H. 'Cooperative Confessionalisation: Lay-Clerical Collaboration in Dutch Catholic Communities during the Golden Age'. 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. 18–32.
- Parker, Charles H. 'Heretics at Home, Heathens Abroad: The Revival of Dutch Catholicism as Global Mission'. *Trajecta* 26 (2017), pp. 89–106.
- Plummer, Marjorie Elizabeth, and Victoria Christman, eds., *Topographies of Tolerance and Intolerance: Responses to Religious Pluralism in Reformation Europe*. Leiden, 2018.
- Pollmann, Judith. *Religious Choice in the Dutch Republic: The Reformation of Arnoldus Buchelius (1565–1641)*. Manchester, 1999.
- Pollmann, Judith. *Catholic Identity and the Revolt of the Netherlands, 1520–1635*. Oxford, 2011.
- Prak, Maarten. *The Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century: Golden Age*. Cambridge, 2005.
- Prak, Maarten. *Nederlands Gouden Eeuw. Vrijheid en geldingsdrang*. Amsterdam, 2020.
- Reinhard, Wolfgang. 'Pressures towards Confessionalization? Prolegomena to a Theory of the Confessional Age'. In *The German Reformation: The Essential Readings*, edited by C. Scott Dixon. Oxford, 1999, pp. 169–92.
- Reinhard, Wolfgang. 'Reformation, Counter-Reformation, and the Early Modern State'. *Catholic Historical Review* 75 (1989), pp. 383–404.
- Rogier, Lodewijk J. *Geschiedenis van het katholicisme in Noord-Nederland in de 16e en de 17e eeuw*, 3 vols. Amsterdam, 1945–1947.
- Safley, Thomas M. 'Multiconfessionalism: A Brief Introduction'. In *A Companion to Multiconfessionalism in the Early Modern World*, edited by Thomas M. Safley. Leiden, 2011, pp. 1–19.
- Safley, Thomas M., ed. *A Companion to Multiconfessionalism in the Early Modern World*. Leiden, 2011.
- Schilling, Heinz. 'Confessional Europe'. In *Handbook of European History 1400–1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation*, 2 vols. edited by Thomas A. Brady, Heiko A. Oberman, and James D. Tracy, II. Leiden, 1995, pp. 641–81.
- Schilling, Heinz. *Early Modern European Civilization and its Political and Cultural Dynamism: the Menahem Stern Jerusalem Lectures*. Hanover and London, 2008.
- Sorabji, Richard. *Moral Conscience through the Ages: Fifth Century BCE to the Present*. Oxford, 2014.
- Spaans, Joke. *Haarlem na de Reformatie: Stedelijke cultuur en kerkelijk leven, 1577–1620*. The Hague, 1989.

- Spaans, Joke. 'De katholieken in de Republiek na de Vrede van Munster'. *De zeventiende eeuw* 13 (1997), pp. 253–60.
- Spaans, Joke. *De Levens der Maechden. Het verhaal van een religieuze vrouwen-gemeenschap in de eerste helft van de zeventiende eeuw*. Hilversum, 2012.
- Spiertz, Mathieu G. 'De katholieke geestelijke leiders en de wereldlijke overheid in de Republiek der Zeven Provinciën'. *Trajecta* 2 (1993), pp. 3–20.
- 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.
- Spohnholz, Jesse, and Mirjam G. K. van Veen. 'Calvinists vs. Libertines: A New Look at Religious Exile and the Origins of "Dutch" Tolerance'. In *Calvinism and the Making of the European Mind*, edited by Gijsbert van den Brink and Harro M. Höpfl. Leiden, 2014, pp. 76–99.
- Stock, Paul. 'History and the Uses of Space'. In *The Uses of Space in Early Modern History*, edited by Paul Stock. Basingstoke, 2015, pp. 1–18.
- Stock, Paul, ed. *The Uses of Space in Early Modern History*. Basingstoke, 2015.
- Terpstra, Nicholas. *Religious Refugees in the Early Modern World: An Alternative History of the Reformation*. Cambridge, 2015.
- Tracy, James D. 'Public Church, *Gemeente Christi*, or *Volkskerk*: Holland's Reformed Church in Civil and Ecclesiastical Perspective'. In *Die Reformation in Deutschland und Europa. Interpretationen und Debatten*, edited by H. R. Guggisberg and G. G. Krodel. Gütersloh, 1993, pp. 487–510.
- Troeltsch, Ernst. *Protestantism and Progress: A Historical Study of the Relation of Protestantism to the Modern World*, translated by W. Montgomery. London and New York, 1912.
- Ven, Adrianus J. van de. *Over den oorsprong van het Aartsbisschoppelijke Kapittel van Utrecht der Oude-Bisschoppelijke clerezij*. Utrecht, 1923.
- Verheggen, Evelyne M. F. *Beelden van passie en hartstocht. Bid en devotieprenten in de Noordelijke Nederlanden, 17^e en 18^e eeuw*. Zutphen, 2006.
- 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.
- Vries, Jan de, and Ad van der Woude. *The First Modern Economy: Success, Failure, and Perseverance of the Dutch Economy, 1500–1815*. Cambridge, 1997.

- Walsham, Alexandra. *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500–1700*. Manchester, 2006.
- Walsham, Alexandra. 'The Reformation and "the Disenchantment of the World" Reassessed'. *Historical Journal* 51 (2008), pp. 497–528.
- Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, translated and edited by Stephen Kalberg. Roxbury, 2002.
- Weintraub, Jeff, and Krishan Kumar, eds. *Public and Private in Thought and Practice: Perspectives on a Grand Dichotomy*. Chicago, 1997.
- Wingens, Marc. *Over de grens. De bedevaart van katholieke Nederlanders in de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw*. Nijmegen, 1994.
- Woltjer, Juliaan J. 'De plaats van de calvinisten in de Nederlandse samenleving'. *De zeventiende eeuw* 10 (1994), pp. 3–23.
- Würgler, Andreas. 'Voices from among the "Silent Masses": Humble Petitions and Social Conflicts in Early Modern Central Europe'. In *Petitions in Social History*, edited by Lex Heerma van Voss. Cambridge, 2001, pp. 11–34.
- Zagorin, Perez. *How the Idea of Religious Toleration Came to the West*. Princeton, 2003.

Part I.

Reformed Governing Strategies

1. Repression: Dynamics of Anti-Catholicism

Abstract: Repression constituted an integral part of the governing strategies adopted by Utrecht's Reformed magistrates. This chapter offers a qualitative and quantitative survey of the Reformed repression of Catholics by tracing how magistrates legislated anti-Catholicism on paper and prosecuted Catholics in practice. Between 1620 and 1672, Utrecht saw a certain tendency towards Reformed confessionalization of the public sphere. The Reformed Church persistently urged the political authorities to issue more anti-Catholic edicts and to submit more legal charges against Catholics, expelling them from urban public life. The magistrates, for their part, sometimes, but certainly not always, pursued this confessionalizing agenda by 'legalizing' Catholic discrimination and persecution. Politico-religious circumstances in and around Utrecht dictated the tides of stricter or laxer repression.

Keywords: repression, persecution, prosecution, anti-Catholicism, religious discrimination, confessionalization

In a letter to his colleague and future apostolic vicar Jacobus de la Torre (1608–1661), dated 13 April 1640, Johannes Wachtelaer described the 'hostile assaults' and 'persecution' which Catholic Utrechters had been suffering since 1639:

We fight for the maintenance of the Catholic faith and for communion with the see of Rome, surrounded by those of other persuasions, as I suppose everyone to know. Should it surprise anyone that things do not always go for the warriors as they might wish? The enemy is strong and presses itself [upon us] powerfully. [...] That we would suffer persecution

is what Christ predicted, the apostle reminded us of and the church experienced in her cradle.¹

Catholics themselves regarded their experiences as persecution. In spite of this, Wachtelaer did not represent his co-religionists as passive victims. Using a vocabulary remarkably laced with war imagery, he portrayed Dutch Catholics, and in particular those living in Utrecht, as soldiers in a holy war, and suggested that those who fell during its course were to be considered martyrs.

What Catholics represented as religiously motivated persecution (*vervolging*), the Reformed saw as lawful prosecution (*vervolging*). This chapter will examine, both qualitatively and quantitatively, how the political authorities repressed Catholics in their attempts to strategically govern the environment of religious coexistence by its anti-Catholic efforts, from legislation on paper to prosecution in practice. It will offer a chronological account of the interplay between the political authorities and the Reformed Church as both sides dealt with the reality of the city's reviving Catholic community. The present survey of the legal records represents the first quantitative analysis of the legal proceedings undertaken against Catholics in the Dutch Republic. For the present purposes, the period stretching from 1620 to 1672 has been divided into four phases, according to the local, national, and international politico-religious context: from 1620 to 1638, when the war against the Habsburg monarchy was resumed after the end of the Twelve Years' Truce (1609–21); from 1639 to 1648, as the last phase of the Dutch Revolt against Spain; from 1649 to 1659, when orthodox Calvinists redefined the Dutch Republic as an independent Protestant state after the Peace of Münster (1648) and the Great Assembly (1651); and from 1660 to 1672, when the Republican regime gained the upper hand in national and local politics, before suddenly losing power in the 'Disaster Year' (*Rampjaar*) of 1672. Against the backdrop of these politico-religious developments in and around Utrecht, I will argue that the Reformed Church constantly urged magistrates to delimit the public of the endangered *corpus christianum* in a confessionalized manner by increasingly depriving Catholic Utrechters of their rights in the public sphere. The magistrates for their part at one time

1 This letter has been transcribed in Deelder, *Bijdragen*, I, pp. 170–76, here especially pp. 170–71: 'vijandelijke aanvallen', 'vervolging', and 'wij strijden voor de instandhouding van het katholiek geloof en voor de gemeenschap met den stoel van Rome, te midden der andersdenkenden, veronderstel ik als aan ieder bekend. Wat wonder, als het den strijders niet immer naar wensch gaat? De vijand is machtig en dringt krachtig op. [...] wij vervolging zouden lijden, heeft Christus voorzegd, heeft de apostel ons herinnerd, heeft de kerk van haar wieg af ondervonden'.

refused such proposals and at other times supported them, institutionalizing religious discrimination against Catholics and harming their legal and politico-social credibility in local society.

1.1. The Politico-Judicial Structure of Post-Reformation Utrecht

In the Dutch Republic, each of the seven sovereign provinces had its own unique political structure. Going back even before the Dutch Revolt against Spain, the Provincial States of Utrecht were composed of three voting units. The first estate represented the clergy (canons) of the Dom cathedral chapter and the four other collegiate chapters in the city. The second estate, the Knighthood (*Ridderschap*), was a delegation from the nobility. The third estate promoted the interests of the city of Utrecht and the province's other, smaller cities. Soon after the outlawing of Catholicism in Utrecht in 1580, militia captains appealed to William I of Orange to abolish the first estate on the grounds that its *raison d'être* as an advisory council of clergymen to the archbishop had been undermined by the Protestant Reformation, but in vain. Behind William's refusal, there was strong pressure from the nobles who, as members of the second estate, shared politico-economic interests in provincial politics with the canons of the first estate, who were the province's major landholders. In the end, the first estate came to consist of eight secularized canons who hailed from the city's five chapters and were known as *Geëligeerden*.² In seventeenth-century provincial politics, the second estate (four to seven representatives of the nobility) and the third estate (two incumbent burgomasters, together with four to six members of the Utrecht city council, as well as between one and three representatives from each smaller city) competed constantly for the eight votes of the *Geëligeerden* of the first estate; there was thus a conflict opposing the noble faction and the civic faction. Although Stadholder Maurice decided in 1618 to distribute the eight representatives of the first estate equally between the nobility and the patriciate so as to achieve a balance in power between the second estate of the noble faction and third estate of the civic faction, in practice this regulation was not always observed. In the course of the seventeenth century, the nobility gradually lost the political influence it had once enjoyed at the provincial level through the first and the second estates, while oligarchization progressed in the third estate and in all of the city councils.³

2 Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, p. 137.

3 Wilders, *Patronage*, pp. 30–31, 138.

It was the canons of the chapters who ranked in the highest socio-economic strata of Utrecht during medieval and early modern times. Possessing a quarter of all the land in the province, the five chapters were made up of no fewer than 140 canons, who enjoyed the right to receive income as prebends, to use the houses in the compounds of their chapters within their immunities (i.e., distinct domains where jurisdiction belonged to the church alone and not to the secular authorities), and to hold political representation in the Provincial States. After the introduction of the Protestant Reformation, these chapters were secularized and their immunities nullified. In the wake of the ensuing disputes which also involved the chapters, the Provincial States, and the provincial court (*Hof*), the city council ended up assuming jurisdiction over the chapter buildings, including compounds and churches. The chapters themselves, however, were not disestablished as corporations. Thus, their canons continued to enjoy socio-economic and political privileges, even in the absence of their former clerical functions.⁴ Furthermore, it remained possible for Catholics, both priests (including our storyteller Wachtelaer) and laymen, to be appointed secularized canons until 1615, when the Provincial States decided that from then on only the Reformed were to be eligible for these prominent positions.⁵ After this legislation was enacted, the number of Catholic canons steadily declined, until in 1680 Gerard van der Steen passed away as the last Catholic (lay) canon in early modern Utrecht. As we shall see, these Catholic canons were successful in exploiting their powerful socio-economic status for the survival of their confessional community.

The political structure of the city of Utrecht changed profoundly in the sixteenth century. From 1304 to 1528, Utrecht was under what has been called a 'guild democracy'. However, when Emperor Charles V (1500–1558) annexed Utrecht in 1528, he drastically curtailed the political power of the guilds, whose role in the political representation of the commoners was transferred to the civic militias. After the militia captains allied themselves with the prince of Orange in 1576, the patricians began to fear that their political influence would wane. To counter this threat, the patriciate introduced the *vroedschap*-model from Holland in the city council of Utrecht in 1586, resulting in the further oligarchization of civic governance.⁶ In this

4 Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, pp. 113–16; Idem, 'Confessionalism', p. 109; Rengers Hora Siccama, *De geestelijke en kerkelijke goederen*, pp. 396–414; Vries, 'Searching', pp. 53–54.

5 *G.P.U.*, I, p. 218 (8 June 1615).

6 Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, pp. 133–37. On the guilds' political function in early modern Utrecht, see Slokker, *Ruggengraat*, pp. 151–69.

development, the riot of 1610 needs to be noted. This riot originated in the longstanding conflict between Utrecht's commoners and nobles, particularly on an economic level. On 21 January 1610, more than 4,000 armed militiamen gathered in front of city hall demanding the resignation of the incumbent city magistrates, who were giving preferential treatment to the nobles and their rural industry, to the detriment of the commoners. They furthermore demanded the restoration of the medieval guild democracy to protect the citizens' economic interests. It is worth noting that the rebels also insisted that a stipulation excluding Catholics from the Utrecht magistracy be deleted. Under threat from the militia, a new government was installed, but the incoming magistrates did not implement the radical reforms demanded by the rebels, retaining the regulation by which Catholics were excluded from political office.⁷ According to Franciscus Dusseldorpius (1567–1630), a hard-line Catholic priest originating from a patrician family in Leiden who was staying in Utrecht during the 1610 riot, all Utrechters counted on the new government to restore the old regime under Catholic rulers.⁸ In the end, the riot was quashed by the States General, with the city council placing the militias under its own direct command and the nobles retaining their powerful politico-economic status within the city. Such political agitation by the general citizenry for the rescinding of anti-Catholic legislation was not repeated afterwards, but the 1610 riot does suggest that Catholic Utrechters formed an integral part of the civic community and were widely trusted for high office.

Between 1620 and 1672, the relationship between the city magistrates and the public church in Utrecht fluctuated significantly. From 1618, when Maurice purged the Remonstrant magistrates, until around 1651, the power in the Utrecht city council was in the hands of the orthodox Calvinists or Voetians under the leadership of Gisbertus Voetius, professor of theology at the university. Starting in the 1660s, the balance of power shifted to the moderate Republicans. Nevertheless, throughout the entire period under study, the consistory of the Reformed Church remained firmly in the hands of the hard-line Voetians.⁹ Under the legal system of early modern Utrecht, the sheriff (*schout*) acted as prosecutor and presided over the city court, where the aldermen heard the cases and, without the involvement of the sheriff, decided on sentences, whose records were then stored in the *criminele*

7 Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, pp. 240–44; Slokker, *Ruggengraat*, pp. 157–58.

8 Lenarduzzi, *De belevingswereld*, pp. 86–88; Idem, 'Subcultuur en tegencultuur', pp. 118–20.

9 For a chronological overview of the relationship between the city magistrates and the Reformed consistory in Utrecht during this period, see Bogaers, 'Een kwestie', pp. 61–84.

sententiën archive.¹⁰ For the city court, the sheriff drafted indictments and gathered diverse documentation, including defendant petitions and interrogation records, all of which were fragmentarily filed in the *criminele stukken* archive.¹¹ Since the sheriff received a part (in some cases up to a half) of the levied fine, he had an indubitable economic incentive for filing lawsuits. Each of the three voting units of the Provincial States of Utrecht nominated candidates for this lucrative position, with the stadholders deciding on the successful candidate.

In 1580 Catholicism was outlawed in Utrecht. From then on, Utrechters were prohibited from practising the 'Roman Religion' and wearing clerical clothing in the city and its suburbs.¹² Religious use of all public church buildings, including those of the former Dom cathedral, the four other collegiate churches, and four parish churches, was reserved exclusively for Reformed believers. All monasteries and convents were secularized. Many of them, including the Abraham Dole Monastery and the Cecilia Convent, were confiscated by secular authorities; the buildings of the former were reallocated for the use of university students for fencing and dissections after 1636, while the latter came to function as a provincial mint after 1647. Five monasteries or convents used by noblewomen in medieval times, including St Servaas Abbey and the Wittevrouwen Convent, were assigned to the Knighthood, to which Catholic nobles nevertheless continued to be nominated well into the seventeenth century. Furthermore, chapels inside hospices were to be reserved exclusively for the Reformed preachers.¹³ In 1581 another edict stipulated that no one was allowed to practice the Catholic faith, whether 'in secret, or in public'.¹⁴ This restriction was reconfirmed in the contracts between the Provincial States and governors or stadholders in 1584/85, 1588, and 1610, with the following proviso recalling the Union of Utrecht: no one was allowed to 'inquire into anyone's conscience, or conduct an investigation in anyone's house'. Here the realm of the conscience was virtually identified with the physical space inside homes. The same contracts also stipulated that Reformed alone were to be eligible for all public offices formerly filled by the appointment of the king of Spain and, later, the governors and stadholders. These public office holders were to

10 HUA, SAII, 2236.

11 HUA, SAII, 2244.

12 *G.P.U.*, III, p. 466 (18 June 1580).

13 Hulzen, *Utrechtse kerken*, passim; Idem, *Utrechtse kloosters*, passim, here especially pp. 48, 57; Kalveen, 'De vijf adellijke vrouwenkloosters', pp. 163–67; Rengers Hora Siccama, *De geestelijke en kerkelijke goederen*, pp. 347–69, 394–419, 622–762.

14 *G.P.U.*, I, p. 350 (26 August 1581): 'in 't heymelyk, ofte in 't openbaar'.

make a ‘public profession’ of the Reformed faith.¹⁵ Another edict of 1588/89 prescribed that priests caught presiding at Mass were to be deprived of their benefices, fined f. (florins) 50, and face possible banishment from the city. Anyone caught attending Catholic assemblies was to pay a fine of f. 25, while those found hosting such communal assemblies were to be fined f. 50.¹⁶ By 1620, therefore, the city council and the Provincial States had already promulgated a long series of edicts to repress Catholics, which were nevertheless rarely applied in practice.¹⁷ It was only after 1620 that the political authorities came to prosecute more Catholics, while also enacting more anti-Catholic legislation.

1.2. Legislation of and Pressure for Anti-Catholicism

1.2.1. The Resumption of War against the Habsburg Monarchy, 1620–1638

In 1620 the Utrecht city council, which at the time was under the control of hard-line Calvinists, requested the Provincial States to urge the States General to renew the anti-Catholic edict issued in 1612.¹⁸ In those days, shortly before the end of the Twelve Years’ Truce, the Reformed perceived the Catholic presence in the Republic as a real political threat. In Utrecht, such a sense of unease was accentuated in 1621 when Jacob Mom, a Catholic nobleman originating from Gelderland, was accused of *crimen laesae majestatis* (treason against the state), a charge that was rarely applied in early modern Dutch trials apart from the famous case against Johan van Oldenbarnevelt in 1619. The city court of Utrecht was ordered by the provincial court to draw up an inventory of the possessions in a house he owned in the city. Although Mom had already attempted several coups d’état with other Catholic noblemen for the re-establishment of Habsburg rule in the Northern Netherlands, his latest plans were uncovered early in 1621. As a result, Mom was decapitated in The Hague on 17 April 1621, shortly after the war resumed.¹⁹

15 *Ibidem*, I, pp. 158–66 (11 September 1584, 10 September 1585, 9 February 1588, 6 February, 2 April 1610): ‘men op yemants conscientie sal inquireren, of in yemants huysinge ondersoek doen’ and ‘openbare professie’.

16 *Ibidem*, III, pp. 466–67 (11 July 1588, 23 December 1589).

17 Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, pp. 223–24, 276.

18 HUA, SAII, 121-8, 24 May 1620.

19 HUA, SAII, 121-9, 22 January, 12 February, 27 March 1621; HUA, SAII, 2244-43, 7 April 1621; HUA, SAII, 2244-44, 7 April 1621; Jacobsz, *Sententiën; N.N.B.W.*, III, col. 876–77; Rogier, *Geschiedenis*, I, p. 74.

In 1622 the States General promulgated a harsh anti-Catholic edict that was soon adopted by the Provincial States of Utrecht. This edict, which was to be augmented and reissued in 1629, 1641, and 1649, set the tone for the legal status of the Dutch Catholic community for years to come.²⁰ The context for the original edict was 'the expiration of the Truce, by which these Lands were again thrown into public [open and official] war against the King of Spain'. The main target were Catholic priests, whom the edict represented as politico-religious agitators. According to it, they were inciting people to rebellion against the 'lawful Government' of the Dutch Republic and instilling them with loyalty to the pope and the king of Spain. Since such priests could potentially disturb the 'public tranquillity', a prohibition was announced on any priests coming in from outside Utrecht. As for the priests who were already established in Utrecht for a long time: they were required to register with the local magistracy. The version of the edict as it was reissued in 1629 decreed anew that Catholic laypeople were forbidden to assemble and practice their 'superstition' anywhere, including 'Churches, or private houses and places, on the field, in ships or boats'. As such, it reconfirmed more clearly and concretely than ever before that Catholics were not allowed to practise their faith even within their private homes. The edict also prohibited them from maintaining their own communal funds, collecting money, and sending it to their priests or ecclesiastical institutions in areas under Habsburg rule. It prescribed that no one was to study in 'Cities, Places, Universities, or Schools under the rule of the King of Spain in enemy Lands, or in other Jesuit Colleges'. All judicial officers were instructed not to accept any compromise with Catholics, nor to show 'connivance' in case of infraction. Finally, Catholics were excluded from judicial offices. This edict, like later, similar anti-Catholic edicts, justified corporal punishment of transgressors.²¹

At the same time, by 1630 at the latest, various activities of the city's reviving Catholic community had come to attract the attention of Reformed neighbours as well as the political authorities. Around that year, a converted former priest from Leuven, Rudolphus Francisci, who was at that time preparing to study Reformed theology in Franeker, leaked information to

20 *G.P.U.*, I, pp. 397–400 (26 February 1622).

21 *Ibidem*, I, pp. 397–400: 'de expiratie van den Treves, daar door dese Landen weder gevallen zyn in openbare oorloge tegen den Koninck van Hispanien', 'wettige Overheyd', 'gemeene ruste', 'Kercken, ofte particuliere huysen ende plaatsens, op den velde, in schepen, ofte schuyten', 'Steden, Plaatsen, Universiteyten, of Scholen, onder het gebied van den Koninck van Hispanien in vyanden Landen, of in andere Jesuiten Collegien', and 'conniventien'.

the States General regarding the illegal activities of Catholic priests in the Utrecht area. Those activities included the celebration of Mass, baptisms, religious education by *kloppjes* (spiritual virgins), the maintenance of their own communal funds and the weekly collection of alms. Francisci moreover portrayed Apostolic Vicar Philippus Rovenius as the 'bishop of Utrecht'.²²

Against this background, the political authorities issued further edicts to deny Catholics even more rights in the public sphere. In 1623 the Provincial States reissued the 1615 edict prohibiting Catholics from holding benefices or canonries.²³ Early in the 1630s the city council decreed that every 'position, office, or benefice on behalf of the City', including that of the militia officers, was to be occupied by Reformed people alone.²⁴ With regard to elementary education, the city magistrates prescribed in 1621 that all the schoolmasters and mistresses of *bijtscholen* (private schools) were to sign the canons of the Synod of Dordrecht or relinquish their schools, while public parish schools had already been Protestantized since 1580.²⁵ However, according to the famous humanist Arnoldus Buchelius (1565–1641), in 1624 forty girls were being taught in a Catholic school, where they learned craftworks, French, and music in the 'superstitious manner'.²⁶ For this reason, a 1631 provincial edict stipulated once again that every schoolmaster and mistress was to be Reformed, and that they were not to teach books 'conflicting with the Reformed Religion and good morals'.²⁷ In 1638 the consistory submitted a plan to the city council for regulating schoolmasters and mistresses like the guilds. The city council then decided that two schoolmasters would be appointed 'school superintendents' (*opsigters der scholen*), commissioned to oversee their fellow teachers in order to aid the sheriff in his investigation.²⁸

Throughout the seventeenth century, Utrecht suffered chronic financial problems, for which Catholics soon began to bear the brunt of the blame. In 1578 the Reformed diaconate started offering alms in cash and commodities to all the working poor (*huiszittende armen*), regardless of

22 For Francisci's testimony, see HUA, OBC, 99; HUA, SAIL, 2244-86, n.d.; Muller, 'Getuigenis', pp. 241-44.

23 *G.P.U.*, I, p. 219 (14 February 1623).

24 E.g. HUA, SAIL, 121-15, 5 September 1631; HUA, SAIL, 121-16, 3 September 1633: 'ampt, office ofte beneficie van Stadts wegen'.

25 HUA, SAIL, 121-9, 15 January, 12 February 1621.

26 Booy, *Kweekhoven*, pp. 66-71, 80-88, 128: 'superstitieus habyt'.

27 *G.P.U.*, III, pp. 501-2 (23 December 1631): 'strydende tegen de Gereformeerde Religie, en de goede zeden'. This edict would be augmented on 14 December 1646 and 12 August 1650.

28 HUA, KR, 4, 4, 18 January 1638; HUA, SAIL, 121-18, 25 June, 13 August 1638.

religion.²⁹ Yet in 1627 the consistory appealed to the city magistrates to reduce the 'excessive burden' on their diaconate, and urged them to establish a municipal chamber of charity (*Aalmoezenierskamer*) promptly.³⁰ During the city council session in which this appeal was discussed, Burgomaster Johan Florisz van der Nijpoort (in office 1625–1628) stated that Catholics had their own illegal means for supporting their poor and that some rich Catholics were skimping on their contributions to the diaconate, preferring to favour the charity established within their own community.³¹ Finally, in 1628 the city council established the municipal chamber of charity to serve the working poor who did not hold membership in the Reformed Church, but had resided in the city for at least four – and, soon thereafter, six – years. From then on, the Reformed diaconate was to bear the burden of care exclusively for communicant members of the Reformed Church. All others were to be entrusted to the care of the municipal chamber of charity, which was composed of a bookkeeper (*boekhouder*), a clerk (*griffier*), and sixteen trustees (*regenten*). Remarkably, the sixteen trustee posts were to be distributed equally between Reformed and Catholic 'qualified persons'. By the inclusion of Catholic administrators in the chamber, the magistrates tried to stimulate Catholics to contribute substantially – and more generously – to public welfare.³² However, in 1638 this bi-confessional system was officially abolished following a conflict between Catholics and the burgomasters the previous year. The new regulation stipulated that the trustees of the municipal chamber of charity were to be elected from among the Reformed alone.³³

At Utrecht University, initially established as an *Illustre School* in 1634, the professors of theology, among them Gisbertus Voetius, trained future ministers of the Reformed Church in an anti-Catholic spirit. In their 1638 mission report to Rome, Rovenius and other secular priests, including De la Torre and Abraham van Brienen (1605–1683), expressed their worries about the professors. According to their report, the professors were unyielding

29 For the history of charity in Utrecht, see, e.g., Adriani, *De Stads-Aalmoezenierskamer*; Bogaers, *Aards*, pp. 497–584; Schaik and Strengers-Olde Kalter, *Het arme roomse leven*; Verhey, *300 jaar*.

30 HUA, KR, 3, 5 August 1627; HUA, SAI, 121-12, 6, 27 August 1627. For earlier discussions on the matter of the public charitable institution, see HUA, *Nederlandse Hervormde gemeente te Utrecht, diaconie*, 1, 11 December 1623, 8 July 1624; HUA, KR, 3, 8 September 1624, 30 July 1627; HUA, SAI, 121-10, 14 June 1624; HUA, SAI, 121-11, 6 September 1624.

31 *Ibidem*, 6 August 1627.

32 *G.P.U.*, III, p. 556; HUA, SAI, 121-12, 5 May, 6, 27 August 1627; HUA, SAI, 121-13, 1 September 1628; HUA, SAI, 1824, 1 September 1628: 'gequalificeert persoon'.

33 HUA, SAI, 121-18, 14 August 1638. See also, HUA, SAI, 1825-1, 1 October 1638.

in their efforts to delete the memory of the Catholic faith, assembling all their powers to 'persecute' the 'public and private assemblies' and 'zealous defenders and priests of the Catholic faith'.³⁴ Indeed, the driving force behind the anti-Catholic legislation in Utrecht was the Reformed consistory, where Voetius was to seize the leadership. One example of its successful intervention is the legislation on doors, entrances, and exits to Catholic houses and monasteries or convents. As early as 1628 the sheriff asked the city council to regulate the way Catholics were using these entranceways to evade judicial officers. Even though the composition of the magistracy also included hard-line Calvinists, the city council gave a brief, negative answer. The city magistracy likewise did not acquiesce in a similar request from the sheriff in 1633.³⁵ But later that same year the magistrates responded in a totally different manner to a remonstrance from the consistory. Several ministers and elders appeared as delegates of the consistory before the city council arguing that Catholic assemblies were 'almost public' and demanding more effective measures against the 'exorbitant licence of the Papists'. This time the city council, in a complete reversal, ordered the sheriff to confiscate the pews and altars he found in any Catholic house.³⁶ In this way, Catholic Utrechters came to lose an increasing number of rights in the public sphere from 1620 to 1638, even though the demands from the public church remained relatively modest. During the final phase of the Dutch Revolt, anti-Catholicism would reach new heights.

1.2.2. The Last Phase of the Dutch Revolt, 1639–1648

From 1639 to the end of the Eighty Years' War in 1648, the city magistracy and the consistory continued to be predominated by Voetians, who were eager to exclude Catholics from the physical and abstract public sphere. During this period, the central target of anti-Catholic legislation shifted from the priests to the laypeople who were opening their homes for Catholic assemblies and harbouring ecclesiastics. Whereas the 1622 edict aimed primarily at the oppression of clerics, a new anti-Catholic edict, promulgated in 1639 under pressure from the Reformed synod in Utrecht,³⁷ not only reconfirmed earlier edicts but also prescribed more specific regulations concerning the

34 Hoogland, 'Descriptio', p. 195: 'persecutionem', 'tum publicas tum privatas conventiones', and 'zelosos Catholicae fidei defensores et pastores'.

35 HUA, SAII, 121-13, 14 January, 7 April 1628; HUA, SAII, 121-16, 6 August 1633.

36 Ibidem, 28 October, 4, 11 November 1633: 'schier publicq' and 'exorbitante licentie der Papisten'. See also KR, 4, 10, 24 October 1633.

37 Gompertz, 'Brief', pp. 434-64.

laity. The new edict stipulated that if judicial officers requested to search a Catholic house, the owners were to open 'all the doors, shutters, cases, chests, and other suspicious places'. It also increased the fine for hosting an illegal assembly to f. 200, or four times the original fine.³⁸ In 1640 owners and residents of Catholic houses were likewise ordered to show the sheriff all the doors, entrances, and exits, or to forfeit f. 100.³⁹ In early 1644 the Provincial States stipulated that anyone who hindered the judicial investigation was to be fined f. 200,⁴⁰ but the sheriff considered these measures insufficient and petitioned the city council to promulgate a new edict.⁴¹ Later that same year the Provincial States therefore introduced a new edict to bolster the edict from 1639. From then on, anyone caught harbouring a priest was to be fined upwards of f. 600.⁴² At the same time, the political authorities cracked down more strictly on the other activities of Catholic laypeople in their houses, including elementary education for children in *bijsholen*. According to edicts promulgated in 1646 and 1650, all the schoolmasters and mistresses were required to leave a strap (*riem*) hanging from the school door during opening hours for school superintendents to use to open the doors, so as to be able to perform an inspection whenever they wanted to. The same edicts prescribed that schools were to be closed on Sundays and on the specific days stipulated by 'public order', but had to remain open on 'Popish superstitious feast days'.⁴³

In the mid-1640s the Provincial States once again cast doubt upon the political trustworthiness of Catholics, especially members of the lay elite, complaining about their 'secret Collection and Taxes' on behalf of priests and ecclesiastical institutions abroad.⁴⁴ Moreover, the political authorities increasingly started regulating the activities of Catholic women, *klopjes* in particular, many of whom originated from well-to-do families.⁴⁵ The provincial edict of 1639 and 1641 declared that *klopjes* and Catholic guardians of orphans were not to lure any children into converting to Catholicism. The edict of 1644 was particularly innovative, since it prohibited Catholic

38 *G.P.U.*, I, pp. 395–96 (9 April 1639): 'alle dueren, luyken, kassen, kisten, ende andere suspecte plaatsen'.

39 *Ibidem*, III, pp. 468–69 (27 July 1640); HUA, SAIL, 121-19, 4 May 1640.

40 *G.P.U.*, III, p. 469 (2 February 1644); HUA, SAIL, 121-20, 29 January 1644.

41 *Ibidem*, 8 April 1644.

42 *G.P.U.*, I, pp. 396–97.

43 *Ibidem*, III, pp. 501–2 (14 December 1646, 12 August 1650): 'publyke ordre' and 'Paapsche superstitieuse vierdagen'.

44 *Ibidem*, I, pp. 405–7 (17 November 1644): 'heymelycke Collectien en Schattingen'.

45 E.g., HUA, KR, 5, 18 May 1646; HUA, SAIL, 121-21, 19 May 1646.

widows, and childless or unmarried women, including nuns or *kloppjes*, from administering their property out of fear that they would transfer or bequeath their wealth to priests or ecclesiastical institutions, especially in the kingdom of Spain, using the names of others or even false names.⁴⁶ The government, therefore, acknowledged that the lay elite, men as well as women, played an important role in bolstering the Catholic community with their financial means. Furthermore, in a petition drawn up in 1648, shortly before the Peace of Münster was concluded, the Reformed consistory urged the magistrates not to confer citizenship on Catholics. According to the petition, the exclusion of Catholics from the core of the civic community as a *corpus christianum* was justified for the sake of the city's prosperity, since a greater number of 'enemies' – i.e., Catholics – within the city meant a greater threat to the magistrates and their subjects. As an example of the 'boldness of Papists', the consistory reminded the magistracy of the incident involving Rovenius {18} (Appendix 1). But the consistory's efforts failed, at least initially.⁴⁷

As the Eighty Years' War was nearing its end, the Reformed Church exerted even greater pressure on the political authorities to deal with Catholics in a determined manner.⁴⁸ In 1647 the Reformed consistory sent a petition signed by Voetius to the Provincial States for immediate publication with a view to the negotiations for the Peace of Münster. It asked the Provincial States to establish and defend the 'Most Sacred, Christian, Apostolic, and Catholic faith' (i.e., the Reformed faith), and to see to the 'express exclusion of the Popish [faith]'. For even though 'pious Patriots' were engaged in the war against the 'public Enemies' or official enemy of the Dutch Republic, others might want to buy 'the freedom and establishment of Popery in place of [the] true Religion'. The petition therefore admonished the Provincial States not to be spineless during the peace negotiations in regard to the Catholic question.⁴⁹ In February 1648, while the peace negotiations were going on, the consistory sent another petition for combating Catholicism to the city council. It claimed that 'the popish priests and those who are papists are enemies of our city'. According to the consistory, the many Catholics living

46 *G.P.U.*, I, pp. 396, 398, 405–7 (9 April 1639, 30 August 1641, 21 August 1644).

47 HUA, KR, 5, 28 February 1648. See also HUA, SAIL, 121–22, 6 March 1648.

48 KR, 5, 18 May 1646, 26 April, 3, 17, 24 May, 2, 9, 26 August 1647; HUA, SAIL, 121–21, 19 May 1646; HUA, SAIL, 121–22, 21 June 1647.

49 *Remonstrantie der Predikanten*, here especially f. A1v, A2v, A3v: 'Alderheyligste, Christelijcke, Apostolijcke, ende Catholijck gheloove', 'expresse exclusie vande Paepsche', 'vroome Patriotten', 'ghemeyne Vyanden', and 'de vrydom en vaststellinghe van het Pausdom in plaetse van ware Religie'.

in Utrecht meant that a significant number of inhabitants were pledging obedience not to the Protestant government but to the pope, who was also a secular monarch. In its petition, the consistory warned of the calamity that might befall the Dutch Republic due to the boldness of the growing number of Catholics, as exemplified in the Catholic revolt in Ireland in 1641. The Peace of Münster, it continued, would not eliminate the threat of Catholic insurrection, since the pope could not be trusted, even if the king of Spain was now a trusted ally – an interesting distinction concerning levels of trust. For the pope could always instigate ‘Papists’ to revolt against the legitimate secular government, and had granted ‘Papists’ in Germany, France, England, and Ireland dispensation from their public, official oaths of loyalty to their civil governments. The Holy Roman Emperor may have concluded a treaty of ‘religious peace’ with some Protestants, and the French king may have allowed Protestants to exercise their faith under the Edict of Nantes; nevertheless, so the petition insisted, the ‘religious peace’ in Germany was given just ‘out of necessity’, while the Edict of Nantes had been issued after ‘severe persecution’. As such, the petition maintained that bi-confessionalism was not an ideal theory but simply a reluctant practical choice. It supposed ‘without doubt’ that, under pressure from both French and Spanish negotiators, the ‘Papists’ would gain more freedom under the Peace of Münster and be bolstered in their position by the Catholics coming in from the ‘provinces of the King of Spain’. In short, there was greater need than ever before for the strict regulation of Catholics.⁵⁰

In this 1648 petition, the Reformed consistory reminded the city council of the legal case against Rovenius {18} (Appendix 1) as well as the 1644 response from the States General to the French ambassador Claude de Mesmes, Comte d’Avaux (1595–1650). D’Avaux’s address to the States General had led the Reformed to fear that Dutch Catholics would gain wider freedoms due to the intervention of foreign Catholic powers. While D’Avaux had demanded that the Dutch government bestow greater freedom upon Catholics, the States General immediately declined this request. The Reformed consistory in Utrecht did not oppose the peace itself, but did worry that the status of Catholics would be raised after the conclusion of the peace.⁵¹ This fear proved groundless. Yet the Reformed Church further increased its pressure on Utrecht’s magistrates after the war ended, demanding even more rigorous anti-Catholic legislation.

50 KR, 5, 28 February 1648: ‘de papen en diegeene die paeps zijn vyanden zijn van onsen stadt’, ‘uyt nootdwang’, and ‘uijterste vervolginge’. See also HUA, KR, 5, 15 May 1648; HUA, SAI, 121-22, 6 March 1648.

51 Broeyer, ‘Ijkpunt 1650’, pp. 46–47, 63–64.

1.2.3. After the Peace of Münster and the Great Assembly, 1648–1659

In 1648 the Peace of Münster finally brought an end to the Eighty Years' War and lent official recognition to the independence of the Dutch Republic from the kingdom of Spain.⁵² Then, in 1651, the 'Great Assembly' (*Grote Vergadering*), which was convened after the unexpected death of William II, inaugurated the First Stadholderless Period (*Eerste Stadhouderloze Tijdperk*). During these years, the grand pensionary of Holland, Johan de Witt (1625–1672), and other 'Republicans', who were considered more moderate in matters of religious policy than the strict Voetians, held power in Dutch politics and reconfirmed the politico-religious constitution of the United Provinces under a Republican regime of 'True Freedom' (*Ware Vrijheid*). As such, the status of the Reformed faith as the Republic's only public religion was ratified, and due observance of the anti-Catholic edicts was proclaimed.⁵³ The mid-seventeenth century, therefore, signalled the dawn of a new phase in the history of Dutch Catholics. Their utopian expectations now took the shape of prophetic dreams of foreign saviours, including English kings like Charles II (1630–1685) and James II (1633–1701), and especially the French king Louis XIV (1638–1715), but no longer the Spanish king, coming to restore the entire public sphere of the Northern Netherlands for Catholics.⁵⁴

Once the war had ended, the Voetian consistory started urging the magistrates even more vigorously to formulate anti-Catholic edicts. Shortly after the consistory petitioned the burgomasters in 1649 to suppress Catholics,⁵⁵ the Provincial States renewed the 1622 edict, identifying not only male clerics but also lay participants in Catholic assemblies and *klopjes* as disturbers of 'public tranquillity'. This 1649 edict was thus an extension of earlier edicts issued in 1639 and 1644, targeting the laity.⁵⁶ A petition from the consistory in 1650 reminded the Provincial States of their responsibility to eradicate the Catholic faith. As had been the practice ever since 1581, when the 'free republic' was established, the Provincial States were to ban all 'popish conventicles', which 'were incompatible with the prosperity of our reformed

52 Dane, *1648. Vrede van Munster*; Groenveld, Leeuwenberg, and Weel, *Unie – Bestand – Vrede*, pp. 131–86.

53 Broeyer, 'Ijcpunt 1650', pp. 54–55; Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, pp. 700–13; Troost, *William III*, pp. 19–22.

54 Frijhoff, 'Catholic Apocalypics', pp. 263–64, 271–72; Idem, *Embodied Belief*, especially pp. 164, 169–72; Idem, 'Katholieke toekomstverwachting', pp. 441, 447–50.

55 HUA, KR, 5, 2 April 1649.

56 *G.P.U.*, I, pp. 395–97 (14 April 1649): 'gemeene ruste'.

and free Republic'.⁵⁷ This petition was soon printed. In the preface, the 'Christian Reader' was reminded of the reply which the States General had given to the French ambassador D'Avaux, arguing that Dutch government was 'not compatible' with 'Papists'.⁵⁸ In 1652 the synod of Utrecht launched a 'plan of ecclesiastical Measures serving the prevention of Popery' to be shared among the province's classes. It urged not only magistrates, Reformed ministers, elders, and deacons, but also Reformed communicant schoolteachers, almshouse trustees, and hospice trustees to refute Catholicism and to foster the Reformed Protestant faith in their daily lives.⁵⁹

One of the most thorough anti-Catholic discourses can be found in a petition, probably drawn up in 1655 or 1656, which the Reformed synod of Utrecht submitted to the Provincial States of Utrecht. This extraordinarily long petition gave numerous reasons why Catholic priests and *klopjes* ought to be denied a 'free and public [open] residence and stay in the province of Utrecht', in the process anticipating objections which it immediately refuted. The synod referred to the Peace of Münster and the Great Assembly, which had reconfirmed that people should only maintain the 'true Christian reformed Religion' and uphold the 'Edicts against the Papists'.⁶⁰ Anticipating that some might object that the synod's proposal represented an infringement of the Peace, the petition insisted that, should the Peace require the Dutch government to grant greater freedom to Catholics, then their Reformed co-religionists in the Habsburg Netherlands should likewise be allowed to enjoy the same freedoms. However, so it continued, the reality was that the Reformed in the South found themselves under stricter regulation than the Catholics in the North. Therefore, the petition concluded, Catholics in the North ought to be subjected to equally strict regulation. The synod's plea, like other petitions from the Reformed Church, once again recalled the States General's reply to D'Avaux in 1644. The synod furthermore justified its argument by comparing international developments with cases in Utrecht and throughout the Dutch Republic. As illustrative examples of Protestant rulers, the petition referred to English sovereigns such as Elizabeth I (1533–1603) and James I (1566–1625), who had banned

57 HUA, KR, 5, 2 December 1650: 'vrije republicke' and 'incompatibel syn met de welstant van onse gereformeerde ende vrije Republycke'.

58 *Remonstrantie der E. Kerkenraedt*: 'Christelicken Leser'.

59 HUA, Nederlandse Hervormde classis Utrecht, 369, n.d. in 1652: 'Project van kerckelijcke Middelen, dienende tot weeringe der Pausdom'.

60 HUA, VBB, 139, probably in 1655 or 1656: 'vrije ende publijcke wooninghe ende verblijf inde Provincie van Utrecht', 'ware Christel[ijcke] gereformeerde Religie', and 'Placcaten tegen de Pausgesinden'.

Catholic ecclesiastics and strictly prohibited the exercise of Catholicism. To highlight the Catholic menace, it mentioned not only the cruelty of the duke of Alba, but also the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre in France in 1572, the Gunpowder Plot in London in 1605, the slaughter of Protestants in the Grisons in 1620, the Catholic revolt in Ireland in 1641, and the massacre of the Waldensians in Piedmont in 1655. These instances of Catholic violence and upheaval were then supplemented with the recollection of local turbulences provoked by Rovenius {18}, Wachtelaer {19}, and Adriaen Ram (Appendix 1). Referring in particular to the edicts issued by the States General in 1612, 1622, and 1641, the synod lamented the laxity with which the government had enforced them in Utrecht.⁶¹

Building on these discourses, the Reformed consistory continued to press the political authorities to take more effective measures against Catholics, once again drawing attention to the activities of priests and *klopjes*, as well as the doors, entrances, and exits of Catholic houses.⁶² Here it should be noted that even though the composition of the Utrecht magistracy started to change following the Great Assembly of 1651, with Republicans beginning to gain the upper hand, the magistrates still developed anti-Catholic policies in partial acceptance of the confessionalizing demands of the Voetian consistory. In 1654, for example, a minister and elder appeared before the city council requesting a new edict targeting the priests and *klopjes* in the city. The magistrates responded by instructing the sheriff and other officers to swear a special oath with regard to the Catholic assemblies, and by organizing a commission composed of militia captains to investigate the entrances and exits of Catholic houses.⁶³ Around the very same time, the Provincial States of Utrecht once again ordered judicial officers not to compromise on the issue of Catholics.⁶⁴ They likewise repeated the prohibition preventing Catholic laymen and -women from transferring and bequeathing their property to Catholic religious institutions or individuals (including ecclesiastics and the poor) inside or outside the Dutch Republic using false names.⁶⁵ Besides, from this period onwards, the city council extended the notion of 'public

61 Ibidem, probably in 1655 or 1656. Similar arguments against the 'free and public residence' (*vrye en openlijke wooninge*) of Catholic clerics were presented by the Reformed synod of North Holland in the 1656 petition to the Provincial States of Holland. Lommel, 'Bouwstoffen voor de kerkelijke geschiedenis', pp. 329–46. I would like to thank Benjamin Kaplan for drawing my attention to this petition.

62 E.g., HUA, KR, 5, 15 October 1649, 27 May 1650, 24 February, 3 March, 2 June 1651.

63 HUA, KR, 6, 3 April 1654; HUA, SAI, 121–25, 10, 22 April, 8 May 1654.

64 *G.P.U.*, I, p. 403 (5 May 1654).

65 *Ibidem*, III, pp. 407–9 (8 May 1656).

office' from which Catholics were to be excluded, so that it now applied to suppliers (*leveranciers*) and day labourers (*werkliuyden*) as well.⁶⁶

During this time, Utrecht's financial problems persisted, directly affecting the municipal chamber of charity. The influx of 'foreigners', which included many non-Reformed indigents, had been regarded as a major cause. In 1649 two Reformed ministers and an elder intervened in a session of the city council, pushing magistrates to check whether applicants for citizenship with smaller incomes were Catholics.⁶⁷ In 1650 and 1651 the trustees of the municipal chamber of charity saw themselves compelled by the continuing financial problems to propose the dissolution of their chamber to the city council, and to suggest that the charity for all the working poor once again be centralized under the Reformed diaconate. Magistrates took serious note of this proposal and therefore consulted with the Reformed consistory about the re-centralization of poor relief.⁶⁸ While these plans for reform were not realized, after 1654 residence permit applicants were required to testify that they had been living in the city for more than eight years without receiving any alms.⁶⁹ Finally, in 1655 it was prescribed that Catholics could no longer acquire citizenship unless the city council approved them 'unanimously for certain evident reasons'.⁷⁰ Following the Peace of Münster and the Great Assembly, therefore, Utrecht's magistracy, including the seemingly more moderate Republican members, under increasing pressure from the Voetian public church, attempted to exclude Catholics from different sectors of the public sphere more vigorously than ever before, partly contributing to the purification of the civic community as a *corpus christianum*. However, the magistracy's attitude towards the Voetian consistory and Catholic Utrechters changed during the 1660s.

1.2.4. Under the Republican Regime, 1660–1672

Until the day of his death in 1676, Voetius continued to hold sway over the consistory. His influence within Utrecht University, however, began to be undermined starting in the 1660s.⁷¹ Furthermore, the Voetian faction found

66 HUA, SAI, 121-24, 5 April 1652; HUA, SAI, 121-25, 11 November 1654, 12 June 1655.

67 HUA, SAI, 121-23, 17, 19 December 1649.

68 *Ibidem*, 28 May 1650, 1 April 1651; HUA, SAI, 121-24, 8 September, 22 December 1651.

69 *G.P.U.*, III, p. 559 (23 March 1654).

70 *Ibidem*, III, p. 271 (12 June 1655); HUA, SAI, 121-25, 21 August 1654, 12 June 1655: 'ten ware om eenige merckelicke redenen de Vroedschap eenpaerlijck quame goet te vinden'.

71 Duker, *Gisbertus Voetius*, II, pp. 319–22; Forclaz, *Catholiques*, p. 75; Lieburg, *De Nadere Reformatie*, p. 57; Roorda, 'Prins Willem III', p. 103.

itself in the position of a numerical minority on the city council after 1651, and especially during the 1660s, even though the burgomaster Cornelis Booth (in office 1656–1658), a convicted Voetian, was able to compensate somewhat for the Republican majority, whose leader was the other burgomaster, Nicolaas Hamel (in office 1656–1658, 1662–1664, 1666–1668).⁷² Beginning around the mid-1650s, the Voetian consistory faced bitter opposition from these Republican magistrates, especially in response to its demands regarding the former ecclesiastical properties.⁷³ The Reformed consistory claimed that the ecclesiastical revenues should be applied for ‘pious uses’, such as the salaries of ministers and financial support for the university and public schools.⁷⁴ In its petition to the city council, which was signed by Voetius, the consistory found the titles of the benefices and prebends problematic since they had been used for the ‘Roman ecclesiastical Positions’ and had the ‘appearance of the superstition’. The petition furthermore argued that the consistory alone was competent to offer appropriate theological answers to the matter of ‘conscience’ relating to the ecclesiastical properties.⁷⁵ When offered a prebend, the alderman and deacon Cornelis Quint (d. 1660) as well as the former burgomaster Frederik Ruysch (1601–1677) declined the honour, both probably pushed to do so by the Voetian consistory.⁷⁶ For its part, the city council felt it necessary to ban a booklet which insisted that the Utrecht magistrates were burdening the conscience of those who held ecclesiastical properties.⁷⁷

The conflict reached a new stage in March 1660, when the city council decided to send ‘political commissioners’ (*politique commissarissen*) to the Voetian consistory to curb its political involvement.⁷⁸ In June of that same year the Provincial States judged a sermon from a Reformed minister concerning the political commissioners to be a danger to ‘the government

72 Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 73–75, 124–25; Lieburg, *De Nadere Reformatie*, pp. 57, 63–65, 70, 81, 97; Roorda, ‘Prins Willem III’, pp. 102–6, 108; Wilders, *Patronage*, pp. 33–34, 39–41, 47–48, 50–51.
73 Bogaers, ‘Een kwestie’, pp. 74–75, 77, 80, 83; Broeyer, ‘Een mislukt streven’, pp. 2–3, 5–6; Duker, *Gisbertus Voetius*, II, pp. 294–328; Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 73–75, 124–25; Lieburg, *De Nadere Reformatie*, pp. 57, 70, 81, 97; Roorda, ‘Prins Willem III’, pp. 102–4; Wilders, *Patronage in de provincie*, pp. 33–34.

74 E.g., HUA, SAI, 121–25, 19, 24, 26 June, 3 July, 1, 2, 3, 25, 30, 31 August, 1, 11, 19 September, 8 November, 7, 21 December 1654, 26 January, 7, 14 February, 20 March, 26 June, 10, 14, 18 July, 3 September 1655; HUA, SAI, 121–26, 7, 17 December 1655; HUA, SAI, 121–26, 28 December 1657, 15 February, 1, 15, 22, 26 March, 5 April 1658.

75 HUA, KR, 7, 27 June 1659: ‘Rooms-kerckelycke Ampten’, ‘schijn van de superstitie’, and ‘conscientie’.

76 *Ibidem*, 23, 25 October 1658; HUA, SAI, 121–26, 7 January, 15 November 1656; 18, 25 October, 1, 8, 15, 22, 24 November, 2 December 1658.

77 *Ibidem*, 10 January 1656.

78 *Ibidem*, 26 March 1660.

and regents', as well as contemptuous of the 'public authority', and for that reason requested the province of Holland to send troops to Utrecht.⁷⁹ The next month, the Provincial States of Utrecht banished the Voetian ministers Abraham van der Velde (1614–1677) and Johannes Teellinck (c. 1614–1674) from the province, alleging that they had taken excessive liberties in opposing 'the Regents and the Government' in their sermons. Finally, at the end of July, the States promulgated new regulations concerning the Reformed ministers, who were now forbidden to use their sermons and catechisms to discuss 'Politics or the Government, as well as the state of Chapters and their properties'.⁸⁰

Catholics could exploit the presence of Republicans among Utrecht's magistrates, and in particular their antagonism towards the Voetian consistory. After several requests from the consistory for stricter enforcement of the existing anti-Catholic edicts,⁸¹ the Republican burgomaster Hamel replied in 1663 that magistrates had not discovered any violations. Although he stated that the city council would discuss the matter further, the clear undertone of his message to the public church was that it should mind its own business.⁸² Apart from Hamel, another Republican figure of decided importance was Lambert van Velthuysen (1622–1685), a renowned Cartesian philosopher who sat on the Utrecht city council from 1667 to 1674.⁸³ Late in the 1660s Apostolic Vicar Johannes van Neercassel (1626–1686) reported in several letters to Rome on the situation of the Catholics in Utrecht. In one such letter, he argued that there was no 'Persecution' in the city.⁸⁴ In another letter he identified a magistrate who had studied the 'heretical theology' in Geneva – no doubt Van Velthuysen – as one 'reason for our tranquillity'. Using Scripture, this 'heretical' magistrate had demonstrated 'most painstakingly' that Catholics ought not to be subjected to 'persecution'.⁸⁵

Indeed, from 1660 to 1672 the city council did not react promptly to demands for anti-Catholic legislation from the Voetian consistory at all times.⁸⁶

79 *Ibidem*, 25 June 1660: 'publique autoriteyt'. See also, *Ibidem*, 8, 12, 18, 20, 21 June, 2, 5, 20, 23, 24 July 1660.

80 *Ibidem*, 19, 30 July 1660 (the latter was printed in *G.P.U.*, I, pp. 383–86): 'de Politie, of Regieringe, off oock den Staet der Capittelen, ende der selver goederen'.

81 HUA, KR, 8, 9 June 1662, 28 September, 5 October, 16 November 1663.

82 *Ibidem*, 30 November 1663.

83 *G.P.U.*, III, pp. 187, 196. On Van Velthuysen and his fellows in the 'college of savants' in Utrecht, see Gootjes, 'The *Collegie der Sçavanten*'.

84 Brom, 'Neerkassels bestuur', p. 232 (28 February 1668): 'Persecutio'.

85 *R.B.*, II, p. 500 (18 October 1669): 'nostrae tranquillitatis causa', 'operosissime', and 'persecutione'.

86 E.g., HUA, KR, 8, 6 May, 19 August 1661, 24 February, 5, 26 May, 2 June 1662, 2 February, 5 October, 30 November 1663, 29 February, 2, 7 May, 6, 27 June, 1, 18, 25 July, 29 August 1664,

Even though they did not always see eye to eye during the 1660s, however, the city magistrates still collaborated with the public church in order to repress the 'boldness' of the city's Catholics.⁸⁷ For instance, in 1664 a rumour was circulating to the effect that Catholics stood to gain the 'freedom of exercise of religion'. The consistory probed the matter by making inquiries with the burgomaster, who then replied that he too had heard the rumour, but that it was entirely unfounded.⁸⁸ The consistory, however, remained in doubt. That same year it appealed to the city council to take serious action against Catholics. Referring in particular to the earlier petitions dated 28 February 1648, 6 May 1661, and 2 June 1662, the consistory complained about the way magistrates had been neglecting the demands. Recalling the rumour, the consistory maintained that it had been 'publicly' and openly said that 'now the time of the freedom for their [Catholic] assemblies is born'. Everyone, it added, knew that Catholics were meeting daily in 'illicit' assemblies.⁸⁹ In the end, the magistrates responded by giving the city court the authority to investigate the entrances and exits to Catholic meeting places.⁹⁰

The pressure for and legislation of anti-Catholicism in the second half of the 1660s can be read against the background of the Dutch wars against such Catholic forces as Münster (1665–1666) and France (1667–1668), even though this connection is not made explicit in the primary sources. In 1665 the consistory complained about priests and *klopjes*, expressing its worry that God would destroy all the inhabitants of the land due to the presence of 'Papists'. Besides, the petition maintained, 'Papists' had caused bloodshed among their ancestors during the Eighty Years' War, as well as among Reformed co-religionists in Ireland in 1641 and in Piedmont in 1655. It warned that the same fate could well befall Utrecht, unless the political authorities brought change to the current situation.⁹¹ The same year, the city court responded to the magistrates' resolution on 4 July 1664 by submitting a report and recommendation regarding the doors, entrances, and exits of Catholic houses on the basis of their investigations. It was probably around the same time that their overview of the residences of Catholic priests in Utrecht was passed on to the magistrates.⁹² In the wake of these events, the

30 June, 4 September 1665, 18 April, 6, 20 June 1670.

87 HUA, KR, 8, 18, 25 July, 1, 29 August 1664.

88 Ibidem, 29 February 1664: 'vrijheid van exercitie van religie'.

89 Ibidem, 21 March, 23 May, 6, 27 June 1664: 'openbaarlijck', 'nu de tijd van de vrijheid harer t'samen-comsten geboren is', and 'licentieuse'.

90 HUA, SAI, 121-27, 4 July 1664.

91 Ibidem, 30 June 1665.

92 HUA, SAI, 616, 29 April 1665 (these reports are transcribed in Hofman, 'Allerlei', pp. 183–89).

city council decreed in 1665 and 1666 that Catholics were not to be allowed to install any doors that were heavy or made of poplar trees in order to thwart judicial investigators, at the risk of a fine of f. 100.⁹³ In 1670 the consistory likewise claimed that Catholics were assembling 'so publicly [openly] and with almost as much liberty as the public church' to collectively practice their 'superstitions'. The consistory demanded that the city council force the judicial officers to observe the anti-Catholic edicts prohibiting Catholics from gathering.⁹⁴

Anti-Catholicism in Utrecht fluctuated between periods of stricter and laxer legislation. It responded to such local, national, and international politico-religious circumstances as the rivalry between Voetians and Republicans, suspicions concerning the political loyalty of Catholics, and open warfare with Catholic powers such as Spain and France. Yet it should be noted that confessionally inspired legislation was continuously undertaken by both the Calvinist or Voetian magistrates (from 1618 to 1650) and the Republicans (from 1651 to 1672).⁹⁵ Although the repeated issuance of the edicts, as we will see, displays signs of the magistrates' laxity in the practical application of the law, it nevertheless demonstrates how eagerly and constantly the Reformed Church under the influence of Voetius was spurring the magistracy on to repress Catholics and to promulgate anti-Catholic legislation. The political authorities sometimes, albeit not always, responded to these confessionalizing demands by issuing and reissuing edicts, thereby discrediting Catholic Utrechters as potential criminals and regulating the city's public sphere. At the same time, they gradually extended and detailed what constituted 'Catholic' crimes, maximizing the opportunity presented them to appropriate financial capital from the Catholics legally by levying fines and demanding heavy bail.

1.3. Legal Proceedings against Catholics

1.3.1. Chronological Developments

How, then, were the anti-Catholic edicts applied in practice to prosecute Catholics? While previous studies have never offered systematic and

93 HUA, SAI, 121-27, 24 July, 28 August 1665, 27 August 1666.

94 HUA, KR, 9, 6 June 1670: 'so opentlyck en byna met so veel libertyt als die van de publycke kercke'. See also *ibidem*, 20 June 1670; HUA, SAI, 121-28, 20 June 1670.


95 See also Bogaers, 'Een kwestie', pp. 86-88, 119; Lieburg, *De Nadere Reformatie*, pp. 63-65.

quantitative analyses of legal proceedings against Dutch Catholics, my survey of these records has demonstrated that Catholics were prosecuted in at least 105 cases in the city court of Utrecht between 1620 and 1672. During the period from 1620 to 1638, when the war between Spain and the Dutch Republic was resumed, fifteen lawsuits were filed against Catholics, amounting to an average of 0.8 cases per year. In the period from 1639 to 1648, as the final phase of the Dutch Revolt, Catholics were prosecuted in twenty-nine cases, or 2.9 cases per year. For the post-war period from 1649 to 1659, when the Dutch Republic redefined itself as an independent Protestant state, thirty-six such legal proceedings were found, or 3.3 cases per year. After 1659, the frequency declined. From 1660 until the beginning of the French occupation of Utrecht in 1672, there were twenty-five cases, or 1.9 cases per year. With seven and six cases respectively, the years 1640 and 1651 mark two peaks (Graph 1). These numbers are striking when compared to the statistics for earlier periods. The *criminele sententiën* of the city court of Utrecht are said to have cited only five people between 1605 and 1617 for breaking the anti-Catholic edicts (0.4 cases per year; three of them related to clerical activities), while the *criminele stukken* between 1580 and 1618 likewise record only six prosecutions against Catholics (0.2 cases per year; five of them involving priests).⁹⁶ Clearly, Utrecht's political authorities found the reviving Catholic community a more serious matter after the settlement of the internal conflict within the Reformed Church in 1619, not only legislating more anti-Catholic edicts on paper but also prosecuting more Catholics in practice. Overall, the numbers seem to reflect the national and international political circumstances as well as the composition of the public authorities in local settings, including magistrates, Reformed ministers, and the sheriff. However, given that Republicans began to consolidate their power after the Great Assembly in 1651, it should be noted that the period from 1649 to 1659 saw the highest rate of accusations against Catholics. Therefore, Catholics were prosecuted not only by the Voetian magistrates for the period from 1618 to 1650, but later on also by the Republicans.

In spite of the frequency and harshness of anti-Catholic legislation enacted after the resumption of the war in 1621, in practice these edicts were not enforced all that rigorously between 1620 and 1638; there were a total of fifteen cases, or 0.8 cases per year. From 1625 to 1643 the sheriff's duties were fulfilled by Henrick Valckenaer.⁹⁷ At his order, one of the most exhaustive judicial investigations of Catholics in early modern Dutch history

⁹⁶ Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, pp. 276–77.

⁹⁷ *G.P.U.*, III, p. 218.



Graph 1. Legal proceedings against Catholics in Utrecht by year, 1620-1672

was conducted in Utrecht in 1639, aiming to apprehend Apostolic Vicar Rovenius {18} (Appendix 1). A series of incidents following this raid can be situated in the context of the last phase of the Dutch Eighty Years' War. The Catholic community in Utrecht and beyond had come under much closer surveillance than ever before, as reflected in the number of trials initiated against Catholics between 1639 and 1648; twenty-nine cases, or 2.9 cases per year.

Late in the evening on 23 August 1639, judicial officers raided a house on Nieuwegracht (nowadays Plompstorengracht) owned by the Catholic noblewoman Hendrica van Duivenvoorde (1595–1658). In his letter to De la Torre, Wachtelaer narrated the course of this 'persecution' in detail.⁹⁸ Wachtelaer wrote: 'I have lived here [in the city of Utrecht] for years, but I have never yet had to endure such an attack, so much vehemence and fury'. Catholics in Utrecht had long heard the 'clamour of the [Reformed] ministers', experiencing 'the bitterness of the ignorant mob [and] the indignation of the incited crowd'. They faced new anti-Catholic edicts 'every year', while priests were assaulted during the services and many laypeople were fined for attending the communal assemblies. Nonetheless, they managed to enjoy the minimum tranquillity offered by 'moderate governments', while also

98 Deelder, *Bijdragen*, I, pp. 170–76. For the legal proceedings against Rovenius and Wachtelaer, see also Hallebeek, 'Godsdienst(on)vrijheid'; Hewett and Hallebeek, 'The Prelate'; Jong, 'Het Utrechtse vicariaat', pp. 93–98; Knuif and Jong, 'Philippus Rovenius', pp. 62–84; Rogier, *Geschiedenis*, II, pp. 72–74; Ven, *Over den oorsprong*, pp. 46–47, 59, 87–88, 90.

succeeding in satisfying the ‘hunger of greedy officials’ with their money in order to temper the ‘eruption’ of anti-Catholicism. What Wachtelaer writes here is suggestive of the payment of a bribe known to historians as a ‘recognition fee’ (*recognitiegeld*). In 1639, however, ‘the body of the church in its head’ – that is, Apostolic Vicar Rovenius – finally also suffered himself. According to Wachtelaer, it was widely known at the time that Rovenius paid frequent visits to Utrecht, although he was not entirely sure who had leaked this information – although one obvious potential source is Francisci, the former priest whose name has already been mentioned earlier on. On this August night, the judicial officers surrounded Van Duivenvoorde’s house and searched it from top to bottom, but failed to catch Rovenius, who managed to escape and went into exile in Cologne, a detail Wachtelaer dared not reveal in his letter.⁹⁹ According to the eighteenth-century hagiography *Batavia Sacra*, Rovenius succeeded in avoiding apprehension by disguising himself as a woman.¹⁰⁰

In place of Rovenius, the investigators arrested the Van Moock brothers and also confiscated various documents, among them the so-called ‘protocol’ kept by Govert van Moock (d. 1652), secretary to the apostolic vicar. This protocol allowed the politico-judicial authorities in Utrecht to gain extensive insight into the illegal activities of the Holland Mission, including the establishment of the *Vicariaat*, and prompted them to prepare for prosecuting other Catholic clerics in addition to the apostolic vicar. In six of the seven cases in which sentences were pronounced in 1640, the judicial investigations were conducted on the basis of this protocol.¹⁰¹ In reading it, the magistrates and judicial officers frequently encountered the name of a priest called Vigilius, who seemed to them to be one of the central figures of the Catholic Church in the Northern Netherlands. After interrogating Govert van Moock, they finally learned that Vigilius and Wachtelaer were one and the same person – as they could, in fact, have known since the former is a Latinization of the latter. The

99 Deelder, *Bijdragen*, I, pp. 171–72: ‘Ik heb hier jaren lang geleefd, maar nog nimmer heb ik zulken aanval te verduren gehad, zooveel vurigheid en woede aanschouwd’, ‘geroep der predikanten’, ‘verbittering van een onwetend gemeen, de verontwaardiging van een opgeruid volk’, ‘gematigde overheden’, ‘honger van begeerige beambten’, ‘uitbarsting’, and ‘het lichaam der kerk in zijn hoofd’.

100 Heussen, *Batavia Sacra*, p. 270.

101 {16} {18} {19} {20} {21} {22} in Appendix 1. Other priests, including Rombout van Medenblick (a native Utrechter) and Suibertus Purmerend and Petrus Purmerend, were sentenced in other cities (Leiden, Delft, and Gouda, respectively). Abels, ‘Beter slaafs’, p. 196; Eck, *Kunst*, p. 128; Hallebeek, ‘Godsdienst(on)vrijheid’, pp. 132–33; Hewett and Hallebeek, ‘The Prelate’, p. 118; HUA, OBC, 157; HUA, SAI, 2244–86; Knuif and Jong, ‘Philippus Rovenius’, p. 83; Rogier, *Geschiedenis*, II, p. 74. The protocol is preserved in HUA, OBC, 499.

city court therefore decided to apprehend this Utrecht citizen.¹⁰² Although Wachtelaer himself managed to evade the raid by pure chance, his house, which functioned as the clandestine church of St Gertrudis (cover image), was subjected to iconoclastic violence. In St Gertrudis, judicial officers opened all the doors and chests, and confiscated every document they found, in compliance with the instructions of the anti-Catholic edicts promulgated during the 1630s.¹⁰³ Utrecht's Catholics seem to have been outraged at these trials against the priests in 1639/40, since an unknown mob, certainly of Catholics, broke the windows of Maeyckien van Varick's house near the Agnieten Convent, and shouted: 'You will bear the consequences for spying on priests' – suggesting, perhaps, that it was Van Varick who had denounced the Catholic priests to the politico-judicial authorities.¹⁰⁴

Catholics were most frequently prosecuted by the city court between 1649 and 1659; thirty-six cases in eleven years, or 3.3 cases per year (Graph 1). This was the time immediately following the Peace of Münster and the Great Assembly, when the political authorities, under pressure from the Reformed Church, became more eager to formulate anti-Catholic regulations, notwithstanding the growing Republican influence in the city council. During most of this period, the sheriff's duties were performed by Anselm Boll (Anselmus Bolle; in office 1643–1658), who had purchased this lucrative post from Valckenaer for f. 2,000.¹⁰⁵

In the provincial context, this was not only the post-war period, but also the time when the influential Catholic nobleman Adriaen Ram, lord of Schalkwijk, bared his fangs at the politico-judicial authorities before being condemned by the provincial court. According to the sentence pronounced against Ram on 29 July 1651, the provincial court of Utrecht had already been informed that numerous Catholics from Schalkwijk and surrounding villages were frequently gathering at his estate to exercise their 'superstitious religion' and that Ram had been harbouring several priests, including Dirck van der Horst, at the time tutor to his children. Since Ram had taken 'greater liberties', Johan Strick, the marshal of Overkwartier in the province of

102 For the interrogation of Moock, see Knuif and Jong, 'Relaas van Godefridus van Moock', pp. 387–401; HUA, SAI, 2244–84, *passim*; HUA, SAI, 2244–86, *passim*.

103 E.g., *G.P.U.*, I, 395–96 (9 April 1639); HUA, SAI, 121–16, 11 November 1633.

104 HUA, SAI, 121–19, 5 August 1640: 'men sal u leeren papen verspieden'.

105 *G.P.U.*, III, pp. 205–8, 218; Wittert van Hoogland, 'Utrechtsche ridderhofsteden en heerlijkheden', pp. 295–96. On Boll's nomination and appointment as sheriff, which aroused a dispute involving him, the city council, the Knighthood, and the stadholder, see Bok, 'Laying Claims', especially pp. 221–22; HUA, SAI, 121–20, 6, 7, 8, 10, 24, 29 March, 4, 10, 17, 21, 24, 25 April, 16 May, 1 June 1643.

Utrecht, together with his subordinates, organized a raid on his castle on Sunday, 1 June 1651, when Catholics were assembled there to practise their faith collectively. However, Ram and the Catholics on his estate prevented them from entering by raising the drawbridge and throwing stones at Strick and his subordinates. Ram even incited Catholics to fight against the officials. Many Catholics armed with swords, pistols, and 'jumping poles' rushed to Ram's castle from the surrounding areas and resorted to 'public violence', wounding numerous officials and soldiers. The violence took place not just around the castle itself, but also on the village square in Brink, where the Reformed church stood. There a group of Catholic rioters encountered reinforcements for the marshal and attacked them, shouting 'Kill, kill!' In the end, the marshal's soldiers regrouped and forced the rioters to take flight, arresting Ram and others, while Van der Horst managed to escape.¹⁰⁶ One of the Utrecht citizens who fought for Ram was called Peter Lamberts van Schalckwijck, and in the end was prosecuted by the city court {56} (Appendix 1). This violent confrontation left a deep impression on Utrecht's Reformed and Catholics alike. On 4 June 1651, the very day Ram was incarcerated in the city's jail, Henrick Pieck, a Catholic and the lord of Wolfswert, was seen and heard in the Wittevrouwen Convent speaking against the legitimacy of the Republic {59} (Appendix 1). In its long petition to the Provincial States of 1655 or 1656 (cf. above), the Reformed synod of Utrecht justified the prohibition on 'free and public residence and stay in the province of Utrecht' for all Catholic priests and *klopjes* by referring to the cases involving Rovenius {18}, Wachtelaer {19}, and Ram as examples of the 'boldness of Papists'.¹⁰⁷

From 1660 to 1672 a relatively small number of lawsuits was filed against Catholics; twenty-five cases, or 1.9 per year. The impression of a certain 'tranquillity' in Utrecht, which Van Neercassel had alluded to in his letter to Rome, was therefore not groundless.¹⁰⁸ At the same time, the apparent tranquillity might be the result of a lacuna in the sources, since the *criminele sententiën* from 1657 to 1669 are missing from the sheriff's archives, potentially distorting the statistics for that period. We should also take into account the composition of the politico-judicial authorities of the period. At the time, the city council was characterized by the dominance of moderate

¹⁰⁶ HUA, HVU, 99-8, 29 July 1651 (this sentence is transcribed in Hilhorst, 'Het kerspel Schalkwijk', pp. 61-67, here especially pp. 62-63, 65): 'superstitieusen godsdienst', 'meer en meer licentierende', 'springhstocken', 'publycq geweld', and 'slae doodt, slae doodt'.

¹⁰⁷ HUA, VBB, 139, probably in 1655 or 1656.

¹⁰⁸ Brom, 'Neerkassels bestuur', p. 232 (28 February 1668); *R.B.*, II, p. 500 (18 October 1669).

Republicans. Moreover, the incumbent sheriff, Frederik Ruysch (in office 1659–1677), who had earlier also served as burgomaster (in office 1639–1643 and 1650–1652), built up friendships with at least some Catholic priests. In a 1674 letter to Vicar General Abraham van Brienen (alias Abraham van der Matt) in Utrecht, Van Neercassel revealed that he had been informed by Evert Bockel, a Carmelite working in Amersfoort,¹⁰⁹ about the ‘affection’ (*affectie*) that the sheriffs active in Utrecht and Amersfoort at the time, thus including Ruysch, had shown for Van Neercassel. Having presumably received judicial or other benefits from the sheriffs, the apostolic vicar asked Van Brienen to ‘cordially thank’ both Evert and the sheriffs.¹¹⁰ Overall, for the period between 1620 and 1672, the diachronic trends in the number of legal proceedings against Catholics correspond with those in anti-Catholic legislation.

1.3.2. Charges

The charges brought against the prosecuted Catholics in the 105 cases reflect the same general trend evident in the target of anti-Catholic legislation (Graph 2). Unlike the earlier legal procedures in Utrecht until around 1618, which predominantly targeted priests,¹¹¹ the 105 cases from 1620 to 1672 pertain to various types of defendants, most of whom were laypeople. For the period under study, we found seventeen priests accused of illegal clerical activities proscribed in the anti-Catholic edicts, concentrated around the first peak in trials in 1640.¹¹² After 1640 the prime target for prosecution shifts to laypeople. This change seems to coincide with the gradual transition from clergy to laity as the main target of the anti-Catholic edicts after 1639.

Between 1620 and 1672, Utrecht’s Catholics were most often suspected of holding and participating in a ‘forbidden Roman assembly’ (*verboden Roomsche vergaderinge*) or committing ‘Popish superstitions’ (*Paapsche superstition*) (seventy-five: Graphs 2 and 3).¹¹³ The diachronic trend in lawsuits relating to Catholic assemblies corresponds with that of the 105 legal procedures in general, as the frequency of those cases rose particularly in the 1640s and 1650s. While previous studies have focussed almost exclusively on clandestine churches as a static cultural phenomenon, the present survey


109 Forclaz, *Catholiques*, p. 126.

110 HUA, OBC, 246, 14 August 1674: ‘hartelyck bedancken’.

111 Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, pp. 276–77.

112 {5} {11} {12} {13} {18} {19} {20} {21} {22} {24} {25} {28} {38} {66} {73} {82} {88} in Appendix 1.

113 For these fixed expressions, see, e.g., HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 6 July 1643, 5 March 1653.



Graph 2. Charges of the legal proceedings in Utrecht, 1620-1672

of the legal records suggests that Catholic meeting places in Utrecht shifted over the course of the seventeenth century from public facilities to private houses, including clandestine churches. Among the legal proceedings for these seventy-five trials, four pertain to Catholic gatherings at public facilities (three in monasteries or convents, and one in a hospice), all of them occurring during the 1620s and 1630s.¹¹⁴ Subsequently, the frequency of the trials relating to illegal Catholic assemblies in homes rises from 0.8 cases per year between 1620 and 1648 (twenty-two cases in total) to 2.0 cases per year between 1649 and 1672 (forty-nine cases in total) (Appendix 1).

These assemblies may well have been presided over by priests, but no names are mentioned in the relevant legal records, with two exceptions. First, according to the sentence records, Wachtelaer was found together with Nicolaes van Hijndersteijn in a Catholic assembly {2} (Appendix 1) in 1621. Second, although the sentence itself does not mention the name of the priest in the procedure against Eelgis Gerritsz {23}, an entry in the city council minutes for 5 August 1641 establishes that it was the priest Herman van Honthorst who presided over the 'large assembly' (*grootte vergadering*) of

114 {3} at Abraham Dole Monastery in 1622, {5} at Arkel Monastery in 1624, {12} at St Job Hospice in 1634 and {14} at the Cecilia Convent in 1636 (Appendix 1).

Catholics in Gerritsz's house. Later that same year, the city court launched a separate procedure against Van Honthorst {25} (Appendix 1). In most cases, judicial officers failed to record information about the presiding priests in the Catholic assemblies because they were unable to arrest or even identify Catholics, including their priests, in the act of gathering due to their spatial practices, as they used the many doors, entrances, and exits of houses and monasteries or convents to escape prosecution. As we shall see, on many occasions, judicial officers rushed to the scene, only to be prevented by laypeople from arresting and identifying the presiding priest and the participants.¹¹⁵

Catholics were also accused of their Spanish political inclination in eight legal procedures, most of them during the Eighty Years' War,¹¹⁶ including the trial against Rovenius {18}. The numerous crimes alleged against him, as detailed in the ninety-five clauses of the indictment against him, can be classified into roughly two categories: illegal clerical activities, and a connection with or loyalty to the Spanish king. Rovenius was accused of carrying out religious activities under the false title of 'archbishop of Utrecht', and his behaviour and statements were considered hostile to the Dutch authorities and favourable to the 'public enemy' or official enemy of the state.¹¹⁷ His four colleagues were likewise charged with loyalty to the Spanish cause {19} {20} {21} {22}. Besides these trials related to Rovenius, another three laypeople were accused of having a connection with or displaying loyalty to the Habsburg monarchy {6} {7} {59} (Appendix 1).

On 7 February 1624, at midnight, while Gerrit van Raedt alias 'Spaenschen Gerrit' was serving as a watchman at city hall, he was arrested for 'many slanderous plans for ill service to the Lands and for sedition' {6}. He was reported to have showed his political inclination openly when 'enemies' crossed the IJssel river to reach the Veluwe, putting Utrechters on high alert for the Spanish army. That night, Van Raedt was found making 'seditious bets', probably meaning that he had bet on the Habsburg side to win the war or the like, thereby demonstrating where his hopes and expectations lay.¹¹⁸ Although the precise plans Spaenschen Gerrit had been entertaining are unclear, the legal records for the trial against Helena van Sijll (Zijl) offer more concrete information regarding the suspicions against her concerning the Spanish cause {7}. According to the sentence, Helena was apprehended

115 E.g. {14} in Appendix 1.

116 {6} {7} {18} {19} {20} {21} {22} {59} in Appendix 1.

117 For Rovenius's indictment, see Doedes, 'Intendit', pp. 278–97; HUA, OBC, 159; HUA, SAI, 2088; HUA, SAI, 2244-86: 'openbaer vyandt'.

118 HUA, SAI, 2236-2, 13 February, 9 March 1624; SAI, 2244-53, 13 February, n.d. in 1624: 'seer smadige propoosten ten ondiens vanden Lande, ende tot seditie' and 'seditieuse weddingen'.

in 1624 over a letter she had written to her brother, Otto van Zijl (1588–1656), who worked as a Jesuit in 's-Hertogenbosch, which at the time was still under Habsburg rule. In that letter, she asked her brother to celebrate Mass in their hometown Utrecht, explaining to him how Utrechters were burdened with financial problems resulting from the resumption of the war. According to the sentence, she prayed to God that he might help 'the King's people'.¹¹⁹ Even after the Peace of Münster was concluded, Utrecht's Catholics felt a connection with the Spanish king – or, at least, this is what the Reformed believed. In 1651 the sheriff and two aldermen visited the secularized Wittevrouwen Convent to interrogate some noblewomen, presumably of the Catholic faith, who were living in or around the convent. Their aim was to obtain confirmation of what Henrick Pieck, lord of Wolfsweert, had stated in the former convent on 4 June 1651, the same day Adriaen Ram and his followers were incarcerated in the city jail {59}. Susanna Custodis and Cecilia van Baburen were certain that Pieck had been talking about the Ram affair, but were unable to confirm the precise words he had used. A woman called Van Nederhorst, however, insisted that Pieck had said to her that 'this land belonged to the King of Spain'. Furthermore, other interrogees such as Maria and Agnes van Merode were able to confirm the precise words the interrogators had wanted confirmed, that is, that Pieck had said: 'this foot that I put down [...] I set on the soil of the King of Spain'.¹²⁰

In nine lawsuits, Catholics were accused of illegally transferring their property, seven of which can be interpreted in the context of the Dutch Revolt (Graphs 2 and 3).¹²¹ In 1638 Maria Ruysch was prohibited from inheriting the property of her deceased brother Henrick, who had served the king of Spain. The sentence against her maintained that after the expiration of the Twelve Years' Truce, the property of Spanish subjects (in this case, Henrick) could not be bequeathed to anyone in the Dutch Republic but was to be confiscated by the secular authorities {15} (Appendix 1). In 1603 a Catholic layman called Diderick Muylert purchased a canonry of the Dom. As a Catholic believer, he felt 'burdened in conscience' over possible simony.¹²²

119 HUA, SAI, 2236-2, 29 May 1624: 'het Conincx volck'. On Otto van Zijl, who worked in Roermond, 's-Hertogenbosch, and Ghent, see Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 58–59; Hoek, *Schets*, pp. 179–80.

120 HUA, SAI, 2244-103, 8, 9, 10 June 1651: 'dit lant heeft de Conninck van Spaengien toebehoort' and 'die voet die ick daer set [...] set ick op de gront vanden Conninck van Spaengien'.

121 The nine cases are {15} {16} {18} {19} {20} {21} {22} {64} {74}, but the cases involving Willem van Merode {64} {74} did not pertain directly to the war with Spain.

122 The quoted passage can be found in Wachtelaer's petition to the stadholder. HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (transcribed in Rogge, 'Memorie', pp. 1–25, here especially p. 24): 'in conscientie beswaert'.

For this reason, Muylert asked Apostolic Vicar Rovenius in 1625 to give the canonry to him anew, even though this changed virtually nothing in his official status as a legitimate Dom canon approved by the Provincial States since, under the Reformed regime, the apostolic vicar was not authorized to confer such canonries. After the politico-judicial authorities learned of this nominal reappointment from Van Mooock's protocol, Mulyert was summoned before the city court in 1639 {16} (Appendix 1).¹²³ Rovenius also faced accusations for his role in the reappointment of this canon, as well as his actions in the appointment of other 'shadow-canon'. When the *Vicariaat* was established, Wachtelaer was the only one among its eleven founding members officially approved as a canon by the Provincial States. Others were shadow-canon who had only been appointed by Rovenius, without confirmation by the Provincial States of Utrecht, thus resembling the members of a shadow cabinet. The establishment of the Catholic institution (i.e., the *Vicariaat*) with communal funds and the appointment of shadow-canon were in complete violation of the 1622 edict.¹²⁴ Four other priests, including Wachtelaer, were also suspected of aiding Rovenius in this matter {18} {19} {20} {21} {22} (Appendix 1).

While these cases show that Catholics were regarded as potential politico-religious traitors, in two other procedures they were accused of directly abusing the Reformed faith {26} {43}, both cases occurring prior to the Peace of Münster (Graphs 2 and 3). In 1641 an immigrant from Germany called Joannes Boshouwer told witness Jan Jansz van Munster that '[Reformed] ministers [...] who stood on the pulpit here had been flogged in other places' and that 'the beggars [the Reformed] would be expelled within five years if [the Holy Roman] emperor should come here' {26}.¹²⁵ In 1648 the Reformed minister Gualtherus de Bruyn visited Adriaen Willemsz, a Reformed man living outside the Tollesteeg gate who lay sick in bed. While Adriaen's wife Maychgen Peters was helping the minister serve him bread and wine, she said to the minister that 'the [Reformed] ministers were false prophets and heretics' and told him that Catholics would soon achieve a victory, literally

123 For the dispensation given to Muylert by Rovenius in 1625, which was originally kept in Van Mooock's protocol, see HUA, OBC, 499, fac. 58, 5 July 1625 (transcribed in Ven, *Over den oorsprong*, p. 184 (Bijlage XXI)).

124 Hallebeek, 'Godsdienst(on)vrijheid', pp. 127–28; Hewett and Hallebeek, 'The Prelate', pp. 130–31; Jong, 'Het Utrechtse vicariaat', pp. 161–69; Knuif and Jong, 'Philippus Rovenius', pp. 103–25; Ven, *Over den oorsprong*, pp. 89–115.

125 HUA, SAII, 2244-89, 15 October 1641: 'predicanten [...] die hier op stoel stonden en predicten, die in ander landen geseselt waren' and 'de geusen binnen vijff jaeren hier wtgebannen soude worden dat het alsdien hier keyzers soude worden'.

saying that ‘their [Catholics]’ cock would soon crow as the King’. When the minister visited their home on another occasion, their son Peter Willemsz prevented him from speaking ‘words of God’ to his father. On that day, Maychgen and Peter were arrested for sedition {43}.¹²⁶

Two other legal cases related to religious education or forced conversion to Catholicism {46} {69}, and were both handled in the city court after the Dutch Revolt had come to an end (Graphs 2 and 3). In 1648 the miller Jan Claesz and his wife, a needlewoman, were accused of contravening the edict on *bijtscholen* originally issued in 1631. This couple vehemently resisted a search of their house by the school superintendents, where the needlewoman was suspected of teaching children ‘popish books’ (*paepse boecken*) and other things under the pretext of sewing lessons {46} (Appendix 1). The legal case opposing Metgen van Lienden and Willem van Beckbergen {69} showed how religious education was at stake in religiously mixed families. The plaintiff Van Lienden petitioned the city court to allow her to take in her seven-year-old niece from the house of the defendant Van Beckbergen. The girl was an orphan, the plaintiff an aunt on her father’s side and the defendant an uncle on her mother’s side. The plaintiff argued that the orphan girl should no longer be allowed to stay with the defendant because his wife was a ‘papist’.¹²⁷ Since Van Beckbergen’s wife and their Catholic daughter taught the girl the ‘*pater noster* [and] some popish prayers’, she would also learn to ‘kiss the images, take a saint as a patron, and think that heaven can be earned’.¹²⁸ The defendant for his part insisted that the plaintiff and her co-plaintiff Joost van der Hogenbergh were morally untrustworthy, seeking to profit financially from the deceased couple’s property which would accrue to them through the orphaned girl. He furthermore insisted that it was not his Catholic wife, but he himself, a Reformed believer, who had held responsibility for fostering the orphan girl, noting that he had taken her to a Reformed church on Sundays.¹²⁹ In the end, the city court decided that the girl should be entrusted to neither plaintiff nor defendant, but rather to a ‘competent citizen’ of the Reformed faith. Both parties were thus regarded as incompetent to raise the girl.¹³⁰ As anti-Catholic legislation developed

126 HUA, KR, 5, 9, 15 May 1648; HUA, SAI, 121-22, 19 May 1648; HUA, SAI, 2236-4, 20, 25 May 1648: ‘de predicanten waren valsche propheten ende kettters’ and ‘haeren haen oock haest eens soude Conninck wesen’.

127 HUA, SAI, 2899, 10 October 1654.

128 Ibidem, 23 October 1654: ‘pater noster enige paepsche gebedens’ and ‘met beeldekens te kissen ende een heylich voor een patroon te nemen den hemel vermeent te verdienen’.

129 Ibidem, 19, 26 October 1654.

130 Ibidem, 11, 13 November 1654.

and expanded over the course of the seventeenth century, Catholic men and women in Utrecht came to be prosecuted for a more diverse variety of crimes, including not just religious practices, clerical activities, and political inclination, but extending also to transfer of property and education.

1.3.3. Sentences


In his letter to De la Torre, Wachtelaer expressed worries about the consequence of the ‘persecution’ that he and his co-religionists had been suffering since 1639. He lamented that things would only go well if ‘into the gaping mouth of the sheriff there were to fall a lump of sugar worth a few thousand florins. Indeed, we are a prey to dogs and wolves that are hungry and thirsty not for blood, but for a fleece of silver or gold’.¹³¹ In order to escape prosecution, Catholics had to bribe judicial officers with what is known as a ‘recognition fee’. Early modern Dutch Catholics therefore had to ‘pay off the sheriff’ and purchase toleration.¹³² When they failed to avoid legal prosecution, Utrecht’s Catholics were in many cases forced to pay a fine or to post bail, part of which went into the sheriff’s pocket. In the 105 cases registered, the penalty most frequently imposed was the payment of a fine or bail (eighty, Graph 3). This statistic follows from the many cases (seventy-five) that involved illegal assembly, whose outcomes are known and ended with pecuniary penalties. In these cases, members of the (lay) elite – normally the owners of the house where Catholics had been found communally assembling – paid a fine as representatives of the assembly or as defenders of the participants or other prosecuted Catholics. The amounts ranged from 12 *stuivers* (for Jan Claesz and his wife {46}) to f. 6,000 (for Wachtelaer {19}). In the former case, Jan Claesz and his wife were accused of opening a Catholic elementary school in their house and resisting the school superintendents when they came for an inspection (Appendix 1).

The Provincial States drew up guidelines for pecuniary penalties and instructed the judicial officers not to accept any compromise with Catholics.¹³³ For many sentences, however, it can be demonstrated that the fines were at times negotiated between the prosecuted Catholics, represented

131 This letter is transcribed in Deelder, *Bijdragen*, I, pp. 170–76, here especially pp. 171, 174–75: ‘in den gapenden mond van den schout een klontje van een paar duizend guldens valt. Wat zijn wij toch ten prooi aan honden en wolven, die hongeren en dorsten, niet naar bloed, maar naar het zilveren of gouden vachtken’.

132 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.

133 E.g. *G.P.U.*, I, pp. 395–98.



Graph 3. Sentences of the legal proceedings in Utrecht, 1620-1672

by their defenders, and the committee composed of aldermen, organized by the city court. In at least sixteen cases, the final fine recorded in the sentences differs from the amount originally demanded by the sheriff in the indictments.¹³⁴ Since sheriffs were known to pocket money from Catholics as either a recognition fee or fine, they were sometimes reproached for their avarice. The 1641 edict stipulated that any judicial officer found to be remiss in prosecuting Catholics was to be dismissed.¹³⁵ In 1648 the Reformed consistory wondered how it 'is possible that they [judicial officers] do not see the conventicles, which all the world sees'.¹³⁶ In 1652 the Reformed synod of Utrecht instructed its classes to monitor judicial officers so as to prevent them from 'conniving at' and 'compromising with the Papists'.¹³⁷

¹³⁴ {5} {8} {39} {48} {62} {82} {83} {84} {87} {89}{89} {90} {91} {93} {94} {95} {98} in Appendix 1.

¹³⁵ *G.P.U.*, I, p. 400.

¹³⁶ KR, 5, 28 February 1648: 'ist mogel[tjck] dat sy de conventiculen niet en souden sien, dewelcke al de werelt siet'.

¹³⁷ HUA, Nederlandse Hervormde classis Utrecht, 369, n.d. in 1652: 'conniveeren', 'met de Papiisten', and 'composeeren'.

Likewise, in its long petition to the Provincial States drafted in 1655 or 1656, the Reformed synod expressed its frustration at 'some God-forsaken and damnable judicial Officers' who 'turn a blind eye to the Idolatry of Popery'. According to the petition, even children knew that judicial officers actually connived at Catholics.¹³⁸

In seven of the 105 cases, Catholics were sentenced to confiscation of their property (Graph 3).¹³⁹ Most of these cases concerned accusations of the illegal transfer of property.¹⁴⁰ So too most (five out of seven) occurred in the context of the Eighty Years' War.¹⁴¹ The 'library' of Rovenius in Utrecht was confiscated by the city and, for the sake of 'public convenience', kept in the university library at the public church of St Jan, whose librarian was the future burgomaster Cornelis Booth {18}.¹⁴² Although the 105 cases feature six Catholic prosecuted canons, Wachtelaer was the only one to be sentenced to the confiscation of his canonry {19}.¹⁴³ This might suggest that the canons' elevated social status prevented the city court from depriving them of the canonries which they had once obtained with public recognition, even though there had been edicts excluding Catholic candidates from new ownership of canonries as early as 1615. Besides, jurisdiction was a significant matter, as the city's claim to jurisdiction over the canons was contested since canonries were to be bestowed by the sovereign Provincial States.¹⁴⁴

Banishment – social death in the civic community – was the most severe penalty applied in the 105 cases (thirteen, Graph 3),¹⁴⁵ since early modern people depended heavily on the *sociabilité* of their local community. The thirteen cases pertained to five laypeople and eight clerics.¹⁴⁶ By expelling these Catholic offenders, the politico-judicial authorities attempted to eradicate the threat to the Reformed public order, partially purifying the

138 HUA, VBB, 139, probably in 1655 or 1656: 'God vergetene ende verdoemel[ijcke] sommiger Officieren' and 'Afgoderye des Pausdoms wert door de vingeren gesien'.

139 {5} {15} {18} {19} {20} {22} {64} in Appendix 1.

140 Paulus van der Rijst was the only one accused not of transferring property, but of performing clerical activities and practising the Catholic faith {5} (Appendix 1).

141 Two exceptional cases are {5} {64} (Appendix 1).

142 HUA, SAI, 121-20, 7 December 1641, 14 February 1642; HUA, SAI, 2244-86, passim: 'publick gerief'.

143 The other cases are {16} {17} {64} {79} {80} (Appendix 1). Before losing his canonry in 1640 {19}, Wachtelaer had already been prosecuted twice {2} {9} (Appendix 1).

144 E.g. {64} in Appendix 1.

145 {5} {6} {7} {11} {18} {19} {20} {22} {25} {43} {45} {56} {66} {108} in Appendix 1.

146 Banished priests were prosecuted in {5} {11} {18} {19} {20} {22} {25} {66} (Appendix 1). The five banished laypeople include four citizens or residents {6} {7} {43} {56} and one garrison soldier {45} (Appendix 1).

corpus christianum. Catholics whose political inclination favoured the ‘public enemy’ were considered dangerous enough to be subjected to banishment. Helena van Sijll (Zijl), the wife of Christiaen Bruyninge, an advocate to the provincial court of Utrecht, was forced to leave Utrecht due to allegations of loyalty to the Spanish cause, despite her high social status within the civic community {7} (Appendix 1). Likewise, Spanish Gerrit was banished for his crime of loyalty to the Spanish king {6} (Appendix 1). Another crime considered worthy of banishment was the insulting of the Reformed religion. Thus, Maychgen Peters and her son Peter Willemsz were banished from the city for offending the Reformed minister {43} (Appendix 1). ‘Public violence’, that is, violence committed openly before the eyes of onlookers, was yet another crime deemed too great a hazard for the civic community to keep the offenders. The two prosecuted Catholics charged with ‘public violence’ (*publijcq[lijck] gewelt*) were ‘publicly’ (*publycque[lijck]*), openly, and officially exposed on a scaffold, and then banished {45} {56} (Appendix 1). Public exposure was a tremendous dishonour for early modern people, who were obsessed with social reputation, and thus it had a deterrent effect for similar crimes in the future. Four of the eight banished priests did not originate from Utrecht, including Paulus van der Rijst {5}, Rovenius {18}, and Govert van Moock {20} (Appendix 1). Van der Rijst’s sentence, for example, referred to the 1622 edict prohibiting non-native priests from coming to Utrecht at the risk of banishment from the province.¹⁴⁷ Remarkably, native priests with citizenship and an elevated social status within the civic community, such as Rombout van Medenblick (d. 1640/42) {11}, Wachtelaer {19}, Gerrit Pelt {22}, and Van Honthorst {25}, also lost the right to reside in their hometown (Appendix 1).

In the indictments, the sheriff originally tried to prosecute Rovenius and Wachtelaer for the *crimen laesae majestatis*, just like Jacob Mom, who had been sent to the scaffold in 1621. In the end, *lèse-majesté* was not mentioned in their sentences, so that they escaped the death penalty, but Rovenius was still banished from the Dutch Republic and Wachtelaer from his hometown Utrecht.¹⁴⁸ After his banishment on 10 March 1640, Wachtelaer sent a petition to the provincial court signed by his ‘special deputy’ Johan de With [93], pleading for a chance to prove his innocence. Since Wachtelaer was anxious

147 *G.P.U.*, I, pp. 397–400; HUA, SAII, 2236-2, 26 March 1624.

148 According to Margaret Hewett and Jan Hallebeek, Antonius Matthaëus II (1601–1654), at the time professor of law at Utrecht University, played a certain role in establishing the penalty for these procedures; he would later serve the Reformed community as an elder (appointed in 1645, 1649, and 1654). Hewett and Hallebeek, ‘The Prelate’; Lieburg, *De Nadere Reformatie*, p. 156.

about his safety in his hometown, he pleaded with the provincial court to allow him to stay in safety in Abcoude or Amersfoort, both within the province of Utrecht.¹⁴⁹ The provincial court accepted his appeal, nullifying the sentence of the city court and forbidding all marshals and officers in the province to enforce the sentences or to arrest him.¹⁵⁰ The provincial court did, however, issue this interdiction without prior consultation with the Provincial States. Then, 'by our Sovereign power', the Provincial States, following the instruction from the States General, ordered the marshals and officers to execute the sentences of the city court and to ignore the interdiction of the provincial court.¹⁵¹ In the end, the city council followed these decisions from the States General and the Provincial States.¹⁵² Whereas Wachtelaer had once found a ray of hope for avoiding legal sanction via the intervention of the provincial court, he ended up failing to prevent the resolution by the sovereign Provincial States, supported by the States General, on the sentence of banishment which had been pronounced by the city court. Wachtelaer passed away in Culemborg in 1653, without ever being able to return to his hometown.¹⁵³ In most of the 105 legal proceedings, the prosecuted Catholics were found guilty and forced to forfeit money, property, or the right to live in the city.¹⁵⁴ Since other early modern confessional states sometimes sent religious offenders to the scaffold, it remains remarkable that none of the Catholic defendants in Utrecht, with the one exception of Jacob Mom who held property in Utrecht but was tried in The Hague, were ever executed for crimes of faith. Still, it should be noted that the politico-judicial authorities could prey on Catholics financially, allowing them to live and to earn toleration in exchange for fines, bails, and bribes and not simply felling this 'money tree'.

1.4. Conclusion

Repression remained one of the Reformed governing strategies for coping with religious diversity throughout the period from 1620 to 1672. Under increasing

149 HUA, MKOKN, 557, n.d. (after 10 March 1640); HUA, SAIL, 121-19, 26 March 1640.

150 HUA, SAIL, 2244-87, 28 March 1640.

151 HUA, SAIL, 121-19, 9, 10 April 1640: 'uyt onse Souveraine macht'.

152 Ibidem, 8 October, 13 November 1640.

153 Hallebeek, 'Godsdienst(on)vrijheid', pp. 129, 134; Hewett and Hallebeek, 'The Prelate', pp. 147-48; Knuif and Jong, 'Philippus Rovenius', pp. 79, 83.

154 Although it is certain that the city court rejected the charges in one case {80}, the final verdicts are lacking for ten other cases {1} {3} {12} {16} {21} {26} {28} {53} {59} {79} (Appendix 1). While the sheriff did collect documentation for these cases, the court may have rejected the charges in the end.

pressure from the Reformed Church, the Utrecht political authorities of the city council and the Provincial States continued to repress Catholics and attempted to exclude them from a growing number of sectors of the public sphere. They stripped Catholics of their physical spaces for the collective, external, and material expression of their faith, while officially representing them as disqualified for public office solely due to their confessional affiliation. By outlawing Catholicism, the politico-judicial authorities developed a legal system for appropriating the economic wealth of Catholic Utrechters. Time and again the Reformed Church, represented by the consistory, classis, and synod, pushed the magistrates to delimit the public in a confessionalized way. The magistrates did sometimes, but not always, collaborate with the public church, 'legalizing' Catholic discrimination and persecution. Although Utrecht's authorities did not sentence Catholics to death, they exploited them financially through fines, bails, or bribes, deprived them of their property, and expelled them from the civic community. While they did not always strictly enforce the anti-Catholic edicts in practice, they still officially discredited Catholics through anti-Catholic legislation and prosecution in a society where public honour mattered greatly. Therefore, they struck devastating blows against the legal and politico-social credibility of the Catholics as a group, who continued to be slandered as potential criminals regardless of whether they were really prosecuted or the nature, number, and value of the penalties ultimately imposed on them. By doing so, the politico-religious authorities strategically continued to delimit the physical and abstract public through anti-Catholic legislation and prosecution, thereby attempting to protect their *corpus christianum* against the perceived Catholic threat.

The anti-Catholicism in Utrecht must be interpreted in the context of the international wars and national politics, as well as local power relationship between the magistrates and the Reformed Church. From 1620 to 1672, the enactment of anti-Catholic legislation coincided largely with the trends in the legal proceedings against Catholics with regard to their target. The politico-judicial authorities first attempted to regulate priests, thereafter shifting their restrictions to primarily target laypeople and their diverse activities, including spatial practices and elementary education by women. The vigour and frequency of the legislation on paper also converge with the trend in the practice of prosecution across time. From 1620 to 1638, in the context of the resumed war against Spain, Utrecht's political authorities introduced harsh anti-Catholic edicts that would be seen as points of reference for years to come. In spite of this, the practical application of these anti-Catholic edicts in the form of legal prosecution remained relatively mild, as judicial authorities were launching fewer trials against Catholics at the time. The situation changed,

however, after the prosecution of Rovenius and Wachtelaer in 1639/40. From that point onwards, the sheriff initiated more legal cases against Catholics, while the Voetian consistory began to incite the magistrates, including likeminded protagonists of Voetius, ever more urgently to enact anti-Catholic legislation. After the Peace of Münster in 1648 and the Great Assembly in 1651, anti-Catholicism in Utrecht reached even greater heights. Under pressure from the public church, the magistrates promulgated and renewed anti-Catholic edicts in their attempts to exclude Catholics from various areas of the public sphere. During this period, the judicial authorities prosecuted Catholics more frequently than in any other phase of the fifty years under study. This is remarkable if we recall that the Republicans began consolidating their political power in Utrecht from 1651 onwards. Then, from 1660 to 1672, the tide of anti-Catholicism temporarily subsided. This was also the time when the Republican magistrates openly resisted the Voetian consistory. Some Republicans, including Van Velthuysen, played an important role in the relative tranquillity enjoyed by Utrecht's Catholics. Yet it should be noted that, under steady pressure from the Reformed Church, even the Republicans did not stop promulgating anti-Catholic edicts and prosecuting Catholics.

As such, we see the emergence of a certain tendency towards Reformed confessionalization of Utrecht's public sphere, although the development was not straightforward and linear, but took the shape of a gradual and complicated process of negotiations and conflicts in which the public church brought constant pressure to bear on the magistrates. Through the governing strategy of repression, the political authorities, driven to do so by the Reformed Church, tried to regulate the existing environment of religious coexistence, delimiting the public in multi-confessional Utrecht. In the end, they legalized anti-Catholicism and religious discrimination in the city's public sphere, even if they did not always yield obediently to the confessionalizing demands of the Reformed Church. It is worth noting that both the theory of legislation and the practice of legal prosecution made it difficult for Catholic Utrechters to live as devout Catholics even within their own private homes and as respected citizens or residents of the multi-religious city.

Abbreviations

- A.A.U. *Archief voor de geschiedenis van het aartsbisdom Utrecht*. Utrecht, 1875–1957.
- B.G.B.H. *Bijdragen voor de geschiedenis van het bisdom van Haarlem*. Haarlem, 1873–1949.

- G.P.U.* Water, Johan van de. *Groot Placaatboek vervattende alle de placaten [...] Staten 's lands van Utrecht*, 3 vols. Utrecht, 1729.
- N.N.B.W.* Molhuysen, P. C., and P. J. Blok, eds. *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, 10 vols. Leiden, 1911–1937.
- R.B.* Cornelissen, J. D. M., R. R. Post, and P. Polman, et al., eds. *Romeinsche bronnen voor den kerkelijken toestand der Nederlanden onder de apostolisch vicarissen, 1592–1727*, 4 vols. The Hague, 1932–1952.
- HUA Het Utrechts Archief, Utrecht
- HVU Hof van Utrecht
- KR Nederlandse Hervormde gemeente Utrecht, kerkeraad
- MKOKN Metropolaan Kapittel van de Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland
- OBC Apostolische vicarissen van de Hollandse Zending
- SA Stadsarchief
- VBB Verzameling van Buchel-Booth

Bibliography

Archival Primary Sources

- HUA, Nederlandse Hervormde classis Utrecht (24-1)
369. Copies of the minutes of the provincial synod and the classes in Utrecht, including a plan for the prevention of Popery formulated by the provincial synod, 1652
- HUA, Hof van Utrecht [HVU] (239-1)
99-8. Sentences in criminal cases in the provincial court of Utrecht, 1638–1732
- HUA, Verzameling van Buchel-Booth [VBB] (355)
139. Notes on the Reformed Church, especially in the province of Utrecht, by Cornelis Booth, 1579–1656, including a petition from the provincial synod of Utrecht to the Provincial States of Utrecht, 1655 or 1656
- HUA, Stadsarchief II [SAII] (702)
121-4 ~ 121-5, 121-8 ~ 121-30. Minutes of the city council, 1599/1600–1612/13 and 1619/20–1686/87
616. Reports on forbidden Catholic assemblies with lists of Catholic priests, 1664–1681
- 1825-1 ~ 1825-6. Minutes of the trustees of the municipal chamber of charity, 1628–1647 and 1657–1687

2088. Documents concerning the trial against Philippus Rovenius, 1640
2236-2 ~ 2236-5. *Crimineele sententiën* of the city court of Utrecht, 1618–1657
and 1670–1684
- 2244-42 ~ 2244-140. *Crimineele stukken* of the city court of Utrecht, 1620–1679
- HUA, Nederlandse Hervormde gemeente Utrecht, kerkeraad [KR] (746)
- 3 ~ 10. Minutes of the Reformed consistory, August 1618–July 1690
- HUA, Nederlandse Hervormde gemeente te Utrecht, diaconie (816)
1. Minutes of the Reformed diaconate, 1623–1625
- HUA, Apostolische vicarissen van de Hollandse Zending [OBC] (1003)
99. Testimony of Rudolphus Francisci before Reformed ministers on the organization of the Catholic Church in the Northern Netherlands, c. 1630
157. Sentence of the aldermen in Leiden against Rombout Medenblick, 30 January 1640
159. Documents concerning the trials against Philippus Rovenius and Johannes Wachtelaer, 1639–1640
246. Copies of letters written by the Apostolic Vicar Johannes van Neercassel, 23 November 1673–16 August 1675
499. 'Protocol' kept by Govert van Mooock, secretary to the apostolic vicar, 1621–1639
- HUA, Metropolaan Kapittel van de Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland [MKOKN] (1835)
557. Documents concerning the trial against Johannes Wachtelaer, 1639–1640 and 1645

Published Primary Sources

- Brom, Gisbert, ed. 'Neerkassels bestuur van 1662 tot 1676'. *A.A.U.* 18 (1890), pp. 172–294.
- Cornelissen, J. D. M., R. R. Post, and P. Polman, eds. *Romeinsche bronnen voor den kerkelijken toestand der Nederlanden onder de apostolisch vicarissen, 1592–1727*. 4 vols. The Hague, 1932–1952. [R.B.]
- Deelder, C. *Bijdragen voor de geschiedenis van de Rooms-Katholieke Kerk in Nederland*. 2 vols. Rotterdam, 1888–1892.
- Doedes, J. I., ed. 'Intendit en sententie tegen Philippus Rovenius, zich noemende aartsbisschop van Utrecht'. *Jaarboeken voor wetenschappelijke theologie* 11 (1853), pp. 276–300.
- Gompertz Pr., L. P. A., ed. 'Brief van Johan Breijer namens de synode aan de Staten van Utrecht'. *A.A.U.* 9 (1881), pp. 463–64.
- Heussen, Hugo Franciscus van. *Batavia Sacra sive res gestae apostolicorum virorum qui fidem Bataviae primi intulerunt*. Brussels, 1714.

- Hofman, J. H., ed. 'Allerlei, betreffende de stad Utrecht'. *A.A.U.* 5 (1878), pp. 180–238.
- Hoogland, A. J. J., ed. 'Descriptio status, in quo anno 1638 erat religio Catholica [...]'. *A.A.U.* 12 (1884), pp. 189–213, 414–33.
- Jacobsz, Hillebrand. *Sententiën over Jacob Mom, gewesene amptman in Maes en Wael, ende Elbert van Botbergen, beyde als Edelen gecompareert hebbende opt Landt-dagen van Gelderlant: Mitsgaders Adriaen van Eynthouts, Schout des Over-ampts vanden Lande van Kuyck*. The Hague, 1621.
- Knuif, Wilhelmus, and Johannes de Jong, eds. 'Relaas van Godefridus van Mook'. *A.A.U.* 50 (1925), pp. 387–401.
- Lommel, Anthonius van, ed. 'Bouwstoffen voor de kerkelijke geschiedenis van verschillende Parochiën thans behoorende tot het Bisdom van Haarlem'. *B.G.B.H.* 9 (1881), pp. 1–42, 321–407.
- Muller, Samuel, ed. 'Getuigenis van een afvalligen priester over de organisatie der rooms-katholieke kerk in Nederland omstreeks 1630'. *A.A.U.* 14 (1886), pp. 241–44.
- Remonstrantie der E. Kerkenraedt van Utrecht. Aende Ed. Mog. Heeren Staten s'Landts van Utrecht*. Rotterdam, 1651.
- Remonstrantie der Predikanten van Wtrecht, overgelevert Aen de Ed. Mogende Heeren Staten 's Landts van Utrecht, Raeckende het poinct van Religie*. 1647.
- Rogge, H. C., ed. 'Memorie, in December 1639 door J. Wtenbogaert ingezonden aan de omgeving van Zijne Hoogheid Prins Frederik Hendrik'. *A.A.U.* 2 (1875), pp. 1–25.
- Water, Johan van de. *Groot Placaat-Boek vervattende all de placaten [...]. Staten 's lands van Utrecht*. 3 vols. Utrecht, 1729. [G.P.U.]

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.
- Adriani, Johannes H. *De Stads-Aalmoezenierskamer te Utrecht 1628–1928*. Utrecht, 1928.
- Bogaers, Llewellyn. 'Een kwestie van macht? Onderzoek naar de trend in de wetgeving aangaande rituele en sociale ontmoetingen in de stad Utrecht in de periode 1528–1713'. MA thesis, Utrecht University, 1983.
- Bogaers, Llewellyn. *Aards, betrokken, en zelfbewust. De verwevenheid van cultuur en religie in katholiek Utrecht, 1300–1600*. Utrecht, 2008.
- Bok, Marten Jan. 'Laying Claims to Nobility in the Dutch Republic: Epitaphs, True and False'. *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 24 (1996), pp. 209–26.
- Booy de, Engelina. *Kweekhoven der wijsheid. Basis- en vervolgonderwijs in de steden van de provincie Utrecht van 1580 tot het begin der 19^{de} eeuw*. Zutphen, 1980.

- Broeyer, Frits. 'Ijkpunt 1650 – "Andre gezintheneden met tollerantie getolereert"'. In *Vervreemding en verzoening. De relatie tussen katholieken en protestanten in Nederland 1550–2000*, edited by Cornelis Augustijn and Eugène Honée. Nijmegen, 1998, pp. 35–67.
- Broeyer, Frits. 'Een mislukt streven naar theocratie. De Utrechtse gereformeerde gemeente van 1660 tot 1680'. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Kerkgeschiedenis* 10 (2007), pp. 2–7.
- Dane, Jacques, ed. 1648. *Vrede van Munster. Feit en verbeelding*. Zwolle, 1998.
- Duker, Arnoldus. *Gisbertus Voetius*, 3 vols. Leiden, 1897–1914.
- Eck, Xander van. *Kunst, twist en devotie. Goudse katholieke schuilkerken 1572–1795*. Delft, 1994.
- Forclaz, Bertrand. *Catholiques au défi de la Réforme. La coexistence confessionnelle à Utrecht au XVIIe siècle*. Paris, 2014.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Katholieke toekomstverwachting ten tijde van de Republiek: structuur, en grondlijnen tot een interpretatie'. *Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden* 98, no. 3 (1983), pp. 430–59.
- Frijhoff, Willem. *Embodied Belief: Ten Essays on Religious Culture in Dutch History*. Hilversum, 2002.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Catholic Apocalypitics in a Protestant Commonwealth? The Dutch Republic (1579–1630)'. In *Konfessioneller Fundamentalismus. Religion als politischer Faktor im europäischen Mächtesystem um 1600*, edited by Heinz Schilling. Munich, 2007, pp. 247–72.
- Gootjes, Albert. 'The *Collegie der Scavanten*: A Seventeenth-Century Cartesian Scholarly Society in Utrecht'. In *Enlightened Religion: From Confessional Churches to Polite Piety in the Dutch Republic*, edited by Joke Spaans and Jetze Touber. Leiden, 2019, pp. 156–82.
- Groenveld, Simon, H. L. Ph. Leeuwenberg, and H. B. van der Weel. *Unie – Bestand – Vrede. Drie fundamentele wetten van de Republiek der Verenigde Nederlanden*. Hilversum, 2009.
- Hallebeek, Jan. 'Godsdienst(on)vrijheid in de Gouden Eeuw? Het proces tegen Johan Wachtelaer (1583–1652)'. *Trajecta* 23 (2014), pp. 123–44.
- Hewett, Margaret, and Jan Hallebeek. 'The Prelate, the Praetor and the Professor: Antonius Matthaëus II and the *Crimen Laesae Majestatis*, Utrecht 1639–1640'. *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis* 66, no. 1 (1998), pp. 115–50.
- Hilhorst, G. 'Het kerspel Schalkwijk'. *A.A.U.* 12 (1884), pp. 1–104.
- Hoek, Frans van. *Schets van de geschiedenis der jezuiteten in Nederland*. Nijmegen, 1940.
- Hulzen, A van. *Utrechtse kerken en kerkgebouwen*. Baarn, 1985.
- Hulzen, A van. *Utrechtse kloosters en gasthuizen*. Baarn, 1986.
- Israel, Jonathan I. *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477–1806*. Oxford, 1995.

- Jong, Johannes de. 'Het Utrechtse vicariaat en de strijd over de hiërarchische orde in de 17e eeuw'. *De Katholiek* 164 (1923), pp. 73–104, 146–86.
- Kalveen, C. A. 'De vijf adellijke vrouwenkloosters in en om de stad Utrecht'. In *De kerk en de Nederlanden. Archieven, instellingen, samenleving*, edited by C. Dekker and E. S. C. Erkelens-Buttinger. Hilversum, 1997, pp. 152–67.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J. *Calvinists and Libertines: Confession and Community in Utrecht, 1578–1620*. Oxford, 1995.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J. 'Confessionalism and Its Limits: Religion in Utrecht, 1600–1650'. In *Masters of Light: Dutch Painters in Utrecht during the Golden Age*, edited by Joaneath A. Spicer and Lynn Federle Orr. New Haven, 1997, pp. 60–71.
- Knuif, Wilhelmus, and Johannes de Jong. 'Philippus Rovenius en zijn bestuur der Hollandsche Zending'. *A.A.U.* 50 (1925), pp. 1–425.
- 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.
- 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.
- Lieburg, Fred van. *De Nadere Reformatie in Utrecht ten tijde van Voetius. Sporen in de gereformeerde kerkeeraadsacta*. Rotterdam, 1989.
- Molhuysen, P. C., and P. J. Blok, eds. *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, 10 vols. Leiden, 1911–1937. [N.N.B.W.]
- 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.
- Rengers Hora Siccama, Duco Gerrold. *De geestelijke en kerkelijke goederen onder het canonieke, het gereformeerde en het neutrale recht. Historisch-juridisch verhandeling, voornamelijk uit Utrechtsche gegevens samengesteld*. Utrecht, 1905.
- Rogier, Lodewijk J. *Geschiedenis van het katholicisme in Noord-Nederland in de 16e en de 17e eeuw*, 3 vols. Amsterdam, 1945–1947.
- Roorda, Daniel Jeen. 'Prins Willem III en het Utrechtse regeringsreglement. Een schets van gebeurtenissen, achtergronden en problemen', In *Van standen tot staten. 600 jaar Staten van Utrecht, 1375–1975*, edited by Huib Leeuwenberg and Louise van Tongerlo. Utrecht, 1975, pp. 99–133.
- Schaik, Ton H. M. van, and Karin Strengers-Olde Kalter. *Het arme roomse leven. Geschiedenis van de katholieke caritas in de stad Utrecht*. Hilversum, 2016.

- Slokker, Nico. *Ruggengraat van de stad. De betekenis van gilden in Utrecht, 1528–1818*. Amsterdam, 2010.
- Troost, Wout. *William III, The Stadholder-King: A Political Biography*. Aldershot, 2005.
- Ven, Adrianus J. van de. *Over den oorsprong van het Aartsbisschoppelijke Kapittel van Utrecht der Oude-Bisschoppelijke clerezij*. Utrecht, 1923.
- Verhey, H. J. W. *300 jaar aalmoezenierszorg. Geschiedenis van de Roomsche-Katholieke Aalmoezenierskamer te Utrecht, (1674–1746) en van de Oude Roomsche-Katholieke Aalmoezenierskamer te Utrecht, (1746–1974)*. Rotterdam, 1974.
- Vries, Jan de. 'Searching for a Role: The Economy of Utrecht in the Golden Age of the Dutch Republic'. In *Masters of Light: Dutch Painters in Utrecht during the Golden Age*, edited by Joaneath A. Spicer and Lynn Federle Orr. New Haven, 1997, pp. 49–59.
- Wilders, Coen. *Patronage in de provincie. Het Utrechtse netwerk van stadhouder Willem III*. Amsterdam, 2015.
- Wittert van Hoogland, E. B. F. F. 'Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis der Utrechtsche ridderhofsteden en heerlijkheden'. *Genealogische en heraldische bladen* 8 (1913), pp. 1–480.

2. Toleration: Limited Recognition and Connivance

Abstract: Toleration was another important governing strategy of the Reformed political authorities in Utrecht. With its qualitative and quantitative analyses of the toleration of Catholics, this chapter examines how the magistrates publicly recognized and non-publicly connived at their presence or behaviour in spite of official prohibitions in the city. Tolerated Catholics were priests who tried to reside or stay in the city, women who attempted to contribute to the rehabilitation of the Catholic community, public office holders, and applicants for citizenship. Deploying toleration as a political practice of social engineering, the magistrates curbed the public church's attempts at Reformed confessionalization of the urban public sphere, while maintaining discriminatory treatment of Catholics in everyday life.

Keywords: toleration, tolerance, limited recognition, connivance, religious diversity, civic community

In his petition to Stadholder Frederick Henry (1584–1647), drawn up in 1639 during the lawsuit against him, Johannes Wachtelaer expressed his admiration for the toleration practised by Dutch magistrates:

So the Catholics here in the land, thanks to the reasonable connivance (which, praise God, has by now already been [practised] for many years in numerous places), have trusted that the Magistrates of the land may well have come to understand [...] that the Catholics should also be allowed to assemble in houses to hear Mass and the sermon.¹

¹ HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, 'Memorie', p. 5): 'Soo hebben oock de Catholyquen hier te lande uyt de redelicke oochluyckinge (die nu veele jaren herwaerts, God loff, in veele plaetsen geweest is) vertrouwt, dat de Heeren Regeerders van 't landt eens soudén mogen gecomen

While he depicted Dutch Catholics as persecuted warriors for the Catholic cause in his letter to his colleague Jacobus de la Torre, Wachtelaer gave the stadholder a totally different representation of them as beneficiaries of toleration. He now argued that Dutch Catholics had long been tolerated for the practice of their faith at home, in stark contrast to the abnormal situation Utrecht's Catholics were facing ever since the raid on Apostolic Vicar Philippus Rovenius and himself earlier that same year. There is no doubt that Wachtelaer's praise for the connivance Dutch magistrates showed towards Catholics was a tactical move aimed at increasing the chance of obtaining mercy from Frederick Henry. In spite of this, the vicar general's acknowledgment that Catholic religious activities were in practice tolerated by the political authorities remains remarkable.

Alongside repression, the political authorities also strategically deployed toleration in order to deal with the reviving Catholic community in seventeenth-century Utrecht. The present study recognizes two distinct modes in the political practice of toleration: limited recognition, which magistrates granted publicly and officially; and connivance, which they exercised non-publicly and unofficially. While existing studies have focused almost exclusively on the latter, this chapter will shed light on limited recognition as well. In so doing, it will examine, qualitatively and quantitatively, how the political authorities strategically attempted to govern the environment of religious coexistence in the Christian social community (*corpus christianum*) and to respond to both the confessionalizing demands of the Reformed Church and the resistance shown by Catholics against the legislation. It will discuss how Utrecht's political authorities bestowed limited recognition upon and exercised connivance towards four categories of Catholics who attempted to win toleration despite the edicts aimed against them: priests who were willing to reside or stay in the city; women who tried to assist religious services, to teach children, and to freely bequeath their property; public office holders; and applicants for citizenship. I will argue that the political authorities strategically deployed the two modes of toleration vis-à-vis these Catholics in order to control the environment of coexistence, tempering the pressure from the Reformed Church for the confessionalization of the public sphere, while still upholding the status of Catholic Utrechters as a discriminated entity within the local society.

sijn tot soodanich verstant [...] dat de Catholycken oock in de huysen vergaderinghen om misse ende predicatie te hooren souden moghen houden'.

2.1. Priests

The outlawing of Catholicism did not mean that Catholic priests were coerced to surrender their benefices and canonries. It was only when they were caught contravening the law that their benefices and canonries could be confiscated.² At the same time, it was difficult for priests to observe the law in their work as priests, since this in principle forbade the wearing of clerical clothing, while the Council of Trent required clerical dress for priests so as to distinguish themselves from the laity. In reluctant acquiescence to the situation under Protestant rule, some Dutch clerics disguised themselves as farmers, fishermen, or merchants to avoid apprehension. Philippus Rovenius {18} disguised himself as a woman in order to escape judicial officers in 1639. The Utrecht secular priest Servaes van der Nypoort (c. 1608–1677) <41> <002> grew a beard to make it difficult for Protestants to identify him by his face. The Brussels nuncio Guido Bentivoglio (1579–1644), however, expressed his displeasure at the secular appearance of Dutch Catholic priests.³ As early as 1620, the city council instructed the sheriff to deliver an ultimatum to priests who were known to preside at Mass, including ‘Johan Huyter, Proeys, [Jan Alexander] Axilius, [Jacob] Bool’.⁴ Given that these priests had not previously been prosecuted even though their names and illegal activities were known to the magistracy, it seems reasonable to assume that the political authorities connived at crimes they had committed earlier in contravention of the existing prohibition.

Even in Utrecht, where many priests had remained despite the outlawing of their faith, Catholics needed new priests coming in from the outside. To compensate for the shortage of priests, Sasbout Vosmeer, the first apostolic vicar, asked the pope to dispatch Jesuits, as the vanguard of Catholic mission activity throughout the world, to the Northern Netherlands. Yet the missionaries sent from religious orders abroad soon proved to be a source of trouble to him and his successors. The apostolic vicars and their secular priests insisted that the Catholic Church had never ceased to exist in the Northern Netherlands, despite the Dutch Revolt and the Protestant Reformation. For this reason, they considered the apostolic vicar the *de facto* archbishop of Utrecht, with the right of jurisdiction over the religious orders in the districts of the Holland Mission. The missionary religious, in contrast, and the Jesuits in particular, saw the Northern Netherlands simply

2 *G.P.U.*, III, p. 466 (18 June 1580).

3 Lenarduzzi, *De belevingswereld*, pp. 164–66; Idem, ‘Subcultuur en tegencultuur’, pp. 197–98.

4 HUA, SAII, 121-8, 7 September 1620.

as a mission territory which had broken with the pre-Reformation church province. They therefore followed the instructions of their superiors in their orders, but rejected the authority which the apostolic vicar sought to exercise over them.⁵ This jurisdictional problem came to be intertwined with international, soteriological disputes on human free will and divine grace (i.e., the Jansenist controversy) and eventually led to the Utrecht Schism of 1723, when the Dutch Catholic Church was divided into two separate groups, one of which ultimately became the Old Catholics. The schism was a unique phenomenon in early modern Catholicism, although comparable jurisdictional conflicts between secular and regular priests also took place in England and the Jansenist influence was likewise visible in France and Ireland.⁶

Throughout the troubles they experienced with the religious orders, the apostolic vicars trained qualified secular priests under the supervision of bishops, following the Tridentine requirements. Since Catholic education had been banned in the Republic, the Holland Mission established the Alticollense college in Cologne (1602) and the Pulcheria college in Leuven (1617), where most Dutch secular priests were to be educated. Others attended the Pope's College in Leuven, which had been established by Pope Adrian VI (born in Utrecht: 1459–1523) in 1523, or the Pontifical Urban College of *Propaganda Fide* in Rome, established in 1627, or else attended Oratorian colleges in France and the Southern Netherlands. The seminary training of the Dutch secular clergy proved to be effective.⁷ Notwithstanding the prohibition on attending universities in 'enemy lands', many Dutch Catholics, including theology students and students of other subjects, boldly matriculated at Catholic universities abroad. Budding theologians in particular were encouraged by the apostolic vicars to study at the universities in Cologne, Leuven, and Douai, all centres of Counter-Reformation revival.⁸ At these universities, Dutch Catholics met co-religionists from England, Germany, and the Southern Netherlands. The Catholics who refused to recognize

5 Parker, *Faith on the Margins*, passim, especially pp. 25, 34, 73–74; Rogier, *Geschiedenis*, passim, especially II, pp. 9–10.

6 Jansenism was an ecclesiastical reform movement named after Cornelius Jansenius (1568–1638), professor at Leuven University, who had close connections with Dutch clerics including Apostolic Vicar Rovenius. E.g., Ackermans, *Herder*, especially pp. 211–56; Parker, *Faith on the Margins*, passim; Schoon, *Een aartsbisschop*, pp. 11–104; Spiertz, 'Anti-jansenisme en jansenisme'; Tans and Kok, *Rome-Utrecht*.

7 Ackermans, *Herders*, pp. 67–120; Parker, *Faith on the Margins*, pp. 73–100.

8 Lenarduzzi, *De belevingswereld*, pp. 70–71; Idem, 'De religieuze spagaat'; Idem, 'Subcultuur en tegencultuur', pp. 104–5.

the Reformed regime, including the first two apostolic vicars Vosmeer and Rovenius, took refuge in such Catholic cities as Cologne and Antwerp, where they became acquainted with other Catholic exiles from England, Germany, and Scandinavia. Both cities saw considerable Jesuit influence and developed into centres where devotional and polemical works for English, Irish, and Dutch Catholics were published.⁹

In that situation, the city of Utrecht enacted a new edict in 1603 requiring incoming Catholic priests to register with the municipality.¹⁰ When this edict proved dead and ineffective, the Provincial States issued a strict edict in 1622 prohibiting new Catholic clerics from entering Utrecht and demanding that priests already living in the city register with the municipality.¹¹ Following this provincial injunction, the Utrecht city council decided on 11 March 1622 that all the priests who had been living in Utrecht for a longer period had eight days to register with magistrates.¹² On 11, 12, and 13 March, thirty priests including Wachtelaer <26> registered with the municipality, giving their name, age, and address, and, in some cases, the name of the person with whom they lodged (Appendix 2).¹³ The thirty registered priests also included Axilius <1> and Bool <3>, who in 1620 were both presented with the aforementioned ultimatum in regard to their clerical activities.¹⁴ Many of the registered priests were of an advanced age; nine of them were over sixty years old. Since Evert van Alphen <15> was 104 years old and too weak to come to the city hall in person, his registration was submitted by his colleague Willem Acrijnsz <14>, who, being seventy-four years old, was not all that young himself (Appendix 2). According to Rovenius's mission report to Rome from 1622, around forty priests were living in Utrecht at the time, including a Jesuit and a Dominican.¹⁵ Similarly, around 1630 the former priest Rudolphus Francisci estimated that forty-six priests, including members of diverse religious orders, were active in Utrecht. According to Francisci, who had originally been sent from Leuven as a Catholic priest, foreign priests were constantly being dispatched to Utrecht from Leuven, Cologne, and Flanders.¹⁶ The number of priests active in the city is striking

9 Arblaster, *Antwerp and the World*, pp. 47–84, 174–96; Idem, 'The Southern Netherlands Connection', *passim*; Parker, *Faith on the Margins*, pp. 28–29, 33–36, 57, 124, 139.

10 HUA, SAIL, 121-4, 2 May 1603.

11 *G.P.U.*, I, pp. 397–400 (26 February 1622).

12 HUA, SAIL, 121-9, 11 March 1622.

13 HUA, VSOKN, 112, 11, 12, 13 March 1622.

14 HUA, SAIL, 121-8, 7 September 1620; HUA, SAIL, 121-9, 11 March 1622.

15 Rogier, *Geschiedenis*, II, p. 388.

16 HUA, OBC, 99; HUA, SAIL, 2244-86, n.d.; Muller, 'Getuigenis', pp. 241–42.

when it is compared to that of Reformed ministers at that point in time, since the public church only had four ministers.¹⁷ In later sessions, the city council frequently noted the high number of Catholic clergy in Utrecht, as well as the influx of incoming priests, especially from 'enemy places'.¹⁸

Once the list of thirty registered priests had been drawn up, magistrates pondered further measures against these and future incoming clerics.¹⁹ At the same time, the politico-judicial authorities tried to pry information about the clergy from lay Catholics. When Anneken Thomas from England and Lijsbeth Laurens from Stavelot in the Southern Netherlands were accused of begging in 1630, the city court not only banished them from the city, but also required them to present their marriage certificates, where the aldermen hoped to find the names of the priests who had presided at their weddings. In Thomas's case, they succeeded in obtaining the information they were after, forcing her to produce a document signed by a Catholic priest named Petrus de la Faille, formerly a Reformed minister. According to this certificate, she had married Willem Derxen in the presence of a Catholic priest in Amsterdam. Although she had initially forgotten or intentionally concealed the priest's name, Utrecht's judicial authorities succeeded in extracting it from her in interrogation: Jacob Blommert (or Blossvelt).²⁰

Around 1630 the city council found it necessary to take more rigorous action against the priests who were still coming to Utrecht 'daily' from outside, in spite of the prohibition. Its response came in the form of a provincial edict issued in 1630 (and reissued in 1636) prescribing that even priests who were 'tolerated' in other cities or places in the United Provinces could no longer come to Utrecht without the prior consent of the burgomasters.²¹ Soon thereafter the city council received a request from the Catholic priest Rombout van Medenblick <31>, one of the founding members of the *Vicari-aat* in 1633. He asked the Utrecht magistracy to allow him to reside in his hometown Utrecht, stating that he had already registered with the Leiden magistracy in 1622. On 15 September the city council of Utrecht publicly recognized his right to live in the city. On that same day, it decided to allow

17 Duker, *Gisbertus Voetius*, III, pp. 108–9; Lieburg, *De Nadere Reformatie*, p. 151.

18 HUA, SAI, 121-10, 29 October 1622, 21 June 1624, 9 August 1624: 'vyanden plaetsen'.

19 Ibidem, 12 April, 24 May 1624; 16 August 1624; HUA, SAI, 121-13, 7 April 1628.

20 For the case of Anneken Thomas, see HUA, SAI, 2236-2, 10, 14 September 1630; HUA, SAI, 2244-69, 10, 14 September 1630. For the case of Lijsbeth Laurens, see HUA, SAI, 2236-2, 11 December 1630; HUA, SAI, 2244-70, 9, 11 December 1630. Petrus de la Faille's conversion was narrated in an eighteenth-century pamphlet. *Bekeeringe van P. de la Faille*. See also Kooi, *Cabvinists and Catholics*, pp. 135–36.

21 *G.P.U.*, III, p. 468 (10 September 1630, 11 January 1636): 'getolereert'.

priests who were sons of citizens to return to the city upon completion of their university studies in 'enemy Lands' after 1622.²² On 20 September 1630 the city council received another petition in the name of all priests who had been living in Utrecht before 1622 and left after that date to study in 'France, Germany, and other Neutral Lands', but had since returned to Utrecht. The city council approved their request for permission to reside in Utrecht, albeit on the condition that they observe the edict of 1630.²³ Similarly, the already secularized chapter of St Marie had publicly recognized Johannes Wachtelaer's theological studies at Leuven University from 1604 to 1606, probably with a view to his family's elevated social status in Utrecht.²⁴ It should be noted here that the line separating priests who could potentially be tolerated from those who could not seems to have been whether or not they still retained relationships with the civic community.

Although Utrecht's political authorities never overcame their anxiety about the influx of incoming priests, from 1630 onwards they did begin to bestow public recognition on Catholic priests by allowing them to stay or take up residence in their city. The present survey of the city council minutes, a study which has before never been undertaken systematically,²⁵ reveals that sixty-four priests were publicly tolerated so as to stay or reside in Utrecht from 1630 to 1672 (Appendix 2). This statistic is all the more remarkable in view of the low number of legal proceedings undertaken against Catholic priests during that same period (sixteen cases: Graphs 2 and 3).

Only two cases have been identified in which priests were refused a permit to stay or reside in Utrecht. In 1650, when Henrick Hoeffslach, a priest working in Huissen, requested permission from the magistrates to stay in Utrecht for a month, his request was denied by the sheriff and the burgomasters.²⁶ In 1656, however, the magistrates did allow him a three-week stay (Appendix 2). In the other case, in 1651, an heir of the late Willem van Pylsweert asked the city council to allow Wachtelaer, who had been sentenced to banishment from the city in 1640 {19}, to return to Utrecht to

22 HUA, SAIL, 121-14, 15 September 1630. On Van Medenblick in Leiden, see Kooi, *Liberty and Religion*, p. 192. Van Medenblick authored Catholic hymns in Dutch under the pseudonym Rumoldus Batavus. Leeuwen, *Hemelse voorbeelden*, pp. 46-47, 134, 139, 162; Lenarduzzi, *De belevingswereld*, pp. 226, 375; Idem, 'Subcultuur en tegencultuur', pp. 102, 264.

23 HUA, SAIL, 121-14, 20 September 1630; HUA, VSOKN, 112, 20 September 1630: 'Vranckrijck, Duytslandt and andere Neutrale Landen'.

24 Hallebeek, 'Godsdienst(on)vrijheid', p. 125; Ven, 'De driehoek', pp. 36-37.

25 A list of tolerated priests was transcribed only for the period from 1657 to 1658 in Muller, 'Lijst van Roomsche-Katholieke priesters'.

26 HUA, SAIL, 121-23, 17 June 1650.

dispose of the property of the deceased, but in vain.²⁷ Some priests were given a permit on multiple occasions. Most notable in this regard are Balthasar van de Kemp from Emmerich <38> and Willem (de) Munter from Dordrecht <59>, who both received permission no fewer than six times (Appendix 2). Others extended their permit prior to expiration. For example, although Henrick van Domselaer was initially permitted to stay in Utrecht for only twelve days, in the end he was granted three extensions allowing him to stay there for no fewer than 145 days <37> (Appendix 2). In four other cases, the magistracy explicitly noted that the permit could not be extended, even though three of the four priests in question did manage to obtain a new permit at a later date.²⁸ The length of stay for those priests ranged from three days for Cornelis van der Hout <53>, who obtained three-day permits no fewer than four times within two years, to an indefinite stay (Appendix 2). Seven priests received permission for an indefinite stay in Utrecht (until cancellation of the permit),²⁹ while Willem van Cruysbergen, a priest in IJsselstein, was given permission to visit Utrecht whenever he needed to <88> (Appendix 2).

The recognized priests came from diverse places where they regularly resided and/or officially served the congregation, at least on paper. While the regular workplaces are unknown for fifteen of the sixty-four priests,³⁰ it proved possible to track down the place(s) of appointment for the remaining forty-nine priests. Three of them once moved from one place to another.³¹ Their workplaces can be roughly divided into three regions, namely the Northern Netherlands (twenty-six priests, or 50% of the fifty-two priests),³² north-western Germany (sixteen priests, 30.8%),³³ and the Southern Netherlands (ten priests, 19.2%).³⁴ A significant number of incoming clerics from the latter two Catholic regions were also born in the Northern Netherlands.

How, then, did Utrecht's political authorities apply the governing strategy of toleration in regard to Catholic priests, and how can this be mapped?

27 HUA, SAI, 121-23, 20 March 1651. During his lifetime, Van Pylsweert was connived as a trustee of St Barbara and St Laurens Hospice and St Anthony Hospice, in spite of his Catholic faith. HUA, BAI, 1254, 8 January 1625; HUA, BAI, 1258, *passim* in 1622-1625; HUA, BAI, 1987-1, *passim* in 1620-1626.

28 <33a> <36> <38a> <63b> in Appendix 2.

29 <31> <33b> <38f> <64> <89> <91> <94> in Appendix 2.

30 <32> <36> <37> <40> <53> <58> <64> <66> <78> <86> <87> <89> <90> <93> <94> in Appendix 2.

31 <46> <51> <72> in Appendix 2.

32 <31> <39> <41> <42> <43> <44> <46ab> <47> <49> <50> <51abd> <51c> <57> <59> <61> <63> <67> <70> <71> <72d> <76> <77> <82> <84> <88> <92> in Appendix 2.

33 <35> <38> <45> <46cd> <54> <55> <56> <60> <65> <68> <69> <72abc> <73> <80> <83> <85> in Appendix 2.

34 <33> <34> <48> <52> <62> <74> <75> <79> <81> <91> in Appendix 2.

In the context of the Eighty Years' War, the politico-religious authorities represented the Catholic clergy as 'enemies' who only brought harm to the soil of the Protestant Republic. In 1636 the Voetian city council drew up a list of the priests who had contravened the edicts, which, however, seems to have been lost.³⁵ Shortly before the raid on the house of Hendrica van Duivenvoorde, where Rovenius was staying, the political authorities toughened the regulations against priests. The 1639 edict prescribed that the Catholic priests who had come to Utrecht after 1622 were to leave, regardless of birthplace, and that the priests who had been living there from before 1622 were once again to register their name and address with the magistracy. Those who were 'tolerated' were required to live in observance of the edicts, which forbade them from serving the congregation as priests.³⁶ Furthermore, in 1639 the city council decided to offer a premium to anyone who caught a Catholic priest (f. (florins) 150 per person).³⁷ Such legislation formed the context in which five Catholic clerics, including Wachtelaer, were prosecuted in 1640 {18} {19} {20} {21} {22} (Appendix 1).

Despite the prohibitions and the trials, a steady stream of priests kept coming to Utrecht from surrounding Catholic territories. In 1643, for instance, the magistrates were informed that a secular priest or Jesuit, who had come from Brabant to Utrecht and was staying in the house of a certain 'Mr Gouda', was collecting money for the clergy in 'Enemy Places'. It cannot be determined whether this Mr Gouda was the registered Jesuit and canon of St Pieter named Jacobus de Gouda (1578–1643) <10>, who had been working in Utrecht since 1613. In any case, judicial officers rushed to the house, but only found the priest's clerical clothing.³⁸ In 1646 the Voetian consistory reported that a monk called Bernardus Bertramus had come from Cologne and visited a Reformed church in Utrecht. The consistory noted that, although the priest had not registered with the magistracy, he was nevertheless staying in the city at the house of a brewer called Vos, where 'Papists' and *klopjes* gathered for their religion.³⁹

As the end of the war approached, the Reformed consistory pushed the political authorities to buckle down on Catholic priests, complaining about the 'public residences' of priests, Jesuits, and *klopjes*, to the 'detriment of

35 HUA, SAII, 121-17, 7 January, 1 February 1636.

36 *G.P.U.*, I, pp. 395–96.

37 HUA, SAII, 121-18, 6 May 1639. See also the provincial edicts issued in 1639 and 1644 in *G.P.U.*, I, pp. 395–97.

38 HUA, SAII, 121-20, 14 November 1643: 'heer Gouda' and 'Vyanden Landen'. On Jacobus de Gouda, see Hoeck, *Schets*, p. 72.

39 HUA, KR, 5, 29 June 1646.

the church of God and the annoyance of the [Reformed] Community'.⁴⁰ The consistory's petition to the city council, submitted in 1648, maintained that if the political authorities showed 'connivance' to Catholicism, which contradicted 'Christian doctrine', God's wrath would fall on all the lands, as it had on the Old Testament Israelites. It insisted that Catholics had been exercising a baneful influence on the city, partly by their religious practices and partly by the agitations of the priests who rejoiced at the successes of the Catholic cause and lamented the prosperity of the Reformed Republic. As concrete countermeasures, the Voetian consistory proposed the establishment of bounties for information not only on priests, but also participants in Catholic assemblies as well as those who intentionally concealed the names of suspected priests and laypeople. Since, as the consistory noted, Catholic priests were known to be 'boldly' presiding over 'conventicles', it requested the city council to nullify the stay/residence permits given to the priests.⁴¹

Yet, the political authorities in Utrecht did not fully adopt these anti-Catholic proposals from the public church. According to De la Torre's mission report to Rome from 1638, the city of Utrecht had twenty-six secular priests, including Wachtelaer, three Jesuits, two Dominicans, and one Augustinian, in addition to seven priests working in the surrounding villages.⁴² Again, the estimated number of Catholic priests in Utrecht was far higher than that of the Reformed ministers, who amounted to only seven at that time.⁴³ From 1630 to 1648, fourteen priests were publicly recognized for permanent or temporary residence in Utrecht (Appendix 2), even though this same period saw the most (twelve) legal procedures against Catholic clerics among the sixteen total cases against them between 1620 and 1672 (Appendix 1). From 1630 to 1648 three priests were given permanent residence in Utrecht: Van Medenblick in 1630 <31>, Herman van Honthorst in 1637 <33b>, and Servaes van der Nypoort in 1648 <41c> (Appendix 2). After receiving their permit, however, the first two were sentenced to banishment from the city in the wake of lawsuits filed against them: Van Medenblick in 1631 {11} and Van Honthorst in 1641 {25} (Appendix 1). Together with two other priests called 'Aegid[ius] de Ridder [van Groenesteyn]' and 'unknown Duyck', Van Honthorst had once been banished in 1638 by the city council without the judgement of the city court.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, it remains remarkable that

40 HUA, SAII, 121-20, 18 May 1646; HUA, SAII, 121-21, 19 May 1646: 'publicque inwoningen' and 'nadeel van Godes kercke ende ergernisse vande Gemeente'.

41 HUA, KR, 5, 28 February 1648: 'conventie' and 'Christelycke leere'.

42 Rogier, *Geschiedenis*, II, p. 389.

43 Duker, *Gisbertus Voetius*, III, pp. 108-10; Lieburg, *De Nadere Reformatie*, p. 151.

44 HUA, SAII 121-18, 6 August 1638.

Catholic priests were publicly permitted to stay or reside in Utrecht despite increasing pressure from the Voetian consistory during the last phase of the Eighty Years' War.

Following the Peace of Münster (1648) and the Great Assembly (1651), the Voetian consistory urged Utrecht's magistrates to take more effective action against Catholics. According to the Reformed consistory, the growing 'boldness of Papists' resulted from the 'free and rather public residence' of priests, who dared to live in the city openly in the view of others as if they enjoyed the freedom to live as Catholic ecclesiastics with no restrictions.⁴⁵ Indeed, the city council was informed about a priest called Hattem who was said to be living in a house in Nieuwstraat without a stay/residence permit.⁴⁶ The magistrates and the city court therefore decided to be more diligent in overseeing the Jesuits coming into Utrecht from the Habsburg Netherlands, which no longer represented official 'enemy territory'.⁴⁷ In several petitions written in the 1650s and the 1660s, the Reformed Church requested the political authorities to be more stringent in their observation of the anti-Catholic edicts concerning the clergy.⁴⁸ Among such petitions from the public church, a particularly aggressive example was the aforementioned long petition which the synod of Utrecht directed to the Provincial States in 1655/56. It justified the withholding of 'free and public residence and stay in the province of Utrecht' to all the priests and *kloppjes*, whom it deemed harmful to the community because of their confessional doctrines and political (dis)loyalties. The 'kingdom of the Antichrist' will only be hindered and the 'Kingdom of our Saviour Christ' will only prosper if the 'grievous wolves', that is, Catholic priests and *kloppjes*, are dispelled. In particular, so the petition claimed, priests and *kloppjes* thought that 'the Monarchy and power of the Pope is infallible and absolute, which may be spoken against by no one', and they placed this absolute authority 'above all the churches and polities, above all the Kings and Princes'. Hence, according to the synod, the Catholic clergy insisted that they were 'free and exempt' from 'obedience to their lawful Governments'. The petition also noted the toleration which the political authorities had been bestowing upon clerics who 'from ancient times have been living inside these lands only under the express condition [...] that they act and order

45 HUA, KR, 5, 15 October 1649: 'vrij ende genoch openbaer wonen'.

46 HUA, SAIL, 121-23, 20 November 1648.

47 HUA, SAIL, 121-25, 31 October 1653.

48 HUA, KR, 5, 2 December 1650 (*Remonstrantie der E. Kerkenraedt*); HUA, KR, 6, 3 April 1654, 23 March 1657; KR, 8, 26 January 1663, 4 September 1665; HUA, SAIL, 121-25, 10 April 1654; HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 23 March 1657.

themselves' after the anti-Catholic edicts. In spite of the oaths sworn by tolerated priests, they behaved 'as if they were given privilege to enter here in the land in [large] numbers without fear, if only they give their names', streaming to cities and villages like 'locusts' in order 'to practise their Roman idolatry'. Again, this calls to mind the bold activities undertaken by Rovenius, the self-styled 'bishop of Utrecht', including the ordination of priests and shadow-canon. Since tolerated priests were violating their oaths and contravening the edicts, so the synod of Utrecht continued, they ought to be 'irrevocably' deprived of 'the toleration and connivances that had been bestowed [on them]'.⁴⁹

Utrecht's magistrates seemed to be unwilling, however, to realize the confessionalizing agenda of the Reformed Church and abolish the toleration extended to the Catholic clergy. According to De la Torre's 1656 mission report, around thirty secular priests were living inside the Utrecht city walls, four secular priests in the suburbs, as well as two Jesuits, two Dominicans, two Augustinians, one Franciscan, and one Carmelite within the city walls.⁵⁰ Judging from this report at least, the number of priests working in Utrecht seems still to have been growing. In 1665 the Reformed consistory lamented that the ratio of Catholic priests to Reformed ministers was no less than three or four to one.⁵¹ This hardly seems an exaggeration, since only thirteen ministers were working in the city at the time.⁵² Moreover, between 1649 and 1672 a total of fifty-two priests were publicly tolerated, allowing them to stay or reside in Utrecht (Appendix 2). During this period, Utrecht's magistrates, including Republicans, therefore bestowed public recognition upon Catholic priests, permitting them to stay or reside in the city, while on the theoretical level of legislation they promulgated harsh anti-Catholic edicts under pressure from the Voetian consistory, especially during the 1650s. Five priests were permitted to stay in Utrecht indefinitely, and they

49 HUA, VBB, 139, probably in 1655 or 1656: 'vrije ende publijcke wooninghe ende verblijf inde Provincie van Utrecht', 'rycke des Antichrists', 'Rycke onses Salichmakers Christi', 'sware wolven', 'de Monarchie ende macht des Paus onfeylbaer ende absoluyt is, die van niemant en mach tegen gesproken worden', 'boven alle kercken en politien, boven alle Coningen en Princen', 'vrij ende exempt', 'gehoorsaemheyte aen haer wetten Overicheden', 'van outs binnen dese landen woonachtich sijn geweest alleen onder de expresse conditien [...] dat se haer sullen gedragen ende reguleren', 'als off haer een privilegie ware gegeven, om sonder eenige vreesse met meenichten hier int lant te come, alsse maer slechts hare namen bekend maken', 'sprinckhanen', 'haeren Roomschen Afgoden-dienst plegen', 'onwedersprekelick', and 'hare gepretendeerde tolerantie ende conniventien'.

50 Rogier, *Geschiedenis*, II, p. 392.

51 HUA, KR, 8, 30 June 1665.

52 Duker, *Gisbertus Voetius*, III, pp. 108–22; Lieburg, *De Nadere Reformatie*, p. 151.

seem never to have been deprived of this right.⁵³ Van Cruysbergen <88> was given permission to visit Utrecht whenever he needed to (Appendix 2). And even though the Reformed consistory suspected that Josephus van der Steen, a Carmelite in Brabant, would cause ‘considerable harm’,⁵⁴ the city council still gave him permission to stay with a nobleman named Wttenhove in Neerlangbroek for a year and a half <79> (Appendix 2). Moreover, although Cornelis van der Hout was incarcerated and then freed on bail (f. 750) in 1641 {24}, he was given permits for a three-day stay on four different occasions in 1653 and 1654 <53> (Appendices 1 and 2). Between the Peace of Münster (1648) and the beginning of the French occupation (1672), only four legal procedures were initiated against priests, namely Robert Redinge in 1653 {66}, Anthonis de Rhode (Rode) in 1655 {73}, Cornelis Duck {82} – whose permit for staying in the city had expired <43> – in 1663, and Aloysius Ballast {88} in 1666. Remarkably, De Rhode would be given permission to stay in Utrecht a month after a lawsuit against him <58> (Appendices 1 and 2). Especially in the 1660s, Catholic priests seem to have benefited from the overwhelmingly Republican composition of the city council and/or its antagonistic relationship with the Voetian consistory.

This does not mean, however, that the Republican magistrates stopped their surveillance of the Catholic clergy. In 1665 they compiled a list of nineteen priests ‘who live and hold fixed residence here’ (Appendix 3).⁵⁵ Among the listed priests, seven were Utrecht natives,⁵⁶ including Abraham van Brienen <001>, the vicar general and a pastor of the clandestine church of St Gertrudis in Mariahoek; Servaes van der Nypoort <002>, a secular priest at the same church; and Cornelis van Velthuysen (c. 1632–1710) <012>, a secular priest at the clandestine church of St Servaas Onder de Linden (Appendix 3).⁵⁷ The name Van der Nypoort <002>, who had been given permission in 1648 to stay in Utrecht indefinitely until cancellation of his permit <41c>,⁵⁸ occurs on the list with the note that he was ‘free’ (*vrij*) in Utrecht. A certain Reinier <007> was also described as free in Utrecht on

53 <38f> <64> <89> <91> <94> in Appendix 2.

54 HUA, KR, 7, 24 October 1659.

55 HUA, SAIL, 616, probably in 1665 (Hofman, ‘Allerlei’, pp. 187–89): ‘die alhier wonen en vaste domicilie houden’.

56 <001> <002> <006> <012> <013> <014> <015> in Appendix 3.

57 On Van Brienen, see also Ackermans, *Herders*, passim, especially p. 331; Ven, ‘De driehoek’, pp. 52–53; 56, 72–74, 80. On Van der Nypoort, see also Ackermans, *Herders*, pp. 407–8; Kruijff, *Miraculeus bewaard*, pp. 148–52, 198, 261, 270, 272–73; Lenarduzzi, ‘Subcultuur en tegencultuur’, pp. 198, 246; Schilfgaarde, ‘d’Everdinge van der Nypoort’, col. 149. On Van Velthuysen, see also Ackermans, *Herders*, p. 458.

58 HUA, SAIL, 121–22, 23 May 1648.

the list, although his name cannot be found among the tolerated priests in the minutes of the city council. This serves to confirm that Van der Nypoot was the only one among the nineteen priests to be given public recognition for stay or residence in Utrecht. Although the city council submitted a list of priests – probably the same one – to the sheriff in July 1665,⁵⁹ a Jesuit called Aloysius Ballast <010> is the only priest reported to have been arrested and detained in the city's jail before the French occupation {88}.⁶⁰ Van Brien en <001> and another Jesuit, Lambert van Dilsen (1619–1679) <009>, appear as defendants in the legal records of the city court, but only after the end of the French occupation.⁶¹ Hence, the list of clerics drawn up in 1665 shows that eighteen out of the nineteen priests, with Ballast being the only exception, benefited from non-public connivance allowing them to live in Utrecht at least until 1672, even though the politico-judicial authorities knew of their existence and in some cases were even aware of where they lived. In 1670 the consistory once again explained to the city council that Catholics, and ecclesiastics in particular, were a danger to the Dutch Republic. According to its petition, Catholic priests were trying to 'establish [...] an authority within the authority' and 'to tear subjects, against the law of all peoples, away from obedience to their lawful Government'.⁶² In spite of this, the Republican magistrates continued to deploy the governing strategy of toleration in regard to the clergy.

From the perspective of the Reformed confessionalization agenda, Catholic priests undoubtedly represented the deadliest enemies against the *corpus christianum*, due not only to their confessional doctrines, but also their political inclination. The public church's fear was not groundless, since Catholic clerics always far outnumbered Reformed ministers in Utrecht, steadily streaming to the city like a swarm of 'locusts'. As the episcopal city turned into centre of the Holland Mission, Utrecht attracted many Catholic ecclesiastics. On the level of principle, the legislation of the political authorities prohibited priests from exercising their pastoral duties

59 HUA, SAI, 121-27, 24 July 1665.

60 The *criminele stukken* do not preserve any information on this case, while the *criminele sententiën* for the period between 1658 and 1669 are lost. The Jesuit Norbertus Aerts's *Acta Missionis Hollandicae* reported that Ballast was arrested in Utrecht {88}. Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 122–23; Hoeck, *Schets*, p. 73.

61 For the legal case concerning Van Brien en, see HUA, SAI, 616, 6 January 1675 (Hofman, 'Allerlei', pp. 192–95). For the Van Dilsen case, see HUA, SAI, 2236-5, 5 January 1676; HUA, SAI, 2244-135, 1, 3, 4, 8, 15, 17, 21 December 1675.

62 HUA, KR, 9, 6 June 1670: 'stabilierende [...] een imperium in imperio' and 'de onderdanen tegen het recht aller volcken aftrekkende van de gehoorsaemh[eijt] haerder wettige Overheden'. See also *ibidem*, 20 June 1670; HUA, SAI, 121-28, 20 June 1670.

to the city's Catholic population. Nevertheless, in practice, they publicly recognized stay/residence permits for a significant number of priests and non-publicly connived at the stay/residence of other clerics in Utrecht. Many of the recognized priests did provide pastoral care to Utrecht's Catholics, breaking the oaths they had sworn when they obtained their permits. Indeed, the politico-judicial authorities prosecuted some of those tolerated priests for their illegal clerical activities. At the same time, they seem to have acknowledged, tacitly at least, that the city's Catholic inhabitants required pastoral care, and therefore connived at the clerical activities of many other tolerated priests during their stay or residence in the city. Against the public church's powerful wish for Reformed confessionalization, the Utrecht magistracy both officially recognized and unofficially connived at the presence of the Catholic clergy in the city.

2.2. Women

Like the priests who had held their benefices in Utrecht from before 1580, existing nuns and beguines were permitted to enjoy their income from the ecclesiastical properties on the condition that they observe the anti-Catholic edicts, but were forbidden to recruit new members.⁶³ Although this regulation seems not to have been strictly observed for some forty years after the outlawing of Catholicism, the Knighthood, which possessed five monasteries and convents, declared in 1621 that Catholic noblewomen were not to be recommended or admitted to the monasteries or convents any longer.⁶⁴ The city council was also keen on regulating former religious women who were still living in Utrecht.⁶⁵ In 1621 the city began selling houses in the Beguinage and in 1644 it decided to sell all the houses there, including those in which beguines were still living. However, the magistrates at the same time declared that six remaining beguines who were forced to move from the Beguinage would be accommodated with a rent-free, 'comfortable home'.⁶⁶ Nuns and beguines in Utrecht were therefore treated in a somewhat respectable manner by the Reformed government. But because they were prohibited from accepting new members, communities of nuns and beguines were destined to die out at some point in the future.

63 Hulzen, *Utrechtse kloosters*, p. 95.

64 Geraerts, *Patrons*, p. 110; Kalveen, 'De vijf adellijke vrouwenkloosters', p. 164.

65 E.g., HUA, SAI, 121-10, 16 August 1624; HUA, SAI, 121-15, 29 August 1631.

66 HUA, SAI, 121-8, 20 August 1621; HUA, SAI, 121-20, 12 February 1644: 'bequame woninge'.

This did not, however, mean the end of the role of women in rehabilitating the Catholic community. Rather, women became more important than ever before, by choosing another (semi-)religious vocation, namely that of *klopje*. These unmarried women or widows, many of whom came from well-to-do families, assisted priests, cared for the poor, educated children, distributed liturgical books, and won wavering souls over to the Catholic faith.⁶⁷ While the Catholic Church in the Northern Netherlands suffered from a chronic lack of priests (c. 400 priests in 1645, 508 in 1668, and 466 in 1701),⁶⁸ the number of *klopjes* living in the Dutch Republic in the 1690s is estimated to have been around 4,800, of whom a remarkable number of around 565 are reported to have been living in the city of Utrecht.⁶⁹ Some of the contemporary testimonies explicitly refer to the number of *klopjes* in Utrecht during the period under study. Around 1630 the converted former priest Francisci alleged that more than 1,000 *klopjes* were living in Utrecht.⁷⁰ Another, seemingly more plausible, estimate was made by Apostolic Vicar Johannes van Neercassel, who set the number of Utrecht's *klopjes* in 1662 at 500.⁷¹

In the eyes of passerby, *klopjes* manifested themselves as distinctive women of the Catholic faith. The Reformed consistory in Utrecht described *klopjes* and their activities as follows: numerous *klopjes* with 'sufficiently distinct and noticeable' clothing daily walked through public streets to visit Catholic and even Reformed homes, to practise 'superstitions' and to instruct children in Catholic catechisms.⁷² Although there were no official rules specifying particular clothing, *klopjes* tended to wear a 'uniform' characterized by modesty even in public spaces, enabling not only Catholics but also Protestants to identify them as Catholic *klopjes* (Fig. 2). Even if many *klopjes* originated from wealthy families, they were eager to put their Catholic piety on public display by their humble clothing, partly realizing their dream of leading an officially forbidden monastic life in the Protestant Republic. Given that priests were inclined to hide their religious vocation in public, it is remarkable that *klopjes* intentionally manifested their Catholic

67 On the *klopjes*, see Abels, *Tussen sloer en heilige*; Kooi, 'Catholic Women'; Monteiro, *Geestelijke maagden*; Schulte van Kessel, *Geest en vlees*; Spaans, *De Levens*; Theissing, 'Over *klopjes* en *kwezels*'; Verheggen, *Beelden*, passim; Watson, 'The Jesuitesses'.

68 Spiertz, 'De katholieke geestelijke leiders', p. 20.

69 Monteiro, *Geestelijke maagden*, pp. 51–56, 351–52.

70 HUA, OBC, 99; HUA, SAI, 2244–86, n.d.; Muller, 'Getuigenis', p. 242.

71 Brom, 'Neerkassels bestuur', p. 183 (28 November 1662).

72 HUA, KR, 9, 6 June 1670 'genoegsaem onderscheyden en gesignaseert'. See also *ibidem*, 20 June 1670; HUA, SAI, 121–28, 20 June 1670.



Fig. 2 Jacob de Man, Portrait of a klopje, c. 1680, parchment, 11.1 x 7.7 cm, Museum Catharijneconvent, Utrecht, photograph by Ruben de Heer

piety in public by openly wearing their uniform of piety and externally displaying their Catholic faith in spite of official prohibition.⁷³

The politico-religious authorities in Utrecht acknowledged how important Catholic women, including *klopjes*, were for the confessional community of 'Papists', how dangerous they were for the public order of the Reformed city. The large number of *klopjes* with identifiable clothes inevitably caught the attention of the politico-religious authorities and Protestant residents. Many edicts issued by the political authorities and petitions submitted by the public church listed *klopjes* together with the priests among the bitter enemies of the Protestant cause. For example, the 1641 edict claimed that there were many 'unmarried Women (whom people call *Klopsusteren* or *Kloppen*)' living in the Republic, who harmed the 'public tranquillity of these Lands' and taught people numerous 'Popish Superstitions'.⁷⁴ Similarly, in 1646 the Reformed consistory insisted that the 'public residences' of priests and *klopjes*, openly known to Protestants, were to the 'detriment of the church of God and the annoyance of the [Reformed] Community'.⁷⁵ In 1655/56 the Reformed synod of Utrecht urged the Provincial States to deny all priests and *klopjes* 'free and public residence and stay in the province of Utrecht'.⁷⁶ After receiving several petitions from the public church for the stricter regulation of *klopjes*, the Provincial States of Utrecht issued an edict in 1655.⁷⁷ According to this edict, the political authorities had learned that Catholic assemblies were being communally held on a daily basis by those who were called *Quesels, Jesuiterssen, Geestelyke dogters, Klop-susteren, or Kloppen*, to the detriment of 'public tranquillity'. The States ordered the *klopjes* originating from outside Utrecht to leave the city within four weeks, while requiring native-born *klopjes* to register with the magistracy within the same span of time, under penalty of confiscation of their citizenship.⁷⁸ In 1661 the city council petitioned the Provincial States to promulgate a severer edict prohibiting citizens from becoming *klopjes*, but in vain.⁷⁹ The

73 Lenarduzzi, *De belevingswereld*, pp. 150–58; Idem, 'Subcultuur en tegencultuur', pp. 184–90.

74 *G.P.U.*, I, p. 398 (30 August 1641): 'ongehouwe Vrouwspooronen (die men Klopsusteren of Kloppen noemt)', 'gemeene ruste deser Landen', and 'Paapsche Superstitien'.

75 HUA, KR, 5, 18 May 1646; HUA, SAI, 121-21, 19 May 1646: 'publicque inwoningen' and 'nadeel van Godes kercke ende ergernisse vande Gemeente'.

76 HUA, VBB, 139, probably in 1655 or 1656: 'vrije ende publijcke wooninghe ende verblijf inde Provincie van Utrecht'. For comparable complaints from the public church about the *klopjes*, see also HUA, KR, 5, 2 December 1650; HUA, KR, 8, 4 September 1665.

77 HUA, KR, 6, 3 April 1654; HUA, SAI, 121-25, 10 April 1654, 12 June 1655; HUA, SAI, 121-26, 26 November 1655.

78 *G.P.U.*, III, p. 469 (28 November 1655): 'gemeene ruste'.

79 HUA, KR, 8, 26 August 1661.

regulations concerning *klopjes* therefore paralleled the rules against priests, not only in the obligation of registration but also in the condition under which their presence could be tolerated – that is, priests and *klopjes* with ties to the civic community of Utrecht could be tolerated to stay in the city, but social outsiders were to be banished immediately. Unfortunately, no list of registered *klopjes* survives, leaving it unclear whether the registrations functioned in practice.

How, then, did Utrecht's Catholic women contribute to Catholic survival, finding ways to thwart the Reformed confessionalization efforts? And to what extent did the political authorities tolerate their activities? Three types of these women's activities merit further examination here: assistance at religious services presided by priests, catechism education for children, and financial support for the confessional community.

Time and again the Reformed consistory complained about *klopjes* and other Catholic women partaking in Catholic sacraments and rituals, including (re-)baptism⁸⁰ and the lighting of candles for the dead.⁸¹ In some legal cases, interrogation or witness reports noted the presence of *klopjes* in the incidents investigated by judicial officers. For instance, Jan Jansz van Soest, living in St Job Hospice, testified as witness in 1634 that some women, seemingly including one *klopje*, together with the registered priest Paulus van Geresteyn <16>, were leading a number of Catholics to St Job Church adjacent to the hospice {12}.⁸² According to an interrogee named Jan Jansz van Munster, numerous *klopjes* were daily visiting Joannes Boshouwer, who faced accusations of insulting the Reformed Church {26}.⁸³ In 1661 the Voetian consistory ordered its church members to keep a watch on *klopjes* to find out why they were knocking (*kloppen* in Dutch) on the doors of Catholic houses. Several months later, the consistory learned that they were doing so to notify Catholics of their assemblies, and informed the militia captains and sheriffs of these practices.⁸⁴ In addition, a significant number of Catholic women with an elevated social status, no doubt including *klopjes*, hosted Catholic assemblies and sheltered priests in their private homes, some of which were transformed into clandestine churches. The 1665 investigation report of the city court noted that *klopjes* were living together, some of them with priests, especially on Mariahoek, Nieuwegracht, and Lollestraat, all places with

80 HUA, KR, 5, 20 April 1646.

81 Ibidem, 27 January 1651.

82 HUA, SAI, 2244-80, 30 January 1635.

83 HUA, SAI, 2244-89, 15 October 1641.

84 HUA, KR, 8, 21 October 1661, 3 March 1662.

Catholic clandestine churches in the vicinity.⁸⁵ In Mariahoek in particular, *klopjes* were living together in a 'beguinage-way', according to the consistory.⁸⁶ Indeed, in thirty-eight of the seventy-one legal cases of Catholic house gatherings in Utrecht (53.5%), the illegal assembly was discovered in the house of a Catholic woman.⁸⁷ Though these cases did make their way to the courts, one may safely assume that on many other occasions the politico-judicial authorities in practice connived at the participation of Catholic women in the exercise of the Catholic faith, which had been outlawed.

Although all the schoolmasters and mistresses of *bijtscholen* were required to confess the Reformed faith in seventeenth-century Utrecht, Catholics, and female Catholics in particular, were quite active in teaching children. Around 1630 the converted former priest Francisci testified that numerous *klopjes* were giving catechism lessons to children in Utrecht using their own question-and-answer manuals.⁸⁸ At the installation of school superintendents in 1638, the city council stressed their duty to monitor needlewomen – presumably *klopjes* – who were holding schools in their houses, 'under the pretext of teaching crafts, reading or writing'.⁸⁹ The anti-Catholic edict of 1639 also prohibited *klopjes* from luring people to 'Popery'.⁹⁰ Indeed, in 1649 the consistory learned that some Catholic women, especially Chrijsella Fermer and two *klopjes* called Lysbeth and Emmerens living on Achter Clarenburg, were luring children to the Catholic faith through their teachings.⁹¹ The suburbs of Weerd and Tollesteeg were also known to the Reformed consistory for the educational activities of the *klopjes*.⁹² At times the consistory informed the school superintendents about schoolmasters and mistresses who had not signed the canons of the Synod of Dordrecht,⁹³ and required them to submit a list of their names.⁹⁴ A copy of the list from 1663 contains some seventy names of schoolmasters

85 HUA, SAI, 616, probably in 1665 (Hofman, 'Allerlei', pp. 187–89).

86 HUA, KR, 8, 2 June 1662: 'begijn-hoff-wijse'.

87 {27} {31} {32} {34} {37} {40} {42} {44} {53} {55} {57} {58} {60} {61} {68} {70} {72} {75} {76} {77} {78} {83} {84} {85} {86} {90} {91} {92} {93} {94} {95} {98} {99} {100} {101} {102} {103} {105} in Appendix 1.

88 HUA, OBC, 99; HUA, SAI, 2244-86, n.d.; Muller, 'Getuigenis', p. 242: 'vraegboeckjens'.

89 HUA, SAI, 121-18, 13 August 1638: 'naaysters' and 'onder het deksel van het leeren van handwercken, mede leeren lesen ofte schryven'.

90 *G.P.U.*, I, p. 396 (9 April 1639).

91 HUA, KR, 5, 10, 17 December 1649; HUA, SAI, 121-23, 17, 19 December 1649.

92 HUA, KR, 5, 12, 28 October 1650; HUA, KR, 7, 19 December 1659; HUA, SAI, 121-23, 14 October 1650.

93 HUA, KR, 5, 2 April 1649.

94 HUA, KR, 8, 19, 26 August, 2 September 1661.

and mistresses, whose confessional affiliation in many cases nevertheless remains unknown.⁹⁵ Among them, the noblewoman Lemeer living on Domkerkhof is considered to have been a later owner of the Catholic school in which Arnoldus Buchelius discovered forty girls being taught in 1624.⁹⁶

The educational activities of Catholic women, especially *klopjes*, were praised by Catholics and denounced by the Reformed consistory. Some Catholic priests recognized the importance of *klopjes* in education, particularly for girls. For instance, according to a book written by the secular Utrecht priest Johannes Lindeborn (1614) (*In matrimonii sacramentum notae catecheticae annotatae*, 1675), the *klopjes* were the reason why Dutch girls had a better chance at a Catholic education than boys.⁹⁷ Surprisingly enough, the teachings of *klopjes* at the elementary level attracted children of not only Catholic but also Reformed parents. Jan Jacob du Bois (1626–1663), the Reformed minister of the Walloon community, thus observed that some Catholic women were luring children to the Catholic religion through their education. As Du Bois saw the matter, the children themselves wanted to stay in the Reformed Church, but were forced by *klopjes* to practise the ‘superstitions’.⁹⁸ In 1652 the Reformed synod of Utrecht ordered Reformed parents not to send their children to ‘popish Schools or to the *kloppen*’.⁹⁹ Nevertheless, in 1664 the Reformed consistory was informed that a child, whose parents were both Reformed communicant members, was living with a *klopje*. The Voetian consistory attempted to bring this child to the public church with the aid of its Reformed friends.¹⁰⁰ The Reformed consistory took the matter of elementary education by Catholic women seriously, fearing the potential conversion of Reformed children to ‘Popery’. However, given that the aforementioned Catholic women were not prosecuted for their educational activities, it can be assumed that, in practice, the politico-judicial authorities non-publicly connived at their educational activities despite the existing prohibitions.

Why, then, did Utrecht’s magistrates in practice tolerate the schools run by Catholic women? One of the reasons may well relate to the high level of

95 HUA, Nederlandse Hervormde classis Utrecht, 265 (the list was transcribed in Booy, ‘Een stad vol scholen’, pp. 21–23).

96 Idem, *Kweekhoven*, p. 130.

97 Forclaz, *Catholiques*, p. 239. On Lindeborn and his devotional books for *klopjes*, see Monteiro, *Geestelijke maagden*, passim.

98 HUA, KR, 5, 10, 17 December 1649; HUA, SAII, 121–23, 17, 19 December 1649.

99 HUA, Nederlandse Hervormde classis Utrecht, 369, n.d. in 1652: ‘paepsche Schoolen, of bij de kloppen’.

100 HUA, KR, 8, 6 June 1664.

education they offered. In this regard, a case involving a French-speaking *klopper* named Anna Maria de Cock, which was repeatedly discussed by the Reformed consistory between 1657 and 1664, is particularly interesting. According to the minutes of the Voetian consistory from 1657, students in De Cock's school on Geertekerkhof were practising such 'vanities' as dance.¹⁰¹ One day she had her students perform a comedy, which presumably ridiculed the Reformed faith, causing 'public annoyance'. The consistory notified the city court of the incident, which responded by summoning De Cock who promised that she would never let the children play comedies again.¹⁰² But in 1658 she once again became embroiled in trouble with her Reformed neighbours. Although De Cock initially insisted that she had instructed the children in 'civic manners', after being pressed by Reformed communicant members in her quarter she finally confessed that she had taught Catholic children how to pray before the crucifix, in violation of the anti-Catholic edicts. However, she still insisted that she had only taught the Reformed children to read and write, and that she had no intention to convert them.¹⁰³ By the time her name reappears in the minutes of the Reformed consistory from 1659, she had moved from Geertekerkhof to Jeruzalemsteeg, probably in an effort to avoid further trouble with her former Reformed neighbours. Still, De Cock did not give up teaching and opened a school at her new address. According to the report of the school superintendents, she also sent some children to a Catholic school in Emmerich.¹⁰⁴ Upon the consistory's request, the city council forbade De Cock to open her school, but in vain.¹⁰⁵ In 1660 and 1661 it was revealed that numerous Reformed parents were sending their children to her school. Not only Catholic parents but also their Reformed counterparts therefore seem to have wanted to have their children taught at her school. While the Voetian consistory asked other Reformed members to persuade their co-religionists not to send their children to De Cock's school, the burgomaster also promised the consistory that her activities would be curtailed.¹⁰⁶ However, in 1664 De Cock could still be found teaching children at home. The school superintendents warned her that she had contravened the order, and the Reformed consistory petitioned the burgomasters to have her punished.¹⁰⁷ After this incident, De Cock's name cannot be found

101 HUA, KR, 6, 20 April 1657: 'ijdelheden'.

102 Ibidem, 31 August, 19 October 1657: 'publycke ergernisse'.

103 Ibidem, 26 March 1658: 'civile manieren'.

104 HUA, KR, 7 21 November, 5 December 1659.

105 Ibidem, 12, 19 December 1659; HUA, SAI, 121-26, 19 December 1659.

106 HUA, KR, 7, 27 February 1660; HUA, KR, 8, 12 August, 2 September, 14, 21 October 1661.

107 Ibidem, 14, 21, 28 March 1664.

in any further records, including consistory minutes and legal documents, presumably indicating that she ended up evading legal sanction. Considering the huge demand for her as an elementary teacher among parents regardless of their confessional affiliation, the political authorities in Utrecht may well have made the pragmatic decision to connive at De Cock's educational activities, despite the ardent appeals from the public church to pursue judicial action against her.

A significant number of *klopjes* and other Catholic women who were active in protecting the Catholic community belonged to elite families. The politico-religious authorities saw their extensive property as a potential danger to the Reformed public order in Utrecht. Although the 1622 edict had already prevented Catholics from transferring their property to Catholic priests and their ecclesiastical institutions in Spanish territories,¹⁰⁸ the 1644 edict targeted Catholic women in particular. It noted that Catholic widows, as well as childless or unmarried women, whether they were called *klopjes* or not, were closely tied to priests, by whom they were being coaxed into donating or bequeathing their property to the clergy or Catholic institutions because of their 'ignorance'. The edict therefore forbade Catholic women to administer their property.¹⁰⁹

Notwithstanding this edict from 1644, magistrates did publicly practise toleration in ninety-five cases between 1645 and 1670, allowing Catholic women to bequeath their property as they saw fit, though to date these cases have not been subjected to the analysis they deserve.¹¹⁰ Since the ninety-five total cases involve eight women who were given permission on two or more separate occasions, it means that a total of eighty-six Catholic women were given limited recognition for the bequeathing of their property. Chronologically speaking, most Catholic women were granted such permission during the 1650s; for example, in 1656 there were nine women who benefited from such toleration.¹¹¹ This seems remarkable, since that was the very decade in which the political authorities reinforced the general regulations on Catholics and also ordered citizen *klopjes* to register with the magistracy and outsider *klopjes* to leave the city.¹¹² Regardless of the tightening regulations on Catholic women, it once again appears that, in practice, the city magistrates, including Republicans, did not enforce the

108 *G.P.U.*, I, p. 399 (26 February 1622).

109 *Ibidem*, I, pp. 405–7 (17 December 1644): 'onverstand'. See also *ibidem*, I, 407–9 (8 May 1656).

110 HUA, SAII, 121-21 ~ 121-28, *passim*.

111 HUA, SAII, 121-26, 4 January, 31 March, 30 June, 11, 15, 28 August, 8 September, 6 October, 6 December 1656.

112 *G.P.U.*, III, p. 469 (28 November 1655).

edicts very strictly. After 1660 the number of Catholic women who were given public recognition for the bequeathing of their property decreased, and no further reference to such permission can be found in the city council minutes after 1671. Unfortunately, it cannot be determined whether Catholic women were from then on no longer publicly permitted to bequeath their property, or whether the city council simply stopped making a record of such permission in its minutes.

One notable feature of the ninety-five cases is that the magistrates failed to record any details about the intended beneficiary in by far the greatest number (eighty-eight) of instances. It is only in the case of the noblewoman Maria de Huyter that the city council explicitly noted that she did not intend to bequeath her property to Catholic priests or religious institutions.¹¹³ In the six remaining cases, the magistrates noted that the women had specified family members as their heirs, whose religious affiliations are not certain.¹¹⁴ The case involving Emerentiana van Pylsweert is noteworthy. In February 1654 Jan Beerntsz van Huijsen, living in Arnhem, informed the Utrecht city council that Van Pylsweert, his wife's sister, was indirectly trying to offer her property to Catholic clerics. He demanded that Utrecht's magistrates appoint a 'suitable' person to manage her property, to which the city council consented. Seven months later, however, the magistrates publicly gave recognition to Van Pylsweert for the bequeathing of her property without either referring to Van Huijsen's appeal or identifying the beneficiary of the bequest.¹¹⁵ Besides, no Catholic woman was charged with contravening the 1644 edict regarding the bequest of property without prior consent from the magistracy. Thus, it can be deduced that the magistracy also non-publicly connived at the bequests of many other Catholic women, tacitly permitting them to do so. Why, then, were the political authorities so reluctant to follow the 1644 regulation? Unfortunately, our primary sources do not allow us to present a clear answer to this question, although they do allow us to formulate a hypothesis. The elevated social status of those wealthy Catholic women, together with their financial contribution to the multi-religious civic community, especially its poor inhabitants, might have stimulated the magistrates to tolerate their property administration despite the danger they allegedly represented to the Reformed public order. This suggestion is supported, for instance, by the public recognition extended

113 HUA, SAI, 121-24, 2 May 1653.

114 HUA, SAI, 121-21, 16 June, 8 September, 3, 24 November 1645, 26 January 1646; HUA, SAI, 121-22, 2 November 1646; HUA, SAI, 121-25, 7 April 1645.

115 Ibidem, 27 February, 18 September 1654.

to Maria van Pallaes, who left her property to the indigent in Utrecht, not limiting the recipients to her co-religionists alone.¹¹⁶

Catholic women, and *klopjes* in particular, played an indispensable role for the Catholic community, whose masculine power in the public sphere was more or less curtailed under the Reformed regime.¹¹⁷ For this reason, the politico-religious authorities considered Catholic women as ‘dangerous’ to the public order as the clergy, and sometimes even more so. Although the illegal activities of the *klopjes* were a public secret, they did rather boldly walk the public streets in their identifiable clothes as evidence of the connivance shown to them. Catholic women therefore did not secretly retreat into the private, domestic sphere, but audaciously expressed their Catholic faith externally and openly in the public sphere. The politico-judicial authorities did indeed prosecute many Catholic women, who participated in illegal Catholic activities, including assemblies. Yet they seem to have connived at many others. Despite the repeated calls from the Reformed Church for rigid regulations against the educational activities of Catholic women, Utrecht’s magistrates non-publicly connived at many of their schools, in pragmatic consideration of the demand for their teaching among more than a few parents, irrespective of confessional affiliation. Moreover, despite the 1644 edict, they gave public recognition to numerous Catholic women, allowing them to bequeath their property as they saw fit, even though the Reformed had informed them of the potential danger that these women represented. The magistrates may well have been stimulated to public recognition of such administration of property by the elevated social status of these Catholic women and their potential socio-economic contribution to the multi-confessional civic community.

2.3. Public Office Holders

In 1633 the city council of Utrecht reaffirmed that every ‘position, office, or benefice on behalf of the City’ was to be occupied by Reformed members alone.¹¹⁸ But what were these ‘public offices’? By 1670, when

116 HUA, BAI, 692, 5 October 1649, 26 November 1662; HUA, BAI, 694, 5 October 1649; HUA, NOT, U021a022, 128, 16 July 1656; HUA, NOT, U021a024, 99, 3 August 1658; HUA, NOT, U021a025, 122, 12 August 1659; HUA, NOT, U021a026, 116, 31 August 1660.

117 Spaans, ‘Orphans and Students’, p. 196. For a similar yet slightly different account, which instead stresses ‘the privatization of Catholicism’ in the Dutch Republic (albeit not witnessed by the present author in the Utrecht case), see Kooi, ‘Catholic Women’, pp. 154, 156–57.

118 HUA, SAI, 121-16, 3 September 1633: ‘ampt, officie ofte beneficie van Stadts wegen’.

the public church demanded that the city restrict 'public services for the city' to Reformed people,¹¹⁹ the connotation of the term 'public office' had undergone significant change. Over the course of the seventeenth century, the political authorities in Utrecht gradually expanded the notion of public office from which Catholics were to be excluded, to the detriment of their honour in the civic community. Nevertheless, Catholic Utrechters continued to be tolerated for service in public offices, including political offices, judicial offices, military offices, as well as canons, social welfare offices, and suppliers.

The first target of Reformed attempts at the confessionalization of public offices, of course, concerned political offices. Ever since the 1580s, it had been stipulated that all the political offices at the municipal and provincial levels were to be filled by those who made 'public profession' of the 'true Christian Reformed Religion'.¹²⁰ As the renowned humanist Buchelius observed in the 1620s and 1630s, however, even though the Utrecht city council came to be dominated by the orthodox Reformed after Stadholder Maurice's coup in 1618, Catholics still managed to wield political influence at the provincial level.¹²¹ Indeed, in the Provincial States of Utrecht, Catholics could count on such co-religionists as Peter van Hardenbroek (1593–1658) and Willem van Zuylen van Nyevelt (d. 1639), who served as representatives for the Knighthood (the second estate). Van Hardenbroek in particular succeeded in carving out a brilliant political career for himself, serving as president to the Utrecht Knighthood and even as a member of the States General and the Council of State.¹²² Against this background, the city council protested against the appointment of Catholic noblemen to the Knighthood in 1641.¹²³ Likewise, the Voetian consistory still insisted as late as 1650 that all government offices ought to be held by Reformed, indicating that the reality of the situation had been otherwise.¹²⁴ All in all, it is evident that prominent members of the Catholic faith benefited from connivance, allowing them

119 HUA, KR, 9, 6 June 1670: 'publique stadsdiensten'. See also *ibidem*, 20 June 1670; HUA, SAI, 121–28, 20 June 1670.

120 E.g. *G.P.U.*, I, pp. 158–66, here especially p. 163: 'openbare professie' and 'ware Christelyke Gereformeerde Religie'.

121 Pollmann, *Religious Choice*, p. 152.

122 On Van Hardenbroek, see Faber, 'Dirck van Baburen'; Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 105–6; Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 38, 76, 87–88, 90, 92, 149, 263, 294; *Idem*, *Patrons*, pp. 35, 46, 79, 103–7, 109, 181–82, 268; *N.N.B.W.*, VI, col. 706–7. On Van Zuylen van Nyevelt, see *B.W.N.*, XIII, p. 394; Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 106, 125–26, 140–41, 156; Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', p. 281; *Idem*, *Patrons*, p. 80.

123 HUA, SAI, 121–19, 17, 19 February 1641.

124 HUA, KR, 5, 2 December 1650 (*Remonstrantie der E. Kerkenraedt*, p. 10).

to retain political power, for Utrecht at the provincial level in particular, at least until the mid-seventeenth century.

In the Utrecht suburbs Catholics did occupy public offices, including those of sheriff, secretary, and alderman, as late as 1670.¹²⁵ In the surrounding countryside, non-Reformed aldermen and sheriffs, including Catholics, were active around 1640,¹²⁶ while Catholic noblemen continued to administer numerous seigneurial estates throughout the province.¹²⁷ One such Catholic nobleman, Adriaen Ram van Schalkwijk, was sentenced to banishment from the province for ten years in 1651, and his seignury, including the *jus patronatus* (right of ecclesiastical patronage), was forfeited.¹²⁸ However, Ram was able to return to the province long before the prescribed sentence had ended. In 1653 Ram could already be found petitioning the provincial court of Utrecht to allow him to stay in the province, and the next year his temporary return to Utrecht was publicly tolerated. After granting him a permit for several short-term stays, in 1658 the Provincial States recognized his eligibility to stay in the province, until the magistrates should find it necessary to banish him again.¹²⁹ The city council was, however, uncomfortable with this decision, which is remarkable in itself given the highly Republican composition of the city magistracy at the time.¹³⁰ In 1661, upon a request submitted by Adriaen's eldest son Everhardt Ram, the Provincial States publicly recognized Everhardt's right to exercise his seigneurial rights in Schalkwijk after his father's death, although a protest from the city council resulted in the *jus patronatus* being denied to him.¹³¹

Catholic Utrechters could not become aldermen, officials who functioned as jurors in the city court. They were also excluded from the decisive positions in the provincial court. During the 1580s it had already been stipulated that the president (*president*), councillors (*raadsheren*), and clerks (*griffiers*) of the provincial court were to be of Reformed conviction.¹³² The councillors, in particular, were required to take an oath to 'support the exercise of the Christian Reformed Religion'.¹³³ Nevertheless, three Catholics were

125 HUA, KR, 8, 18, 25 February 1661; HUA, KR, 9, 29 August 1670.

126 *G.P.U.*, I, p. 403 (25 February 1642); HUA, SAI, 121-18, 1 July 1639.

127 Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility'; Idem, *Patrons*.

128 HUA, HVU, 99-8, 29 July 1651 (Hilhorst, 'Het kerspel Schalkwijk', pp. 65-67).

129 HUA, SAI, 121-25, 8 November 1653, 18 November 1654, 1 June, 13 Augustus 1655; HUA, SAI, 121-26, 25 February, 15 July 1656, 3 May 1658.

130 HUA, SAI, 121-27, 2 March 1661.

131 *Ibidem*, 18 November 1661. See also Hilhorst, 'Het kerspel Schalkwijk', p. 75.

132 *G.P.U.*, I, pp. 158-62.

133 *Ibidem*, II, p. 1039 (4 July 1610): 'de exercitie van de Christelyke Gereformeerde Religie voor te staen'.

publicly recognized by the Provincial States as councillors to the provincial court, namely Otto Schrassert (in office 1627–1630), Jacob de Wys (in office 1630–1651), and Pieter Dierhout (Derout) (in office 1630–1640). According to the book of provincial edicts, Schrassert was commissioned as councillor for his ‘excellent erudition and experience’, in spite of his Catholic faith.¹³⁴ The city council even went so far as to nominate him for a new councillor’s position at the Provincial States in 1627. Three years later, however, the city magistrates regarded the ‘Roman religion’ of De Wys and Dierhout as problematic. The magistrates protested against their nomination by the first and the second estates of the Provincial States, complaining to the stadholder, but in vain.¹³⁵ Similarly, the Catholic Cornelis Portengen was publicly appointed sub-clerk to the provincial court (in office 1645–1674).¹³⁶ He appeared as the defender of prosecuted Catholics on four occasions [67] (Appendix 4). In 1649 the Provincial States found it necessary to re-confirm the stipulation restricting eligibility for the post of councillor in the provincial court to the Reformed alone.¹³⁷ It should be noted, however, that many members of the Catholic social elite chose to become solicitors and advocates of the city and provincial courts, from which they were not excluded in Utrecht until the early 1670s or later.

The Teutonic Order’s bailiwick of Utrecht, which was restricted to members of the nobility, came to function as an instrument of distinction for the nobility to protect their interests against the urban regents and the *nouveaux riches* in the Dutch Republic.¹³⁸ From 1615 onwards land commanders of the Teutonic Order were required to swear an oath to the Reformed faith,¹³⁹ but, in practice, Catholics were still connived as new members of the order for some years to come. Moreover, even after 1615 the knights of the bailiwick had to make a vow of celibacy, as an apparent vestige of the order’s original, Catholic nature. For this reason, Albrecht van Duvenvoorde, a Catholic commander, decided to resign from his position shortly before his marriage. The rule of celibacy was abolished in 1640 when the last Catholic commander Willem de Wael van Vronesteyn (1622–1659) was accepted into the bailiwick.¹⁴⁰ It was his father Gerard (d. 1647) who in 1625 publicly won

134 *Ibidem*, II, p. 1054: ‘excelleerende geleertheyd en ecperientie’.

135 HUA, SAIL, 121–12, 12, 23 April 1627; HUA, SAIL, 121–14, 28 April, 3 May 1630.

136 *G.P.U.*, II, p. 1063.

137 *Ibidem*, II, pp. 1044–45 (10 May 1649).

138 Bruin, ‘De ridderlijke Duitse Orde’. See also Geraerts, ‘The Catholic Nobility’, p. 91; Idem, *Patrons*, pp. 108–9.

139 HUA, VSOKN, 109; HUA, SAIL, 2095, fasc. E.

140 Bruin, ‘Religious Identity’, pp. 239–44.

limited recognition for the future appointment of his son as a member of the Teutonic Order, even though Willem had been baptized by a Catholic priest. When Willem came of age in 1639, Gerard petitioned the Provincial States of Utrecht for dispensation from the religious oath required of all prospective knights. In the end, the Provincial States accepted his appeal and decided to absolve Willem of this requirement.¹⁴¹

The name of Ernst van Reede van Drakesteyn, a nobleman and marshal of Overkwartier, appears in the *criminele sententiën* of 1622 {4}. His house on Janskerkhof was opened for a communal assembly at a time when Van Reede van Drakesteyn himself and his wife Elisabeth van Uytenhove were absent. Although there is no further testimony that would confirm the nature of the assembly, all participants – in total, twelve men and nine women – were required by the city court to pay a fine of f. 25. The punishment levied suggests that the assembly might have been a Catholic one. The same is implied by Van Uytenhove's family background, as her mother Agnes van Renesse van Baer (d. 1613) was a former nun.¹⁴² If the assembly in question was indeed a Catholic gathering, Van Reede van Drakesteyn's appointment as marshal of Overkwartier may have come in spite of his (real, inward) devotion to the Catholic faith.¹⁴³ Although Catholics were deprived of the right to become militia officers in 1631,¹⁴⁴ four years later a Catholic called Jacob Adriaensz van Beeck was revealed to have been connived as a commander in the militia for some time.¹⁴⁵ In 1649 the Reformed consistory urged magistrates to exclude as many Catholics as possible from the army and militias.¹⁴⁶ But in 1659 the city council once again found it necessary to reconfirm the stipulation restricting eligibility as militia officers to citizens of the Reformed faith.¹⁴⁷ The repeated reissuing of these edicts seems to suggest that, in practice, the magistrates continuously connived at Catholic Utrechters holding military offices and civic militias.

In medieval times, canonries were ecclesiastical offices, meaning that laypeople were by definition excluded from appointment. However,

141 HUA, SAI, 121-18, 4 May 1639; HUA, SAI, 121-19, 6 March 1640. For a more detailed account of the story behind this dispensation, see Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 91, 275–76; Idem, 'Dutch Test Acts', pp. 72–74; Idem, *Patrons*, pp. 107–9.

142 HUA, SAI, 2236-2, 23 October 1622. On Ernst van Reede van Drakesteyn, see *N.N.B.W.*, III, col. 1010. On Agnes van Renesse van Baer, see Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', p. 269.

143 This does not seem impossible, since another Catholic, François de Witt, was also appointed the substitute for the field marshal of Overkwartier in 1681. *Ibidem*, p. 90; Idem, 'Dutch Test Acts', p. 72; Idem, *Patrons*, p. 106.

144 HUA, SAI, 121-15, 5 September 1631.

145 HUA, SAI, 121-17, 25 May 1635.

146 HUA, SAI, 121-23, 17, 19 December 1649. See also HUA, KR, 5, 10, 17 December 1649.

147 HUA, SAI, 121-26, 13 June 1659.

following the Protestant Reformation, people of both faiths, including Catholic priests and laypeople, became eligible for one of the no fewer than 140 canon's positions in Utrecht. We can therefore regard a canonry in early modern Utrecht as a public office for present purposes. In 1600 the Provincial States declared that 'a papist who is pious and well-disposed towards the fatherland shall not be rejected' as a canon.¹⁴⁸ As such, Catholic priests and laymen continued to be publicly employed as canons by the Reformed government for decades, provided that they were considered sufficiently patriotic. However, this special proviso was rescinded in 1615, when the Provincial States decided to prohibit Catholics from acquiring benefices and canonries. From then on, the enormous ecclesiastical wealth of the chapters came to be distributed among the Reformed alone.¹⁴⁹ In spite of this, in July 1622 the chapter of St Pieter bestowed one of its canonries on a Catholic advocate named Hieronymus van Buren (Bueren), who was working for the provincial court.¹⁵⁰ Soon thereafter, in February 1623, the Provincial States found it necessary to reiterate the same prohibition.¹⁵¹ However, once again a Catholic, this time Jacobus van Buren, was publicly appointed a canon of St Pieter, only nine days after the edict had been reissued.¹⁵² Toleration as limited recognition was therefore certainly exercised in the matter of appointments to canonries in post-Reformation Utrecht.

Exactly how many Catholic canons there were in seventeenth-century Utrecht, however, remains largely unknown. Some eighteenth-century polemicists of the *Oud-Bisschoppelijke Clerezij* estimated that around 1635 fifty of the 140 canons were Catholics. Yet a twentieth-century Roman Catholic writer estimated their number at no more than twenty. In neither case, however, were the calculations based on primary sources but on confessionally driven expectations.¹⁵³ According to a more recent account, Willem van der Nypoort (d. 1653), who was a canon of St Marie and became dean of the same chapter (in office 1627–1649), may have

148 This resolution of the Provincial States was transcribed in Ven, *Over den oorsprong*, p. 170 (22 February 1600): 'een vroom ende tot den vaderlande geaffectioneert papist nyet gereiecteert en wordt'.

149 *G.P.U.*, I, p. 218 (8 June 1615).

150 Ven, *Over den oorsprong*, p. 53.

151 *G.P.U.*, I, p. 219 (14 February 1623).

152 Ven, *Over den oorsprong*, p. 53.

153 The eighteenth-century polemicists are Nicolaas Broedersen (c. 1682–1762) and Gabriël Dupac de Bellegarde (1717–1789). Broedersen, *Tractatus Historicus*, I, p. 475; Dupac de Bellegarde, *Histoire abrégée*, p. 132. The twentieth-century writer is Johannes de Jong (1885–1955). Jong, 'Het Utrechtse vicariaat', pp. 76–77.

belonged to the Catholic Church.¹⁵⁴ When the Provincial States were required in 1654 to grant the Catholic nobleman Jacob van Rysenburch dispensation from the requirement of signing statements concerning religion to permit him to accept a canonry of St Pieter, the city council objected, noting that this would contravene the provincial edicts of 1615 and 1623.¹⁵⁵ If the mission report of De la Torre from 1656 is to be trusted, there were eleven Catholic canons in Utrecht at the time, although Van Rysenburch was not included among them.¹⁵⁶ In 1659 Johannes Schade (1612/13–1665), a priest born in Utrecht and a member of the *Vicariaat* since 1645, drew a blueprint for restoring the Dom chapter to the Catholic clergy in 1659,¹⁵⁷ but such a plan would never be realized in the Dutch Republic. According to a report that Apostolic Vicar Johannes van Neercassel sent to *Propaganda Fide* in 1672, during the French occupation, all canonries, with three exceptions, were occupied by ‘heretics’.¹⁵⁸ Finally, the year 1680 saw the death of the last Catholic canon, Gerard van der Steen. In this way, Catholics were gradually excluded from the canonries after the edicts of 1615 and 1623. Yet it remains remarkable that once Catholics were publicly allowed to assume a canonry, they were tolerated in these lucrative public offices until their death, with the one exception of Wachtelaer, who was sentenced to the deprivation of his canonry in 1640 {19}.

Even after the Protestant Reformation, hospices for the sick and elderly in Utrecht retained their Christian character and remained accessible to Catholic patients. Responding to the situation in which trustees (*regenten, broeders, or huismeeesters*) still ‘daily’ invited secular priests and Jesuits into their hospices, which each had their own chapels, the city council decided in 1615, and again in 1620, that those working for the hospices, including trustees and female overseers (*moeders*), had to be Reformed.¹⁵⁹ As this regulation was disregarded, the city council re-confirmed it in August 1637. Three months later it added Catholic maids (*dienstmaagden*) to the list.¹⁶⁰ Between then and 1658, the minutes of the city council and the Reformed consistory at times reported the presence of Catholic figures in hospices,

154 For Willem van der Nypoort, see Forclaz, *Catholiques*, p. 171; Schilfgaarde, ‘d’Everdinge van der Nypoort’, col. 149.

155 HUA, SAI, 121-25, 14 March, 12, 19 June 1654.

156 Lommel, ‘Relatio seu descriptio’.

157 HUA, MKOKN, 625.

158 *R.B.*, II, p. 634 (22 July 1672 (N.S.)): ‘haeretici’.

159 HUA, SAI, 121-6, 4 December 1615; HUA, SAI, 121-8, 29 May 1620.

160 HUA, SAI, 121-17, 28 August 1637; HUA, SAI, 121-18, 6 November 1637.

including St Job,¹⁶¹ *Dolhuis*,¹⁶² St Bartholomew,¹⁶³ the Apostle,¹⁶⁴ and the Holy Cross,¹⁶⁵ with other references in the minutes failing to specify the name of the hospice in question.¹⁶⁶ The plan for the ‘prevention of Popery’ formulated by the Reformed synod of Utrecht in 1652 also suggests that the presence of Catholics on hospice boards had actually been tolerated.¹⁶⁷ Indeed, the archives of the twelve hospices, which have largely been neglected in scholarship to date, show that the regulation was disregarded in practice.¹⁶⁸ At least until the early 1660s, Catholic Utrechters benefited from connivance, allowing them to serve as hospice trustees. Furthermore, until the end of the period studied, many of those who appeared as defenders for the prosecuted Catholics in the 105 legal procedures functioned as hospice trustees. Among the connived trustees, we can find the priest Paulus van Geresteyn, who registered with the municipality in 1622 <16> (Appendix 2). In spite of the discovery of an altar with ornaments in his house in 1633,¹⁶⁹ as well as his denunciation for presiding at Catholic services at St Job Hospice in 1635 {12} (Appendix 1), he was during these very same years non-publicly connived as a trustee of St Anthony Hospice (in office at least 1631–1633, 1635–1636).¹⁷⁰ The magistrates, therefore, unofficially connived at the presence of Catholic trustees, including this prosecuted priest, allowing the latter to maintain an influence in some hospices, especially Holy Cross and St Anthony, where they acted rather ‘boldly’ at times in openly showing their religiosity.¹⁷¹

At its establishment in 1628, the municipal chamber of charity was required to distribute sixteen trustee posts equally between Reformed and Catholic ‘qualified persons’.¹⁷² This bi-confessional system was short-lived,

161 Ibidem, 15 July 1639.

162 HUA, KR, 7, 30 August, 6 September 1658; HUA, SAIL, 121-18, 15 July 1639.

163 HUA, SAIL, 121-19, 14 October 1639.

164 HUA, KR, 4, 27 August 1640; HUA, SAIL, 121-19, 31 August 1640.

165 HUA, KR, 5, 4, 11 February 1650; HUA, KR, 6, 28 September 1652; HUA, SAIL, 121-23, 18 February 1650.

166 HUA, KR, 7, 15 July, 18 October 1658; HUA, SAIL, 121-18, 30 October 1637; HUA, SAIL, 121-23, 2 November 1650; HUA, SAIL, 121-24, 7 February 1652; HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 25 October 1658.

167 HUA, *Nederlandse Hervormde classis Utrecht*, 369, n.d. in 1652.

168 The twelve hospices are St Catharine, St Barbara and St Laurens, St Bartholomew, the Holy Cross, St Anthony, St Martin, St Job, the plague hospice Leeuwenberch, the Apostle, St Jacob, St Joosten, and St Martha. The archives of all twelve hospices are preserved in HUA, BAIL.

169 HUA, SAIL, 121-16, 11 November 1633.

170 HUA, BAIL, 1987-1, passim in 1631–1633, 1635–1636.

171 HUA, BAIL, 1840-1 (the Holy Cross Hospice, 1643–1695); HUA, BAIL, 1987-1 (St Anthony Hospice, 1603–1649).

172 *G.P.U.*, III, p. 556 (1 September 1628); HUA, SAIL, 121-13, 1 September 1628; HUA, SAIL, 1824, 1 September 1628.

at least officially. One month after the edict banning Catholics from hospice boards was reissued in August 1637,¹⁷³ three Catholic laymen named Mulaert, Buyren, and Zas van Weldam, who had just been newly chosen as trustees of the municipal chamber of charity, appeared before the city council. Zas van Weldam argued that if they, as Catholics, were eligible to serve as trustees to the municipal chamber of charity, they should also be allowed to serve on the boards of hospices. After debate between the burgomasters and the Catholics, the city council decided that these Catholic men were to be discharged and replaced by three Reformed members.¹⁷⁴ The next year the magistracy decreed that eligibility for the board of the municipal chamber of charity was to be restricted to the Reformed.¹⁷⁵

In actual practice, however, Catholics were continuously connived as trustees of this public charitable institution. My survey of the minutes of the municipal chamber of charity, which records all the yearly appointments between 1628 and 1673, with the exception of the period from 1648 to 1656, reveals the presence of a significant number of Catholics almost every single year.¹⁷⁶ All the same, it is impossible to determine whether the bi-confessional administration of the chamber functioned in practice between 1628 and 1637, since the confessional affiliation of some of the trustees is unclear. At least twenty of 160 trustees appointed during the same period (12.5%) were certainly Catholics. From the abolition of the bi-confessional administrative system in 1638 until 1671, shortly before the French occupation, the names of trustees are available for a total of twenty-five years: from 1638 to 1647, and from 1657 to 1671. Out of the 400 total appointments for these twenty-five years, at least fifty were Catholics (12.5%). Even though no official modification was made to the rules regarding the confessional affiliation of trustees after 1638, Utrecht's magistrates continued to connive non-publicly at the appointment of Catholic trustees to the municipal chamber of charity.

Furthermore, Mulaert and Buyren, two of the three aforementioned Catholic petitioners, may well have assumed public social welfare offices even after their conflict with the burgomasters in 1637. Although

173 HUA, SAI, 121-17, 28 August 1637. Catholic trustees of the chamber during the period of the bi-confessional administration include Anthoni van Blockland, Assuerus van Brakel, Willem van der Burch, Hieronymus van Buren, Nicolaes Dierhout, Pieter Schade, Hendrick van Schroyesteyn, and Gerard van der Steen. HUA, SAI, 1825-1, 1 September 1628, 19 October 1630, 13 October 1631, 12 October 1632, 12 October 1633.

174 HUA, SAI, 121-17, 27 September 1637. See also, HUA, SAI, 1825-1, 5 October 1638.

175 HUA, SAI, 121-18, 14 August 1638. See also, HUA, SAI, 1825-1, 1 October 1638.

176 HUA, SAI, 1825-1 ~ 1825-5.

the minutes of the city council fail to specify the three petitioners' first names, the 'Mulaert' in question may be Diderick Muylert, who was a trustee of St Bartholomew Hospice (in office at least in 1653), and 'Buyren' Hieronymus van Buren, who served as trustee to the municipal chamber of charity (in office 1633–1635), the Apostle Hospice (in office at least in 1640), and St Bartholomew Hospice (in office at least in 1653).¹⁷⁷ The advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht, Hendrick (Henricus) van Erckel (d. 1687), was likewise non-publicly connived as a trustee of the municipal chamber of charity.¹⁷⁸ His three brothers Franciscus (c. 1638–1678), Lambertus (c. 1638–1692), and Nicolaus (d. 1697) were all secular priests working in Holland.¹⁷⁹ Johan Christiaan van Erckel, a son of Hendrick van Erckel and Margaretha van der Poort (d. 1665), also was a priest, who went on to function as one of the most important priests in the *Oud-Bisschoppelijke Clerezij* at the time of the Utrecht Schism in 1723.¹⁸⁰ Given the vital positions held by these connived Catholic trustees within their confessional community, the connivance may have been extended to induce other Catholics to contribute more generously to the public collection of alms. As such, the magistrates acknowledged the importance of Catholic Utrechters with elevated social status, both as trustees and as donors to the public charitable institution.

After 1648 the concept of public office, from which Catholics were banned, was further expanded. In a long petition the Voetian consistory drew up in 1648, shortly before the Peace of Münster, it maintained that Catholics should be excluded from 'public offices and services' as well as the ranks of 'suppliers to the City'. The public church insisted that Reformed believers should be favoured for such professions, just as Catholics were favoured by the French king and the Holy Roman Emperor in their respective territories.¹⁸¹ In another plea to the city council from 1649, the consistory urged the magistrates to deny Catholics the right to assume some public offices, including those of guild-master and beer-supplier (*bierdraggers*).¹⁸² On yet another occasion, the Reformed consistory noted that some guilds were filled with 'Papists' who,

177 HUA, BAI, 1604, c. 1653; HUA, SAI, 121-19, 13 September 1640; HUA, SAI, 1825-1, 12 October 1633, 9 October 1634.

178 HUA, SAI, 1825-3, 24 August 1657.

179 Ackermans, *Herders*, pp. 356–58.

180 *Ibidem*, passim, especially pp. 356–57; Jacobs, *Joan Christiaan van Erckel*; Spaans and Hof, *Het beroerde Rome*, passim.

181 HUA, KR, 5, 28 February 1648: 'publycque ampten en bedieningen' and 'Stadts werckct leverantien'.

182 *Ibidem*, 10, 17 December 1649; HUA, SAI, 121-23, 17, 19 December 1649.

in its words, were a 'great obstacle to Christ's Kingdom'.¹⁸³ In 1652 the city magistracy decided that from then on, the skippers (*schippers*) of small barges (*cleyne schuyte*) between Utrecht and Amsterdam were to be exclusively Reformed.¹⁸⁴ Later the city council generalized the regulation even further, stipulating that those who worked for the civic audit office (*Cameraer rekening*) and served the city (*Stadsdienst*), including beer-suppliers, porters (*sackdragers*), bargemen, general suppliers (*leveranciers*), and day labourers (*werkluuden*), ought to be Reformed.¹⁸⁵ Since the Catholic butcher Dirk van Schorrenberg was witnessed in 1673, during the French occupation, to have shouted, 'Now we shall govern, and then no one will become porters and carriers, unless they are papists',¹⁸⁶ the prohibition seems to have been at least partly enforced. At the same time, given the size of the Catholic population, it also seems to have been impossible to bar Catholic Utrechters from these professions altogether.

In the course of the seventeenth century, the political authorities significantly altered the concept of public office, the foundation of the city as a *corpus christianum*, from which Catholics were to be excluded. Originally, the notion included only political, judicial, military, and former ecclesiastical posts, but later it was extended to cover also social welfare offices, city suppliers, and day labourers. This reflected the tendency towards the Reformed confessionalization of public offices, damaging the honour of Catholic Utrechters in the urban public sphere. However, this process was never completed, as, in practice, a level of toleration was shown in the form of public limited recognition and non-public connivance. Utrecht's political authorities publicly recognized Catholics for the assumption of certain political offices, especially at the provincial level, but also councillors to the provincial court and military offices ranging from marshal to militia officers, at least until the mid-seventeenth century. At the same time, they non-publicly connived at numerous Catholics, allowing them to serve the public charitable institutions even during the latter half of the seventeenth century. For them, it may well have been unrealistic, in practice, to exclude Catholics systematically from all the public offices covering an increasing number of aspects of civic life, given the large Catholic population and the tangible presence of the Catholic elite in Utrecht.

183 HUA, KR, 6, 12 February 1655: 'grote verhinderinge vant koninkrijke Christi'.

184 HUA, SAI, 121-24, 5 April 1652.

185 HUA, SAI, 121-25, 11 November 1654, 12 June 1655.

186 HUA, SAI, 2244-134, 27 October 1673, 20 May 1674: 'nu sullen wij een regeren, en dan sal niemand tot saekdragers, voerluijden gemaakt worden, ter sij mede paaps waren'.

2.4. Applicants for Citizenship

Up until the early sixteenth century, Utrecht's 20,000 inhabitants ranked it among the ten largest European cities. The city's population then grew further to c. 25,000 in 1577 and c. 33,500 in 1670. In spite of this, the enormous growth experienced by the cities in Holland relegated Utrecht to fourth or fifth place in population size among the cities of the Northern Netherlands in the seventeenth century. The population expansion in the Dutch Republic resulted mainly from the incoming flux of immigrants.¹⁸⁷ Utrecht was demographically connected to the areas to the east, including north-western Germany.¹⁸⁸ Most immigrants entering Utrecht from such recruitment zones were skilled craftsmen who addressed local and regional needs, in contrast to the skilled textile workers from Flanders and international merchants from Brabant or the Iberian peninsula, whose migration to Holland brought an enormous economic impulse there in the late sixteenth century in the context of the Eighty Years' War against Spain.¹⁸⁹

The premodern civic community consisted of diverse groups of people with different rights and obligations, who can be divided into citizens (*burgers* or *poorters* in Dutch), residents (*inwoners* or *ingezetenen*) who had no citizenship but did have the right to live in the city, and foreigners (*vreemdelingen*).¹⁹⁰ Before the rise of modern nation-states, 'only citizens were considered full members of the urban community, entitled to the advantages that this entailed'.¹⁹¹ Citizenship constituted the nucleus of the civic community. Politically, only citizens were eligible for major offices, including those on the city council. Judicially, citizens accused of wrongdoing were first summoned before the court of their city, composed of aldermen (that is, their fellow citizens), and not a court outside their hometown. Economically, citizens were exempt from the payment of certain tolls and had exclusive access to the guilds. In exchange for these beneficial rights, citizens were obliged to pledge allegiance to the civic community and its authorities, and to defend the city, so that male adult members were required to join civic militias.¹⁹² Especially in Utrecht, people attempted

187 Rommes, *Oost*, pp. 17–35; Vries, *European Urbanization*, pp. 33, 271.

188 Rommes, *Oost*, pp. 63–171; Vries, 'Searching for a Role', p. 55.

189 Ibidem, pp. 55–56.

190 Rommes, *Oost*, p. 36.

191 Prak, 'The Politics of Intolerance', p. 161. On pre-modern citizenship in general, see idem, *Citizens without Nations*. On pre-modern citizenship in Utrecht, see Bogaers, *Aards*, pp. 36–52; Prak, 'The Politics of Intolerance', passim; Rommes, *Oost*, pp. 36–52.

192 Bogaers, *Aards*, p. 47; Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 264–69; Prak, *Citizens without Nations*, pp. 50–160; Idem, 'The Politics of Intolerance', p. 161; Rommes, *Oost*, p. 36.

to gain citizenship in order to join the guilds, which had been one of the backbones of the civic community politically, socio-economically, and religiously.¹⁹³ Utrecht citizenship was somewhat more selective than it was in many other cities in the Low Countries and Germany. People could acquire Utrecht citizenship in three ways, namely through 1) paternal succession, 2) purchase, and 3) free donation, for a select few notables only. In such cities as Antwerp and 's-Hertogenbosch, on the other hand, anyone born inside the city walls was automatically registered as a citizen. Other cities, including Amsterdam, Amersfoort, Augsburg, and Strasburg, offered newcomers citizenship freely when they married citizens. Utrecht provided no such options for citizenship applicants. Families of citizens constituted roughly half of Utrecht's population (between 15,000 and 18,000, or 48% to 58% of the total population in 1650), which was for the most part composed of guild craftsmen, rentiers, independent professionals, patricians, and nobles. It is worth noting that seventeenth-century Utrecht had many citizens from the socio-economic elite, including clergy, nobles, and jurists, but was largely devoid of the wealthy merchant class so often depicted as the textbook image of the Dutch Golden Age. At the conclusion of the citizenship ceremony, the bell at the Buur Church (literally meaning 'the church of citizens') was sounded, symbolizing the public, official enrolment of new Utrecht *burgers*.¹⁹⁴

For the first seventy years or so following the introduction of the Protestant Reformation to Utrecht, citizenship had remained immune from the Reformed confessionalization demands. Catholic citizens were not deprived of their citizenship on religious grounds, and Catholic newcomers could still be enrolled as new citizens. In 1611 the city council declared that applicants for citizenship were to be required to present a 'sealed certification or attestation' of their 'good comportment' issued by their former place of living.¹⁹⁵ Likewise, in 1629 the city magistrates stipulated that applicants were to present a testimony of their 'qualification and comportment', but they imposed no religious requirement yet.¹⁹⁶ Beginning around the mid-seventeenth century, however, the public church started urging magistrates to exclude Catholic applicants from the citizenry. In 1648, shortly before the Peace of Münster, the Voetian consistory claimed in a petition to the city

193 Slokker, *Ruggengraat*.

194 Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, pp. 119–20, 132; Rommes, *Oost*, pp. 36–41, 44–45.

195 HUA, SAI, 121-5, 21 January 1611: 'besegelde certificatie ofte attestatie' and 'goed comportement'.

196 HUA, SAI, 121-14, 20 April 1629: 'qualificatie ende comportement'.

council that Catholics should not be allowed to acquire new citizenship or to enter the guilds. According to the consistory, Utrecht would become even poorer if it accepted more Catholics, since the city would be forced to offer financial support to those who bought papal indulgences and used the city's funds for the construction of churches and monasteries in Catholic territories abroad.¹⁹⁷ Likewise, in 1649 the Reformed consistory requested the city magistrates to check the applicants' qualifications for citizenship strictly, especially if they were 'papists'.¹⁹⁸ The consistory thus represented Catholics as a fifth column inside Utrecht and demanded confessional purification of the civic community through the regulation of citizenship, identifying Catholics as one of the reasons for the city's financial problems.

Utrecht's financial situation grew even worse in the second half of the seventeenth century. In 1654 the city council responded to the above demands from the Reformed consistory by deciding that applicants for citizenship, and Catholics in particular, had to provide testimony of their 'religion and comportments', although it is unknown how exactly a person's faith was to be proved.¹⁹⁹ It also stipulated that officers verify where applicants had been living immediately prior to their arrival in Utrecht, whether they were going to marry, or had already married, the daughter or widow of a citizen and whether they had lived in the city or its suburbs for three consecutive years.²⁰⁰ The following year, after receiving complaints from the consistory about the influx of Catholics, the magistracy, which included Republican members, finally prescribed that Catholics could no longer acquire citizenship 'unless the City Council approved [them] unanimously for certain evident reasons'. Moreover, if anyone was found to have converted to the Catholic faith after becoming a citizen, their citizenship would be forfeited upon death. Therefore, if a father became Catholic, his citizenship would not be transferred to his children, even though the father himself could enjoy its privileges during his own lifetime.²⁰¹

Similar anti-dissenter policies relating to citizenship could be found in cities in the eastern, inland provinces of the Dutch Republic, such as Nijmegen and 's-Hertogenbosch, as well as in Germany, in Aachen and Cologne, although cities in the province of Holland such as Amsterdam and Haarlem did not adopt such confessionally driven discriminative

197 HUA, KR, 5, 28 February 1648. See also HUA, SAI, 121-22, 6 March 1648.

198 HUA, SAI, 121-23, 17, 19 December 1649. See also HUA, KR, 5, 10, 17 December 1649.

199 HUA, SAI, 121-25, 21 August, 27 November 1654: 'religie ende comportementen'.

200 *Ibidem*, 21 December 1654.

201 *G.P.U.*, III, p. 271 (12 June 1655); HUA, SAI, 121-25, 12 June 1655: 'ten ware om eenige merckelicke redenen de Vroedschap eenpaerlijck quame goet te vinden'.

measures against citizenship applicants.²⁰² Unlike the cities of Holland, which profited from international trade and enjoyed economic prosperity during the Dutch Golden Age, Utrecht's economy depended largely on local artisanal production and experienced constant decline during the seventeenth century.²⁰³ Under such circumstances, Utrecht's political authorities sought a way out of the severe financial situation by excluding Catholics, as confessional others, from the ranks of the citizens and from the guilds. It should be noted, however, that the magistrates introduced an ambiguous exception clause ('unless the City Council approved [them] unanimously for some evident reasons') to the 1655 edict, creating room to obtain citizenship for those Catholics who represented a socio-economic benefit and were considered to be politically trustworthy. At least on paper, the city magistrates, including Republicans, accepted the confessionalizing demands of the Voetian consistory for religious purification of the *corpus christianum* as one of their financial policies.

How strictly, then, was this anti-Catholic edict on citizenship enforced in practice? Normally, registration records for citizen applicants only noted such information as name, profession, birthplace, and former residence, and whether or not the application had been granted, but did not document religious affiliation. However, on the basis of one register, we can identify ninety-six applicants between the promulgation of the 1655 edict and the French occupation in 1672 as Catholics, since it notes in each case that the officers, in compliance with the 1655 edict, decided to either deny or approve their citizenship application.²⁰⁴ Thus, each year an average of 5.6 Catholics applied for citizenship. Among the ninety-six Catholic applicants, the city magistracy ended up publicly recognizing eighty-six as Utrecht citizens (90.0%). Until 1672, it did not deprive Catholics of their citizenship. Once enrolled as Utrecht citizens, Catholics therefore never lost their privileges during the period under consideration.

There were only four female applicants in the register. Many of the ninety-two male applicants were craftsmen or merchants. They may have been stimulated in their application for citizenship by the prospect of the socio-economic privileges it entailed, such as exclusive access to guilds and exemption from tolls. Eight of the eighty-six successful applicants acquired citizenship after

202 Frijhoff and Spies, *Bevochten eendracht*, p. 184; Kuijpers, *Migrantenstad*, p. 131; Lourens and Lucassen, 'Zunftlandschaften', p. 19; Prak, 'The Policies of Intolerance', pp. 162–75; Rommes, *Oost*, pp. 41–42; Vos, *Burgers*, pp. 45–47.

203 Vries, 'Searching for a Role'.

204 HUA, SAI, 414-1. Unless otherwise noted, the description below is based on this source.

having been refused the right on several earlier occasions. Jelis Reyniersz, for example, failed three times before his successful enrolment as a citizen in 1660.²⁰⁵ At least twelve successful applicants are known to have paid a fee, ranging from the f. 12.1 paid by Herman Joosten and Peter Cornelisz Verlaen to the f. 30 paid by Philips Jacobsz van Oosterlaeck. The former two married the daughter or widow of a citizen.²⁰⁶ The amount paid by these Catholics is almost the equivalent of what the city council stipulated in 1624: f. 12.5 for residents born in Utrecht and for those who married daughters or widows of citizens; f. 25 for all others including newcomers.²⁰⁷ While the Republican magistrates in principle endorsed anti-Catholic proposals from the Voetian consistory, depriving Catholics of their right to acquire citizenship, they, in practice, publicly recognized numerous Catholic newcomers as citizens. In other words, Catholics proved successful in exploiting the aforementioned ambiguous exception clause in order to acquire Utrecht citizenship.

For sixty applicants, the registration record notes the birthplace or former/current place of residence. Among them, fifty-one came from the Northern Netherlands, including the suburbs of the city of Utrecht (85.0%), while seven originated from Germany (especially north-western Germany), one from the Southern Netherlands, and one from Ireland. Although two-thirds of the growth in the population of Utrecht in the seventeenth century is said to have been caused by immigration from outside the Dutch Republic, most of the Catholic applicants for citizenship came from within the Republic.²⁰⁸ In contrast to the clergy, Catholic laypeople from neighbouring Catholic territories had no religious motive for moving to Utrecht under Reformed rule, whereas Protestants from these areas certainly did. According to the registration record, thirty-three of the ninety-two male applicants for citizenship had married or were going to marry the daughter or widow of a citizen (35.9%). For only three of them, the application was rejected.²⁰⁹ When two Catholics who had been refused Utrecht citizenship at an earlier occasion were accepted on their second attempt, the registration record noted that they had married the daughters of citizens.²¹⁰ Their marriage may therefore have led the city council to revisit the earlier decision. The requirement of three years' residency seems to have been just a minimum. Even though the period of prior residency cannot be confirmed for every

205 *Ibidem*, 18 June 1660.

206 HUA, SAII, 121-26, 24 March 1656.

207 Rommes, *Oost*, p. 41.

208 *Ibidem*, pp. 76-102.

209 HUA, SAII, 414-1, 9 April 1667, 2 August 1669, 14 February 1671.

210 *Ibidem*, 31 January, 7 February 1659.

applicant, the longest residency found was seventeen years, in the case of Jan Claesz, who succeeded in obtaining citizenship.²¹¹ On the other hand, the applicant with the shortest residency in Utrecht (six years) was Ariaentgen Hogeboom, whose citizenship application was rejected.²¹²

Personal relationships were also important for Catholics in order to gain public recognition as new citizens. According to the registration record, the craftsman Willem Wittens, who had been living in Utrecht for more than ten years, was approved as a new citizen because ‘wine merchants really needed him’.²¹³ Some Catholic applicants had established ties to the local, social elite in Utrecht. For Herbert van Raveswaey’s successful application, the registration record noted his parents’ social standing: his father was the sheriff of nearby Jutphaas, and his mother was the daughter of an Utrecht citizen.²¹⁴ The Van Raveswaey family was known in Utrecht as well. Andries van Raveswaey (d. before 1667) [72] appeared in the city court as a defender in the trial against Aert Willemsz Peerboom (Pereboom), who was charged with hosting a Catholic assembly in his house {50} (Appendices 1 and 4).

Beginning around the mid-seventeenth century, the Voetian consistory pursued the confessionalization of citizenship, and in response the magistracy, including Republican members, promulgated the 1655 edict, denying Catholics the right to enrolment as new Utrecht citizens. Nevertheless, in practice the magistracy publicly recognized a significant number of Catholics as new citizens. Nor does it seem to have put the citizenship of established Catholic citizens in jeopardy until at least 1672. From the viewpoint of the public church, which insisted on the confessional purification of the citizenry of their *corpus christianum*, the 1655 edict was thus scarcely implemented in practice. Yet from the perspective of the city magistrates, who had already made room in the edict for the admission of socio-economically beneficial and politically trustworthy Catholics, sixty-eight of the ninety-six Catholic applicants simply met such – admittedly unspecified – standards. The political authorities tolerated these useful Catholics, recognizing them as new citizens, in the hope that the multi-religious civic community would benefit from them financially or otherwise. Many tolerated Catholic new citizens had various relationships with the civic community of Utrecht, whether by birth, marriage (to the daughters of citizens), previous residency in Utrecht, or other, personal connections, especially with native Catholic Utrechters of elevated social status.

211 Ibidem, 21 July 1656.

212 Ibidem, 4 December 1671.

213 Ibidem, 15 June 1657: ‘wyncopers hem seer nodich van doen hebben’.

214 Ibidem, 30 May 1656.

2.5. Conclusion

Apart from repression, Utrecht's political authorities also applied the other governing strategy of toleration to Catholics in order to cope with religious diversity. Although the tides of repression changed constantly between 1620 and 1672, toleration was always practised not just by the Republican magistrates of the 1660s, but even by Calvinist and Voetian magistrates. Notwithstanding the anti-Catholicism enacted in legislation adopted under increasing pressure from the Reformed Church, in practice the magistrates continued publicly to bestow limited recognition on Catholics, as well as non-publicly displayed connivance towards them, thereby searching for a solution to maintain the endangered unity of their *corpus christianum*. By doing so, they sought to preserve the supremacy of the Reformed, physically and symbolically representing their authority in the public sphere, while enhancing their chances to exploit Catholic Utrechters socio-economically to the advantage of the civic community. Although scholars have tended to focus exclusively on passive practices of connivance in the Dutch Republic, it is important to note that Utrecht's political authorities not only exercised such unofficial connivance, but also officially recognized the presence or behaviours of Catholics in different sectors of the civic community, on a surprisingly large scale.

Since Catholic priests were considered a great danger to the Reformed public order, Utrecht's magistrates prohibited them from acting as clerics and ministering to Catholic souls. Nevertheless, they publicly recognized many priests as sojourners, residents, and citizens in Utrecht. Furthermore, the magistrates may well have non-publicly connived at a significant number of priests, allowing them to stay or reside in the city, even though their name and place of residence were known. The Utrecht political authorities seem to have tacitly confirmed the Catholic inhabitants' need for pastoral care exercised by the clergy. Apart from priests, Catholic women, and *klopjes* in particular, were likewise regarded as a hazard to the officially Reformed city. Given their high numbers and recognizable clothes, the existence of *klopjes* was openly known. Despite numerous petitions from the Reformed Church, however, Utrecht's magistrates connived at the presence and activities of many *klopjes*. Even though the politico-judicial authorities prosecuted many Catholic women for hosting Catholic assemblies, they also connived at many other women who participated in such illegal gatherings. Given the popularity of the elementary education given by Catholic women among parents irrespective of their confessional affiliation, the magistracy in practice connived at

many of their schools. Seeing their undeniable economic potential for the civic community, Utrecht's magistrates publicly recognized a considerable number of wealthy Catholic women, allowing them to administer their property despite existing prohibitions. Under increasing pressure from the public church, the political authorities extended the notion of public office, from which Catholics were to be excluded, encompassing not only political, judicial, military, and former ecclesiastical offices, but also offices pertaining to social welfare, city suppliers, and day labourers. Nevertheless, the Reformed magistrates at the same time publicly recognized Catholics, allowing them to assume certain political, judicial, military, and formerly ecclesiastical offices, especially at the provincial level, at least until the mid-seventeenth century. Besides, they non-publicly connived at the presence of many Catholic social welfare officers. From a pragmatic perspective, Utrecht's political authorities could not ignore demands from the citizens who, in the practice of their everyday lives, needed Catholics, especially those of elevated social status, as public office holders. Beginning around the mid-seventeenth century, the Voetian consistory urged the magistracy to deny Catholics the right to acquire new Utrecht citizenship, already a more exclusive privilege than it was in other cities in the Low Countries and Germany. Yet the political authorities also continued to publicly recognize many Catholics as new Utrecht *burgers*, in consideration of their potential socio-economic contribution to the city.

The pursuit of Reformed confessionalization of the public sphere, therefore, failed in practice. Utrecht's public sphere was, in the end, not entirely confessionalized as Reformed, although it was not deconfessionalized or secularized, either.²¹⁵ Through the governing strategies of toleration, the political authorities resisted the confessionalizing demands of the Reformed Church, delimiting the physical and abstract public in the multi-confessional civic community in a different way from that advocated by the church. On the one hand, the political practices of toleration put the brakes on the radical theocratic ideal of confessionalization endorsed by Calvinists and Voetians. On the other hand, toleration replicated the asymmetrical power relationship between Reformed and Catholics, between those who tolerated and those who were tolerated, allowing the former to exploit the latter socio-economically. The toleration served to preserve the discriminatory situation in which Catholics faced significant obstacles in living as pious Catholics and esteemed urban inhabitants.

²¹⁵ Cf. Frijhoff's argument on the deconfessionalization and secularization of the public sphere. Frijhoff, 'How Plural', p. 48; Idem, 'Was the Dutch Republic', p. 112.

Abbreviations

- A.A.U.* *Archief voor de geschiedenis van het aartsbisdom Utrecht.* Utrecht, 1875–1957.
- B.W.N.* Aa, A. J. van der, *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, 26 vols. Haarlem, 1852–1878.
- D.N.L.* *De Nederlandsche Leeuw.*
- G.P.U.* Water, Johan van de. *Groot Placaatboek vervattende alle de placaten [...] Staten 's lands van Utrecht*, 3 vols. Utrecht, 1729.
- J.O.U.* *Jaarboek Oud-Utrecht.*
- M.O.U.* *Maandblad Oud-Utrecht.*
- N.N.B.W.* Molhuysen, P. C., and P. J. Blok, eds. *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, 10 vols. Leiden, 1911–1937.
- HUA Het Utrechts Archief, Utrecht
- BA Bewaarde archieven
- HVU Hof van Utrecht
- KR Nederlandse Hervormde gemeente Utrecht, kerkeraad
- MKOKN Metropolaan Kapittel van de Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland
- NOT Notarieel archief
- OBC Apostolische vicarissen van de Hollandse Zending
- SA Stadsarchief
- VBB Verzameling van Buchel-Booth
- VSOKN Verzamelde stukken van de oud-katholieke kerk in Nederland

Bibliography

Archival Primary Sources

- HUA, Nederlandse Hervormde classis Utrecht (24-1)
 265. List of schoolmasters and mistresses of *bijtscholen* in the city of Utrecht, c. 1663
 369. Copies of the minutes of the provincial synod and the classes in Utrecht, including a plan for the prevention of Popery formulated by the provincial synod, 1652
- HUA, Notarissen in de stad Utrecht 1560–1905 [NOT] (34-1)
- HUA, Verzamelde stukken van de oud-katholieke kerk in Nederland [VSOKN] (88)
 109. Summary of the resolutions of the Provincial States of Utrecht concerning the appointment of the land commander of the Teutonic Order, 1615

112. Petitions from Catholic priests who had lived in the city since before 1622 to the Utrecht magistracy, 1630
HUA, Hof van Utrecht [HVU] (239-1)
- 99-8. Sentences in criminal cases in the provincial court of Utrecht, 1638-1732
HUA, Verzameling van Buchel-Booth [VBB] (355)
139. Notes on the Reformed Church, especially in the province of Utrecht, by Cornelis Booth, 1579-1656, including a petition from the provincial synod of Utrecht to the Provincial States of Utrecht, 1655 or 1656
HUA, Bewaarde archieven I [BAI] (708)
692. 'Foundation Book' (*Fundatie-boeck*) of the almshouses of Maria van Pallaes, 1665-1708
694. Request of Maria van Pallaes to the Provincial States of Utrecht concerning her testament, 1649
HUA, Bewaarde archieven II [BAII] (709)
1254. Documents concerning the appointment of new trustees in St Barbara and St Laurens Hospice, 1616-1631
1258. Minutes of the trustees of St Barbara and St Laurens Hospice, 1615-1765
1604. Lists of the trustees of St Bartholomew Hospice, c. 1651 and 1653
- 1840-1. Minutes of the trustees of the Holy Cross Hospice, 1643-1695
- 1987-1. Minutes of the trustees of St Anthony Hospice, 1603-22 September 1722
HUA, Nederlandse Hervormde gemeente Utrecht, kerkeraad [KR] (746)
- 3 ~ 10. Minutes of the Reformed consistory, August 1618-July 1690
HUA, Stadsarchief II [SAII] (702)
- 121-4 ~ 121-5, 121-8 ~ 121-30. Minutes of the city council, 1599/1600-1612/13 and 1619/20-1686/87
- 414-1. Register of various permits given by the city council, part I, 1654-1679
616. Reports on forbidden Catholic assemblies with lists of Catholic priests, 1664-1681
- 1825-1 ~ 1825-6. Minutes of the trustees of the municipal *Aalmoezenierskamer*, 1628-1647 and 1657-1687
2095. Documents concerning the trial against Willem van Merode, 1652
- 2236-2 ~ 2236-5. *Crimineele sententiën* of the city court of Utrecht, 1618-1657 and 1670-1684
- 2244-42 ~ 2244-140. *Crimineele stukken* of the city court of Utrecht, 1620-1679
HUA, Apostolische vicarissen van de Hollandse Zending [OBC] (1003)
99. Testimony of Rudolphus Francisci before Reformed ministers on the organization of the Catholic Church in the Northern Netherlands, c. 1630
159. Documents concerning the trials against Philippus Rovenius and Johannes Wachtelaer, 1639-1640
HUA, Metropolitaaan Kapittel van de Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland [MKOKN] (1835)

625. Excerpt of the establishment of dioceses in 1559, and a plan for the re-establishment of the Dom chapter in 1659

Published Primary Sources

- Bekeeringe van P. de la Faille, predikant te Koudekerk, uyt de Calvinissche ketterye, tot het H. Katholyk geloof der H. Katholyke Roomsche Kerke door het lesen der Oud-vaders.* Antwerp, 1764.
- Broedersen, Nicolaas. *Tractatus Historicus de rebus metropolitanae ecclesiae Ultrajectinae*, 4 vols. Delft, 1729–Utrecht, 1763.
- Brom, Gisbert, ed. 'Neerkassels bestuur van 1662 tot 1676'. *A.A.U.* 18 (1890), pp. 172–294.
- Dupac de Bellegarde, Gabriël. *Histoire abrégée de l'Église métropolitaine d'Utrecht principalement depuis la révolution arrivée dans les sept Provinces-Unies des Pays-Bas sous Philippe II jusqu'à l'an 1784.* Utrecht, 1852.
- Hofman, J. H., ed. 'Allerlei, betreffende de stad Utrecht'. *A.A.U.* 5 (1878), pp. 180–238.
- Lommel, Anthonius van, ed. 'Relatio seu descriptio status religionis Catholicae in Hollandia etc...'. *A.A.U.* 10 (1882), pp. 95–240.
- Muller, Samuel, ed. 'Getuigenis van een afvalligen priester over de organisatie der rooms-katholieke kerk in Nederland omstreeks 1630'. *A.A.U.* 14 (1886), pp. 241–44.
- Muller, Samuel, ed. 'Lijst van Rooms-Katholieke priesters, wien door de vroedschap der stad Utrecht in 1657 en 1658 verlof («geleyde») gegeven is om in de stad te komen. Afschrift Rijksarchieven van Utrecht'. *A.A.U.* 14 (1886), pp. 245–46.
- Remonstrantie der E. Kerkenraedt van Utrecht. Aende Ed. Mog. Heeren Staten s'Landts van Utrecht.* Rotterdam, 1651.
- Water, Johan van de. *Groot Placaat-Boek vervattende all de placaten [...] Staten's lands van Utrecht.* 3 vols. Utrecht, 1729. [G.P.U.]

Secondary Literature

- Aa, A. J. van der. *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden.* 26 vols. Haarlem, 1852–1878. [B.W.N.]
- Abels, Marieke. *Tussen sloer en heilige. Beeld en zelfbeeld van Goudse en Haarlemse kloppen in de zeventiende eeuw.* Utrecht, 2010.
- Ackermans, Gian. *Herders en huurlingen. Bisschoppen en priesters in de Republiek (1663–1705).* Amsterdam, 2003.
- Arblaster, Paul. *Antwerp and the World: Richard Verstegen and the International Culture of Catholic Reformation.* Leuven, 2004.
- Arblaster, Paul. 'The Southern Netherlands Connection: Networks of Support and Patronage'. 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. 123–38.
- Bogaers, Llewellyn. *Aards, betrokken, en zelfbewust. De verwevenheid van cultuur en religie in katholiek Utrecht, 1300–1600*. Utrecht, 2008.
- Booy, Engelina de. 'Een stad vol scholen. Utrechtse scholenhouders in 1663'. *M.O.U.* (1972), pp. 21–23.
- Booy, Engelina de. *Kweekhoven der wijsheid. Basis- en vervolgonderwijs in de steden van de provincie Utrecht van 1580 tot het begin der 19^{de} eeuw*. Zutphen, 1980.
- Bruin, Renger de. 'De ridderlijke Duitse Orde balije van Utrecht. Een adellijk distinctie-instrument in de Republiek der Verenigde Nederlanden gedurende de achttiende eeuw'. *Virtus. Journal of Nobility Studies* 16 (2009), pp. 34–53.
- Bruin, Renger de. 'Religious Identity of the Teutonic Order Bailiwick of Utrecht, 1560–2006'. *Ordines Militares Colloquia Torunesia Historica: Yearbook for the Study of the Military Orders* 23 (2018), pp. 235–71.
- Duker, Arnoldus. *Gisbertus Voetius*, 3 vols. Leiden, 1897–1914.
- Faber, Dirk. 'Dirck van Baburen, His Commissioner and His Motifs'. In *Hendrick ter Brugghen und die Nachfolger Caravaggios in Holland*, edited by Rüdiger Klessmann. Braunschweig, 1988, pp. 143–49.
- Forclaz, Bertrand. *Catholiques au défi de la Réforme. La coexistence confessionnelle à Utrecht au XVII^e siècle*. Paris, 2014.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Was the Dutch Republic a Calvinist Community? The State, the Confessions, and Culture in the Early Modern Netherlands'. In *The Republican Alternative: The Netherlands and Switzerland Compared*, edited by André Holenstein, Thomas Maissen and Maarten Prak. Amsterdam, 2008, pp. 99–122.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'How Plural Were the Religious Worlds in Early-Modern Europe? Critical Reflections from the Netherlandic Experience'. In *Living with Religious Diversity in Early-Modern Europe*, edited by C. Scott Dixon, Dagmar Freist, and Mark Greengrass. Aldershot, 2009, pp. 21–51.
- Frijhoff, Willem, and Marijke Spies. *1650. Bevochten eendracht*. The Hague, 1999.
- Geraerts, Jaap. 'Dutch Test Acts: Oaths, Office Holding, and the Catholic Nobility in the Province of Utrecht, c. 1580–1700'. *Virtus. Journal of Nobility Studies* 20 (2013), pp. 61–83.
- 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.
- Hallebeek, Jan. 'Godsdienst(on)vrijheid in de Gouden Eeuw? Het proces tegen Johan Wachtelaer (1583–1652)'. *Trajecta* 23 (2014), pp. 123–44.
- Hilhorst, G. 'Het kerspel Schalkwijk'. *A.A.U.* 12 (1884), pp. 1–104.

- Hoek, Frans van. *Schets van de geschiedenis der jezùieten in Nederland*. Nijmegen, 1940.
- Hulzen, A. van. *Utrechtse kloosters en gasthuizen*. Baarn, 1986.
- Jacobs, Jan Y. H. A. *Joan Christiaan van Erckel (1654–1734). Pleitbezorger voor een locale kerk*. Amsterdam, 1982.
- Jong, Johannes de. 'Het Utrechtse vicariaat en de strijd over de hiërarchische orde in de 17e eeuw'. *De Katholiek* 164 (1923), pp. 73–104, 146–86.
- Kalveen, C. A. 'De vijf adellijke vrouwenkloosters in en om de stad Utrecht'. In *De kerk en de Nederlanden. Archieven, instellingen, samenleving*, edited by C. Dekker and E. S. C. Erkelens-Buttinger. Hilversum, 1997, pp. 152–67.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J. *Calvinists and Libertines: Confession and Community in Utrecht, 1578–1620*. Oxford, 1995.
- Kooi, Christine. *Liberty and Religion: Church and State in Leiden's Reformation, 1572–1620*. Leiden, 2000.
- Kooi, Christine. *Calvinists and Catholics during Holland's Golden Age: Heretics and Idolaters*. Cambridge, 2012.
- Kooi, Christine. 'Catholic Women in the Dutch Golden Age'. In *Embodiment, Identity, and Gender in the Early Modern Age*, edited by Amy E. Leonard and David M. Whitford. London and New York, 2020, pp. 148–59.
- Kruijf, Anique C. de. *Miraculeus bewaard. Middeleeuwse Utrechtse relieken op reis: de schat van de Oud-Katholieke Gertrudiskathedraal*. Zutphen, 2011.
- Kuijpers, Erika. *Migrantenstad. Immigratie en sociale verhoudingen in zeventiende-eeuws Amsterdam*. Hilversum, 2005.
- Leeuwen, Charles van. *Hemelse voorbeelden. De heiligenliederen van Johannes Stalpart van der Wiele, 1579–1630*. Nijmegen, 2001.
- Lenarduzzi, Carolina. 'De religieuze spagaat van katholieke studenten in de Republiek rond 1600'. *De zeventiende eeuw* 31, no. 2 (2015), pp. 267–83.
- 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.
- Lieburg, Fred van. *De Nadere Reformatie in Utrecht ten tijde van Voetius. Sporen in de gereformeerde kerkeeraadsacta*. Rotterdam, 1989.
- Lourens, Piet, and Jan Lucassen. "'Zunftlandschaften' in den Niederlanden und im benachbarten Deutschland'. In *Zunftlandschaften in Deutschland und den Niederlanden im Vergleich*, edited by Wilfried Reininghaus. Münster, 2000, pp. 11–43.
- Molhuysen, P. C., and P. J. Blok, eds. *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, 10 vols. Leiden, 1911–1937. [N.N.B.W.]
- Monteiro, Marit. *Geestelijke maagden. Leven tussen klooster en wereld in Noord-Nederland gedurende de zeventiende eeuw*. Hilversum, 1996.

- Parker, Charles H. *Faith on the Margins: Catholics and Catholicism in the Dutch Golden Age*. Cambridge, MA and London, 2008.
- Pollmann, Judith. *Religious Choice in the Dutch Republic: The Reformation of Arnoldus Buchelius (1565–1641)*. Manchester, 1999.
- 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.
- Prak, Maarten. *Citizens without Nations: Urban Citizenship in Europe and the World, c. 1000–1789*. Cambridge, 2018.
- Rogier, Lodewijk J. *Geschiedenis van het katholicisme in Noord-Nederland in de 16e en de 17e eeuw*, 3 vols. Amsterdam, 1945–1947.
- Rommès, Ronald. *Oost, west, Utrecht best? Driehonderd jaar migratie en migranten in de stad Utrecht (begin 16^e–begin 19^e eeuw)*. Amsterdam, 1998.
- Schilfgaarde, A. P. van. 'd'Everdinge van der Nypoort'. *D.N.L.* 58 (1940), col. 147–53.
- Schoon, Dick. *Een aartsbisschop aangeklaagd in Rome. Dagboeken over het verblijf van Petrus Codde te Rome, 1700–1703*. Hilversum, 2019.
- Schulte van Kessel, Elisja. *Geest en vlees in godsdienst en wetenschap. Vijf opstellen over gezagsconflicten in de 17^{de} eeuw*. The Hague, 1980.
- Spaans, Joke. 'Orphans and Students: Recruiting Boys and Girls for the Holland Mission'. 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. 183–99.
- 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, and Trudélien van 't Hof. 'Het beroerde Rome'. *Spotprenten op de paus in een pleidooi voor een 'Nederlandse' katholieke kerk, 1705–1724*. Hilversum, 2010.
- Spiertz, Mathieu G. 'Anti-jansenisme en jansenisme in de Nederlanden in de achttiende en negentiende eeuw'. *Trajecta* 1 (1992), pp. 233–51.
- Spiertz, Mathieu G. 'De katholieke geestelijke leiders en de wereldlijke overheid in de Republiek der Zeven Provinciën'. *Trajecta* 2 (1993), pp. 3–20.
- Tans, J. A. G., and M. Kok. *Rome-Utrecht. Over de historische oorzaken van de breuk tussen de rooms-katholieke en de oud-katholieke kerken en de huidige beoordeling van die oorzaken*. Hilversum, 1966.
- Theissing, Eugénie E. A. J. M. 'Over kloppjes en kwezels'. PhD diss., Utrecht University, 1935.
- Ven, Adrianus J. van de. *Over den oorsprong van het Aartsbisschoppelijke Kapittel van Utrecht der Oude-Bisschoppelijke clerezij*. Utrecht, 1923.
- Ven, Adrianus J. van de. 'De driehoek van Sint Marie te Utrecht'. *J.O.U.* (1955), pp. 30–80.

- Verheggen, Evelyne M. F. *Beelden van passie en hartstocht. Bid- en devotieprenten in de Noordelijke Nederlanden, 17^e en 18^e eeuw*. Zutphen, 2006.
- Vos, Aart. *Burgers, broeders en bazen. Het maatschappelijk middenveld van 's-Hertogenbosch in de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw*. Hilversum, 2007.
- Vries, Jan de. *European Urbanization, 1500–1800*. London, 1984.
- Vries, Jan de. 'Searching for a Role: The Economy of Utrecht in the Golden Age of the Dutch Republic'. In *Masters of Light: Dutch Painters in Utrecht during the Golden Age*, edited by Joaneath A. Spicer and Lynn Federle Orr. New Haven, 1997, pp. 49–59.
- Watson, Elise. 'The Jesuitesses in the Bookshop: Catholic Lay Sisters' Participation in the Dutch Book Trade, 1650–1750'. *Studies in Church History* 57 (2021), pp. 163–84.

Part II.

Catholic Survival Tactics

3. Foundational Infrastructure: Social Status and Networks

Abstract: Social status and networks formed a firm basis for Catholic survival. Focussing on Catholics with elevated social status and their networks of sociability, this chapter uncovers the infrastructure that was crucial to the survival of Catholics as individuals and as a group in Utrecht. These notable Catholics were composed of the defenders of prosecuted Catholics, nobles as well as canons, lawyers, and those with privileged connections to the Reformed elite. On the basis of their socio-economic capital, citizenship, and patronage, these prominent Catholics were not only guardians of the Catholic community, but also pillars of the wider civic community of Utrecht and beyond. Under their leadership, Catholics found themselves at the focal point of multi-religious Utrecht and its urban public sphere.

Keywords: social status, network, sociability, socio-economic capital, citizenship, patronage

Johannes Wachtelaer began his petition to the stadholder in 1639 by referring to the elevated social status of many native Catholics in the Northern Netherlands:

[I]n the United Provinces there are, and from of old have been, many (even a great host) who are of the old Catholic Roman religion, specifically also from the most prominent families of the land, both noble and bourgeois, so that there is hardly anyone of good family in the government of the land who has no close friends or relatives of this religion.¹

¹ HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, 'Memorie', p. 2): 'in de Geunieerde Provintien resideren ende van oudts geresideert hebben zeer veel (tot een groote menichte) die zijn van de oude catholycque roomsche religie, ende namentlick oock van de principaelsten, soo adelijcke

In order to soften Frederick Henry's heart towards Philippus Rovenius and other Catholics, including himself, Wachtelaer represented Dutch Catholics as his natural friends and as being closest to him in social standing, with established ties in the Northern Netherlands dating back to before the Protestant Reformation and the Dutch Revolt.

This chapter will examine the social status of the repressed and tolerated Catholics, as well as their defenders, who appear in the period under study. By combining the information from existing genealogical and prosopographical studies with the data produced by the present survey, it will unveil part of the hitherto underexplored networks of sociability used by Utrecht's Catholics to survive the Protestant regime.² It will position Catholic individuals and their defenders in their confessional and multi-confessional communities in Utrecht and, more widely, the Dutch Republic. While Catholics formed one-third of the city's total population of 30,000, which included a wide range of people from unknown indigents to prominent figures, this chapter will focus on those of elevated social status and their networks. It will argue that such notables were indispensable for the survival of the politico-religiously discriminated community of Catholics in Utrecht and beyond, providing their fellow believers with the necessary infrastructure for their survival through spatial practices and in discourses of self-representation – which will be, respectively, the topics of the next two chapters. The leading Catholics have been divided into four categories: defenders of the prosecuted Catholics; nobles and canons; jurists; and those with close ties to the Reformed elite. I shall argue that Catholics, both as individuals and as a group, could survive as devout Catholics and respected Utrechters backed by the elevated social status, ample socio-economic capital, eminent public reputation, and various networks of the Catholic elite, including their connections with their Reformed counterparts, notwithstanding the suppression of or significant constraints upon their rights and the serious damages inflicted

als burgerlicke familien van 't landt; soo datter qualick iemant is in 's landts regeeringe van eenich geslachte, off hij heeft navrienden ende bloetverwanten van de selve religie'.

2 I would like to express my deep gratitude to Marten Jan Bok, who kindly shared many of his (unpublished) findings and materials relating to the genealogy of early modern Utrechters with me. For a genealogical study of Utrechters until 1650, see also Burik, Kemp, and Verhoef, *Utrechtse Parentelen*. For genealogical studies of Catholics in the city of Utrecht, see also Boukema, 'Geloven in het geloof', pp. 45–51; Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 53–62, 143–77. For a genealogical study of Catholics in the province of Utrecht, see Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', passim; Idem, *Patrons*, passim. For a prosopographical study of Catholic priests working in the Northern Netherlands from 1663 to 1700, see Ackermans, *Herders*, especially pp. 311–478. Sebastien A. C. Dudok van Heel shows the value of genealogical research in tracing the avenues of social power to which Amsterdam's Catholics had access. Dudok van Heel, *Van Amsterdamse burgers*.

upon their politico-social credibility or fame in the urban public sphere. They constituted an integral part of the multi-confessional Christian social community (*corpus christianum*).

3.1. Defenders of the Prosecuted Catholics

According to a petition from his brother [86] and sister [87] to the Utrecht city court, Wachtelaer {19} left his hometown after the sheriff had summoned him, because he solicited the help of three advocates in Arnhem, The Hague, and Amsterdam. In the end, he was supported by Johan de With [93], an advocate of the provincial court of Holland who was located in Amsterdam, as well as several advocates of the provincial court of Utrecht. He trusted these ‘experienced lawyers’.³ If we wish to gain a better understanding of Catholic survival tactics, it is necessary to shed light on the hitherto underrepresented roles of these defenders who arbitrated with the sheriff on behalf of prosecuted Catholics, attested their innocence, and wrote pleas for them, regardless of any official legal capacity they might have had. In at least seventy-three of the 105 cases (70.0%), the presence of such defenders can be attested,⁴ amounting to a total of 100 (Appendix 4). Wachtelaer obtained support from the highest number of defenders {19} (eleven, Appendix 1). While sixty-nine of the defenders (69.0%) appear in the legal records only a single time,⁵ Berent (Bernhardt) van Zutphen, an advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht [99], appears most frequently, with a total of twelve appearances in the 105 cases.⁶

The defenders not only refuted charges filed against prosecuted Catholics and defended them, but also sought to negotiate penalties and even paid fines for them or posted bond on their behalf. In at least ten cases, defenders asked the city court to form a committee composed of aldermen to arbitrate between the sheriff and the prosecuted party, even though existing edicts prohibited all compromise with Catholics.⁷ By at least 1665, some defenders from legal

3 HUA, MKOKN, 557, n.d. (after 10 March 1640): ‘gepractiseerte rech[t]sgeleerden’.

4 Involvement of defenders cannot be confirmed in {2} {3} {4} {6} {7} {9} {10} {11} {12} {15} {18} {23} {25} {26} {28} {30} {33} {43} {45} {46} {47} {49} {53} {56} {59} {61} {62} {63} {66} {75} {77} {97} (Appendix 1).

5 The thirty-one defenders who appeared in the legal records more than once are [4] [7] [13] [15] [21] [22] [27] [28] [31] [33] [34] [37] [38] [41] [44] [45] [49] [50] [51] [53] [58] [62] [63] [64] [67] [78] [79] [80] [89] [98] [99] (Appendix 4).

6 {29} {42} {48} {50} {51} {52} {55} {57} {60} {72} {87} {104} in Appendix 1.

7 {5} {8} {86} {87} {90} {91} {92} {93} {95} {98} in Appendix 1.

professions started using a fixed formula for negotiations with the city court.⁸ In at least sixteen trials, the arbitration efforts of the defenders resulted in the final fine noted in the sentences being different from the original fine levied by the sheriff.⁹ For instance, in the case against Gerard van der Steen, the Catholic canon of St Jan, the sheriff initially demanded fines for all twenty-six participants caught at a gathering in his house {17}. However, according to a petition signed by an Utrecht provincial court advocate named Abraham van Kerckraad [45], most of the participants were simply too poor, old, or young to be fined. In the end, Van der Steen paid a total fine of f. (florins) 550 for all participants, a significant decrease from the amount prescribed in the edicts (Appendices 1 and 4). But prosecuted Catholics were not always successful in their negotiations. When the Catholic farmer Wouter Woutersz was charged with holding a Catholic assembly at his house at which, according to the sheriff, 200 or 300 ‘anonymous and indigent’ people were present {39}, the sheriff demanded a fine of f. 1,200, which was already lower than officially required. Yet a petition from Woutersz’s side, signed by the city court solicitor Didolph van de Poel [66], explained that Woutersz was too poor to pay and requested further leniency. This plea seems to have irritated the city court, for in the end Woutersz was fined f. 4,800, nearly the full amount legally stipulated for an unlawful ‘popish’ assembly with 200 participants (Appendices 1 and 4). Although Wachtelaer’s sister [87] swiftly managed to raise the sum of f. 6,000 demanded from him by selling his books and paintings {19},¹⁰ others, including Woutersz, no doubt had a harder time paying such large amounts. Presumably, non-wealthy Catholics could depend on the Catholic community, with its many members from the socio-economic elite as well as illegally administered ‘communal funds’, or else on the defenders within their socio-judicial networks. Indeed, Everard van der Schuer [78], a provincial court advocate, and another provincial court advocate named Richard van Coesfelt [21], paid a fine of f. 600 for the 200 anonymous Catholics who had gathered in the Cecilia Convent {14} (Appendices 1 and 4).

What motivated the defenders to stand for the prosecuted Catholics? At least some of them will have been sympathetic towards them on religious grounds. For at least twenty-five of the 100 defenders (25.0%), it can be determined with certainty that they belonged to the Catholic Church.¹¹

8 {86} {87} {90} {92} {93} {95} {98} in Appendix 1.

9 {5} {8} {39} {48} {62} {82} {83} {84} {87} {89} {89} {90} {91} {93} {94} {95} {98} in Appendix 1.

10 HUA, MKOKN, 557, n.d. (after 10 March 1640); HUA, SAIL, 2244-87, n.d., 18, 19 December 1640.

11 [2] [7] [8] [13] [15] [28] [30] [38] [41] [44] [50] [60] [63] [64] [67] [70] [78] [79] [80] [85] [89] [90] [91] [96] [99] in Appendix 4.

Family relationships were another factor motivating defenders to support prosecuted Catholics. At least twelve of the 100 defenders (12.0%) were relatives, whose own religious affiliation nevertheless remains unclear.¹² For example, Balthasar van Bueren, lord of Zuidoort (1604–1669), embraced the Catholic faith and was the third and last husband of a Catholic noblewoman named Beatrix de Wael van Vronesteyn (1617–1653), sister to Willem de Wael van Vronesteyn, a recognized Catholic member of the Teutonic Order.¹³ Together with other defenders, Van Bueren posted bail of f. 1,200 for the Jesuit Aloysius Ballast {88} and paid a fine of f. 380 for Agatha Dierhout {94} [15] (Appendices 1 and 4). Another Catholic defender was Cornelis Portengen (d. 1687), stepfather of the Catholic priest Nicolaus Henricus van der Poort (c. 1657–1718).¹⁴ At the same time, he was publicly recognized as a sub-clerk of the provincial court despite the prohibition of the edict (in office 1645–1674),¹⁵ appearing in four legal cases as a defender of prosecuted Catholics [67] (Appendix 4). Besides, the twenty-seven Catholic defenders included two bookkeepers¹⁶ and four trustees¹⁷ of the Catholic chamber of charity established in 1674. They supported Catholic Utrechters both judicially and financially. Among them, the wine merchant Nicolaes van Wenckum (d. before 1697) appears twice in the legal documents as a defender of prosecuted Catholics [89] (Appendix 4). He was connived as a trustee of the municipal chamber of charity (in office 1666–1668), before becoming one of the ten founders of the Catholic chamber of charity (in office as a trustee 1674–1677).¹⁸ Nicolaes's son Anthonius (c. 1665–1732) became a priest in Zevenhoven in the province of Holland, while his daughters Gertruda (d. before 1746) and Elisabeth (d. after 1748) were probably *kloppjes*.¹⁹ Six of the twenty-five Catholic defenders were themselves prosecuted in the 105 legal cases examined.²⁰ The fuse-maker Jan Jansz Dons, for instance, was accused of attending a Catholic assembly held in the house of Petertgen op Bedlehem in 1664 {83}. Six years later, he appeared as a defender for Petertje Gerrits living in Bethlem {99} [30], probably to be identified with Petertgen

12 [12] [16] [42] [58] [61] [68] [69] [72] [74] [75] [86] [87] in Appendix 4.

13 Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 276, 286, 290; Idem, *Patrons*, p. 274.

14 Ackermans, *Herders*, p. 419.

15 *G.P.U.*, II, p. 1063.

16 [38] [96] in Appendix 4.

17 [8] [41] [89] [90] in Appendix 4.

18 HUA, ORKA, 1, 1 October 1674; HUA, ORKA, 23, 1 October 1674, 1 September 1675, 1 September 1676; HUA, SAI, 1825-5, 1 August, 5 September 1666, 7, 24 August 1667. On Nicolaes, see also Verhey, *300 jaar*, pp. 15, 49, 51, 211, 240.

19 Ackermans, *Herders*, p. 469.

20 [13] [30] [64] [70] [78] [80] in Appendix 4.

op Bedlehem (Appendices 1 and 4). The advocate Van der Schuer, who was found participating in the Catholic assembly in Van der Steen's house {17}, appears as defender of other prosecuted Catholics in three lawsuits [78] (Appendices 1 and 4).

However, defenders may also have been inspired by purely professional motives, since at least five defenders also assisted the sheriff or a Reformed plaintiff in the procedures against Catholics.²¹ Moreover, at least four of these defenders seem to have been Reformed: the three magistrates and aldermen Van Kerckraad [45], Nicolaes van Merkerck [53], and Henrick van Zuylen [100], as well as the city court secretary Gerard van Lienden [48]. Furthermore, Van Kerckraad and Joost (Justus) van Ewijck [34] assumed the position of councillor to the provincial court of Utrecht without any opposition on religious grounds: hence, Van Ewijck too may have been Reformed.²² In the case of Van Kerckraad [45] and Van Zuylen [100] it can be demonstrated that they served the Reformed Church as members of the consistory.²³ Therefore, supra-confessional collaboration did exist between prosecuted Catholics and Reformed defenders. Remarkably, even Wachtelaer {19}, one of the central figures within the Dutch Catholic Church, received legal support from at least three Reformed lawyers, namely Van Ewijck [34], Van Kerckraad [45], and Van Lienden [48] (Appendices 1 and 4). Even in the legal proceedings against Catholics, therefore, we can find traces of the ecumenicity of everyday life between the prosecuted and their defenders.

For a total of eighty-nine defenders, their social status could be determined (Graph 4).²⁴ Out of these eighty-nine defenders, six belonged to the lower-middle class (6.7%).²⁵ Some in this latter category were colleagues of the prosecuted Catholics they defended. The fuse-maker Henrick Jansz Doel [29] thus stood for his guild colleague Jan Jansz Dons, who was charged with participating in an illegal assembly {83} (Appendices 1 and 4). Family relationships could push defenders with humble jobs to appear in court, as the plumber Cornelis Dircksz van der Hout [42] defended his relative, the


21 Van Coesfelt [21] assisted the sheriff in case {19}, Van Kerckraad [45] did so in case {23}, Gerard van Lienden [48] in cases {79} and {80}, Nicolaes van Merkerck [53] in case {19}, and Henrick van Zuylen [100] in cases {81} and {84}, also assisting a Reformed plaintiff in case {69} (Appendix 1).

22 *G.P.U.*, II, p. 1054, III, pp. 165, 185–88, 196–97.

23 Lieburg, *De Nadere Reformatie*, pp. 155, 159.

24 Three defenders were mentioned or are known just as the wife or daughter of someone else: [18] [47] [52] in Appendix 4. The professions and social status of the other eight defenders are unknown: [6] [9] [11] [19] [32] [39] [65] [77] in Appendix 4.

25 [1] [5] [17] [29] [30] [42] in Appendix 4. See also Graph 4.



Graph 4. Profession and social status of defenders in Utrecht, 1620-1672

priest Cornelis van der Hout {24} (Appendices 1 and 4). Out of the eighty-nine defenders, twenty-three were in the higher or upper-middle class without legal professions, including nobles, canons, and medical doctors (25.8%).²⁶ Prosecuted Catholics may have expected that the elevated social status of these defenders would prove advantageous to them.

Sixty out of the eighty-nine defenders (67.4%) had legal professions. Although it is understandable that prosecuted Catholics would seek legal experts, the high number of Utrecht provincial court advocates is more remarkable, with thirty-four of the total of sixty lawyers being at the provincial court (56.7%).²⁷ One of the reasons for this preponderance may have been the pervasive influence of Catholics at the level of the provincial court, which was served by three Catholic councillors in the first half of the seventeenth century: Otto Schrassert (in office 1627–1630), Jacob de Wys (in office 1630–1651) and Pieter Dierhout (in office 1630–1640).²⁸ At least eleven advocates of the provincial court who appear as defenders in the 105 documented cases certainly belonged to the Catholic Church.²⁹ Together with his ‘special deputy’ Johan de With [93], Wachtelaer {19} repeatedly

26 [2] [8] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [41] [44] [51] [61] [63] [64] [69] [70] [72] [75] [79] [80] [83] [86] [89] [94] in Appendix 4.

27 [3] [7] [21] [25] [27] [28] [31] [33] [34] [35] [38] [45] [50] [54] [55] [56] [57] [58] [59] [60] [68] [71] [73] [78] [81] [85] [90] [91] [92] [95] [96] [97] [98] [99] in Appendix 4.

28 *G.P.U.*, II, p. 1054.

29 [7] [28] [38] [50] [60] [78] [85] [90] [91] [96] [99] in Appendix 4.

launched appeals before the provincial court of Utrecht,³⁰ which his father had served as a solicitor.³¹ Indeed, Van Coesfelt [21], an advocate of the provincial court, made secret revelations to his 'confrere' – Wachtelaer or his defenders – about the state of affairs inside the provincial court with regard to the procedures against Catholic priests, including Wachtelaer, Van Moock, and Pelt. Warning the recipient that the letter should be 'burned immediately' after reading, Van Coesfelt reported that the provincial court was favourably disposed to Wachtelaer in particular.³² After being sentenced by the city court, Wachtelaer immediately sent an appeal signed by De With to the provincial court, saying that it still offered him a means of 'recourse'.³³

The presence of defenders was too important for prosecuted Catholics to be ignored. Their roles included the refutation of the charges filed against the prosecuted, arbitration between sheriff and prosecuted, and penalty negotiations with the city court. Some defenders seem to have had religious and familial motives to fight for their co-religionists or relatives in court, while others were led by purely professional motives to act as defenders of Catholics in spite of their own allegiance to the Reformed faith. Whereas some defenders belonged to the lower middle class, a significant number of them hailed from the upper middle or higher social strata of the Utrecht civic community. Among them, Catholic Utrechters depended in particular on advocates of the provincial court, where their co-religionists retained a certain influence.

3.2. Nobles and Canons

For Catholic survival in post-Reformation Utrecht, Catholic nobles and canons were indispensable not only for their role as defenders of prosecuted co-religionists. Those who had the means to host Catholic assemblies were mostly well-to-do persons, including many noblemen, noblewomen, and canons, whose names the judicial officers recorded as representatives of the gatherings so that they were obliged to appear in court and face prosecution. In the seventeenth century, more than a few noble families had

30 HUA, MKOKN, 557, n.d. (after 24), 28 September, 10 October, 5 November 1639; HUA, SAI, 2244-87, 10, 28 October, 5 November 1639.

31 HUA, NOT, U001a001, 221, 20 Aug 1579; Ven, 'De Driehoek', p. 35.

32 HUA, MKOKN, 557, 5 November 1639.

33 *Ibidem*, n.d. (after 10 March 1640): 'recours'. De With repeatedly petitioned the provincial court after Wachtelaer was sentenced by the city court on 10 March 1640. HUA, Kapittel Sint Marie te Utrecht, 93, 17, 18 March 1640; HUA, SAI, 121-19, 26 March, 13 November 1640; HUA, SAI, 2244-87, 17, 28 March 1640.

their residence within Utrecht's city walls, although they also owned their fiefs in the countryside. Apart from his rural castle in Schalkwijk, Adriaen Ram thus owned a house within the city, on Achter Clarenburg, which grew into the secular clandestine church of Maria Minor where he was found participating in an illegal assembly {35} (Appendix 1). Many of the Catholic nobles were well connected with other nobles and patricians. For example, the Catholic nobleman Gerard Moliaert van Zirckzee, who had been accused of hosting a Catholic assembly in his house on Oudemunsterkerkhof {89},³⁴ would later act as an executor to the testament of Agneta Aerts, widow of Claes Vosch, along with other Catholic notables like Gerard Otto Schrassert and Johan Pelt.³⁵ The same goes for the noblewoman Aletta van Schendel, who was charged with holding Catholic assemblies in her house on Achter Clarenburg on three different occasions {78} {93} {103} (Appendix 1) and who was publicly permitted to bequeath her property as she saw fit.³⁶ Her sister Stephanie (1623–1657) married the merchant Johan Godfried Boot (b. 1627/28), and their son Arnoldus Boot (c. 1660–1724) became a priest working in Haarlem.³⁷

Some other prominent noble families, which formed an integral part of the Dutch Catholic community, had both repressed and tolerated Catholics in Utrecht among their members, while also producing many priests. The Van der Burch family, for instance, had played an important role within the civic community of Utrecht since before the Dutch Revolt.³⁸ Lambert van der Burch (1542–1617) was a canon of St Marie and became its dean in 1578, shortly before the outlawing of Catholicism. Despite his deep attachment to the Catholic faith, he was able to continue in this post as dean until his death. Representing the five chapters, he held a seat in the first estate at the Provincial States and reluctantly signed the Union of Utrecht in 1579. The next year Calvinists banished him along with several other Catholic canons. Nevertheless, Lambert came back to Utrecht no later than 1592. Until his death, he continued to serve the Catholic Church, for instance by writing a history of the collegiate chapter of St Marie. A nephew of Lambert, Frans van der Burch (1567–1644), became bishop of Ghent (in office 1613–1616) and

34 HUA, SAII, 2244-122, 7, 8, 17 November, 22, 23 December 1665, 6 January 1666.

35 HUA, NOT, Uo56a005, 43, 30 November 1667.

36 HUA, SAII, 121-27, 30 May 1661.

37 Ackermans, *Herders*, p. 327.

38 On the Van der Burch family in general, see Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 19, 79, 120, 154, 183, 186–87, 191, 193, 288, 290, 299; Idem, *Patrons*, pp. 9, 137, 165, 202, 205, 207, 213, 217, 234, 237.

then archbishop of Cambrai (1616–1644).³⁹ In 1608 Lambert, together with a Catholic canon (priest) of St Marie named Bruno Foeck <11>, secured a canonry of the same chapter for a Catholic patrician named Johannes de Witt (1566–1622).⁴⁰ Apart from Foeck, the priest Niclaes van der Burch was also registered with the municipality in 1622 <12> (Appendix 2). On the other hand, Willem van der Burch, who matriculated at the University of Cologne in 1623,⁴¹ was charged with hosting Catholic assemblies on two occasions {62} {63}, while he also defended Anna Catharina Mom {70} and the priest Anthonis de Rhode {73} at their trials [13] (Appendices 1 and 4). Willem also served as a trustee of the municipal chamber of charity (in office 1635–1637), and was non-publicly connived as a trustee of St Bartholomew Hospice.⁴²

The De Ridder van Groenestejn noble family, whose origins lay in Holland, likewise included tolerated Catholics and defenders of prosecuted Catholics.⁴³ Among them, Daniel de Ridder van Groenestejn (1596–1669) lived next to other Catholic notables along Utrecht's Nieuwegracht canal, including Anthoni van Blockland (c. 1584–1654) [7], Agatha Dierhout {58} {75} {94} {105}, and Dirck Lommetzum [50].⁴⁴ Daniel was non-publicly connived as a trustee of St Barbara and St Laurens Hospice.⁴⁵ His nephew Cornelis Frederik acted as a defender in the trial against Agatha Dierhout in 1679.⁴⁶ Daniel's younger brother Cornelis (1600–1667) and their nephew Dirk Ferdinand (Cornelis Frederik's elder brother) (1624–1705) became Jesuits working outside Utrecht after the passing of their (last) wives. Both of them were given public recognition allowing them to return to their birthplace Utrecht <74> <75> (Appendix 2).⁴⁷ Furthermore, Daniel's

39 *N.N.B.W.*, VI, col. 232–33. See also Forclaz, *Catholiqueus*, pp. 47–48; Kuys, *Repertorium*, pp. 301, 317, 336.

40 Sterk, 'Johannes de Witt Stevenszoon', pp. 109–10. On Foeck <11>, see also Ven, *Over den oorsprong*, p. 52.

41 Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 166, 288; Idem, *Patrons*, p. 92.

42 HUA, BAI, 1604, c. 1651, c. 1653; HUA, SAI, 1825-1, 10 October 1635, 5 October 1636.

43 On the De Ridder van Groenestejn family in general, see Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 56, 74, 78, 101, 180, 291; Idem, *Patrons*, pp. 62, 89, 92, 124, 202; Wittert van Hoogland, 'Utrechtsche ridderhofsteden en heerlijkheden', pp. 96–100, 329–38.

44 HUA, SAI, 121-25, 26 March 1655. On Daniel, see also Geraerts, 'Contested Rights', p. 211.

45 HUA, BAI, 1258, *passim* in 1641.

46 HUA, SAI, 2236-5, 17 January 1679. On Cornelis Frederik, see Wittert van Hoogland, 'Utrechtsche ridderhofsteden en heerlijkheden', p. 332.

47 On Cornelis, see also Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 58, 117; Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 78, 291; Idem, *Patrons*, p. 92; Wittert van Hoogland, 'Utrechtsche ridderhofsteden en heerlijkheden', pp. 97–98, 334. On Dirk Ferdinand, see also Forclaz, *Catholiques*, p. 117; Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', p. 101; Idem, *Patrons*, p. 124; Hoeck, *Schets*, pp. 89, 202, 260; Wittert van Hoogland, 'Utrechtsche ridderhofsteden en heerlijkheden', p. 332.

other older brother Aegidius became a secular priest and was arrested in Mijdrecht in 1632, but by 1636 his bail had still not been paid.⁴⁸ Gerard de Wael van Vronesteyn, one of the many Catholics of this noble family,⁴⁹ was the father of Willem (1622–1651), a tolerated Catholic member of the Teutonic Order, and was himself charged with holding a Catholic assembly {36} (Appendix 1). Gerard's younger brother Willem (1583–1659) worked as a Jesuit in Maastricht, Leuven, and Brussels, being promoted to provincial in the Belgian province of the Society of Jesus.⁵⁰ Besides, Ermgard de Wael van Vronesteyn was publicly permitted to bequeath her property as she saw fit despite her Catholic faith.⁵¹ Likewise, the Van Renesse van Baer noble family also produced numerous Catholics,⁵² some of whom were repressed and tolerated in Utrecht. For instance, Adriaen (d. 1635) was non-publicly connived as a trustee of St Barbara and St Laurens Hospice.⁵³ Adriaen's nephew Jacob (Frederick) van Renesse van Baer, who had been a trustee of the same hospice, became a secular priest after the death of his last wife.⁵⁴ Jacob (Frederick)'s older brother, who was also named Adriaen (1599–1647), was a Jesuit working in Groningen and Amersfoort,⁵⁵ and their grandnephews Jacob Willem and Frederick Ignatius were both appointed canons of St Gertrude Abbey near Leuven, for which only noblemen were eligible.⁵⁶ A grandson of Adriaen, Johan Adriaen (1635–1721), also adhered to the Catholic faith and had his children baptized by Catholic priests, even though he served in the Dutch army.⁵⁷ He, together with a woman named Van Oudheusden, was once found attending a Catholic assembly being held

48 HUA, SAII, 121–17, 12 May 1636.

49 On the De Wael van Vronesteyn family, see Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 58–59, 148–51; Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', passim, especially pp. 37–38, 274–77; Idem, *Patrons*, passim, especially pp. 34–36.

50 Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 58–59; Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 54, 116–17, 131, 139, 148, 182, 185, 275; Idem, *Patrons*, pp. 60, 148–49, 156, 159, 174, 180; Hoeck, *Schets*, p. 405.

51 HUA, SAII, 121–21, 24 February 1646.

52 On the Van Renesse van Baer family, see Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 149, 207; Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', passim, especially pp. 37–38, 268–71; Idem, *Patrons*, passim, especially pp. 34–36; Rogier, *Geschiedenis*, II, p. 392.

53 HUA, BAI, 1254, 11 January 1620, 20 September 1627, 26 October 1631; HUA, BAI, 1258, passim in 1620–1625, 1627–1629, 1631–1633. On Adriaen, see Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 98, 269; Idem, *Patrons*, p. 121.

54 HUA, BAI, 1258, passim in 1620, 1645, 1647. On Jacob (Frederick), see Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 46, 59, 269; Idem, *Patrons*, pp. 44, 67; Hoogland, 'Descriptio status', p. 182.

55 Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 58–59; Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', p. 269; Hoeck, *Schets*, pp. 75, 93, 151, 156; *N.N.B.W.*, V, col. 588.

56 Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 53, 271; *N.N.B.W.*, V, col. 588–89.

57 Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 41, 46, 61, 142, 166, 173, 270–71; Idem, *Patrons*, pp. 38–39, 41–42, 45, 208, 221, 244.

in the house of a noblewoman known as Van Loenersloot, Maria Johanna van Amstel van Mijnden, which functioned as the Jesuit clandestine church of St Martinus {92} (Appendix 1).⁵⁸

The Catholic nobility acted as patrons and guardians of their co-religionists. Hendrica van Duivenvoorde was one of them, sheltering Catholic priests in Utrecht. She was born as the third child of Odilia Valkenaar and Admiral Johan van Duivenvoorde, who came from a younger branch of the Wassenaar family. Both the Van Duivenvoorde and Wassenaar families remained Catholic after the Protestant Reformation, and Hendrica too grew up a devout Catholic. As a hunchback, she probably had low prospects on the aristocratic marriage market, nor could she enter convent life in the Protestant Republic. She therefore inherited a vast amount of property from her father, including life annuities and several estates. No later than 1635, she could be found living in one such inherited house on Nieuwegracht (nowadays Plompstorengracht), where she sheltered core members of the Holland Mission, including Apostolic Vicar Rovenius. Remarkably, even after a raid on her house by judicial officers who tried to apprehend Rovenius (but in vain), Hendrica herself managed to evade legal prosecution and continued to harbour members of the Holland Mission. Even though Rovenius was sentenced to banishment from the Dutch Republic, he continued to frequent Utrecht thereafter, often visiting Hendrica. He died in her house and was probably buried there, although his grave has never been found. After the death of the apostolic vicar, Hendrica left Utrecht for Antwerp, where she found her final resting place in St Jacob Church.⁵⁹

Numerous Catholic nobles were related by blood. One such entangled network involved the Mom, Van Brakel, and Van Spangen families, all of which acted as champions of the Catholic faith in Utrecht and beyond. Jacob Mom was a Catholic nobleman originating from Gelderland who was accused of *lèse-majesté* and beheaded in The Hague in 1621 shortly after the resumption of the Eighty Years' War.⁶⁰ Since the charge of *lèse-majesté* and the death penalty were rare in the Dutch Republic,⁶¹ Mom was undoubtedly

58 For the parish and the castle of Loenerslooth held by the Van Amstel van Mijnden family, see idem, 'The Catholic Nobility', passim; Idem, *Patrons*, passim; Heijden, *Het kerspel Loenerslooth*. On Maria Johanna van Amstel van Mijnden, see Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 104, 166, 201, 299; Idem, *Patrons*, pp. 71, 208, 246–47, 269.

59 On Hendrica van Duivenvoorde and her families, see Hallebeek, 'Godsdienst(on)vrijheid', pp. 134, 137; Hewett and Hallebeek, 'The Prelate', pp. 147–48; Kort, *Wassenaar*; Kuiken, 'Henrica van Duivenvoorde'.

60 *N.N.B.W.*, III, col. 876–77; Rogier, *Geschiedenis*, I, pp. 474–75.

61 Hewett and Hallebeek, 'The Prelate', pp. 136–38, 141–43.

seen as one of the most dangerous traitors to the Protestant state, so that his bereaved came to attract the closest attention from the politico-judicial authorities. Nevertheless, his family continued to play a pivotal role in Catholic survival in Utrecht. In 1609 Anna Catharina Mom (d. 1663), Jacob Mom's daughter, married the Catholic nobleman Assuerus (Zweder) van Brakel (d. 1641), lord of Blikkenburg. Assuerus posted bail before the Utrecht city court to prevent the furniture of his father-in-law Jacob Mom from being confiscated.⁶² Assuerus inherited a house on Achter Clarenburg from his own father Jaspas van Brakel (d. 1596). After Assuerus sold the house in 1631, it was transformed into the secular clandestine church of Maria Minor Achter Clarenburg.⁶³ After her husband's passing, Anna Catharina Mom, who was known as the noblewoman Van Blikkenburg as well as lady of Huis te Beest, was charged with hosting a Catholic assembly in her house near Lollestraat, Cellebroederstraat, and St Hieronymus School, that is, the secular clandestine church of St Nicolaas Achter de Wal, on at least four different occasions {27} {42} {70} {72}. In two of these cases, her son-in-law Cornelis van Spangen (1597–1663) [79], husband of Henrica van Brakel, appeared in court to pay a fine on her behalf (Appendices 1 and 4).

The Van Spangen family, which derived its title from land in the Rotterdam area, were also well-connected with the nobility and the patriciate of both Holland and Utrecht.⁶⁴ It is worth noting that Cornelis van Spangen stood surety for new Catholic citizens of seemingly low profile. When Adriaen Claesz was recognized as a new citizen in 1663, the registration record notes that he was lodging with a 'Mr Van Spangen'.⁶⁵ Moreover, when Frans (François) Schepens, who had been refused citizenship on 16 June 1656, was tolerated as a new citizen on 3 November 1656, it was Van Spangen who promised the city council that he would prevent Schepens's children from soliciting alms from the municipal chamber of charity.⁶⁶ While the political authorities seem to have been concerned that the Schepens family would become a financial

62 HUA, SAI, 2244-43, 9 April 1621; HUA, SAI, 2244-44, 9 April 1621.

63 Ven, 'Het huis Clarenburch', pp. 42–43, 61. On the Van Brakel family, see Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 125, 131, 150, 153–54, 170, 182, 184, 188, 250, 293; Idem, *Patrons*, pp. 151, 158, 164–65, 183, 204, 213, 215, 218, 267.

64 On the Mom, Van Brakel, and Van Spangen noble families, see also Klaveren, 'Jans kameren', pp. 128–40; Wittert van Hoogland, 'Utrechtsche ridderhofsteden en heerlijkheden', pp. 249–50. On Cornelis van Spangen, see Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 153, 200–1; Idem, *Patrons*, pp. 164, 246. On the Van Spangen family, see Ackermans, *Herders*, p. 317; Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 97, 153, 188, 198, 200–1, 289, 293; Idem, *Patrons*, pp. 118, 140, 218, 243, 247, 267; Rogier, *Geschiedenis*, I, p. 483.

65 HUA, SAI, 414-1, 3 August 1663.

66 HUA, SAI, 121-26, 3 November 1656; HUA, SAI, 414-1, 3 November 1656.

burden on the city's public welfare, Van Spangen relieved them of their anxiety so that Schepens was granted Utrecht citizenship. Using his elevated social status in the civic community of Utrecht, Van Spangen succeeded in persuading the Reformed magistracy to accept Catholics as new citizens.

The Mom, Van Brakel, and Van Spangen families were also active in the administration of charity in Utrecht. For example, Assuerus van Brakel was appointed a trustee of the municipal chamber of charity (in office 1628–1631).⁶⁷ Ever since the Middle Ages, churches, charitable institutions, and wealthy individuals in the Low Countries had established housing complexes called free dwellings (*vrije woningen*) or so-called God's chambers (*Godskameren*) to supply fellow inhabitants with housing and alms (cash and commodities). Utrecht had many such free dwellings, amounting to around 300 in 1687.⁶⁸ Among the six complexes of free dwellings established after 1580, five were founded by Catholics, from whose confessional ranks most of the residents also came.⁶⁹ The free dwellings on Hieronymusplantsoen, which had been established in the fifteenth century by Jan van der Meer, came into the possession of Jacob Mom. From him, their ownership was transferred on to his daughter Anna Catharina Mom, then to her daughter Maria van Brakel, and finally to Maria's nephew Assuerus Hendrik van Spangen, lord of Terlist (son of Cornelis van Spangen and Henrica van Brakel).⁷⁰ The dwellings were called 'Mom's and Brakel's chambers', and all ten residents in 1687 were of the Catholic faith.⁷¹

Canons belonged to the highest social echelons within Utrecht's civic community. Catholic canons were therefore of great importance for Catholic survival. For more than forty years after the outlawing of Catholicism, several Catholic priests still managed to retain their canonries. Among the thirty registered priests in 1622, we find five canons,⁷² including Jacobus de Gouda <10>, who had become a Jesuit after acquiring a canonry of St Pieter and was living within this chapter's former immunity. Likewise, his older brother Johannes (1571–1630), an active polemicist, was appointed a canon

67 HUA, SAII, 1825-1, 1 September 1628, 19 October 1630.

68 Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 256–58. For the free dwellings in Utrecht, see Adriani, 'De Gronsveltkameren'; Bogaers, *Aards*, p. 558; Kam, *Voor de armen alhier*; Klaveren, 'Jans kameren'; Lap van Waveren, 'Memorie'; Offringa and Hidden, *Fundatie*; Schaik and Strengers-Olde Kalter, *Het arme roomse leven*, pp. 44–48; Temminck Groll, 'De Beyerskameren te Utrecht'; Thoomes, *Hoffes in Utrecht*.

69 Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 258–62; HUA, KR, 10, 18 July, 26 September 1687 (the final entry was transcribed in Klaveren, 'Vrijwoningen').

70 Idem, 'Jans kameren', pp. 128–40.

71 HUA, KR, 10, 18 July, 26 September 1687 (Klaveren, 'Vrijwoningen', p. 27); Idem, 'Jans kameren', pp. 128–40: 'Moms en Brakels kameren'.

72 <1> <10> <11> <26> <30> in Appendix 2.

of the same chapter, before beginning his work for the Society of Jesus in the Southern Netherlands. Their parents, Dirk Jansz (Theodorus) de Gouda (d. 1584) and Catharina van Moerendael (d. 1618), came from noble families. Dirk Jansz had served the provincial court of Utrecht as secretary.⁷³

Six Catholic canons, including Wachtelaer and five laymen, were prosecuted; their cases are part of the 105 legal proceedings. Their family members were also devoted to the Catholic cause, while making an enormous socio-economic contribution to the multi-confessional city.⁷⁴ Huybert de Roy obtained his canonry of St Marie through his guardian Gerrit van Wassenaer, an advocate of the provincial court. De Roy was charged with converting to the Catholic faith in spite of the oath Van Wassenaer had sworn to raise his charge in the Reformed faith {79} (Appendix 1). Dirck de Roy, living on Nieuwegracht, was named in the list of priests living in the city that was probably drawn up in 1665 <017> (Appendix 3). There were also two other secular priests called De Roy originating from Utrecht, Henricus (c. 1625–1695) and Clemens (c. 1630–1673).⁷⁵ Hugo de Roy, a cousin of the Catholic painter Frederick Bloemaert, was appointed trustee of the municipal chamber of charity.⁷⁶ Although the family of another Catholic canon of St Marie, Gisbert Junius {80}, remains largely unknown, he was related to Huybert de Roy and likewise accused of converting to the Catholic faith despite an oath sworn by his father. In spite of this, Junius still acted as a defender for two other prosecuted Catholics [44] (Appendices 1 and 4). He was also active in poor relief in Utrecht, as he was non-publicly connived as a trustee of the municipal chamber of charity (in office 1660–1663).⁷⁷ Furthermore, he was publicly appointed vice-dean of the chapter of St Marie, directing the chapter's charitable activities as a 'curator of the poor' (*curator pauperum*) in 1663.⁷⁸ Thus, Junius was not only a guardian of the Catholic community, but also a leading figure within the civic community as a whole.

The Utrecht noble family of Van Haeften, which produced several canons, was one of the stalwarts of post-Tridentine Catholicism in the Low

73 On Johannes, see Andriessen, *De jezuiteten*, passim; Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 57–58, 234; Gennip, *Controversen*, passim, especially pp. 90–174; Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', p. 296; Hofman, 'Wilger van Moerendael', p. 169; *N.N.B.W.*, III, col. 481–82; Ven, *Over den oorsprong*, p. 50. On Jacobus, see Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 44, 57–58; Gennip, *Controversen*, p. 91; Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 187, 245; Idem, *Patrons*, p. 217; Hofman, 'Wilger van Moerendael', p. 169; Jong, 'Het Utrechtse vicariaat', p. 154; Ven, *Over den oorsprong*, p. 51.

74 {2} {9} {16} {17} {19} {64} {79} {80} in Appendix 1.

75 Ackermans, *Herders*, p. 430.

76 Roethlisberger and Bok, *Abraham Bloemaert*, I, pp. 611, 658.

77 HUA, SAI, 1825-3, 17, 20 August 1660, 21, 30 August 1661, 24 September 1662.

78 HUA, Kapittel van Sint Marie, 2201.

Countries. Jan van Haeften (1448–1526), a canon of St Marie in Utrecht, and his concubine Henrica van Brakel had a son called Otto Jansz van Haeften (1475–1558), whose descendants continued to uphold the Catholic faith after the Protestant Reformation while enjoying an elevated social status in the city.⁷⁹ These included Anthonius (1557–1645), a Catholic lay canon of St Jan and a trustee of the Apostle Hospice as well as the Holy Cross Hospice. Four of Anthonius's six children chose a Catholic religious vocation, as three daughters became nuns in Mechelen, while his son Jacob came to be known as Benedictus (1588–1648) and was the abbot of Affligem Abbey in Brabant. All of them, together with their parents, are depicted on a family portrait from 1613.⁸⁰ In his youth, Benedictus attended St Hieronymus Latin school in Utrecht, where he befriended Otto Zijl, who would later become a Jesuit. Together with Zijl, Benedictus then entered Leuven University, where he became a close associate of Cornelius Jansenius, the future bishop of Ieper, and of Judocus Cats (1581–1641), the future dean of the Haarlem chapter.⁸¹ While Benedictus is remembered primarily as a reformer of Affligem in the Southern Netherlands and an influential author of religious works,⁸² he nevertheless kept his sense of belonging to Utrecht, as reflected on the titlepages of some of his writings: the name of his hometown was printed in capital letters right after his name, while his status as abbot of Affligem Abbey was added in small letters.⁸³ In 1632 Benedictus's return to Utrecht was publicly tolerated, when he came to visit his father Antonius <34>.

Our storyteller, Johannes Wachtelaer {2} {9} {19} <26>, was one of the most important mainstays of the Dutch Catholic community. He was born as the son of Jan Wachtelaer, a solicitor of the provincial court of Utrecht, and Marijke Dircksdr van Werckhoven. The Wachtelaer family were one of the most respected families within the civic community of Utrecht, having produced a number of canons in medieval times. Following in the footsteps of his ancestors, Johannes acquired a canonry in St Marie, which his parents purchased for him in 1593 when the canonries were still open to Catholics. Remarkably, the chapter allowed him to study Catholic theology at Leuven University from 1604 to 1606. Hence, the chapter tolerated Wachtelaer's training at the heart of the Counter/Catholic Reformation, tacitly allowing

79 Verleyn, *Dom Benedictus van Haeften*, pp. 37–38.

80 Verheggen, 'Religieuze kunst', passim, especially pp. 261–68; Verleyn, *Dom Benedictus van Haeften*, pp. 39–41. On Anthonius, see also Kruijf, *Miraculeus bewaard*, p. 146.

81 *Ibidem*, pp. 41–48.

82 Verheggen, 'Religieuze kunst', pp. 268–71, 276–83, 286–92; Verleyn, *Dom Benedictus van Haeften*, pp. 62–205.

83 Verheggen, 'Religieuze kunst', p. 293.

him to be ordained as a Catholic priest. After completing his studies in the South, Wachtelaer returned home as a cleric and became vicar general to Apostolic Vicars Vosmeer and Rovenius.⁸⁴ When Wachtelaer established his clandestine church of St Gertrudis in Mariahoek, located within the former immunity of the collegiate chapter of St Marie, he utilized his privilege as a canon of the same chapter, purchasing houses there belonging to the chapter.⁸⁵ Wachtelaer's family on his mother's side occupied political and judicial offices in Utrecht. In particular, his cousin Cornelis van Werckhoven (1617–1665), who would be one of Johannes's heirs alongside his childless sister and brother, built a brilliant political career for himself at both the local and national levels. Van Werckhoven became a member of the city council and an alderman in Utrecht, and represented the province of Utrecht on the Council of State.⁸⁶ Wachtelaer was therefore an eminent figure not only among the Catholic community but also among the civic community of Utrecht and beyond.

Nobles and canons therefore played crucial roles for Catholic survival in Utrecht and, more widely, the Dutch Republic. Some of them had retained their family legacy and excellent reputation since before the Protestant Reformation. They hosted numerous illegal gatherings for their co-religionists in their houses, harboured priests, and paid fines or put up bail, representing the local Catholic congregation. Some others appeared in court as defenders of prosecuted Catholics. Many noble families produced clergy, some of whom won toleration so as to reside in Utrecht, and included those wealthy women of the Catholic faith who had secured the right to bequeath their property. A number of the Catholic nobles and canons contributed markedly not only to their confessional community, but also to the religiously diverse civic community of Utrecht. They acted as guarantors for new Catholic citizens with lower incomes and served the city's poor through their charitable activities. They were not only guiding spirits of Catholicism in the post-Reformation Low Countries, but also prominent figures of the multi-confessional society in the Dutch Republic.

3.3. Jurists

One of the means available to Catholic patricians to compensate for their exclusion from political power in post-Reformation Utrecht was a legal

84 For the biographical details, see Hallebeek, 'Godsdienst(on)vrijheid', pp. 124–26; Ven, 'De driehoek', pp. 35–37.

85 Ibidem, pp. 35–41, 49–50.

86 *G.P.U.*, III, pp. 175–76, 184, 194–95; HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, 'Memorie', p. 20).

career.⁸⁷ While it is impossible to calculate the exact confessional distribution among the legal professionals in the Dutch Republic, where people could freely choose their religion, it is worth noting that, in our Utrecht case study, Catholic jurists can be found not only among the defenders of the prosecuted Catholics but also among both repressed and tolerated Catholics, and likewise appear as their family members. Apart from their role as judicial experts, Catholic lawyers were essential for Catholic survival in other roles as well, as hosts of illegal assemblies, for example, or as fathers of priests and *klopjes*, administrators of charitable institutions, and financial guarantors of the confessional community via their bequests.

As we will note in greater detail later on, Utrecht had two 'hot spots' of Catholic activity, one around Nieuwegracht and the other around Mariahoek, where not only clandestine churches but also many Catholic jurists' houses were located. Numerous Catholic advocates of the provincial court resided on or near Nieuwegracht, in the vicinity of their court which stood on the site of the former Paulus Abbey. These advocates were interconnected through their many confessional, professional, and family bonds. In 1647 the Reformed consistory identified the house of Peter Vuysting [85], an advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht, in Nieuwestraat as a Catholic meeting place.⁸⁸ According to the sheriff's investigation report from 1655, a man named Vuysting, perhaps the aforementioned advocate Peter Vuysting [85], lived next to a Van Borculo, who was probably a Catholic believer as well.⁸⁹ According to the same investigation report, other Catholic advocates who defended prosecuted Catholics in the 105 cases, such as Anthoni van Blockland [7] and Dirck (Theodorus) Lommetzum [50], lived next to each other on Nieuwegracht. So too Geertruid van Blockland (c. 1580–1655), a sister of Anthoni and the widow of the Catholic provincial court councillor Pieter Dierhout (c. 1572–1640), and her children including Agatha Dierhout (d. 1691), who was charged with hosting Catholic assemblies in her house on Nieuwegracht no fewer than four times, lived there as well.⁹⁰ In one of the trials launched against Agatha Dierhout [58] for hosting an illegal assembly, her neighbours Van Blockland [7] and Lommetzum [50] appeared as her defenders together with their colleague Gerard Prins [68], who was a brother of the tolerated priest Nicolaes Prins <51> (Appendices 1, 2, and 4).

87 Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 105–6, 125–26, 140–41, 156.

88 HUA, KR, 5, 9 August 1647.

89 HUA, SAI, 121–25, 22 January 1655.

90 *Ibidem*, 26 March 1655.

The Van Blockland and Dierhout patrician families, both of which produced lawyers, were related by marriage and united by faith. The provincial court advocate Anthoni van Blockland [7] was a trustee of the municipal chamber of charity and non-publicly connived as a trustee of the Holy Cross Hospice.⁹¹ Anthoni's sister Geertruid married Pieter Dierhout before aldermen in 1601.⁹² Gerard van Blockland, the lord of Emmikhoven, married Suzanna Dierhout (1616–1665), daughter of Pieter, and together they had a son, Petrus Anthonius van Blockland (1657–1693), who became a secular priest active in Gouda and Utrecht. Petrus Anthonius's brother Philippus Ignatius (d. 1677) entered the Carmelite order in Antwerp.⁹³

The Dierhouts came to settle in Utrecht in the late sixteenth century. Cornelis Dierhout married Aefken van Honcoop (d. 1585) in Gorkum in 1569, before moving to Utrecht.⁹⁴ Among the other members of his family to stay in Gorkum, there was a brewer called Adriaen who was related by marriage to the Van Neercassel and Van Wevelinckhoven families, which both produced several important Catholic prelates.⁹⁵ Cornelis's son Pieter Dierhout, the husband of Geertruid van Blockland, established his family's elevated social status in Utrecht. He was publicly recognized as a councillor of the provincial court of Utrecht (in office 1630–1640) despite his Catholic faith.⁹⁶ At almost the same time, he was knighted by the Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand II (1578–1637).⁹⁷ Pieter's children were Catholics too. His daughter Agatha was one of the most frequently accused Catholics in the 105 proceedings investigated, being prosecuted in four separate trials for illegal assemblies in her house, which functioned as the Jesuit clandestine church of St Catharijne {58} {75} {93} {105} (Appendix 1). In spite of this, Agatha's right to bequeath her property was publicly recognized.⁹⁸ Another of Pieter's children, Cornelis Pietersz (d. 1687), was an advocate of the provincial court and the lord of Gan-swijk. He was non-publicly connived as a trustee of the municipal chamber of charity (in office 1642–1644) and appointed by Maria van Pallaes as an administrator of her foundation.⁹⁹ A son of Cornelis Pietersz was also called

91 HUA, BAI, 1840-1, passim in 1647–1649, 1652–1653; HUA, SAI, 1825-1, 12 October 1632, 12 October 1633.

92 HUA, DTB, 85, 12 September 1601.

93 Ackermans, *Herders*, p. 325; Reinboud, 'Van Blocklant', col. 215.

94 Wijnarndts, 'De oudere generaties', col. 31.

95 I would like to thank Marten Jan Bok for sharing this genealogical information with me.

96 *G.P.U.*, II, p. 1054; HUA, SAI, 121-14, 28 April, 3 May 1630.

97 Muschart, 'Onjuiste namen en wapens', col. 347–49. On Pieter Dierhout, see also Vennes, 'Zes gelegenheidsgedichten'.

98 HUA, SAI, 121-26, 31 March 1656.

99 HUA, BAI, 692, 26, 29 November 1662; HUA, SAI, 1825-2, 5 October 1642, 27 September 1643.

Pieter (d. 1702), lord of Ganswijk, who had three sons, Cornelius Bonaventura (1670–1722), Franciscus Cornelius (1675–1745), and Petrus Nicolaus (1675–1736) all secular priests, and two daughters, Anna Cornelia and Geertrudis Maria, both *klopjes*.¹⁰⁰ There was also a certain Henricus Dierhout (1640–1690), whose precise relationship to the other Dierhouts is unknown, who came from Utrecht and worked as a Jesuit in Groningen and Antwerp.¹⁰¹ Pieter Dierhout, the councillor of the provincial court, had both a brother and a son called Nicolaes: the former was a painter (d. 1666)¹⁰² and the latter an advocate of the provincial court (1603–1658).¹⁰³ A man called Nicolaes Dierhout – which of the two it was cannot be confirmed – appeared as a defender in two legal proceedings against Catholics [28] (Appendix 4) and served as a trustee of the Holy Cross Hospice (in office at least 1645, 1647–1662) as well as the municipal chamber of charity (in office 1631–1633, 1639–1641).¹⁰⁴

Another Catholic advocate of the provincial court living on Nieuwegracht, Dirck Lommetzum [50], was the father of Adriaen, who also went on to become an advocate of the same court. Adriaen was non-publicly connived as a trustee of the municipal chamber of charity (in office 1668–1670) and later became a trustee of the Catholic chamber of charity (in office 1680–1682).¹⁰⁵ His sister Margareta Maria married a provincial court advocate named Anthoni van Honthorst (c. 1638–1718), a son of the famous Catholic painter Gerrit Hermansz van Honthorst (1592–1656).¹⁰⁶ The Lommetzum family produced Catholic priests as well. Elisabeth Lommetzum married Claes Simonsz van Velsen, uncle of Richardus van Velsen (d. 1692), a secular priest working in Amersfoort and Vianen. Elisabeth's son Simon Claesz van Velsen (1627–1672) joined the Society of Jesus, serving this congregation in Amersfoort around 1666. Lodewijk Lommetzum married Mechtelt van Raveswaey (d. 1667), one of the three daughters of Andries van Raveswaey [72], who was a brother-in-law of the priest Regnerus Godefridi van Eijndhoven.¹⁰⁷

The other Catholic hot spot was around Mariahoek, an area within the former immunity of the collegiate chapter of St Marie, where many priests,

100 Ackermans, *Herders*, pp. 349–50.

101 Forclaz, *Catholiques*, p. 58; *N.N.B.W.*, VIII, col. 393.

102 Bok, 'Vraag en aanbod', p. 236; Idem and Wijburg, 'De nakomelingen', pp. 185–86.

103 Dudok van Heel, 'Een Amsterdamse burgemeester', col. 109–12.

104 HUA, BAI, 1840-1, passim in 1645, 1647–1662; HUA, SAI, 1825-1, 13 October 1631, 12 October 1632; HUA, SAI, 1825-2, 4 October 1639, 2 October 1640.

105 HUA, ORKA, 23, 1 September 1680, 1 September 1681; HUA, SAI, 1825-5, 5, 17 August 1668, 4 August, 1 September 1669. On Adriaen, see also Verhey, *300 jaar*, pp. 51, 61, 218, 242.

106 *Ibidem*, pp. 218, 242.

107 Ackermans, *Herders*, pp. 359, 458.

klopjes, and Catholic lawyers resided. In 1647 the Reformed consistory identified the house of the provincial court advocate Johan de Munter [60] near Mariahoek as a Catholic meeting place.¹⁰⁸ His son Willem became a secular priest in Dordrecht and publicly received permission to return home to Utrecht no fewer than six times between 1656 and 1658 <59> (Appendix 2). His aunt Wilhelmina Both married Johan Zael van Vianen [98], an advocate of the provincial court, who appeared as a defender of prosecuted Catholics on three occasions (Appendix 4). On the death of his wife, Zael van Vianen remarried, taking Elisabeth Portengen as his new wife, whose previous marriage had produced the priests Clemens and Henricus de Roy.¹⁰⁹ The Catholic advocate Berent van Zutphen [99], who appeared in court to defend prosecuted Catholics in twelve different lawsuits, owned two houses in Mariahoek, at least on paper. It is quite probable that he simply lent his name as the owner of the second of these houses, which functioned as the secular clandestine church of St Gertrudis, whose ownership was transferred to him from Wachtelaer in 1652.¹¹⁰ When Catholics organized a public procession for the feast day of Corpus Christi in 1673 during the French occupation, an altar with special ornaments was erected in front of the house of 'the Advocate Zutphen' on Oudemunsterstrans.¹¹¹ Members of Berent's family were of the Catholic faith as well. Anna van Voorst, his wife Maria's older sister, was a *klopje*, and Maria's older brother Dirck was a Catholic painter.¹¹² A daughter of Berent and Maria, Cornelia van Zutphen, also adhered to the Catholic faith. According to her testament dated 24 July 1690, Cornelia bequeathed f. 1,400 to 'Roman Catholic indigents' and in her will left 'religious books with the [prayer] bench [prie-dieu]', nine religious paintings (including *Christ on the Cross* and *Mary Magdalene*), and three prints of the Dutch Catholic priests Johannes van Neercassel, Abraham van Brienen, and Antonius van der Plaet (1605–1678), of whom the latter two lived in Mariahoek.¹¹³

An entangled network of Catholic lawyers grew around the Van der Eem patrician family. The daughters of Cornelis van der Eem (1575/6–1622),

108 HUA, KR, 5, 9 August 1647.

109 Ackermans, *Herders*, pp. 404–5, 430.

110 On the houses owned by Van Zutphen in Mariahoek, see Ven, 'De driehoek', pp. 50, 56.

111 Wicquefort, *Journael*, p. 200.

112 Dirkse, *Begijnen*, pp. 190–97; Idem and Schilleman, 'Dirck van Voorst', pp. 8, 9, 17; Eck, 'The Artist's Religion', p. 90.

113 HUA, NOT, U093a019, 4, 24 July 1690: 'geestelijcke boecken met het bankie'. On Anthonius van der Plaet, see Ackermans, *Herders*, pp. 47, 187, 396, 417. I would like to thank Marten Jan Bok for guiding me to these genealogical data and materials concerning Berent van Zutphen and his relatives.

an advocate of the provincial court, can be seen as the 'glue' connecting a number of patrician families by marriage, which went on to produce many Catholic advocates: Margaretha (d. 1671) married the Catholic painter Hendrick Bloemaert (1601/02–1672); Anthonetta (d. before 1682) married the Catholic advocate Valentijn van Vianen (d. 1654); Geertruyd (d. 1671) married the Catholic advocate Clemens van Gessel (c. 1611–1695); and Divera (d. 1682) married the Catholic advocate Simon van Veen (d. 1651).¹¹⁴

The advocate Valentijn van Vianen also assumed the post of secretary to the Teutonic Order. His son Godefroy (Godefridus) (c. 1642–1708) became a secular priest working in Kockengen, Mijdrecht, and Mons, and publicly obtained a permit in 1668 allowing him to stay in Utrecht permanently <91> thanks to a plea submitted by his mother Anthonetta van der Eem (Appendix 2).¹¹⁵ A grandnephew of Godefroy, Gisbertus (d. after 1730), was a secular priest in Bergschenhoek. Likewise, Florentinus (d. 1665) worked as a secular priest in Aarlanderveen and Weesp, and Franciscus (1615–1693) moved from Utrecht to Leuven, where he became the president of the Pope's College (in office 1650–1677) established by Pope Adrian VI, a fellow Utrechter.¹¹⁶ Cornelis (1568–1649), an advocate at the provincial court, first married Hadewich van Haeften (d. 1611) and, after her death, Mechteld van der Burch (d. 1638) in a Catholic clandestine church in The Hague.¹¹⁷ He was non-publicly connived as a trustee of St Anthony Hospice.¹¹⁸ In his house resided a registered priest named Niclaes van der Burch <12> (Appendix 2).

Geertruyd van Eem's husband, Clemens van Gessel, was also a distinguished patron of the Catholic community, although he and his children acquired Utrecht citizenship relatively late, in 1656.¹¹⁹ In the legal procedures against Catholics, Clemens defended other prominent Catholics, such as Gerard Moliaert van Zirckzee {89} and Agatha Dierhout {94} {105} [38] (Appendices 1 and 4). Clemens's brother, Cornelis (c. 1647–1691), was a secular priest, and he himself had five sons: Johan (c. 1649–1679), an advocate; Cornelis and Hendrick, both medical doctors; Timotheus, another advocate; and Otto Jacobus, whose profession is unknown.¹²⁰ The physician Cornelis defended Agatha Dierhout in the city court in 1679,¹²¹ the advocate Johan

114 Roethlisberger and Bok, *Abraham Bloemaert*, I, pp. 658–60.

115 On Valentijn and Godefroy van Vianen, see also Ackermans, *Herders*, pp. 462–63.

116 *Ibidem*, pp. 80, 103, 106–7, 111, 225, 462; Parker, *Faith on the Margins*, p. 81.

117 Roethlisberger and Bok, *Abraham Bloemaert*, I, pp. 659–60.

118 HUA, BAI, 1987-1, passim in 1621–1644.

119 Verhey, *300 jaar*, p. 240.

120 Ackermans, *Herders*, p. 363; Verhey, *300 jaar*, p. 240.

121 HUA, SAII, 2236-5, 17 January 1679.

became a trustee of the municipal chamber of charity during the French occupation (in office 1673) and the medical doctor Hendrick was non-publicly connived as a trustee of the Holy Cross Hospice.¹²² Clemens and Johan founded the Catholic chamber of charity in 1674, with the former becoming the first bookkeeper (in office 1674–1677) and the latter a trustee (in office 1674–1676). Later, Clemens's other sons Cornelis (in office 1678–1680) and Otto Jacobus (in office 1692–1694) also assumed posts as trustees of the same chamber of charity.¹²³ Although the wine merchant Peter van Gessel was accused of hosting a Catholic gathering in 1651 {54} (Appendix 1), he was also connived as a trustee of the municipal chamber of charity (in office 1644–1646).¹²⁴ A wine merchant only identified as Van Gessel (but probably the same Peter), was charged with hosting a Catholic assembly in 1649 {47} (Appendix 1). After he passed away, his wife Vreda Baerkens's right to bequeath her property was publicly recognized despite her Catholic faith.¹²⁵ The Van Gessel family also produced another secular priest, Arnoud (1645–1695), who was a relative of the secular priest Johannes van Heumen.¹²⁶

Divera van der Eem's husband, Simon van Veen, was an advocate and the lord of Drakensteyn (in office 1611–1630).¹²⁷ Simon owned a house in Mariahoek which functioned as the secular clandestine church of St Gertrudis.¹²⁸ He was non-publicly connived as a trustee of the municipal chamber of charity (in office 1642–1644).¹²⁹ His son Isidorus Franciscus (c. 1640–1679) became a secular priest working in Amerongen and Voorburg.¹³⁰ Simon's daughter Catharina Lucia married a Catholic advocate of the provincial court, Godert (Godard) de Wys (d. before 1704), the son of François de Wys and Cornelia van Westrenen.¹³¹ Godert de Wys appeared as a defender for Maria Johanna van Amstel van Mijnden {91} [95] (Appendices 1 and 4), and was connived as a trustee of the municipal chamber of charity (in office 1664–1665) before becoming the bookkeeper of the Catholic chamber of

122 HUA, BAI, 1840-1, passim in 1652–1656, 1659–1666, 1668–1679; HUA, SAI, 1825-5, 26 August, 6 September 1673.

123 HUA, ORKA, 1, 1 October 1674; HUA, ORKA, 23, 1 October 1674, 1 September 1675, 1 September 1676, 1 September 1678, 1 September 1679, 1 September 1692, 1 September 1693. See also Verhey, *300 jaar*, pp. 15, 18, 60, 75, 211, 240.

124 HUA, SAI, 1825-2, 27 September 1644, 26 September 1645.

125 HUA, SAI, 121-26, 17 August 1658.

126 Ackermans, *Herders*, pp. 362–63, 372.

127 *Ibidem*, p. 456.

128 Ven, 'De driehoek', pp. 49–50, 56.

129 HUA, SAI, 1825-2, 5 October 1642, 27 September 1643.

130 Ackermans, *Herders*, pp. 456–57.

131 Verhey, *300 jaar*, p. 242.

charity (in office 1683–1685).¹³² Godert's father François was also an advocate of the provincial court and acted as a defender for Mechtelt de Lange, the widow of Anthonis van Schaick {44} [95] (Appendices 1 and 4). Jacob de Wys (d. 1651), the Catholic provincial court councillor (in office 1630–1651), was connived as a trustee of the Holy Cross Hospice.¹³³

The roles Catholic jurists assumed in Utrecht were therefore not limited to that of legal experts for both Reformed and Catholics. They or their family members provided the Catholic community with sacred spaces in their houses, presiding priests for worship, and financial support through their bequests and otherwise. It is worth noting that a number of Catholic jurists were closely connected through their confessional, professional, and family networks, in which many other Catholic lay or ecclesiastic notables took part. Numerous Catholic lawyers served as donors and administrators to the civic or Catholic charitable institutions in Utrecht. Like the Catholic nobles and canons, Catholic jurists were therefore pillars of the Catholic community as well as of the multi-confessional civic community.

3.4. Those with Close Ties to the Reformed Elite

After the Protestant Reformation and the Dutch Revolt, established families in Utrecht and elsewhere in the Northern Netherlands had to choose whether they would remain faithful to the Catholic faith, jeopardizing their access to public offices, or enter the Reformed Church, which gave them such access. Consequently, many noble and patrician families split into Protestant and Catholic branches, or else raised some of their children in the Reformed faith and others in the Catholic faith.¹³⁴ Through blood ties as well as personal and professional networks, a number of Catholic Utrechters cultivated close relationships with the Reformed elite, including patron-client relations, and exploited such connections for the survival of their confessional community.

One of the bi-confessional patrician families in Utrecht was the Ruysch family. Although Maria Ruysch {15} and her brother Henrick remained loyal to the Catholic faith, many other family members converted to Protestantism. Nevertheless, Frederik Ruysch, who was Reformed, cultivated friendships

¹³² HUA, ORKA, 23, 1 September 1683, 1 September 1684; HUA, SAI, 1825-4, 7 September 1664.

¹³³ *G.P.U.*, II, p. 1054; HUA, BAI, 1840-1, *passim* in 1645, 1647; HUA, SAI, 121-14, 28 April, 3 May 1630.

¹³⁴ For marriage tactics deployed by Dutch Catholic noble families, see Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 33–62; *Idem*, *Patrons*, pp. 29–70.

with Catholic priests, including Apostolic Vicar Van Neercassel,¹³⁵ while also carving out a brilliant career for himself in politics and the administration of justice in Utrecht, serving as burgomaster, city council member, alderman, and sheriff.¹³⁶ In 1651, when Frederik was burgomaster of Utrecht, he was shocked to hear that his cousin Johannes (before 1607–1680), an advocate of the provincial court, had converted from Reformed Protestantism to Catholicism.¹³⁷ The Reformed consistory discussed Johannes's apostasy on numerous occasions in 1650 and 1651.¹³⁸ The minutes of the consistory for April 1651 note that the burgomaster Frederik had already contacted the consistory, ordering the Reformed ministers to clarify from the pulpit that the censured Johannes Ruysch was a son of Nicolaes Ruysch, and not the burgomaster's brother. The consistory complied with this request. Frederik therefore preferred to keep a certain distance from his convert cousin.¹³⁹ Even though the consistory did not entirely give up on Johannes, keeping in contact with him via delegates, he came to acknowledge the Council of Trent. In the end, in September 1651, the Reformed Church excommunicated Johannes.¹⁴⁰ His conversion proved genuine, as he embarked on the study of Catholic theology and was ordained a secular priest in Rotterdam in 1656, changing his name to Johannes Ignatius. During the French occupation, Johannes Ignatius was appointed an 'ecclesiastical judge' (*geestelijken rechter* or *foro sacro judicem*) in Hilversum, a position he nevertheless lost after the French evacuation. From 1676 he began serving a congregation in Amsterdam, where he died in 1680 as a Catholic priest.¹⁴¹

Another family that produced advocates of both the Reformed and Catholic faiths was the Schade family. The Reformed jurist Gaspar Schade became extraordinary councillor of the provincial court, and afterwards its president, while also serving St Bartholomew Hospice as a trustee.¹⁴² Another advocate of the provincial court, Pieter Schade (1582–1653), was one of the family's Catholic members.¹⁴³ In 1610 Pieter married Maria

135 HUA, OBC, 246, 14 August 1674.

136 *G.P.U.*, III, pp. 184, 192–95, 218.

137 HUA, KR, 5, April 1651. For conversion from Reformed Protestantism to Catholicism in Utrecht in general, see Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 325–59.

138 HUA, KR, 5, 29 July, 19 August, 4 November 1650, 27 January, 3, 17, 24 February, 3, 10, 17 March 1651.

139 *Ibidem*, 15, 21 April, 14 August 1651.

140 *Ibidem*, 2 June, 8, 15, 20, 22, 29 September 1651.

141 *N.N.B.W.*, IX, col. 911–12.

142 *G.P.U.*, II, 1048, 1050, 1055; HUA, BAII, 1604, c. 1653.

143 For the Catholic members of the Schade family, see Verheggen, 'Religieuze kunst', *passim*, especially pp. 263–68; Verleyn, *Dom Benedictus van Haeften*, *passim*.

van Haeften (1587–1629), a daughter of the aforementioned Anthonius van Haeften. Like his father-in-law, he was non-publicly connived as a trustee of the Holy Cross Hospice.¹⁴⁴ Pieter Schade's son Johannes (1612/3–1665) worked in Utrecht and Delft as a secular priest. Ever since 1645 Johannes had been a member of the Utrecht *Vicariaat* and a confidant of Van Neercassel. Johannes's nephews Ernestus (1641–1678) and Anthonius (1648–1721), sons of Arnoldus (Franciscus) Schade (d. 1674) and Elisabeth van Vianen, also became secular priests. Their aunt Maria van Vianen was the wife of the provincial court advocate Anthonie van Wevelinckhoven, a brother to the priest Balthasar.¹⁴⁵ Arnoldus Schade, Ernestus' and Anthonius' father, bought the house Clarenburg from Adriaen Ram in 1647, which had functioned as the secular clandestine church of Maria Minor Achter Clarenburg. Arnoldus continued to own the house until his death in 1674.¹⁴⁶ Another one of Arnoldus's sons, Dirck, likewise an advocate of the provincial court, was non-publicly connived as a trustee of the municipal chamber of charity (in office 1669–1670) and later became a trustee of the Catholic chamber of charity (in office 1678–1680, 1703–1706).¹⁴⁷

Following the Protestant Reformation, the Van Wijckerslooth family was also divided into a Reformed and a Catholic branch, producing leading figures within the civic community as well as the Catholic community in Utrecht.¹⁴⁸ Reformed members included the politico-judicial elite, among them Gijsbert van Wijckerslooth (d. 1660), who served as burgomaster, member of the city council, and alderman, as well as a Reformed deacon and elder.¹⁴⁹ Abraham Gijsbertsz was also of the Reformed persuasion, and became professor *extraordinarius* of law at Utrecht University, member of

144 HUA, BAI, 1840-1, passim in 1643–1653.

145 Ackermans, *Herders*, pp. 431–32, 471.

146 Ven, 'Het huis Clarenburch', pp. 49, 61; Idem, 'Het huis Clarenburch te Utrecht. Een aanvulling', p. 37.

147 HUA, ORKA, 23, 1 September 1678, 1 September 1679, 1 September 1703, 1 September 1704, 1 September 1705; HUA, SAI, 1825-5, 4 August, 1 September 1669. On Dirck Schade, see also Verhey, *300 jaar*, p. 218.

148 Wittert van Hoogland, 'Aanteekeningen', p. 145. On the Protestant branch, see Pollmann, *Religious Choice*, pp. 116–17, 138, 141, 156, 176, 183, 193; Wittert van Hoogland, 'Aanteekeningen', p. 158; Idem, 'Eenige Utrechtsche Geslachten', pp. 206–27. On the Catholic branch, see idem, 'Aanteekeningen', pp. 158–59; Idem, 'Eenige Utrechtsche Geslachten', pp. 227–57. On the family in general, see also Kemp, 'De oorsprong', col. 101–30.

149 *G.P.U.*, III, pp. 185, 193, 196; Lieburg, *De Nadere Reformatie*, pp. 110, 159; Wittert van Hoogland, 'Eenige Utrechtsche Geslachten', p. 226.

the city council, alderman, and provincial court councillor.¹⁵⁰ The Catholic branch included numerous priests. In 1661 Johan van Wijckerslooth, a priest in Weesp, was publicly granted permission for a short, fourteen-day stay in Utrecht <84> (Appendix 2). There were at least four other priests in the Van Wijckerslooth family.¹⁵¹ The right of the sisters Deliana (c. 1570–after 1661) and Aleydis (d. 1656) to bequeath their property was publicly recognized, in spite of their Catholic faith.¹⁵² An advocate of the provincial court, Anthoni (b. 1623), was non-publicly connived as a trustee of the municipal chamber of charity (in office 1664–1667, 1670–1672) and then became a trustee of the Catholic chamber of charity (in office 1681–1683). Another advocate of Utrecht's provincial court, Cornelis (1634–1682), fulfilled a similar role in Utrecht. He was connived as a trustee of the municipal chamber of charity (in office 1661–1663) and appeared before the city court as a defender of Thomas de Knijff, who was accused of hosting an illegal gathering {104} [91] (Appendices 1 and 4).¹⁵³ Towards the end of the French occupation (1672–1673), he was appointed a councillor of the provincial court by Louis XIV, but was dismissed after the French evacuation.¹⁵⁴ Nevertheless, differing political stances could be found within the Catholic branch of the Van Wijckerslooth family. Despite his Catholic faith, the painter Giovanni was an Orangist, and he sketched an allegory on the French invasion of 1672 from an Orangist point of view.¹⁵⁵ In 1647 the Reformed consistory reported that the house of a brewer named Wijckerslooth near Mariahoek functioned as a Catholic meeting place.¹⁵⁶ This may have been Aert van Wijckerslooth (1582–1651), whose daughter Geertruid (1608–1686) married Jacob van Blockland (d. 1667) in 1633, and the prenuptial conditions were presented to their family members, including the bride's father and her

150 *G.P.U.*, II, p. 1055, III, pp. 187, 196; Wittert van Hoogland, 'Eenige Utrechtsche Geslachten', pp. 226–27.

151 Ackermans, *Herders*, pp. 475–76; Hoeck, *Schets*, p. 258; Wittert van Hoogland, 'Eenige Utrechtsche Geslachten', pp. 229–30, 252–53.

152 HUA, SAI, 121-25, 19 May 1655. Deliana's nephew Gosimus ter Lau became a priest who worked regularly in Cologne and whose stay in Utrecht was tolerated in 1660, when Deliana, as a petitioner, was over ninety years old <83>. HUA, SAI, 121-27, 4 October 1660.

153 HUA, SAI, 1825-3, 21, 30 August 1661, 24 September 1662; HUA, SAI, 1825-4, 7 September 1664, 6 September 1665; HUA, SAI, 1825-5, 3 August, 7 September 1670, 26 July, 6 September 1671. On Cornelis, see also Wittert van Hoogland, 'Eenige Utrechtsche Geslachten', pp. 233–34.

154 HUA, Familie Van Wijckerlsooth, 51; HUA, SAI, 121-28, 1 November 1673; HUA, SVU, 232-36, 1, 2 November 1673.

155 Bok and Jansen, 'De Utrechtse schilder'. On Giovanni, see also Wittert van Hoogland, 'Eenige Utrechtsche Geslachten', p. 250.

156 HUA, KR, 5, 9 August 1647.

nephew Anthoni de Ridder van Groenesteyn, as well as the bridegroom's nephew Anthoni van Blockland [7].¹⁵⁷ Aert's son Thomas was a provincial court advocate and held a post as trustee of the Catholic chamber of charity (in office 1674–1677) and then as bookkeeper of the same chamber (in office 1677–1681).¹⁵⁸

Although one branch of the Pelt family converted to Protestantism and moved to the Generality Lands to acquire public offices, other Pelts stayed loyal to the Catholic faith and remained in Utrecht, producing both lawyers and priests. A solicitor of the city court of Utrecht, Steven Pelt (c. 1565–1642), was a Catholic, while his mother was the illegitimate child of a canon.¹⁵⁹ Steven was non-publicly connived as a trustee of St Anthony Hospice.¹⁶⁰ Three of Steven's six children chose to become clerics. Petrus (1598/9–1646) was a secular priest serving the secular clandestine church of St Jacobus in Drakenburgersteeg, while Adam (c. 1600–1664) became a Capuchin in the Southern Netherlands.¹⁶¹ Steven's first child Gerrit (before 1592–1642) was one of the thirty priests registered in 1622 <5> (Appendix 2). As a secular priest he worked in Montfoort and then in the former parish of the Buur Church in Utrecht, while becoming a founding member of the *Vicariaat* in 1633.¹⁶² When the sheriff was informed of the illegal activities of Catholic priests by Govert van Moock's 'protocol' in 1639, Gerrit ended up being among those prosecuted. Although he escaped the sheriff's raid, he was sentenced to the confiscation of his property and banishment from the Dutch Republic {22} (Appendix 1).

One of Steven's other sons, Johan Pelt (1597–after 1653), was non-publicly connived as a trustee of the plague hospice Leeuwenberch.¹⁶³ Like Johan, his

157 Kemp, 'De oorsprong', col. 126–27; Wittert van Hoogland, 'Eenige Utrechtsche Geslachten', pp. 246–48.

158 HUA, ORKA, 1, 1 October 1674; HUA, ORKA, 23, 1 October 1674, 1 September 1675, 1 September 1676, 1 September 1677, 1 September 1678, 1 September 1679, 1 September 1680. On Thomas, see also Verhey, *300 jaar*, pp. 15, 18, 35, 121, 211, 240; Wittert van Hoogland, 'Eenige Utrechtsche Geslachten', pp. 247–48.

159 Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 153–54. On the Pelt family, see Boukema, 'Geloven in het geloof', pp. 45–51; Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 54–56, 121–22, 138, 152, 161, 171, 207, 249; Ven, 'Een Utrechtse familie'.

160 HUA, BAIL, 1987-1, passim in 1625–1627, 1638, 1640–1642. On Steven, see also Boukema, 'Geloven in het geloof', p. 45; Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 54, 152–53; Ven, 'Een Utrechtse familie', pp. 120–21, 123–24.

161 Ackermans, *Herders*, p. 414; Boukema, 'Geloven in het geloof', pp. 45, 48, 51; Forclaz, *Catholiques*, p. 54; Ven, 'Een Utrechtse familie', pp. 120, 124–25.

162 Hallebeek, 'Godsdienst(on)vrijheid', pp. 127–28; Hewett and Hallebeek, 'The Prelate', pp. 130–31; Jong, 'Het Utrechtse vicariaat', p. 162; Knuif and Jong, 'Philippus Rovenius', p. 119; Ven, *Over den oorsprong*, pp. 90–91. On Gerrit, see also Boukema, 'Geloven in het geloof', pp. 48–50; Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 54, 153, 312; Ven, 'Een Utrechtse familie', pp. 124–25.

163 HUA, BAIL, 2205-1, 23 October 1624. On Johan, see also Ven, 'Een Utrechtse familie', p. 125.

younger brother Anthoni (1604–1661), a renowned medical doctor married to Maria van Honthorst (d. 1653), was active in charity, being connived as a trustee of St Anthony Hospice.¹⁶⁴ Anthoni was an essential member of the Catholic community and of the civic community in Utrecht. He was accused of organizing a Catholic assembly in the secular clandestine church of Maria Minor Achter Clarenburg {35}. In other trials, he defended his brother Gerrit {22}, as well as the gardener Peter Jansz van Loenen, who was accused of holding an illegal gathering {41} [64] (Appendices 1 and 4).¹⁶⁵ Four of Anthoni's sons chose a Catholic religious vocation: while Theodorus (c. 1638–1716) became a Capuchin, Joannes (c. 1639–1704), Petrus (c. 1645–1696), and Gerardus (c. 1649–1724) were ordained as secular priests after entering the Oratory in France or the Southern Netherlands.¹⁶⁶ Among them, Joannes was publicly recognized to come back to Utrecht in 1668 <92> (Appendix 2). Another one of Anthoni's sons, Steven Anthonisz (1647–1717), followed in his father's footsteps to become a medical doctor. He married Antonia Paulina Portengen (1647–1683),¹⁶⁷ a niece of Hendrick Moreelse (1615–1666), who was one of the members of the ruling elite in Utrecht and served as burgomaster, member of the city council, alderman, professor of law at Utrecht University, and councillor of the provincial court.¹⁶⁸ During the French occupation, Steven Anthonisz Pelt was appointed a trustee of the municipal chamber of charity (in office 1672–1673) and then became a trustee of the Catholic chamber of charity (in office 1678–1680).¹⁶⁹ The Pelt family also had a provincial court advocate, Theodorus, whose house near Mariahoek was mentioned by the Reformed consistory as a meeting point for Catholics.¹⁷⁰

Some other Catholic Utrechters were also closely connected with the Reformed ruling class. For instance, Peter van Hardenbroek, a member of the Knighthood, was a friend of Stadholder Frederick Henry. Once a Remonstrant, he later converted to Catholicism, marrying the Catholic noblewoman Agnes van Hanxelaer. Their wedding took place in a Reformed

164 HUA, BAI, 1987-1, passim in 1636–1642, 1644–1649.

165 On Anthoni, see also Ven, 'Een Utrechtse familie', pp. 125–26.

166 Ackermans, *Herders*, pp. 414–15; Ven, 'Een Utrechtse familie', pp. 126–33, 135, 138–41. On Gerardus, see also Frijhoff, 'The Oratory', p. 212.

167 Forclaz, *Catholiques*, p. 153; Ven, 'Een Utrechtse familie', p. 127.

168 *G.P.U.*, II, p. 1054, III, pp. 186–87, 193, 195.

169 HUA, ORKA, 23, 1 September 1678, 1 September 1679; HUA, SAI, 1825-5, 26 July, 6 September 1672, 26 August, 6 September 1673. On Steven Anthonisz Pelt, see also Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 208, 250, 312; Ven, 'Een Utrechtse familie', pp. 120–21, 123, 127–28, 135, 138–41.

170 HUA, KR, 5, 9 August 1647.

church in 1629 and their union was solemnized anew in 1633 by Petrus Aloysius, the papal nuncio in Liège.¹⁷¹ Van Hardenbroek appointed a number of Protestant nobles as co-guardians to his child, but at the same time chose a Catholic, the Utrecht provincial court councillor Otto Schrassert, as financial advisor to the principal trustee, that is, his own wife Agnes.¹⁷²

Likewise, Maria van Pallaes (1587–1664) was part of a circle of outstanding figures which included Reformed rulers in Utrecht and beyond, in spite of her staunch adherence to the Catholic faith. Maria was the oldest child of Lubbert Jansz van Pallaes (d. 1610) and Maria Johansdr van Reede (d. 1649), both of whom belonged to old prominent families in Utrecht.¹⁷³ Although Johan (d. 1650), one of her younger two brothers, was a Reformed believer and became a member of the city council, alderman, and provincial court councillor,¹⁷⁴ Maria was raised in the Catholic faith. As a survival tactic, elite families may have decided to raise their daughters in the Catholic faith, while having their sons swear allegiance to the Reformed faith in order to secure public offices. Maria's husband Hendrick van Schroyesteyn (d. 1630) was an advocate of the provincial court and a trustee of the municipal chamber of charity (in office 1628–1630).¹⁷⁵ In 1624 Maria and Hendrick made a joint testament designating four of their five children at the time – their sixth and youngest child, also named Hendrick, was born later – as heirs of their property, while excluding their eldest son Johan. According to the testament, Johan had declined his parents' repeated requests to return, preferring to stay in Catholic Brabant where he lived in dire straits. It also indicated that Johan should regard the costs of study they had covered as 'his legitimate portion', and that he would not be named as heir. Maria and her husband therefore appear to have been displeased with their oldest son's decision to settle in the Habsburg territories during the Eighty Years' War.¹⁷⁶

In 1649, when she had become a widow, Maria van Pallaes petitioned the Provincial States for an exemption from the 1644 edict so that she would

171 Faber, 'Dirck van Baburen', pp. 142–49; Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 105–6; Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 38, 76, 87–88, 263; Idem, *Patrons*, pp. 35, 46, 79, 103–7, 109, 181–82, 268; *N.N.B.W.*, VI, col. 706–7.

172 Faber, 'Dirck van Baburen', p. 146; Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', p. 38; Idem, *Patrons*, pp. 79–80.

173 On the Van Pallaes and the Van Reede families, see Offringa and Hidden, *Fundatie*, here especially pp. 21, 27.

174 *G.P.U.*, II, p. 1054, III, pp. 181–82, 184, 194.

175 HUA, SAII, 1825-1, 1 September 1628.

176 HUA, BAI, 701, 16 July 1624: 'zijne legittime portie'. For a comparable case in which a notable Catholic in Delft named Pieter Opmeer disinherited two of his sons in 1593, see Janssen, *The Dutch Revolt*, p. 156; Idem, 'Quo Vadis?', p. 472.

be able to bequeath her property as she wished, noting that she herself was neither a nun nor a *klopper*. This request was approved, even though the States did confirm that her only surviving child Adriana was a Carmelite nun in Antwerp, tacitly acknowledging that Maria could bequeath her property to this religious woman in a Catholic territory.¹⁷⁷ Adriana was not the only child to follow a Catholic religious vocation, for her youngest son Hendrick did so as well.¹⁷⁸ Maria, who would never have grandchildren, went on to make five testaments, all of which referred explicitly to the approval granted in 1649.¹⁷⁹ Her testaments show her deep devotion to Catholicism. In wills written in 1656, 1658, and 1659, she identified her niece Johanna Maria van Pallaes, daughter of her younger brother Johan, as her universal heir.¹⁸⁰ However, after Johanna Maria remarried, taking a Protestant called Johan van Egeren as her new husband, Maria omitted her niece's name from the list of heirs in testaments written in 1660 and 1662.¹⁸¹ At the same time, the testaments written in 1659, 1660, and 1662 stipulated that f. 12 be bequeathed annually to a beguine in Antwerp named Anna Buijs for the rest of her life.¹⁸² Unlike when Maria disinherited her oldest son in 1624, in this case she may not have felt politico-religiously compromised in her conscience about bequeathing her property to a person living in the Habsburg Netherlands, since they were no longer 'enemy lands' but soon became the lands of an ally of the Dutch Republic in its battle against Bourbon France.

On the other hand, Maria van Pallaes counted on the aid of Reformed power holders in her network. She had numerous movable and immovable properties in the city of Utrecht. In her final testament, written in 1662, Maria appointed four administrators to her foundation (*fundatie*) for managing the free dwellings for the poor in Agnietenstraat, called the Twelve Chambers (*XII Cameren*) or the *hofje* (court of almshouses), which Maria had bought from the Agnieten Convent in 1651.¹⁸³ The four original administrators of the foundation were all influential figures in Utrecht: Everard van Weede, lord

177 HUA, BAI, 692, 5 October 1649; HUA, BAI, 694, 5 October 1649.

178 On Adriana and Hendrick, see HUA, BAI, 692, 'Inboedel', fol. 4.

179 The five testaments were written in 1656 (HUA, NOT, U021a022, 128, 16 July 1656), 1658 (HUA, NOT, U021a024, 99, 3 August 1658), 1659 (HUA, NOT, U021a025, 122, 12 August 1659), 1660 (HUA, NOT, U021a026, 116, 31 August 1660), and 1662 (HUA, BAI, 692, 26 November 1662). See also Offringa and Hidden, *Fundatie*, pp. 65–66.

180 HUA, NOT, U021a022, 128, 16 July 1656; HUA, NOT, U021a024, 99, 3 August 1658; HUA, NOT, U021a025, 122, 12 August 1659.

181 HUA, BAI, 692, 26 November 1662; HUA, NOT, U021a026, 116, 31 August 1660.

182 HUA, BAI, 692, 26 November 1662; HUA, NOT, U021a025, 122, 12 August 1659; HUA, NOT, U021a026, 116, 31 August 1660.

183 HUA, BAI, 692, 26, 29 November 1662; Offringa and Hidden, *Fundatie*, pp. 31–39.

of Dijkveld (1626–1702), Maria's relative on her mother's side, who would be the representative of the first estate in the Provincial States and one of the trusted minions of William III of Orange (1650–1702); Arent van den Bergh, an advocate of the provincial court; Cornelis Dierhout, lord of Ganswijk; and Vincent Stalpert van der Wiele (1616–1692), a rich merchant.¹⁸⁴ Although Dijkveld was Reformed, Dierhout and Stalpert van der Wiele were certainly Catholic. Stalpert van der Wiele, who had married Johanna van Weede (d. 1699) and lived on Nieuwegracht, became one of the ten founders of Utrecht's Catholic chamber of charity established in 1674.¹⁸⁵ His oldest son Theodorus (c. 1650–1680) was ordained a priest by Van Neercassel in 1675.¹⁸⁶ Moreover, Stalpert van der Wiele was one of the executors of the testament of Agatha Dierhout, along with her nephews, including Pieter Cornelisz Dierhout, lord of Ganswijk, and Johan Diderick van Blockland, lord of Giessen (d. 1694).¹⁸⁷ Maria van Pallaes may have nominated the four administrators on the basis of her religious and familial (and thus professional) relations, as she was connected to Catholic notables and jurists as well as Reformed politicians. Maria was supported by such distinguished figures of both faiths to realize the final wishes of her last will and testament.

The Van Honthorst patrician family was another family to play a critical role for Catholic survival, while also being well connected to the Protestant rulers. The family produced two Catholic canons of Oudmunster, Peter and Hendrick. Peter sheltered the Dominican Petrus Harselius in 1598.¹⁸⁸ Hendrick was connived as a trustee of St Barbara and St Laurens Hospice and the plague hospice Leeuwenberch.¹⁸⁹ The painter Gerrit Hermansz van Honthorst, whose name has already been mentioned, was a favourite of Stadholder Frederick Henry.¹⁹⁰ Thanks to a petition Gerrit made before the stadholder as his patron, his brother Herman, a secular priest, was given public recognition to be able to reside permanently in Utrecht <33> (Appendix 2), although he was later accused of performing clerical activities and banished {23} {25} (Appendix 1). Gerrit Hermansz's son Anthoni, a provincial court advocate whose name has likewise been mentioned above,

184 HUA, BAI, 692, 26, 29 November 1662.

185 HUA, ORKA, 1, 1 October 1674; Verhey, *300 jaar*, pp. 15, 240.

186 Ackermans, *Herders*, p. 444.

187 HUA, NOT, U053a015, 27, 21 May 1670. On Johan Diderick van Blockland, see Reinboud, 'Van Blocklant', col. 215.

188 Hoogland, 'De Dominicanen', p. 205.

189 HUA, BAI, 1254, 11 January 1620, 8 January 1625; HUA, BAI, 2205-1, 20 November 1621.

190 Bok, 'Gerard Hermansz. van Honthorst', pp. 276–79; Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 109, 152, 159, 276; Judson and Ekkart, *Gerrit van Honthorst; N.N.B.W.*, X, col. 384–85; Rogier, *Geschiedenis*, II, p. 684.

was non-publicly connived as a trustee of the municipal chamber of charity (in office 1658–1660) and then assumed the post of trustee of the Catholic chamber of charity (in office 1681–1683).¹⁹¹ Gerardus, another of his sons, was ordained a priest and then publicly recognized in June 1658 to come back to Utrecht to visit his elderly, invalid mother Sophia Coopmans, who would pass away later that same month <69a> (Appendix 2). On 26 July 1658, during his stay in Utrecht, Gerardus protested before the notary Nicolaes de Cruyff [23] that he was unable to receive his prebend in Xanten due to ‘incorrect’ information, which is not further specified, allegedly given to the prince-electors of Brandenburg and the duke of Palatinate-Neuburg.¹⁹² Later Gerardus obtained a canonry of St Servaas in Maastricht.¹⁹³ Remarkably, from 1660 to 1661 Gerardus, who was already ordained by the time, joined a Dutch diplomatic delegation to Spain, the first such endeavour after the Peace of Münster, together with Lodewijck Huygens (1631–1699), the third son of the famous poet Constantijn (1596–1687), with whom Gerardus’s father Gerrit Hermansz had cultivated a friendship.¹⁹⁴

Similarly, the patrician Van der Steen family, which produced such priests as the registered secular priest Hendrick <6> and the recognized Carmelite Josephus <79> (Appendix 2), played an indispensable role for Catholic revival in the Dutch Republic, building up friendships with the Reformed ruling elite. Among them, Gerard van der Steen (1590–1680), the last Catholic canon in early modern Utrecht, was crucial for salvaging medieval relics and bequeathing them to Catholic posterity.¹⁹⁵ According to a *klopje* called Maria van der Steen, Gerard’s niece, in the late sixteenth century the Catholic canons of St Jan attempted to protect Catholic ornaments and relics in the collegiate churches from the iconoclasts. In particular, Maria’s relative Arnold van Esch succeeded in salvaging some relics, including an alb of St Bernulphus, bishop of Utrecht (in office 1027–1054), and two basins of St Odulphus (d. 855), a medieval canon in Utrecht. On 28 February 1610 he transferred the alb to his nephew Dirk van Esch, who was also a canon of St Jan, and on 6 November 1611 he conferred ownership of his canonry upon his nephew Gerard van der Steen. On 29 October 1622 Gerard received the alb, which was then transmitted to Apostolic Vicar Petrus Codde (1648–1710). Gerard was appointed executor to the testament of a Catholic canon of

191 HUA, ORKA, 23, 1 September 1681, 1 September 1682; HUA, SAIL, 1825-3, 1 September 1658, 31 August 1659.

192 HUA, NOT, U034a004, 213, 26 July 1658.

193 Bok, ‘Gerard Hermansz. Van Honthorst’, pp. 278–79.

194 Ebben, *Lodewijck Huygens’ Spaans journaal*, pp. 19, 71–72, 362–63.

195 Kruijf, *Miraculeus bewaard*, especially pp. 145–47.

Oudmunster, Pompeius van Montzima (d. 1637), from whom he received relics of St Willibrord. In 1666 these relics were transmitted to Vicar General Van Brienen.¹⁹⁶

Gerard van der Steen offered significant support to Dutch Catholics by other means as well. While he himself was accused of hosting a Catholic assembly in his house in the former immunity of St Jan {17}, he also defended prosecuted Catholics in five other legal proceedings [80] (Appendices 1 and 4). He was active in charitable activities, assuming posts as trustee of the municipal chamber of charity (in office 1631–1633) and of St Bartholomew Hospice as well as St Anthony Hospice.¹⁹⁷ He also offered financial support to Catholics living outside Utrecht, sending money to Catholics in Groningen and establishing a fund for students originating from the former diocese of Utrecht who went to the seminary in Cologne.¹⁹⁸ Furthermore, Gerard was appointed an executor to the testament of Johan Albert van Solms (1599–1648), the provost of the chapter of St Jan, a colonel in the Dutch army, and a brother-in-law of Stadholder Frederick Henry.¹⁹⁹ Like her uncle Gerard, Maria van der Steen was connected with members of the Reformed elite. Born in Liège, she had become a *klopje* before she came to Utrecht. When the famous French Jansenist Antoine Arnauld (1612–1694) visited Utrecht in 1680, she copied certain books for him. She was in touch with a *klopje* in Brussels and undertook a pilgrimage in the Southern Netherlands. In spite of their differences in faith, she also exchanged cordial letters with Anna Elisabeth van Falkenstein, the wife of Johan Albert van Solms and the great-aunt of William III of Orange.²⁰⁰ Gerard and Maria van der Steen were therefore prominent figures not only within the Catholic community at the local, national, and international levels, but also more widely in the Dutch Republic.

More than a few distinguished families were internally divided by faith in the early modern Low Countries. It is worth noting that the abovementioned bi-confessional patrician families in Utrecht produced not only Reformed politicians and jurists, but also Catholic notables, the latter of whom, like the

196 HUA, VSOKN, 590-a (transcribed in Dodt van Flensburg, *Archief*, III, pp. 197–99). See also Brom, 'Kerksieraden van Oud-Munster', pp. 395–98; Forclaz, *Catholiques*, p. 46; HUA, VSOKN, 205; HUA, VSOKN, 206; Kruijff, *Miraculeus bewaard*, pp. 128–48, 154–59; Lenarduzzi, *De belevingswereld*, pp. 158, 186–88; Idem, 'Subcultuur en tegencultuur', pp. 190–91; 227–29; Ven, *Over den oorsprong*, p. 49; Visser, 'Een inventaris', pp. 186–88; Idem, 'Relieken van den H. Willibrordus', pp. 161–63.

197 HUA, BAI, 1604, c. 1653; HUA, BAI, 1987-1, passim in 1637–1638.

198 Forclaz, *Catholiques*, p. 47.

199 HUA, VSOKN, 590-a (Dodt van Flensburg, *Archief*, III, p. 199). On Johan Albert van Solms, see *N.N.B.W.*, II, col. 1343.

200 Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 47, 61–62, 221–22; Jacques, *Les années d'exil*, pp. 206–7.

former, contributed in a remarkable way to the multi-confessional *corpus christianum* through, for instance, their legal expertise and charitable activities. It should also be noted that some members of Utrecht's Catholic social elite cultivated close relationships with the Reformed ruling class, including family members of the stadholders and their favourites. Undoubtedly, Catholic survival in Utrecht could not have been realized without these distinguished figures of the Catholic faith who were connected to the Reformed elite by blood, friendship, or patronage.

3.5. Conclusion

Apart from population size and historical roots, the social status of Catholic Utrechters was another factor which helped them to establish a tangible presence within the multi-confessional civic community. Although it is known that the Catholic community was not monolithic in socio-economic standing, Catholic members of the socio-economic elite were crucial for rehabilitating their confessional group in post-Reformation Utrecht, where Catholics never forfeited their property rights. Indeed, they formed a powerful pressure group within the city's public sphere notwithstanding the serious harm inflicted upon their public rights and honour by anti-Catholic legislation and prosecution, tacitly claiming their legitimate position within the city and beyond.

Given that numerous Catholics faced judicial investigation and prosecution in Utrecht, their defenders played a crucial role for the survival of the city's Catholic community. These defenders refuted the charges and arbitrated or negotiated with the judicial authorities on their behalf. While some of the defenders were undoubtedly Catholics themselves, a number of others apparently belonged to the Reformed Church. Evidently, it was not just confessional ties but also family and neighbourly relations or professionalism that motivated the defenders to stand up for prosecuted Catholics. Catholic Utrechters received particular support from the advocates of the provincial court, where their co-religionists continued to exert influence in the seventeenth century, especially during the first half. Apart from official lawyers, the defenders also included others in the higher social strata, such as nobles and canons, who acted as guardians of the Catholic faith in many different respects. In seventeenth-century Utrecht, Catholic noblemen, noblewomen, and canons provided their co-religionists with elements of the necessary external infrastructure of salvation, such as physical spaces for worship, priests, and *klopjes*. Furthermore, they paid fines or posted bail for other anonymous

and non-wealthy prosecuted Catholics, stood as surety for indigent Catholic newcomers and bequeathed property to the Catholic community through their female members. Dedicating themselves to charitable activities, they contributed enormously to Catholic rehabilitation and the common good in seventeenth-century Utrecht. In addition, many patricians were publicly or non-publicly tolerated as social welfare office holders. More than a few Catholic patricians in Utrecht adopted legal professions, upholding their confessional convictions. Catholic jurists were important outside the court of justice as well because, like the nobles and canons, they also hosted illegal assemblies and had family ties with priests and *klopjes*. Via networks of family, neighbourhood, profession, and patron-client relations, Utrecht's elite Catholics were connected not only with their co-religionists, laypeople as well as clerics, but also with the Reformed, including members of the ruling class. Here the supra-confessional relationships – or the ecumenicity of everyday life – prove to have been a real, hard asset, which Catholic Utrechters did not hesitate to deploy to their advantage. Prominent Catholics established their social status in Utrecht through their family connections, socio-economic capital, and professional skills, even though the political authorities, driven by the Reformed Church, attempted to exclude them from Utrecht's public sphere, not just physically but also symbolically by slandering them as potential criminals.

The statement Wachtelaer made regarding the longstanding elevated status of Catholics, quoted at the outset of this chapter, was therefore not groundless. The distinguished social status of some Catholics originated in medieval times, harking back to before the Protestant Reformation and the Dutch Revolt. Some Catholic notables in Utrecht were indeed related to the Reformed in one way or another. The Ruysch and Van Wijckerslooth families, for example, had both Catholic and Reformed members, including politico-judicial rulers of the city. Some other Catholics, including Maria van Pallaes, Gerrit Hermansz van Honthorst, and Gerard van der Steen, cultivated close relationships and patron-client networks with Protestants, including renowned figures in and around the House of Orange. Although the Van Gessel and Dierhout families, for instance, were newcomers in Utrecht, it did not take very long for them to incorporate themselves into their new civic community and acquire a respectable status there. Others, including the Wachtelaer, De Wael van Vronesteyn, and Van der Burch families, had already established their distinguished status and fame since medieval times. On the basis of their elevated social status and ample socio-economic capital, many of them, especially such canons as Gerard van der Steen, Gisbert Junius, and Johannes Wachtelaer, could marshal financial and legal support in the civic community of Utrecht, as family, shared citizenship, and neighbourly contact counterbalanced the strategic

exclusion of Catholics from the public sphere on religious grounds. All in all, Catholics with elevated social status and distinguished networks were indispensable not only for the Catholic community in Utrecht and the Low Countries, but also for the multi-religious society of Utrecht and the Dutch Republic. For Catholic survival, it was crucial for them to be not only guardians of the Catholic faith but also prominent pillars of the civic community and beyond. Backed by these notable individuals and their families, Catholics as a confessional group positioned themselves not on the 'margins', but in the very midst of multi-religious Utrecht and the urban public sphere, tacitly asserting their legitimacy and honour within the civic community on the basis of their numerical, socio-economic, and historical presence.²⁰¹

Abbreviations

A.A.U.	<i>Archief voor de geschiedenis van het aartsbisdom Utrecht</i> . Utrecht, 1875–1957.
D.N.L.	<i>De Nederlandsche Leeuw</i> .
G.P.U.	van de Water, Johan. <i>Groot Placaatboek vervattende alle de placaten [...] Staten 's lands van Utrecht</i> , 3 vols. Utrecht, 1729.
J.O.U.	<i>Jaarboek Oud-Utrecht</i> .
M.O.U.	<i>Maandblad Oud-Utrecht</i> .
N.N.B.W.	Molhuysen, P. C., and P. J. Blok, eds. <i>Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek</i> , 10 vols. Leiden, 1911–1937.
HUA	Het Utrechts Archief, Utrecht
BA	Bewaarde archieven
DTB	Doop- Trouw- en Begraafboeken
KR	Nederlandse Hervormde gemeente Utrecht, kerkeraad
MKOKN	Metropolitaan Kapittel van de Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland
NOT	Notarieel archief
OBC	Apostolische vicarissen van de Hollandse Zending
ORKA	Oude rooms-katholieke aalmoezenierskamer te Utrecht
SA	Stadsarchief
SVU	Staten van Utrecht
VSOKN	Verzamelde stukken van de oud-katholieke kerk in Nederland

201 Cf. Forclaz, *Catholiques*, p. 361; Parker, *Faith on the Margins*, pp. 13, 52, 58.

Bibliography

Archival Primary Sources

HUA, Doop- Trouw- en Begraafboeken [DTB]

HUA, Notarissen in de stad Utrecht 1560–1905 [NOT] (34-1)

HUA, Verzamelde stukken van de oud-katholieke kerk in Nederland [VSOKN] (88)

205. Documents concerning the sale of Catholic vestments originating from St Jan Church, 1581 and 1603

206. List of vestments and relics originating from St Jan Church, 1622, 1623, 1629, and 1637

590-a. Biographies written by Maria van der Steen of Arnold van Esch and Gerard van der Steen, late seventeenth century

HUA, Kapittel van Sint Marie te Utrecht (221)

93. Documents concerning the trial against Johannes Wachtelaer, 1640

2201. Bill of the treasury of the chapter signed by treasurer Johan de Goijer and 'curator of the poor' Gisbert Junius, 1663

HUA, Staten van Utrecht [SVU] (233)

232-36. Minutes of the Provincial States of Utrecht, 5 March 1673–9 November 1673

HUA, Stadsarchief II [SAII] (702)

121-4 ~ 121-5, 121-8 ~ 121-30. Minutes of the city council, 1599/1600–1612/13 and 1619/20–1686/87

414-1. Register of various permits given by the city council, part I, 1654–1679

1825-1 ~ 1825-6. Minutes of the trustees of the municipal chamber of charity, 1628–1647 and 1657–1687

2236-2 ~ 2236-5. *Crimineele sententiën* of the city court of Utrecht, 1618–1657 and 1670–1684

2244-42 ~ 2244-140. *Crimineele stukken* of the city court of Utrecht, 1620–1679

HUA, Bewaarde archieven I [BAI] (708)

692. 'Foundation Book' (*Fundatie-boeck*) of the almshouses of Maria van Pallaes, 1665–1708

694. Request of Maria van Pallaes to the Provincial States of Utrecht concerning her testament, 1649

701. Testament of Hendrick van Schroyesteyn and Maria van Pallaes, 1624

HUA, Bewaarde archieven II [BAII] (709)

1254. Documents concerning the appointment of new trustees in St Barbara and St Laurens Hospice, 1616–1631

1258. Minutes of the trustees of St Barbara and St Laurens Hospice, 1615–1765

1604. Lists of the trustees of St Bartholomew Hospice, c. 1651 and 1653
 1840-1. Minutes of the trustees of the Holy Cross Hospice, 1643–1695
 1987-1. Minutes of the trustees of St Anthony Hospice, 1603–22 September 1722
 2205-1. Minutes of the trustees of the plague hospice Leeuwenberch, 1579–1678
 HUA, Nederlandse Hervormde gemeente Utrecht, kerkeraad [KR] (746)
 3 ~ 10. Minutes of the Reformed consistory, August 1618–July 1690
 HUA, Oude rooms-katholieke aalmoezenierskamer te Utrecht [ORKA] (794-1)
 1. Minutes of the trustees of the Catholic chamber of charity, 1674–1693, January 1707 and February 1708–June 1715
 23. List of the trustees of the Catholic chamber of charity, 1674–1721
 HUA, Apostolische vicarissen van de Hollandse Zending [OBC] (1003)
 159. Documents concerning the trials against Philippus Rovenius and Johannes Wachtelaer, 1639–1640
 246. Copies of letters written by the Apostolic Vicar Johannes van Neercassel, 23 November 1673–16 August 1675
 HUA, Metropolitaaan Kapittel van de Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland [MKOKN] (1835)
 557. Documents concerning the trial against Johannes Wachtelaer, 1639–1640 and 1645

Published Primary Sources

- Brom, Gisbert, ed. 'Kerksieraden van Oud-Munster'. *A.A.U.* 27 (1901), pp. 377–99.
 Dodt van Flensburg, Jens Jenssen, ed. *Archief voor kerkelijke en wereldsche geschiedenissen, inzonderheid van Utrecht*. 7 vols. Utrecht, 1838–1848.
 Hoogland, A. J. J., ed. 'Descriptio status, in quo anno 1638 erat religio Catholica [...]'. *A.A.U.* 12 (1884), pp. 189–213, 414–33.
 Klaveren, G. van, ed. 'Vrijwoningen in 1687'. *M.O.U.* (1940), pp. 26–28.
 Rogge, H. C., ed. 'Memorie, in December 1639 door J. Wtenbogaert ingezonden aan de omgeving van Zijne Hoogheid Prins Frederik Hendrik'. *A.A.U.* 2 (1875), pp. 1–25.
 Visser, W. J. A., ed. 'Relieken van den H. Willibrordus, die te 1301 aan de Oudmunster te Utrecht ten geschenke zijn gegeven'. *A.A.U.* 57 (1933), pp. 137–210.
 Visser, W. J. A., ed. 'Een inventaris van kerksieraden uit 1609, toebehoorende aan Oudmunster te Utrecht'. *A.A.U.* 58 (1934), pp. 207–9.
 Water, Johan van de. *Groot Placaat-Boek vervattende all de placaten [...] Staten 's lands van Utrecht*. 3 vols. Utrecht, 1729. [*G.P.U.*]
 Wicquefort, Abraham de. *Journal, of dagelijksch verhael van de handel der Franschen in de steden van Uytrecht en Woerden [...]*. Amsterdam, 1674.

Secondary Literature

- Ackermans, Gian. *Herders en huurlingen. Bisschoppen en priesters in de Republiek (1663–1705)*. Amsterdam, 2003.
- Andriessen, Jozef. *De jezùieten en het samenhorigheidsbesef der Nederlanden, 1585–1648*. Antwerp, 1957.
- Bok, Marten Jan. 'Gerard Hermansz. van Honthorst, 1592–1656'. In *Nieuw licht op de Gouden Eeuw. Hendrick ter Brugghen en tijdgenoten*, edited by Albert Blankert and Leonard J. Slatkes. Utrecht, 1986, pp. 276–79.
- Bok, Marten Jan. 'Vraag en aanbod op de Nederlandse kunstmarkt, 1580–1700'. PhD diss., Utrecht University, 1994.
- Bok, Marten Jan, and Guido Jansen. 'De Utrechtse schilder Johannes van Wijckersloot en zijn "Allegorie" op de Franse invasie, 1672'. *Bulletin van het Rijksmuseum* 43, no. 4 (1995), pp. 337–49.
- Bok, Marten Jan, and W. A. Wijburg. 'De nakomelingen van de Utrechtse kunstschilder Jan van Scorel'. In *Utrechtse Parentelen vóór 1650*, 8 vols. edited by Casper van Burik, Bob Kemp, and Denis Verhoef, III. Rotterdam, 2012, pp. 10–56.
- Boukema, Niek. 'Geloven in het geloof. Een onderzoek naar de positie van de katholieken en de katholieke seculiere zielzorg binnen de stad Utrecht gedurende de periode 1580–1672, met accent op de eerst helft van de 17e eeuw'. MA thesis, Utrecht University, 1982.
- Burik, Casper van, Bob Kemp, and Denis Verhoef, eds. *Utrechtse parentelen vóór 1650*, 8 vols. Rotterdam, 2010–2019.
- Dirkse, Paul. *Begijnen, pastoors en predikanten. Religie en kunst in de Gouden Eeuw*. Leiden, 2001.
- Dirkse, Paul, and Robert Schilleman. 'Dirck van Voorst (ca. 1610/1615–1658). Een onbekend Utrechts schilder uit het atelier van Abraham en Hendrick Bloemaert'. *J.O.U.* (1993), pp. 5–18.
- Dudok van Heel, Sebastien A. C. 'Een Amsterdamse burgemeester in Athene. Symon Marten Dircksz. gez. van de Ruwiel (1504–1574) en zijn nakomenligen'. *Jaarboek van het Centraal Bureau voor Genealogie* (1988).
- Dudok van Heel, Sebastien A. C. *Van Amsterdamse burgers tot Europese aristocraten*. The Hague, 2008.
- Ebben, Maurits. *Lodewijck Huygens' Spaans journaal. Reis naar het hof van de koning van Spanje, 1660–1661*. Zutphen, 2005.
- Eck, Xander van. 'The Artist's Religion: Paintings Commissioned for Clandestine Catholic Churches in the Northern Netherlands, 1600–1800'. *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 27 (1999), pp. 70–94.

- Faber, Dirk. 'Dirck van Baburen, His Commissioner and His Motifs'. In *Hendrick ter Brugghen und die Nachfolger Caravaggios in Holland*, edited by Rüdiger Klessmann. Braunschweig, 1988, pp. 143–49.
- Forclaz, Bertrand. *Catholiques au défi de la Réforme. La coexistence confessionnelle à Utrecht au XVIIe siècle*. Paris, 2014.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'The Oratory in the Seventeenth-Century Low Countries'. *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 107, no. 1 (2012), pp. 169–220.
- Gennip, Joep van. *Controversen in context. Een comparatief onderzoek naar de Nederlandstalige controversepublicaties van de jezuiten in de zeventiende-eeuwse Republiek*. Hilversum, 2014.
- Geraerts, Jaap. 'The Catholic Nobility in Utrecht and Guelders, c. 1580–1702'. PhD diss., University College London, 2015.
- Geraerts, Jaap. 'Contested Rights: Clerical and Lay Authority in the Holland Mission'. *Early Modern Low Countries* 2, no. 2 (2018), pp. 198–225.
- Geraerts, Jaap. *Patrons of the Old Faith: The Catholic Nobility in Utrecht and Guelders, c. 1580–1702*. Leiden, 2018.
- Hallebeek, Jan. 'Godsdienst(on)vrijheid in de Gouden Eeuw? Het proces tegen Johan Wachtelaer (1583–1652)'. *Trajecta* 23 (2014), pp. 123–44.
- Heijden, L. J. van der. *Het kerspel Loenerslooth*. Utrecht, 1913.
- Hewett, Margaret, and Jan Hallebeek. 'The Prelate, the Praetor and the Professor: Antonius Matthaeus II and the *Crimen Laesae Majestatis*, Utrecht 1639–1640'. *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis* 66, no. 1 (1998), pp. 115–50.
- Hoek, Frans van. *Schets van de geschiedenis der jezuiten in Nederland*. Nijmegen, 1940.
- Hofman, J. H. 'Wilger van Moerendael en zijn studiebeurs in het Pauscollege te Leuven'. *A.A.U.* 24 (1897), pp. 165–72.
- Hoogland, A. J. J. 'De Dominicanen te Utrecht'. *A.A.U.* 9 (1881), pp. 178–246.
- Jacques, Émile. *Les années d'exil d'Antoine Arnauld (1679–1694)*. Leuven, 1976.
- Janssen, Geert H. 'Quo Vadis? Catholic Perceptions of Flight and the Revolt of the Low Countries, 1566–1609'. *Renaissance Quarterly* 64 (2011), pp. 472–99.
- Janssen, Geert H. *The Dutch Revolt and Catholic Exile in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge 2014).
- Jong, Johannes de. 'Het Utrechtse vicariaat en de strijd over de hiërarchische orde in de 17e eeuw'. *De Katholiek* 164 (1923), pp. 73–104, 146–86.
- Judson, J. Richard, and Rudolf E. O. Ekkart. *Gerrit van Honthorst, 1592–1656*. Ghent, 1999.
- Kemp, M. S. F. 'De oorsprong van het adellijke geslacht De Wijckerslooth'. *D.N.L.* 105 (1988), col. 101–46.
- Klaveren, G. van. 'Jans kameren van der Meer'. *J.O.U.* (1930), pp. 114–49.

- Knuif, Wilhelmus, and Johannes de Jong. 'Philippus Rovenius en zijn bestuur der Hollandsche Zending'. *A.A.U.* 50 (1925), pp. 1–425.
- Kort, J. C. *Wassenaer, de oudste. Het archief van de familie Wassenaer van Duvenvoorde*. Hilversum, 2002.
- Kruijf, Anique C. de. *Miraculeus bewaard. Middeleeuwse Utrechtse relieken op reis: de schat van de Oud-Katholieke Gertrudiskathedraal*. Zutphen, 2011.
- Kuiken, Kees. 'Henrica van Duivenvoorde en Wassenaar (1595–1658)'. In *1001 vrouwen uit de Nederlandse geschiedenis*, edited by Els Kloek. Nijmegen, 2013, pp. 307–8.
- Kuys, Jan. *Repertorium van collegiale kapittels in het middeleeuwse bisdom Utrecht*. Hilversum, 2014.
- 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.
- Lieburg, Fred van. *De Nadere Reformatie in Utrecht ten tijde van Voetius. Sporen in de gereformeerde kerkeradsacta*. Rotterdam, 1989.
- Molhuysen, P. C., and P. J. Blok, eds. *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, 10 vols. Leiden, 1911–1937. [*N.N.B.W.*]
- Muschart, R. T. 'Onjuiste namen en wapens van Nederlandsche geslachten in het *Armorial Général* van J.B. Rietstap'. *D.N.L.* 51 (1933), col. 17–22, 55–58, 117–23, 347–50, 412–16.
- Offringa, Gerianne, and Warner Hidden, *Fundatie van Vrouwe Maria van Pallaes*. Utrecht, 1980.
- Parker, Charles H. *Faith on the Margins: Catholics and Catholicism in the Dutch Golden Age*. Cambridge, MA and London, 2008.
- Pollmann, Judith. *Religious Choice in the Dutch Republic: The Reformation of Arnoldus Buchelius (1565–1641)*. Manchester, 1999.
- Reinboud, J. M. 'Van Blocklant'. *D.N.L.* 73 (1956), col. 215.
- Roethlisberger, Marcel, and Marten Jan Bok. *Abraham Bloemaert and His Sons: Paintings and Prints*, 2 vols. Doornspijk, 1993.
- Rogier, Lodewijk J. *Geschiedenis van het katholicisme in Noord-Nederland in de 16e en de 17e eeuw*, 3 vols. Amsterdam, 1945–1947.
- Sterk, J. J. B. M. M. 'Johannes de Witt Stevenszoon'. *J.O.U.* (1974), pp. 108–62.
- Ven, Adrianus J. van de. *Over den oorsprong van het Aartsbisschoppelijke Kapittel van Utrecht der Oude-Bisschoppelijke clerezij*. Utrecht, 1923.
- Ven, Adrianus J. van de. 'Het huis Clarenburch te Utrecht'. *J.O.U.* (1952), pp. 32–61.
- Ven, Adrianus J. van de. 'Het huis Clarenburch te Utrecht. Een aanvulling'. *J.O.U.* (1953), pp. 37–39.
- Ven, Adrianus J. van de. 'De driehoek van Sint Marie te Utrecht'. *J.O.U.* (1955), pp. 30–80.

- Ven, Adrianus J. van de. 'Een Utrechtse familie uit de 17^e eeuw'. *J.O.U.* (1960), pp. 119–41.
- Vennes, H. van de. 'Zes gelegenheidsgedichten van Utrechtse lofdichters. Adrianus Vander-Burchius, Petrus Dierout en Antonius Everdingius'. In *De Utrechtse Parnas. Utrechtse Neolatijnse dichters uit de zestiende en de zeventiende eeuw*, edited by J. Bloemendal. Amersfoort, 2003, pp. 127–58.
- Verheggen, Evelyne M. F. 'Religieuze kunst als verzet en troost in de Tachtigjarige Oorlog. Een portret van de Utrechtse patriciërfamilie Van Haeften'. *Volkskunde. Tijdschrift over de cultuur van het dagelijks leven* 122, no. 2 (2021), pp. 261–313.
- Verhey, H. J. W. *300 jaar aalmoezenierszorg. Geschiedenis van de Rooms-Katholieke Aalmoezenierskamer te Utrecht, (1674–1746) en van de Oude Rooms-Katholieke Aalmoezenierskamer te Utrecht, (1746–1974)*. Rotterdam, 1974.
- Verleyn, H. *Dom Benedictus van Haeften proost van Affligem 1588–1648. Bijdragen tot de studie van het kloosterleven in de zuidelijke Nederlanden*. Brussels, 1983.
- Wijnarndts, H. 'De oudere generaties van de Leerdamsch-Gorcumsche familie Dirout-Dierhout'. *D.N.L.* 54 (1936), col. 29–33.
- Wittert van Hoogland, E. B. F. F. 'Aanteekeningen betreffende Utrechtsche geslachten van Wijckersloot, Van Duynkercken'. *Genealogische en heraldische bladen* 3 (1908), pp. 145–256.
- Wittert van Hoogland, E. B. F. F. 'Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van eenige Utrechtsche geslachten'. *Genealogische en heraldische bladen* 5 (1910), pp. 193–319.
- Wittert van Hoogland, E. B. F. F. 'Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis der Utrechtsche ridderhofsteden en heerlijkheden'. *Genealogische en heraldische bladen* 8 (1913), pp. 1–480.

4. Spatial Practices: The Making of the Urban Landscape of Coexistence

Abstract: Spatial practices represented an essential aspect of Catholic survival tactics in Utrecht. This chapter analyses how Catholics produced spaces to facilitate their Catholic way of life. Through their creative spatial practices in Utrecht, which concerned public facilities (including public church buildings, monasteries, convents, and hospices) as well as public streets and their own houses (including clandestine churches), Catholic Utrechters managed both to preserve their traditional sacred spaces and to create new ones. By continuing to use the urban space as in medieval times, and by newly appropriating that space to adjust themselves to post-Reformation religious diversity, Catholics sought spaces to live as observant Catholics and transformed Utrecht's urban space from a mono-religious medieval city into a multi-religious early modern city.

Keywords: space, spatial practice, urban landscape, sacred space, public facility, clandestine church

Even after the 1639 raid on the house of Hendrica van Duivenvoorde, from which Apostolic Vicar Philippus Rovenius escaped, Vicar General Johannes Wachtelaer continued to live in Utrecht without adopting any special measures. But later that same year he was suddenly forced to seek refuge from his hometown following an assault on his house, which functioned as the secular clandestine church of St Gertrudis in Mariahoek (cover image). As he wrote to his colleague Jacobus de la Torre,

In the meantime, Vigilius [Wachtelaer himself] had been wandering [the public streets] for a long time without fear, relying on his right as a citizen and his known residence [in Utrecht], until his house was raided and occupied by the sheriff and his judicial officers, while, by divine foreordination, he was sitting for breakfast nearby [at the moment of the

raid]. [...] They then proceeded to the chapel, where the altarpiece was removed and the ornaments, of both silk and silver, were thrown on the ground, in order that they, after the example of the old heretics, might show that they were fighting not so much against people as against God and his saints.¹

Legally, Catholics were in principle not allowed to assemble anywhere, meaning their private homes were no exception to the regulations.² This is why Wachtelaer's house, which served as a clandestine church, was subjected to this raid and suffered iconoclastic violence. Yet even in such an antagonistic situation, Catholic Utrechters attempted to create and defend their own sacred spaces to live as observant Catholics through various spatial practices.

This chapter demonstrates how Catholics, more as a group than individuals, tactically created room for their survival as Catholics through their spatial practices in the shared physical urban space of Utrecht, from which the political authorities attempted to strategically exclude them. To that end, it will discuss the spatial dimension of the delimitation of the public, in which perceptibility by the human senses, such as visibility and audibility, represented a key element as it defined the epistemological conditions for others to perceive Catholic activities. After tracing chronological developments in Catholic spatial practices in Utrecht, it will take the reader on an 'urban tour' through the city. In a first round, we will pay visits to public facilities, including public church buildings, monasteries and convents, and hospices. In a second round, we will call at houses and public streets especially outside the city wall and in the districts around the two Catholic 'hot spots' of Nieuwegracht and Mariahoek. This chapter will uncover two features of Catholic survival tactics: continuity with the medieval heritage, and adjustment to the post-Reformation multi-confessional reality. I shall argue that in order to survive identifiably as devout Catholics, Catholic Utrechters continued to use their traditional sacred spaces as before, and also accommodated themselves to the city's religious diversity by inventing new sacred spaces through various spatial practices in the urban *corpus christianum*.

1 Deelder, *Bijdragen*, I, p. 173: 'Vigilius wandelde ondertusschen lang zonder vrees voort, vertrouwende op zijn recht als burger en zijn bekend verblijf, totdat door de goddelijke beschikking, terwijl hij in de nabuurschap aan het ontbijt zat, zijn huis overvallen en bezet werd door den schout en zijne gerechtsdienaars. [...] Toen begaf men zich naar de kapel, waar het altaarblad werd weggenomen en de sieraden, zoo van zijden als zilver, op den grond werden geworpen, opdat zij, naar het voorbeeld der oude ketters, zouden toonen te strijden, niet zoo zeer tegen de menschen als tegen God en zijne heiligen'.

2 E.g., *G.P.U.*, I, pp. 394–403, III, pp. 466–69.

4.1. Chronological Developments in Catholic Spatial Practices

For urban habitants, sharing objective time and space in the multi-confessional city meant perceiving the presence of those of different religions on a daily basis.³ Reformed and Catholics in Utrecht were among those who had to adjust themselves to this environment of coexistence. Although Catholics had been deprived of their right to act as Catholics in Utrecht, they developed a variety of spatial practices to survive such a discriminatory situation. As discussed above, anti-Catholic edicts and legal proceedings against Catholics attest quantitatively to a gradual shift in Catholic meeting points from public facilities to houses. This observation on the chronological trend is generally confirmed by other contemporary testimonies, including the minutes of the city council and of the Reformed consistory, which nevertheless also slightly nuance it.

Physical and material remnants of medieval Catholicism persisted long in public facilities, allowing Catholics to regard such public spaces as still theirs. In 1620 the Reformed consistory petitioned the city council to eradicate the 'numerous remnants of the Idolatry of the Popery' in the 'public churches, monasteries, convents etc.', including '[a]ltars, images, *ora pro nobis*, prayers for the souls [in purgatory] etc.'⁴ That same year, the city magistrates observed that people of the 'Roman Religion' were daily holding large assemblies to practise their 'superstition', especially in monasteries and convents. These gatherings were regarded as 'public assemblies and conventicles', causing 'contempt of the public authority'. To counter such Catholic activities, the city council ordered all nuns and beguines living in monasteries and convents to close the doors until four o'clock in the afternoon every Sunday and on Catholic feast days.⁵ In 1622 Utrecht's magistrates ordered that 'those Idolatrous Images and Altars in the Convents be thrown underfoot'.⁶ Nevertheless, in 1635 such 'idolatrous' things could still be found in the city. For this reason, the city council once

3 For a distinguished study, see Davis, 'The Sacred and the Body Social'. Spatial practices inevitably entailed temporalities as an essential aspect. For an excellent study of temporalities and seasonable coexistence among people of different confessions in Spa, a health resort town in the Southern Netherlands, see Corens, 'Seasonable Coexistence'.

4 HUA, KR, 3, 23 November 1620: 'veele reliquen vande Afgoderijen des Pausdoms', 'openbaeren kercken, cloosteren, conventen etc.', and 'Altaeren, beelden, ora pro nobis, bidt voor de ziele etc.'.

5 HUA, SAI, 121-8, 7 September 1620: 'openbare vergaderingen ende conventiculen' and 'verachtinge vande publycke auctoriteyt'.

6 HUA, SAI, 121-10, 29 October 1622: 'die Affgodische Beelden ende Altaren inde Conventen sall gaen onder de voeten werpen'.

again prohibited trustees of convents and the Beguinage from hanging sacred images, crosses, and 'superstitious' drawings on the walls.⁷ As for the hospices, in 1633 the city council instructed the substitute sheriff to make an inventory of sacred images, ornaments, and other objects for the 'practice of popish superstitions and idolatries' in all the hospices, especially St Anthony Hospice and the Holy Cross Hospice, and to remove them.⁸ In these two hospices, a significant number of Catholics continued for a long time to be non-publicly connived as trustees.⁹ However, the remnants of Catholicism still did not disappear altogether.¹⁰ Thus, in 1637 the city council declared that trustees of hospices were to remove all the 'Papist' images and ornaments within twenty-four hours, or else face a fine (f. (florins) 25).¹¹ And yet in 1638 the Voetian consistory was informed of many monasteries with stained glass windows bearing 'offensive' images. Three months later, the magistrates created a list of 'offensive paintings and images, remnants of Popery in [public] churches, Monasteries, and elsewhere' in Utrecht, paying special attention to the former Dom cathedral and the former collegiate church of St Marie.¹² In 1646 a French traveller called Claude Joly met a Catholic canon of the chapter of St Jan in St Jan Church, where he found a painting of St John the Baptist as well as an altar.¹³

Even in the second half of the seventeenth century, Catholic material remnants could still be found in Utrecht's public facilities. In the Wittevrouwen Convent, for instance, crosses and 'popish pictures' were discovered in 1653.¹⁴ Likewise, 'superstitious' statues and images were found in the same convent as well as in the Agnieten Convent in 1658.¹⁵ The Voetian consistory remarked that year that 'superstitious' statues and images still existed in public churches and 'public places' in the city.¹⁶ Although the 'expurgation of the interior' of the Dom through the destruction of its altars and statues is said to have been completed no later than 1595,¹⁷ in 1659 'offensive' stained glass panes and other 'idolatrous' and 'superstitious'

7 HUA, SAI, 121-17, 20 April 1635.

8 HUA, SAI, 121-16, 15 April 1633: 'exercitie vande paepsche superstition ende affgederijen'.

9 HUA, BAI, 1840-1; HUA, BAI, 1987-1.

10 HUA, SAI, 121-17, 20 April 1635.

11 HUA, SAI, 121-18, 6 November 1637.

12 HUA, KR, 4, 23 May 1638; HUA, SAI, 121-18, 6 August 1638: 'ergelijcke' and 'argerlijcke schilderijen ende beelden reliquien vant Pausdom in kercken, Cloosters ende elders'.

13 Nijenhuis, 'Appartenance', pp. 188-89.

14 HUA, KR, 6, 17 October 1653: 'paepsche tafereelen'.

15 HUA, KR, 7, 30 August 1658.

16 *Ibidem*, 23 August 1658: 'publijcke plaetsen'.

17 Groot, 'Internal Arrangements', pp. 256-57.

monuments still remained and were noted for the record by Reformed ministers.¹⁸ In 1658 the consistory reported that 'superstitious' statues and images were still present in the public church of St Pieter, and therefore asked the city court to remove these 'scandalous' paintings, including one of St Mary of Egypt.¹⁹ Yet people found the painting of St Peter in the same church as late as 1678, when it was to be thrown away.²⁰ Notwithstanding the absence of legal records indicating that Catholic activities were found taking place in public facilities in the second half of the seventeenth century, the magistrates and the Reformed consistory confirmed that the Catholic faith continued to be openly and externally visible there.

Since the outlawing of their faith in 1580, Catholic Utrechters had continued to gather in their homes to practice their faith in spite of the prohibition. From around 1620, they started converting some of their meeting houses into clandestine churches as fixed places of worship, while the politico-religious authorities at the same time began to pay close attention to Catholic spatial practices in and around their homes and on public streets. According to the sheriff who appeared before the city council in 1628, Catholics used 'whole streets as they want' and in various places could come in and go out wherever they wanted to, 'through their houses, gardens, and premises', thus enabling them to escape judicial investigation.²¹ Around 1630 Rudolphus Francisci, the former Catholic priest who had converted to Reformed Protestantism, affirmed that Utrecht's Catholics had 'innumerable', 'highly secret entrances' which were interconnected and used to escape from the judicial officers.²² In 1633 the city council ordered the sheriff to confiscate the pews and altars found in Catholic houses, to bring them to city hall, to take 'perfect' note of the entrances and exits to Catholic houses, and to levy a fine of f. 600 on the owner of the house if he or she were to reinstall pews or altars.²³ In 1635, after receiving a remonstrance from the consistory concerning Catholic assemblies and priests, the city council instructed the sheriff to exercise vigilance on public streets, especially on Sundays.²⁴ Upon the order of the city council and the Provincial States, the sheriff conducted investigations

18 HUA, KR, 7, 21 November 1659: 'ergerlijke'.

19 Ibidem, 30 August 1658.

20 HUA, KR, 10, 4, 18 November 1678.

21 HUA, SAI, 121-13, 7 April 1628: 'geheele straten tot haer wille hebben' and 'door hare huysingen, hoven, ende erven'.

22 HUA, SAI, 2244-86, n.d. (Muller, 'Getuigenis', p. 243): 'ontallijcke' and 'seer secreete toegangen'.

23 HUA, SAI, 121-16, 4, 11 November 1633.

24 HUA, KR, 4, 11 June 1635; HUA, SAI, 121-17, 15 June 1635.

into Catholic spatial practices in 1641, visiting their houses and premises, and taking notes on the doors and entrances or exits there.²⁵ In 1646 the consistory complained to the city council about the numerous roads, gates, and entrances or exits used by Catholic priests to escape.²⁶ Based on an overview of Catholic 'conventicles' offered by the Reformed ministers in 1647, the consistory informed the city council of places of Catholic assembly as well as priests' residences, including those around the Mariahoek district and in the city's suburbs.²⁷

Following the Peace of Münster in 1648, the magistrates began to respond to the pleas of the Reformed Church concerning Catholic spatial practices in and around their houses and on public streets. In 1649 the city council permitted militia captains to undertake an investigation into the entrances and exits of Catholic houses.²⁸ Several months later, the magistrates received the results and ordered Catholics in some quarters to close their entrances and exits within fourteen days, under pain of a fine.²⁹ Nevertheless, the consistory remarked that the 'boldness of Papists' was growing daily due to the sheer number of doors, entrances, and exits to Catholic houses, as well as the 'free and very public residence' of clerics.³⁰ It therefore demanded of the magistracy that it close the entrances and exits that did not lead to public streets.³¹ Until the mid-1650s, the city magistrates organized further investigations, led by the sheriff, on 'all Catholic houses', especially those near the Catholic hot spots in and around Nieuwegracht and Mariahoek. They authorized the sheriff to destroy all the 'utensils and ornaments serving the popish conventicles and superstitions' found during the investigations.³² According to the Voetian consistory, Catholic Utrechters were 'publicly' establishing an increasing number of clandestine churches and schools in the mid-1660s.³³ In 1665 the city court in response exhibited reports pertaining to Catholic spatial practices which identified specific houses, in particular around Nieuwegracht and Mariahoek, where numerous Catholics, including priests and *klopjes*, were living together and had installed heavy

25 HUA, SAI, 121-19, 1 February 1641.

26 HUA, KR, 5, 18 May 1646; HUA, SAI, 121-21, 19 May 1646.

27 HUA, KR, 5, 3, 17, 24 May, 2, 9, 26 August 1647.

28 HUA, SAI, 121-23, 26 April 1649.

29 Ibidem, 23 August, 1 September 1649.

30 HUA, KR, 5, 15 October 1649: 'vrij ende genoch openbaer wonen'.

31 Ibidem, 10, 17 December 1649; HUA, SAI, 121-23, 17, 19 December 1649.

32 HUA, KR, 6, 3 April 1654; HUA, SAI, 121-23, 10 June 1650; HUA, SAI, 121-24, 28 February 1652; HUA, SAI, 121-25, 10, 22 April, 8 May, 1 November 1654, 4, 29 January 1655; 'gereetschap ende ornamenten, dienende tot paepse conventiculen ende superstitiën'.

33 HUA, KR, 8, 30 June 1665.

doors to forestall judicial investigations.³⁴ By 1672 Catholic Utrechters had fourteen clandestine churches – eleven within the city walls, and three outside – where secular or regular priests took shelter.³⁵ Around these clandestine churches, Catholics formed stations (crypto-parishes) as if they still enjoyed the Catholic parochial life of old.

In this way, Catholic Utrechters seem to have gradually shifted their meeting places from public facilities to their houses over the course of the seventeenth century, although material remnants of Catholicism were still visible to everyone in the urban public spaces and thus offended Reformed sensibilities. Catholics developed various spatial practices in public facilities, in and around their houses, and on public streets in the multi-confessional city.

4.2. Public Facilities

4.2.1. Public Church Buildings

With this chronological examination of Catholic spatial practices in Utrecht in place, we can move on to the first round of our urban tour, which stops at the public facilities. Catholic activities will be presented in a gradation from less to more apparent. Beginning with activities in public church buildings, the centre of religious life for Christians, the analysis will move on to monasteries and convents and, finally, to hospices.

Although all public church buildings in Utrecht were reserved for the exclusive use of Reformed religious services, their practical management was not entrusted to the consistory but to churchwardens (*kerkmeesters*), who were appointed by the city council and did not always yield to the confessionalizing demands of the consistory concerning church interiors.³⁶ As the only public church of the Dutch Republic, the Reformed Church was required to serve everyone, regardless of religion. Thus, even Catholics could baptize their children, marry, and be buried there. As Catholics could still enter public church buildings and participate in communal rites, this may have strengthened their sense that those sacred spaces were still part of their daily lives.³⁷

34 HUA, SAI, 616, 29 April 1665 (Hofman, 'Allerlei', pp. 183–89).

35 *Lettres historiques*, I, p. 212 (report written on 5 July 1672).

36 Pollmann, 'The Cleansing of the Temple', p. 182; Rengers Hora Siccama, *De geestelijke en kerkelijke goederen*, pp. 347–69.

37 E.g., Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 80–81; Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, pp. 266–70; Lenarduzzi, *De belevingswereld*, pp. 127–29; Idem, 'Subcultuur en tegencultuur', pp. 160–62; Pollmann, 'Burying

Catholic funerals traditionally were a very public, communal ritual. Conformity to the starkly sober Reformed custom therefore offended Catholic sensibilities. Eventually, Dutch Catholics were to develop new customs of mourning, shifting the scene of the ritual from the public church buildings and public cemeteries to domestic, private spaces inside the family home.³⁸ Given this general pattern, it is notable that Utrecht's Catholics seem to have been quite persistent in finding ways to preserve as much of their public, communal ritual funerary programme as possible. In 1638, for instance, 'superstition' was exercised in the choir of the public church of St Pieter during the funeral of a noblewoman of unknown faith.³⁹ A Catholic member of the Knighthood, Peter van Hardenbroek, was fined by the city council for violating an edict when he used an 'illicit' decoration at the funeral of his daughter in the public church of St Catharijne.⁴⁰ Since Reformed and Catholics simultaneously participated in funerals, the former seem to have mimicked the ritualism of the latter in church buildings. In 1638 the Voetian consistory prohibited Reformed believers from taking their hats off when they participated in the funerals at public churches, claiming that such a custom was 'an old superstition sprouting from and preserved in Popery'.⁴¹ Likewise, Catholics continued to place candles around the corpse and to pray for the dead in public churches or churchyards openly, practices which, according to the consistory, were all 'popish superstition' and should thus be forbidden, following a similar ban in Haarlem and 's-Hertogenbosch.⁴² The consistory argued that *klopjes* played a significant role in this custom.⁴³ Coexistence of different confessional groups at funerals at times even resulted in violent conflicts. When neighbours gathered in the house of an innkeeper named Willem Servaes on Whit Tuesday (28 May) in 1667 to discuss how to transport a corpse, the Reformed carpenter Dirck Leendersz van Hoorn began quarrelling with others. On another night, Van Hoorn met one of his neighbours, Jan Willemsz van Emerick, who was walking in Nieuwstraat together with his wife. Van Hoorn suddenly began

the Dead', pp. 94–95; Spaans, *Haarlem*, pp. 113–24; Idem, 'Stad van vele geloven', pp. 388–401; Tracy, 'Public Church', pp. 501–2. For a helpful analysis of early modern Dutch Catholic claims to public church buildings as legal, sacred, and social spaces, see Geraerts, 'Competing Sacred Spaces'.

38 For the early modern Dutch Catholic mourning culture, see Mudde, 'Rouwen in de marge'.

39 HUA, SAI, 121-18, 17 September 1638.

40 HUA, SAI, 121-19, 7 September 1640: 'ongoorlooffde'. For the edict, see *G.P.U.*, III, pp. 527–29 (14 July 1624). See also Geraerts, 'Competing Sacred Space', pp. 29–30.

41 HUA, KR, 4, 18 January 1638: 'een oude superstitie gesprooten ende onderhouden int Pausdom'.

42 HUA, KR, 5, 2 February 1646; HUA, SAI, 121-21, 16 February 1646, 10 January, 28 February 1648; HUA, SAI, 121-22, 6 March 1648.

43 HUA, KR, 5, 27 January 1651.

fighting with Van Emerick, who came away with several injuries. According to a witness, Van Hoorn had shouted after the victim: 'Papist, Papist'.⁴⁴

Memories of medieval Catholicism were not only preserved, but also newly revealed and revived through the Catholic material remnants in Utrecht's public churches. On the evening of 27 November 1656, the grave of St Bernulphus, bishop of Utrecht (d. 1054), in the choir of the public church of St Pieter was exhumed.⁴⁵ A Catholic believer named Heindrick Gijsbertsz Weyman delightedly reported this 'miracle' to his co-religionist Henricus Velthoen, the president of the college of 'High Hill' (*Hooge Heuvel*) in Cologne, that is, the Alticollense college where many Dutch secular priests were trained. According to Weyman, people found the 'episcopal garment, with his staff, a golden ring on his hand, a silver gilded chalice, and [a] dish' in the grave. He noted: 'Thousands of people have come here to see [the relics], including those of the Catholic faith with devotion, as well as those of other religions with curiosity, many of whom mocked at and joked about [the relics]'.⁴⁶ Catholics succeeded in safeguarding the relics from destruction or confiscation by the Reformed, and they were to be preserved by the already secularized chapter of St Pieter. A report by the chapter's secretary testifies that many Catholics were coming there daily 'with great devotion' for the relics.⁴⁷ The relics brought Utrecht's Catholics 'miracles' – or, Catholic ecclesiastics used the relics as a confessional weapon in their apologetics. In 1688 Apostolic Vicar Petrus Codde reported that the chalice of St Bernulphus had 'miraculously' cured the serious respiratory illness of a local Catholic woman called Joanna Tibbel.⁴⁸

Well into the latter half of the seventeenth century, Catholic Utrechters continued to attach their own religious meanings to spaces of the public church buildings and also gave new confessional values to those spaces, where they sometimes openly, externally, and identifiably acted as Catholics even in front of the Reformed. But more audacious spatial practices took place in monasteries and convents.

44 HUA, SAll, 2244-126, 21, 25 June, 12, 19 July 1667: 'Paep, Paep'.

45 HUA, Kapittel van Sint Pieter, 114-a. On mourning culture in St Pieter Church from the eleventh to the eighteenth centuries, see Bogaers, *Aards*, pp. 593–677.

46 This letter was transcribed in Evers, 'De sarcophaag', p. 90: 'bisschoplijcke gewaeyt, met sijn staff, een gouden rinck an sijn handt en een silvere vergult kelcxken en pateelken' and 'Hier hebben duessenden van menschen commen kijcken, die katholijcke met divotie, die van andere religie uut nieusciericheit, waervan der veel spotten en geckten'. On Velthoen, see Rogier, *Geschiedenis*, II, p. 46.

47 HUA, Kapittel van Sint Pieter, 114-a: 'met grote devotie'.

48 Bogaers, *Aards*, p. 605; Parker, *Faith on the Margins*, p. 180.

4.2.2. Monasteries and Convents

Monasteries and convents had functioned as sacred spaces during medieval times, but were officially secularized in post-Reformation Utrecht. As noted above, some of them were in the possession of the Knighthood, of which Catholic nobles retained membership in the seventeenth century. Those who had lived in monasteries and convents from before 1580 were not deprived of their right to draw a pension from their ecclesiastical properties and some of them, especially nuns, were allowed to live there, unless they violated the anti-Catholic edicts.⁴⁹ The Catholic nobles in the Knighthood and the presence of Catholic residents in monasteries and convents may have enabled Catholic Utrechters to imagine that they were still in Catholic use, even though ordinary laypeople had not had access to them in medieval times.

In order to safeguard their worship and to protect their clerics, Catholics utilized multiple entrances and exits to the monasteries and convents. This led the city magistrates to decide in 1624 that all the entrances and exits to Catholic houses that belonged to convents were to be closed, and their keys kept in the city hall. Catholic priests were prohibited from visiting monasteries and convents, under pain of forfeiting their benefices and livelihood, if indeed they still had them.⁵⁰ Since the outlawing of Catholicism in 1580, the Jeruzalem Convent had been one of the most popular places for illegal Catholic assemblies held especially by one of the first Jesuits dispatched to the Dutch Republic, Willem de Leeuw (1559–1612), who died and was buried in the same convent. The political authorities tried to check Catholic activities in the convent, confiscating all the properties belonging to it in 1613.⁵¹ But, one day in 1628, the sheriff was informed that Catholics were planning to gather in the Jeruzalem Convent. However, when he raided the place, he found nothing except scattered holy water. Appearing before the city council, the sheriff explained that the Catholics had escaped the judicial officers using the many entrances and exits of the convent. He petitioned the magistrates to stipulate that every monastery and convent be restricted to a single entrance or exit. Yet the magistracy all but ignored this request. Dismissing the sheriff's plea, the magistrates declared that the trustees of the monasteries and convents, and not the sheriff, were to assume the authority over the entrances and exits there.⁵² Despite

49 Hulzen, *Utrechtse kloosters*, passim.

50 *G.P.U.*, III, pp. 467–68 (14 July 1624); HUA, SAI, 121-10, 12 July 1624.

51 Hoek, *Schets*, p. 72; *N.N.B.W.*, III, col. 747–48.

52 HUA, SAI, 121-13, 14 January, 7 April 1628.

urgent appeals from the sheriff, the political authorities seemed hesitant to infringe upon the rights of the owners of monasteries and convents, including the Knighthood, with regard to their territories and buildings. Behind the magistrates' indecision, the agency of the Catholics seems indirect.

However, Catholics sometimes also held large-scale assemblies in monasteries and convents especially on important dates in their confessional calendar, testifying to a more direct and evident agency on their part. Around ten o'clock in the morning on Ascension Day, 1622, the sheriff, together with other judicial officers, visited the Abraham Dole Monastery. They knew that people were celebrating Mass in a room in the monastery on that feast day. However, the room was far from the front entrance, and the Catholics had closed numerous doors in between. By keeping the doors closed, they were able to prevent the judicial officers from reaching them. Judging from the sound of the crowd, the sheriff estimated that more than 200 Catholics may have been in attendance there {3}.⁵³ In 1624 thirteen or fourteen Catholics, including the Dominican Paulus van der Rijst, as well as beguines and residents of the monastery, were found holding a gathering in the Arkel Monastery {5}.⁵⁴ A decade later, the sheriff and substitute sheriff learned that Catholics were planning to hold their 'conventicles' in various places on 15 August 1636, the feast day of the Assumption of Mary. Accordingly, they rushed to the Cecilia Convent where they found more than 200 Catholics gathered. Behind the crowds, the sheriff caught a glimpse of someone wearing vestments. However, Catholic women threw themselves in the way to prevent the sheriff from reaching the door through which the priest managed to escape. Responding to the report from the sheriff, the magistracy ordered that all the entrances to the convent, which provided access to and from the neighbouring houses, were to be closed immediately {14}.⁵⁵ Four years later, however, the city magistrates found 'two secret doors or holes' in the Cecilia Convent, leading to the neighbouring premises. They judged that Catholics were still using these doors or holes to prevent judicial officers from apprehending their ecclesiastics.⁵⁶ Even after the Peace of Münster, Catholics displayed their 'boldness' in St Servaas Abbey, after which the consistory warned the city council and the Knighthood, as the owner of the abbey, of these illicit activities.⁵⁷

53 HUA, SAI, 2244-46, fasc. 11, 31 May 1622.

54 HUA, SAI, 2236-2, 26 May 1624 (Hoogland, 'De gevangenneming', p. 243); HUA, SAI, 2244-53, fasc. 8, 24 January 1624 (Hoogland, 'De gevangenneming', p. 240).

55 HUA, SAI, 121-17, 15 August 1636, 12 September 1636; HUA, SAI, 2236-3, 31 December 1636.

56 HUA, SAI, 121-19, 25 June, 8, 22 July 1640: 'twee heymelicke deurgangen off gaten'.

57 HUA, KR, 5, 30 September, 7, 28 October 1650.

Through their spatial practices using doors, entrances, and exits, Catholic Utrechters secured their sacred spaces in the officially secularized monasteries and convents, allowing their presiding priests to escape arrest. Catholic activities were perhaps most tangible, however, in Utrecht's hospices.

4.2.3. Hospices

Despite repeated prohibitions, Catholics continued to hold positions as trustees or overseers in Utrecht's hospices until at least the early 1660s. The presence of their co-religionists as administrators of hospices may well have enabled Catholics to regard them as their own sacred spaces, although legally the use of the chapels was reserved to Reformed preachers alone.

Catholic clerics sometimes sneaked illegally into Utrecht's hospices to administer their sacraments. In 1624, for instance, two Catholics on their death beds were caught receiving extreme unction from priests in St Anthony Hospice in the suburb of Weerd, where Catholics were connived as trustees at least during the period from 1623 to 1649.⁵⁸ In response, the city magistrates decided in 1624 that priests found in hospices were to forfeit their benefices if they still had rights to them.⁵⁹ That same year a provincial edict confirmed that all Catholic priests were to be forbidden from visiting hospices.⁶⁰ However, Catholics continued to be active in hospices to show their religiosity, inviting priests to preside over services there. Around Christmas 1634, Catholics gathered in St Job Hospice outside the Catharijne gate {12}. When interrogated by judicial officers, a resident of the hospice named Jan Jansz van Soest testified that the registered Catholic priest Paulus van Geresteyn <16>, whom he called 'Pauwels van de Straet' (Paul of the Street), opened the door of St Job Church adjacent to the hospice in the morning on 22 December 1634. After he and two women living outside the Catharijne gate had entered the church, other elderly people together with a woman who Van Soest guessed was a *klopje*, followed them and closed the door of the church. After a while, they came out and entered the hospice. According to Van Soest, Van Geresteyn frequently visited the sick in the hospice. Accompanied by Catholic residents living in the hospice, the priest often entered St Job Church and closed its door, although Van Soest was unable to clarify explicitly whether Catholics were practising their faith there. Van Soest, or the author of the interrogation report, seems to have

58 HUA, BAI, 1987-1, passim in 1623-1649.

59 HUA, SAI, 121-10, 12 July 1624.

60 This provincial edict was issued on 14 July 1624. *G.P.U.*, III, pp. 467-68.

noted deliberately that Catholics were creating an invisible space inside the public church building by closing the door. Here we find the liminality of the physical public whose boundary was shifted by Catholic spatial practices.⁶¹

During the seventeenth century, the *kermis* frequently took place in Utrecht's hospices.⁶² The *kermis* had originally been a celebration to mark the feast day commemorating the consecration of a particular church, but by the seventeenth century, it had become a popular festival held around the annual fair. According to a petition sent by the consistory to the city council in 1654, Catholics committed 'terrible idolatry' during the *kermis*, trying to apply 'popish odour' to their churches to 'establish their own authority' in the city. In the consistory's understanding, for Catholics, no church could exist 'without the authority of the Pope'. As Pope Alexander II (1010/15–1073) had granted an indulgence at the *kermis* in 1066, so the Voetian consistory continued, Utrecht's Catholics still received indulgences at the *kermis* every year. Besides, Utrechters, including Reformed believers, were being lured into dancing and drinking during the *kermis* period, which was judged scandalous by Calvinist moral standards. The consistory problematized the very term '*kermis*' as well. When the Reformed referred to the *kermis* as *kermis*, they were forced to place themselves 'under the dominion of the anti-Christ'. As biblical examples suggested, if the Reformed were to permit Catholics to celebrate the *kermis*, they would themselves incur the wrath of God.⁶³ According to the consistory, St Anthony Hospice, St Job Hospice, the *Dolhuis*, and St Bartholomew Hospice were known as places for the *kermis*.⁶⁴

It was in these four hospices famous for the *kermis* that Catholic Utrechters were particularly active and even audacious in openly and externally displaying their faith. In 1624 a Catholic priest was reported to have entered St Anthony Hospice to administer extreme unction.⁶⁵ In 1637 Reformed communicant members living in the suburb of Weerd, where this hospice stood, appealed to the consistory to hold weekly sermons in the hospice for 'edification' and to the 'detriment of Popery'.⁶⁶ A beguine called Huijbertgen van Nyckercken is said to have frequented St Bartholomew Hospice in Lange Smeestraat, where Catholic female overseers were still working in

61 For {12}, see HUA, SAI, 121-17, 29 December 1634; HUA, SAI, 2244-80, 30 January 1635. For <16>, see HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12 March 1622.

62 *G.P.U.*, III, pp. 472–73 (15 April 1630); HUA, KR, 5, 3 May 1647.

63 HUA, KR, 6, 13 November 1654: 'paepsche geur', 'schrickelycke afgoderie', 'syn eygen auctoriteyt bevestigen', 'sonder auctoriteyt der Paus', and 'onder de heerschappe der antichrist'.

64 HUA, KR, 5, 2 April 1649.

65 HUA, SAI, 121-10, 12 July 1624.

66 HUA, KR, 4, 3 August 1637: 'stichtinge' and 'affbreuck van t'Pausdom'.

1637. As such, she was forbidden by the city council to visit the hospice, on pain of forfeiting her income from St Nicolaas Monastery.⁶⁷ In the same hospice, Catholic residents mocked their Reformed counterparts when the latter were observing a fast by allowing themselves an extra dish.⁶⁸ In the *Dolhuis*, Catholics likewise added fuel to their conflict with the Reformed. Someone, surely of the Catholic faith, had a psychiatric patient sing 'two popish parodies' (lit. 'scoffing songs'), which mocked the 'contemporary situation and success of the weapons of this State'.⁶⁹

The Holy Cross Hospice outside the Wittevrouwen gate was one of the most popular sites for Catholics. A reason for its popularity was the relic of an alleged fragment of the Holy Cross that had been kept in a chapel of the hospice since its establishment in the fifteenth century by the Holy Cross confraternity of St Jacob Church.⁷⁰ Despite the existing prohibitions, Catholics were appointed trustees there at least from 1643 to 1662.⁷¹ Especially from the end of the 1620s until the end of the 1630s, Catholics were particularly bold in this hospice, stirring up trouble with the Reformed. On 3 May 1628, a Catholic feast day of the Holy Cross, Catholics gathered in this hospice to practise 'horrible idolatry and superstition'. On that same day, 'many barges full of people were transporting the sick there from Lopik [a village near Utrecht] and other places, in order to exercise this idolatry and for pilgrimages'. The Reformed consistory regarded this as 'harmful to our reformation and [a] scandal to numerous pious people'.⁷² Two months later the city council instructed trustees of the hospice to remove the Catholic images and to close the hospice on 3 May every year to prevent Catholics from exercising their 'superstition' on their feast day.⁷³ Nevertheless, according to the minutes of the city council of 1633, Catholics also assembled in the hospice on Fridays, in particular on Good Friday, to practise their 'diverse superstitions'. The city magistrates saw this as 'a scandal and offence to many patriots and sympathizers of the true Christian reformed Religion, and contempt of the Magistrate of this City'. They ordered the trustees of

67 HUA, SAI, 121-18, 18 November 1637.

68 HUA, KR, 6, 18 October 1652.

69 HUA, SAI, 121-18, 6 August 1638: 'twee paepsche schempliedekens' and 'jegenwoordige gelegentheynt ende succes der wapenen van desen Staet'.

70 Margry and Caspers, *Bedevaartplaatsen*, I, pp. 759-60.

71 HUA, BAI, 1840-1, passim in 1643-1662.

72 HUA, KR, 4, 18 May 1628: 'growlicke affgoderie ende superstitie', 'veele schuyten vol menschen tot pleginge deser affgoderie en bedevaerden van Lopick en andere plaetsen sieck daerhenen transporteren', and 'schaede onser reformatie ende schandael veeler vromen'.

73 HUA, SAI, 121-13, 8 July 1628.

the hospice to close all the doors, windows, and entrances or exits between Thursday evening and Friday evening. Still, the trustees of the hospice, perhaps themselves Catholics, attempted to make a new object shaped like a cross. They were therefore forbidden by the city magistracy from producing such things without the prior consent of the burgomasters.⁷⁴ On 7 March 1636 the city council decreed that the trustees of the hospice were to remove Catholic images and ornaments by 11 March, and that the sheriff was to bring the Catholic materials found in hospices and elsewhere to the city hall.⁷⁵ Subsequently, in 1638 numerous Catholics came to a room in the hospice called the 'Offering Room' to practise their 'superstition' communally. Moreover, elderly Catholic women in the hospice scorned people who worked on the Catholic feast days. That same year Catholics continued to practise their 'superstition of pilgrimages' on the feast day of the Holy Cross.⁷⁶ On 25 April 1639 the Reformed consistory postponed sermons in hospices to the next week in order to warn against the 'superstition' which had been 'ordinarily' practised outside the Wittevrouten gate, probably in the Holy Cross Hospice, particularly on the feast day of the Holy Cross.⁷⁷

After this date, the minutes of the city council and consistory contain no further references to the cult of the Holy Cross in the hospice. However, in his mission report to Rome in 1656, Apostolic Vicar De la Torre did mention the cult in the Holy Cross Hospice:

In the other [hospice] of the Holy Cross near the city walls, a commemoration and a huge cult of the Holy Cross has existed from times of old, and Catholics from abroad rush there even in this tempest [of Protestant rule] for the sake of prayer, since God is working various miracles there.⁷⁸

Indeed, Catholics continued to be active in the Holy Cross Hospice even in the second half of the seventeenth century. On the night of 31 January 1650,

74 HUA, SAI, 121-16, 15 April 1633: 'een scandael ende ergernisse van veele patriotten ende liefhebbers vande ware Christelijcke gereformeerde Religie ende cleijnachtige vande Magistraet deser Stadt'.

75 HUA, SAI, 121-17, 7 March 1636.

76 HUA, KR, 4, 10 May 1638; HUA, SAI, 121-18, 3 December 1638: 'Offer Camertgen' and 'superstitie van de bevaerden'.

77 HUA, KR, 4, 25 April 1639.

78 Lommel, 'Relatio seu descriptio', p. 175: 'In alio vero S[anc]tae Crucis juxta civitatis moenia ab antiquo memoria et cultus maximus fuit ejusdem S[anc]tae Crucis, accurrentibus voti causa etiam hac tempestate undequaque Catholicis et Deo varia ibidem miracula operante'. Almost the same description can be found in the mission report from Rovenius and other secular priests, including De la Torre, to Rome in 1638. Hoogland, 'Descriptio', p. 192.

the priest Johannes Schade was invited into the hospice by his father Pieter, who was an advocate at the provincial court and a trustee of the Holy Cross Hospice, to give the last rites to women on their deathbed. A female overseer of the hospice is said to have greeted the priest cheerfully. She was then summoned by the Voetian consistory, which accused her of neglecting her duty to prevent 'popish superstitions', offending the Reformed communicant members residing in the hospice. Appearing before the consistory, she insisted that she had not known of the anointing by the priest. The consistory delegated two ministers to the city council to complain about this incident. The magistrates in their turn ordered the sheriff to conduct further investigations.⁷⁹ Nevertheless, in 1652, when Pieter Schade was still a trustee of the same hospice, the consistory was informed about Catholic trustees and Remonstrant trustees of the same hospice who were practising their 'superstitions'.⁸⁰ It is worth mentioning that in 1661, when at least one Catholic, that is, Nicolaes Dierhout, was serving the same hospice as a trustee, the Voetian consistory asked the trustees to lower the curtains to cover the stained glass panes, at least while Reformed ministers were preaching there.⁸¹ On this occasion, the consistory seems to have given up hope of ridding itself of the 'superstitious' images of the stained glass windows.

Catholic Utrechters were therefore quite bold in giving external and material expression to their religiosity in Utrecht's hospices, as the presence of Catholic trustees or overseers there made it possible for them to continue to treat the public space as if it were still their own.

While previous studies typically assumed that Dutch Catholics retreated from the urban public space in the wake of the Protestant Reformation and the Dutch Revolt, restricting their religious expression to the inside of their private homes, Utrecht's Catholics prove to have been far more active in demonstrating their faith in the city's public facilities. The physical and material presence of Catholicism there pushed Catholics to continue to regard such public spaces as their sacred spaces, collectively practising their faith and communally celebrating their feast days there, although Protestants had denied these spaces such sacredness. But continuity went hand in hand with adjustment, as Catholic Utrechters adapted themselves to the early modern multi-confessional reality by creating new doors and entrances or exits, re-installing their material objects in the public facilities, and the

79 HUA, BAI, 1840-1, passim in 1643-1653; HUA, KR, 5, 4, 11 February 1650; HUA, SAII, 121-23, 18 February 1650.

80 HUA, KR, 6, 28 September 1652.

81 HUA, BAI, 1840-1, passim in 1645, 1647-1662; HUA, KR, 8, 9 September 1661.

like, in their attempts to facilitate easy escape from judicial investigators. The spaces of such public facilities were therefore not just *lieux de mémoire* of a lost medieval Catholicism, but also lived spaces of an early modern outlawed Catholicism.

4.3. Houses and Public Streets

4.3.1. Open Clashes

At this point we begin the second round of our urban tour, visiting Catholic houses and public streets. A first feature of this tour is the open clashes between Catholic Utrechters and the politico-judicial authorities or Reformed neighbours, which were provoked by Catholic spatial practices through their homes, spaces between houses, and public streets. We will then go on outside the city walls, calling at houses and a castle owned by Catholics. After returning inside the walled city, the urban tour will be completed with a visit to the districts around Nieuwegracht and Mariahoek, where Catholics lived together and demonstrated a previously underestimated dynamism in their spatial practices.

Numerous Catholics with elevated social status provided their co-religionists with spaces for communal worship, even if their houses were not turned into clandestine churches. The large scale on which Catholics were holding illegal assemblies inside their private homes inevitably caught the attention of the authorities and Reformed neighbours, especially on Catholic holy days. On the feast day of the Assumption of Mary in 1638, for example, Gerard van der Steen, the Catholic canon of St Jan, hosted a gathering of twenty-six people in his house on Janskerkhof, inside the former immunity of St Jan {17} (Appendix 1). In another instance, the noblewoman De Edel tightly closed the door of her house on Christmas Eve 1628, when a number of Catholics were assembled there. The sheriff tried to interrupt this assembly by smashing the door with an iron hammer, but failed to enter. To his mind, this represented 'premeditated resistance', a 'disdain for justice and the public authority'.⁸² Utrecht's Catholics sometimes chose to assemble after dark or before sunrise, just like their co-religionists in other

82 HUA, SAII, 121-14, 29 December 1628: 'premeditate resistentie' and 'vilipendie vande justitie ende publiccq autoriteyt'. This noblewoman might be Maria d'Edell, who regarded the Buur Church as a Catholic sanctuary and provided a fund for the establishment of an altar in the same church. Geraerts, 'Competing Sacred Space', pp. 21, 26.

places of the Dutch Republic.⁸³ However, the scale or frequency of their gatherings at night rendered them recognizable as punishable offences through visibility or audibility as punishable offences.⁸⁴ A petition which the Reformed consistory sent to the city council in 1648 impatiently complained that Catholics were holding their gatherings in ‘innumerable places’ as if they had ‘freedom’ of assembly. It claimed that Catholics had already re-established their bishopric and divided the city into parishes – that is, the so-called stations formed around clandestine churches. The next potential step for Catholics would be to set up a ‘political government’.⁸⁵

Catholic clandestine churches were constructed in houses that were large enough to accommodate the congregation and were thus mostly owned by wealthy individuals. Two clandestine churches in Utrecht had been under Dominican supervision. One of them, the *Onze Lieve Vrouw Rozenkrans*, had been standing at the corner of *Dorstige Hartsteeg* (or *Hendrick de Royensteeg*) and *Lange Nieuwstraat* since around 1620. Its founder, the Dominican Vincent Andriesz, was accused of performing clerical activities in 1636 {13}.⁸⁶ The 1665 investigation report referred to a ‘church’ constructed in the house of the Dominican Christophorus Floris <008>, who lived with his mother in *Lange Nieuwstraat*, near the *Onze Lieve Vrouw Rozenkrans*.⁸⁷ It is also known that Grietgen Janssen {53} lived in *Dorstige Hartsteeg*, and that Maria Francken {95} lived near the end of *Dorstige Hartsteeg* in *Lange Nieuwstraat*, although it is unclear whether their houses functioned as the Dominican clandestine church. In any case, both were suspected of hosting Catholic assemblies (Appendix 1). In 1657 the Reformed consistory reported that a priest called Hatterem was residing in a house on *Nieuwstraat* near *Dorstige Hartsteeg*.⁸⁸

One of the most exhaustive judicial investigations of Dutch Catholic houses was conducted in Utrecht in 1639. It was carried out on the house of the Catholic noblewoman Van Duivenvoorde, where Apostolic Vicar Rovenius frequently stayed.⁸⁹ During the subsequent trials against Catholic priests, including Wachtelaer {19}, two other priests, namely Jacobus de Gouda <10> and Johan van de Wall, were also interrogated, even though they evaded legal prosecution. The interrogation, together with the trials themselves, made the

83 E.g., Frijhoff, ‘Dimensions’, p. 230; Idem, *Embodied Belief*, p. 59.

84 E.g., {12} {35} in Appendix 1.

85 HUA, KR, 5, 28 February 1648: ‘ontalijcke plaetsen’, ‘vryheyt’, and ‘polityct regeringe’.

86 For the general history of this Dominican clandestine church, see Hoogland, ‘De Dominicanen’, pp. 206–12. For {13}, see HUA, SAI, 2236-3, 10, 19 November 1636, 3 December 1636.

87 HUA, SAI, 616, probably in 1665 (Hofman, ‘Allerlei’, p. 188).

88 HUA, KR, 6, 20 April 1657.

89 Deelder, *Bijdragen*, I, pp. 170–76.

magistrates aware of the urgent need for further countermeasures to deal with Catholic spatial practices through doors, entrances, and exits.⁹⁰ Soon thereafter they decided that the sheriff, accompanied by militia captains, was to visit houses in every quarter of the city to investigate the doors and entrances or exits there.⁹¹ Such investigations were indeed frequently conducted, especially from around the mid-seventeenth century.⁹² Pews, altars with ornaments, sacred images, manuscript documents, (religious) books, and even relics were discovered in Catholic houses and confiscated by the authorities.⁹³

In this antagonistic situation where the authorities attempted to deprive Catholics of their physical spaces to act as Catholics even inside their private homes, the latter nevertheless never abandoned their effort to create and protect their sacred space inside their houses. Some Catholics civilly requested instructions from the magistrates. In February 1644, for instance, Anna Catharina Mom and the Catholic nobleman Assuerus van Borculo petitioned the city council to permit them to install new doors and entrances or exits to their houses. Upon receiving this request, the city magistracy found it necessary to delegate someone to inspect the premises visually, but the results of this investigation are unfortunately not known.⁹⁴ This does not mean, however, that the petitioners evaded legal prosecution. Van Borculo had already been accused by the city court of hosting a Catholic assembly a month earlier {32}. Likewise, Mom was charged by the court with hosting Catholic gatherings in her house in 1642 {27}, 1648 {42}, and 1655 {70} {72}, which functioned as the secular clandestine church of St Nicolaas Achter de Wal (Appendix 1). Catholic activities had been noticeable to the eyes of the magistracy in and around the secular clandestine church of St Nicolaas Achter de Wal, which, according to contemporary testimonies, was located near Lollestraat, Cellebroederstraat, and St Hieronymus School. As early as 1633, the sheriff had confiscated Catholic ornaments, pews, and an altar from the house of Cornelis van Kessel near St Hieronymus School.⁹⁵

90 HUA, SAI, 121-19, 16 March 1640.

91 Ibidem, 4 May, 23 July 1640.

92 E.g., HUA, KR, 5, 9 August 1647 (Klaveren, 'Vergaderplaatsen'); HUA, SAI, 121-23, 26 April 1649; HUA, SAI, 121-27, 4 July 1664; HUA, SAI, 616, 29 April 1665 (Hofman, 'Allerlei', pp. 183-89).

93 E.g., HUA, SAI, 121-23, 23 August 1649.

94 HUA, SAI, 121-20, 2 February 1644. Van Borculo was active in charity as he was connived as a trustee of St Anthony Hospice (in office at least 1628-1633, 1636-1638, 1641-1649) and of the municipal chamber of charity (in office 1638-1640). HUA, BAI, 1987-1, *passim* in 1628-1633, 1636-1638, 1641-1649; HUA, SAI, 1825-1, 3 October 1638, 4 October 1639.

95 HUA, SAI, 121-16, 4, 11 November 1633. The house of a man known as Puyt (Poeyt), whose stall served as a meeting point for Catholics, was also situated near St Hieronymus School {48} (Appendix 1).

Other Catholics, however, were belligerent when facing the politico-judicial authorities and their Reformed neighbours. On one day in 1644, the sheriff together with other judicial officers raided a house to break up an illegal Catholic assembly, but the participants prevented them from entering and added further insult by calling them 'snitches, crooks, traitors, devils'.⁹⁶ An appeal from the public church to the city magistracy reveals that Catholics, even after being fined by the city court, continued to use their special doors or entrances and exits, and posted sentries on public streets near houses whose owners had already been prosecuted.⁹⁷ In 1649 the sheriff found a heavy door in the house of Grietgen Janssen, comparing it to the 'door of a castle' which, according to him, functioned as a 'door for retreat' {53}.⁹⁸ The 1665 investigation report shows that some Catholics equipped their houses with heavy doors made of poplar trees, physically obstructing judicial investigators. For instance, the house of 'Van Blickenburg', that is, the secular clandestine church of St Nicolaas Achter de Wal, had a door made of poplar trees, and two Catholic secular priests, Johannes Putkamer <013> and Johannes Lindeborn <014>, were residing in a neighbouring house with a blue gate. These houses were described as 'a large nest of *kloppen*'.⁹⁹ According to the city council, Catholics were planting trees in front of their doors to hide visitors from the public eye, drilling (possibly large) holes through walls (presumably as extra entrances and exits), and reinforcing doors with iron on the inside.¹⁰⁰ In 1662 the Voetian consistory claimed that, after their illegal assemblies, Catholics were even committing physical violence against Reformed communicant members on public streets, noting that three of them had recently been attacked.¹⁰¹

Catholics sometimes grossly provoked the judicial officers who raided their house assemblies. According to the 1665 investigation, Gerrichje van Wijck lived in a house on Oudegracht which had formerly been owned by the renowned Catholic medical doctor Anthoni Pelt, where several doors made of poplar trees were found.¹⁰² In August of that same year, the city magistracy ordered the sheriff to visit the same house to confiscate Catholic

96 *G.P.U.*, III, p. 469 (29 January 1644); HUA, SAI, 121-20, 29 January 1644: 'verklikkers, schelmen, diefleyders, duyvels'.

97 HUA, KR, 7, 4 September 1659.

98 HUA, SAI, 2244-100, fasc. 14, n.d. in 1649/50: 'deur van een kasteel' and 'deur van retraite'.

99 HUA, SAI, 616, 29 April 1665 (Hofman, 'Allerlei', pp. 183-89, here especially pp. 185, 188): 'een groot nest van kloppen'.

100 HUA, SAI, 121-27, 24 July, 28 August 1665, 27 August 1666.

101 HUA, KR, 8, 2 June 1662; HUA, SAI, 121-27, 2 June 1662.

102 HUA, SAI, 616, 29 April 1665 (Hofman, 'Allerlei', p. 185).

ornaments.¹⁰³ Two years later, judicial officers raided the same house, in which Marichge (Maria) Jacobs now resided. The sheriff and other judicial officers had been unable to enter the house and were forced to wait in front of the closed door. Meanwhile, a man inside told the sheriff through the iron lattice: 'Sir, we have committed an offence, we admit our guilt, but I seem to have mislaid the key'. The sheriff replied that he 'had to open the door, to see what assembly there was', but the man left without opening. The sheriff struck the door with a hammer, opening it, but then came upon another door inside the front entrance that was locked with a strong bolt. While he was hindered by these doors, many participants, whose number the sheriff estimated at more than one hundred, managed to escape onto Oudegracht canal by fleeing through a wharf cellar. In the same quarter, the sheriff found a maid who had lived with the late Pelt in another cellar, and twenty others in another house, all of whom seem to have fled from the gathering {90}.¹⁰⁴

Catholic Utrechters were flexible in the use and appropriation of their homes, spaces between houses, and public streets so as to create room to live as devout Catholics. Many members of the Catholic lay elite hosted illegal assemblies in their houses, harboured priests there, and paid substantial fines on behalf of their co-religionists. Catholics' active and even aggressive spatial practices provoked constant clashes with the politico-judicial authorities and their Reformed neighbours. This was particularly apparent outside the city walls.

4.3.2. Outside the City Walls

In the Utrecht suburbs, where Catholics occupied political and judicial offices even as late as 1670,¹⁰⁵ and where they continued to assume posts as trustees of St Anthony Hospice and the Holy Cross Hospice, they openly displayed the Catholic faith. On Easter Sunday in 1646 (22 March), for instance, the farmer Wouter Woutersz, living in the suburb of Lageweide, hosted a Catholic assembly, which was raided by the Nederkwartier substitute marshal Michiell Loevre. Some 200 or 300 Catholics were said to have participated in that gathering, which may well have taken place in a warehouse or barn

103 HUA, SAI, 121-27, 28 August 1665.

104 HUA, SAI, 2244-125, n.d. in 1667: 'mijn heer wij sijn in breucke gevallen en bekennen onse schult, de sleutel kan ick niet bij de handt vinden' and 'de deur soude openen, dat moetste sien, wat vergaderingh daer was'. For the approximate address of the house formerly owned by Anthoni Pelt (Oudegracht), see, e.g., HUA, NOT, U056a001, 21, 14 December 1661.

105 HUA, KR, 8, 18, 25 February 1661; HUA, KR, 9, 29 August 1670.

belonging to the prosecuted farmer {39} (Appendix 1). According to the 1647 report of the consistory, Catholics were particularly active in the suburbs of Tollesteeg, Catharijne, and Absteede.¹⁰⁶ Maychgen Peters and her son, who insulted the Reformed minister Gualtherus de Bruyn, were living outside the Tollesteeg gate. The Reformed consistory took the incident seriously, delegating De Bruyn himself and several elders to the city council to urge the magistrates to enact stricter regulations against the Catholics in the Tollesteeg suburb {43} (Appendix 1). Likewise, outside the Tollesteeg gate and even beyond the jurisdiction of the city, Catholics were ‘publicly’, openly, and collectively holding their ‘conventicles’.¹⁰⁷ According to the sheriff, Catholics were constructing a church in the suburb of Lauwerecht in 1651, although it is unknown whether the construction had been completed.¹⁰⁸ In 1656 the Reformed consistory was informed that ‘Papists’ were practising their ‘idolatry’ in the suburb of Oudwijk as well.¹⁰⁹

Two of the most prominent centres of Catholic activity were the Utrecht suburbs of Wittevrouwen and Weerd. On Easter Sunday in 1641, thirty-six Catholics were found assembling in the house of the gardener Eelgis Gerritsz in Wittevrouwen, including their priest Herman van Honthorst {23} (Appendix 1). After investigating two Catholic houses in 1664, the sheriff learned that a large assembly would soon be held outside the Wittevrouwen gate.¹¹⁰ Similarly, Catholics gathered in the house of Peter Jansz van Loenen, which stood in Bethlem in the suburb of Weerd, in 1647 {41} (Appendix 1).¹¹¹ There were more than 300 Reformed communicant members living in Weerd, but they had no minister and were therefore forced to attend worship in St Jacob Church inside the city walls. Catholics, in contrast, were ‘publicly’ and openly holding their assemblies in Weerd. The Reformed in the suburbs at times even turned to Catholic priests when their co-religionists became sick or fell critically ill, since Catholic priests were regularly present and always ready to anoint the sick or the dying even after the city gate was closed, preventing Reformed ministers from arriving.¹¹² Indeed, from around 1643 Catholics had a secular clandestine church called St Jacobus Buiten de Weerd,¹¹³ and in 1652

106 HUA, KR, 5, 9 August 1647 (Klaveren, ‘Vergaderplaatsen’, p. 27).

107 HUA, KR, 8, 25 February 1661: ‘openbaerlijck’.

108 HUA, SAII, 121-24, 15 September 1651.

109 HUA, KR, 6, 14 April 1656.

110 HUA, KR, 8, 4 April 1664. Given the season of this report, the assembly may have been held for the cult of the Holy Cross at the Holy Cross Hospice in the suburb of Wittevrouwen.

111 HUA, KR, 5, 9 August 1647 (Klaveren, ‘Vergaderplaatsen’, p. 27).

112 HUA, KR, 5, 12 October 1650: ‘oopenlijck’.

113 Faber and Rommes, ‘Op weg’, p. 255; *Naamlijst der pastoors*, 87.

the Catholic patrician Wilhelmus van Wenckum was accused of escorting a priest to the house of a sick woman in Weerd, probably to give her the last rites {61} (Appendix 1). In 1653 Cornelis Fransz was prosecuted for hosting a Catholic gathering in his house in Weerd {65} (Appendix 1). Two years later the magistrates were informed that Catholics were preparing their 'conventicles' in houses near the Bethlem Convent in Weerd, and thus ordered the sheriff to confiscate Catholic ornaments and pews there.¹¹⁴ In 1664 the consistory referred to the area around Bethlem as a place infamous for the 'boldness of Papists'.¹¹⁵ And indeed, in 1670 Petertje Gerrits in Bethlem was charged with holding a forbidden assembly {99} (Appendix 1).¹¹⁶

Although it fell outside the city's jurisdiction, Schalkwijk was one of the Catholic bastions where Utrechters could also be found in attendance. Its centre was the castle of Adriaen Ram, lord of Schalkwijk. According to the Utrecht provincial court's sentence against him on 29 July 1651, Ram confessed in the city's jail that he had renovated the tower of his castle as 'a formal church for those of the Roman faith', with a baptismal font stolen from 'the Reformed public church' in Schalkwijk.¹¹⁷ The provincial court argued that according to the provincial edicts, the doors should have been opened at the officials' request without resistance. The court demanded that the tower of the clandestine church be demolished, and that a fixed bridge or dam be installed to replace the drawbridge, which had hindered the officials from reaching the castle, in order to make sure that the 'House of Schalkwijk would always have an open entrance'.¹¹⁸ Although Ram was forced to surrender to the authorities, other notable Catholics, whose houses stood within the city walls, continued to play a crucial role for creating and defending Catholic sacred spaces in Utrecht.

Utrecht's Catholics may have found it relatively easier to practise their faith collectively and externally in the suburbs since they could exploit open spaces outside the city walls to escape Reformed eyes and to flee from judicial investigators. Yet Catholic spatial practices were even more evident around the Nieuwegracht district, inside the walled city, where a lot of Catholic Utrechters with elevated social status resided.

114 HUA, SAI, 121-25, 8 January 1655.

115 HUA, KR, 8, 28 March 1664.

116 Petertje Gerrits might be the same person as 'Petertgen op Bedlehem', who was accused in 1664 {83} (Appendix 1)

117 HUA, HVU, 99-8, 29 July 1651 (Hilhorst, 'Het kerspel Schalkwijk', p. 61): 'een formele kerck voor de Roomsche-gesinde' and 'de Gereformeerde publycke kercke'.

118 HUA, HVU, 99-8, 29 July 1651 (Hilhorst, 'Het kerspel Schalkwijk', pp. 65-67): 'Huys van Schalckwyck altyt te mogen hebben een open toeganck'.

4.3.3. Around Nieuwegracht

The district around Nieuwegracht was a prestigious residential area where the provincial court of Utrecht stood and many (Catholic and other) jurists lived. The area had two clandestine churches for Jesuits, one for Augustinians, and two for secular priests. Around 1612 the Jesuit Joannes Rijser (Ryserius: 1572–1650) arrived in Utrecht as a substitute for the late Willem de Leeuw. Rijser came to serve the clandestine church of St Catharijne in Catharijnesteeg near Nieuwegracht. When he sought to leave Utrecht for the Southern Netherlands in 1649, Catholic Utrechters are said to have tried to keep him in the city. In 1623 another Jesuit, Theodorus de Weeze (1586–1629), came to Utrecht and established the Jesuit clandestine church of St Martinus in Herenstraat, not far from Nieuwegracht.¹¹⁹ Catholics likewise established the secular clandestine church of St Marie Op de Kamp alias Soli Deo Gloria in 1645, the secular clandestine church of St Servaas Onder de Linden in Servaashek and the Augustinian clandestine church of St Augustinus in Hieronymussteeg, the latter two no later than the mid-seventeenth century.¹²⁰

Catholics clashed with the politico-judicial authorities in the Nieuwegracht area around 1650, by which time the aforementioned clandestine churches had been established. In January 1644 the house of Assuerus van Borculo in Jeruzalemstraat was found to be the site of a Catholic assembly {32} (Appendix 1), although the next month Van Borculo petitioned the city council to allow him to install doors and entrances or exits in his house.¹²¹ Catholics are known to have assembled frequently around St Servaas Abbey, at least in 1647.¹²² In 1652 the house of the Catholic nobleman Willem van der Burch was twice identified as a place of Catholic assembly {62} {63} (Appendix 1). Given the brief, three-month interval between the two instances, he seems not to have been scared off by legal prosecution. At almost the same time, in 1651, the Catholic noblewoman Agatha Dierhout was charged with hosting a forbidden Catholic gathering in her house near Brigittenbrug, just around the corner of Catharijnesteeg and Nieuwegracht, which functioned as the Jesuit clandestine church of St Catharijne {58} (Appendix 1). This was hardly the last time she would be fined for such an

119 Hoeck, *Schets*, pp. 72–73; Lommel, 'Lijst der aanwezige pp. Jesuïeten', pp. 231–32, 234–35; *N.N.B.W.*, III, col. 1116, X, col. 1158–59.

120 Faber and Rommes, 'Op weg', p. 255.

121 HUA, SAII, 121–20, 2 February 1644.

122 HUA, KR, 5, 9 August 1647 (Klaveren, 'Vergaderplaatsen', p. 27).

offence, as her name is the one that appears most frequently in trials against Catholics in the fifty years under study; by 1672, she had been accused of hosting Catholic assemblies no fewer than four times.¹²³

In 1655 Catholics and the authorities further escalated their conflicts around Nieuwegracht. In that year the sheriff raided the houses of Catholics there in order to regulate their spatial practices through doors and entrances or exits. The sheriff first closed a number of entrances and exits leading to Herenstraat, and broke down a door there. He then put a lock on a door or gate between the houses of Van Borculo and Vuysting in Jeruzalemstraat, keeping the two keys for himself and the substitute sheriff. Double front doors were found in another house in the same area, along with an altar and many Catholic paintings. On 22 January 1655 the sheriff ordered the residents to tear down the doors and to throw away the altar and paintings, which had been used for the 'exercise of popish superstitions and assemblies'.¹²⁴ Later, the Catholic noblemen Willem de Wael van Vronesteyn and Cornelis Dierhout, both of whom owned houses in Herenstraat along Nieuwegracht, appealed to the city council to modify those orders.¹²⁵ The magistracy seems not to have acceded to their request, since the sheriff continued to conduct further investigations on other houses on both sides of Nieuwegracht. During these investigations, the sheriff found numerous doors and entrances or exits connecting the houses of the Catholic nobleman Aelbert Proeys van Hogelande; Geertruid van Blockland, the widow of the late Catholic provincial court councillor Pieter Dierhout and their children (including Agatha Dierhout); the Catholic provincial court advocate Dirck Lommetzum [50]; another Catholic provincial court advocate called Anthoni van Blockland (Geertruid's brother) [7]; and the Catholic nobleman Daniel de Ridder van Groenesteyn. The sheriff ordered these Catholic notables to close the doors, entrances, and exits within fourteen days, stipulating a fine of f. 600 in case of non-compliance.¹²⁶ Representing the Catholic owners of the houses, De Ridder van Groenesteyn and Lommetzum petitioned the city council to have the orders changed, but without avail.¹²⁷

123 {58} {75} {94} {105} in Appendix 1. In the late 1670s, she was charged with hosting Catholic assemblies twice: in 1676 (HUA, SAIL, 2236-5, 5 January 1676; HUA, SAIL, 2244-135, 1, 3, 4, 8, 15, 17, 21 December 1675); and 1679 (HUA, SAIL, 2236-5, 17 January 1679).

124 HUA, SAIL, 121-25, 22 January 1655 (this entry of the minutes of the city council was transcribed in Muller, 'Raadsbesluiten', pp. 237-39): 'exercitie van de paepse superstitiën ende bijeencomsten'.

125 HUA, SAIL, 121-25, 12 February 1655.

126 *Ibidem*, 26 March 1655.

127 *Ibidem*, 11 June 1655 (this entry of the minutes of the city council was transcribed in Muller, ed., 'Raadsbesluiten', pp. 239-40).

Catholics nevertheless continued to regard the area around Nieuwegracht as one of their bastions. A number of Catholic clerics continued to live there, including an Augustinian friar named Joan van Hoven <011>, whose residence was two or three doors down from that of the Reformed minister Arnoldus Teekmans.¹²⁸ Likewise, the area included the residences of the Jesuit Aloysius Ballast <010>, who served the Jesuit clandestine church of St Martinus in Herenstraat, and of the secular priests Cornelis van Velthuysen <012>, Johannes Roos <016>, and Dirck de Roy <017> (Appendix 3). According to a visitation report by the provincial superior of the Jesuit *Provincia Flandro-Belgica* in 1656, Ballast was an enthusiastic preacher. In his clandestine church of St Martinus, he sometimes celebrated Mass twice a day on Sundays and feast days, and four times a week during Lent.¹²⁹ Another Jesuit, Lambert van Dilsen <009>, who was dispatched to Utrecht in 1661,¹³⁰ lived next to Agatha Dierhout and served the clandestine church constructed in her house. A secular priest called Godefridus <019> worked for 'the new church' behind Agatha Dierhout's house (Appendix 3).¹³¹

It should be emphasized that Catholic (noble) women played a remarkable role there. As early as 1656 Agatha Dierhout was once again accused of hosting a Catholic gathering in her house, the Jesuit clandestine church of St Catharijne {75} (Appendix 1). The 1665 investigation reports still paid special attention to the houses of other Catholic women along Nieuwegracht. Among them, Gerrichje Verburch's house had several doors made of poplar trees, and the noblewoman Van Zanen's house had several (possibly secret) rooms along the wall as well as doors made of poplar trees.¹³² Van Zanen was probably the same person as Maria van Sanen, who was accused of hosting Catholic assemblies in 1664 {84} and 1665 {86} (Appendix 1). Likewise, there were Catholic assemblies taking place in the houses of the Catholic women Maria van Coddenoort (in 1664) {85} and Cornelia van de Kemp (in 1671) {102}, both located in Servaashek (Appendix 1). In August 1665, following an investigation, the city council authorized the sheriff to confiscate Catholic ornaments from Dierhout's house.¹³³ But as noted above, Dierhout was determined to continue serving the Catholic faith. On Whit Tuesday (22 May) 1668, she again hosted an assembly of fifty or sixty Catholics in her

128 HUA, SAII, 616, probably in 1665 (Hofman, 'Allerlei', p. 188).

129 Besides, Ballast often visited houses of the nobility to carry out religious services there. Lommel, 'Relatio visitationis', p. 80.

130 Post, 'Zes verslagen', p. 150.

131 HUA, SAII, 616, probably in 1665 (Hofman, 'Allerlei', pp. 188–89): 'de nieuwe kerck'.

132 HUA, SAII, 616, 29 April 1665 (Hofman, 'Allerlei', p. 185).

133 HUA, SAII, 121–27, 28 August 1665.

home {94} (Appendix 1). The other Jesuit clandestine church, St Martinus in Herenstraat, was served by Ballast <010> and owned by Maria Johanna van Amstel van Mijnden, known as the noblewoman Van Loenersloot. In 1666, one year after the aforementioned investigation report confirmed his presence in Herenstraat, Ballast was arrested in his St Martinus Church and then released after a bail of f. 1,200 was posted by Willem Baerle [3] and Balthasar van Bueren [15] {88} (Appendices 1 and 4).¹³⁴ In September 1667 the sheriff once again rushed to the clandestine church of St Martinus, knocking on the door and ringing the bell many times, but he failed to enter. The sheriff argued that Catholics had installed windows to allow them to escape to 'secret places'. Upon leaving the front entrance, he went behind the house, where he came upon some 100 people {91}.¹³⁵ Less than two months later, Van Loenersloot's house was once again raided by the sheriff. He claimed that he had seen around thirty people coming out of a gate in Herenstraat, near her house {92} (Appendix 1). Like Agatha Dierhout, Van Loenersloot was uncompromising in her Catholic devotion.

The district around Nieuwegracht was therefore crucial for the survival of Utrecht's Catholics, even though existing literature has rarely acknowledged this important function. Effectively using their doors and entrances or exits for the sake of escape, Catholic jurists and noblemen or -women in particular cooperated to defend their sacred spaces there. Another essential area for Utrecht's Catholics was the Mariahoek district.

4.3.4. Around Mariahoek

Mariahoek, located within the former immunity of the chapter of St Marie, has long been recognized by historians as a centre of Dutch Catholicism. The apostolic vicars regularly came to stay on Mariahoek, and numerous other important Catholics, both ecclesiastics and laypeople, lived together there in a kind of voluntarily created Catholic 'ghetto' (Fig. 3).

As early as 1636 Utrecht's politico-judicial authorities were aware that Catholics were gathering in houses on Mariakerkhof. No matter how often the sheriff rang the bell and hammered on the bolted doors, no one opened them. The sheriff also grumbled about the numerous entrances and exits connecting the houses there, preventing him from carrying out a successful raid.¹³⁶ Shortly thereafter, two important secular clandestine

¹³⁴ It should be noted that Van Bueren [15] was one of the defenders of Agatha Dierhout at her prosecution in 1668 {94} (Appendices 1 and 4).

¹³⁵ HUA, SAII, 2244-125, n.d. in 1667: 'heijmelijcke plaetsen'.

¹³⁶ HUA, SAII, 121-17, 11 January 1636.



Fig. 3 Pieter Jansz Saenredam, *St Marie Square and St Marie Church in Utrecht*, 1662, oil on canvas, 109.5 x 139.5 cm, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam, photograph by Studio Tromp

churches were established around the former collegiate church of St Marie: Maria Minor Achter Clarenburg and St Gertrudis in Mariahoek. The influential Catholic nobleman Adriaen Ram bought a house on Achter Clarenburg in 1640, whose former owner was the Catholic nobleman Asuerus (Zweder) van Brakel van Blikkenburg, husband of Anna Catharina Mom {27} {42} {77} (Appendix 1). Ram permitted this house to be used as an important secular clandestine church, Maria Minor Achter Clarenburg, while he himself had the option at that time to participate in Mass in the clandestine church of his castle in Schalkwijk as well.¹³⁷ The clandestine church of Maria Minor was also raided by the sheriff. Late at night, just before midnight on Wednesday, 19 June 1644, Ram and Dr Anthoni Pelt [64] were found holding a Catholic assembly there {35} (Appendix 1). In 1647 Ram sold the house to the Catholic provincial court advocate Arnoldus Schade, so that the clandestine church came into the hands of a Catholic jurist.¹³⁸

¹³⁷ Ven, 'Het huis Clarenburch', pp. 43, 48–51, 61.

¹³⁸ *Ibidem*, pp. 49, 61.

The other important secular clandestine church, St Gertrudis, was established by Vicar General Wachtelaer. Using his privilege as a canon of St Marie, in 1625 he purchased the former choir house and chapter school located in Mariahoek, in the former immunity of the collegiate chapter of St Marie. Wachtelaer probably opened the former chapter school for Catholic gatherings, and had it expanded in 1633. Then, in 1638, Simon van Veen, the Catholic advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht, bought the former sixth cloister house in Mariahoek, although he was just a title-holder. It was in fact Wachtelaer who owned the house, and he turned it into the secular clandestine church of St Gertrudis.¹³⁹ In 1639 the city court brought accusations against him, and St Gertrudis was subjected to a violent raid. After being banished from his hometown in 1640, Wachtelaer in 1652 transferred the clandestine church to the Catholic provincial court advocate Berent van Zutphen, who appeared many times in legal records for the judicial defence of prosecuted Catholics [99] (Appendix 4).¹⁴⁰ Like their counterparts living in the Nieuwegracht quarters, Catholic jurists in and around Mariahoek, such as Schade, Van Veen, and Van Zutphen, played a pivotal role in Catholic survival, not only by providing legal support for the prosecuted Catholics but also by safeguarding their sacred spaces in word and deed.

Even after Wachtelaer was forced to leave Utrecht, the area around Mariahoek continued to function as the centre of the Catholic community. In its 1647 report, the Voetian consistory warned that Catholics were frequently assembling around Mariahoek, among other places in the house of the advocate Johan de Munter [60].¹⁴¹ In the 1650s the politico-judicial authorities time and again attempted to oppress Catholic spatial practices around Mariahoek. In 1652 the sheriff investigated houses in Walsteeg near Mariahoek, where 'secret' shutters, boxes, and other paraphernalia for 'large gatherings and forbidden assemblies' were found. The city council ordered the owners of the houses to destroy these utensils intended for their 'superstitions', and to close the doors and entrances or exits connecting the various houses and sites.¹⁴² Two years later the city magistracy ordered Catholics living in Mariahoek to close the doors leading to the cloister of the public church of St Marie.¹⁴³ Several days after this order was given,

139 *Idem*, 'De driehoek', pp. 35–41, 49–50.

140 *Ibidem*, pp. 50, 56.

141 HUA, KR, 5, 9 August 1647 (Klaveren, 'Vergaderplaatsen', p. 27).

142 HUA, SAI, 121–24, 4 October 1652 (this entry of the minutes of the city council was transcribed in Muller, 'Raadsbesluiten', pp. 236–37): 'verborgen' and 'grootte bijeenkomsten ende verboden vergaderingen'.

143 HUA, SAI, 121–25, 12 October 1654.

Divera van der Eem, the widow of the advocate Simon van Veen, and other owners of houses in Mariahoek petitioned the city council to change it, but in vain. The sheriff, who had already closed a number of shutters and doors while confiscating the keys, insisted that the magistrates should not accept any compromise with the Catholics.¹⁴⁴ In January 1655 he reported to the magistrates that he had finished closing the doors, entrances, and exits leading to the cloister of St Marie Church.¹⁴⁵ Nevertheless, Catholics continued to be extremely active in the areas around Mariahoek. Geertruyd van der Heyden was, for example, accused of hosting a Catholic gathering in her house on Achter Clarenburg in 1656 {76} (Appendix 1). In 1658 the Reformed consistory found a painting depicting the Trinity in a chapter-house of St Marie. When a Reformed canon of that chapter was summoned by the consistory, he promised that the painting would be removed or at least hidden from people's eyes.¹⁴⁶ When the sheriff investigated houses in Mariahoek in 1660, he found a new building along the city wall. It had been constructed by Maria van Ruempst, the widow of Reynier Loots, who was fined f. 100.¹⁴⁷ The Dominican clandestine church of St Dominicus is known to have moved from the Utrecht suburb of Wittevrouwen to Walsteeg in 1665,¹⁴⁸ and the investigation reports of the same year reveal that Catholics installed several doors made of poplar trees in Walsteeg.¹⁴⁹

The 1665 investigation report also shows that many priests were residing in Mariahoek. The vicar general in Utrecht, Abraham van Brienen <001>, was referred to as the 'prior' (*overste*) of the city's Catholics. He was reported to be living in Mariahoek, together with several *klopjes* and the tolerated secular priest Servaes van der Nypoort <41> <002> (Appendices 2 and 3). As Wachtelaer's successor, Van Brienen served the clandestine church of St Gertrudis, which was to be raided by the sheriff in 1674.¹⁵⁰ Other secular priests also took up residence in Mariahoek, including Anthonius van der Plaet <005>, Jacobus Vlugh <006>, and a certain Reinier <007>. The Dominican Albertus Wijnen <003>, who served the clandestine church of St Dominicus, and a secular priest called Teeckelenbergh <004>, who worked regularly in nearby Schalkwijk, likewise lived in Walsteeg, together with their relatives (Appendix 3).

144 Ibidem, 23 October, 1 November 1654.

145 Ibidem, 4 January 1655.

146 HUA, KR, 7, 30 August, 6 September 1658.

147 HUA, SAI, 121-26, 3, 13, 27 August 1660.

148 Hoogland, 'De Dominicanen', pp. 206-7, 212-14.

149 HUA, SAI, 616, 29 April 1665, probably 1665 (Hofman, 'Allerlei', p. 185).

150 HUA, SAI, 616, 6 January 1675 (Hofman, 'Allerlei', pp. 192-95). On Van Brienen, see, e.g., Ackermans, *Herders*, passim; Ven, 'De driehoek', pp. 52-53, 56, 72-74, 80.

As was the case for the district around Nieuwegracht, Catholic women, including *klopjes*, were notably active in Mariahoek. According to the Reformed consistory, numerous *klopjes* in Mariahoek lived together in a 'beguinage way'.¹⁵¹ Indeed, the investigation report of 1665 noted that a lot of Catholic noblewomen resided around Mariahoek. In the house of the widow of Loots, for instance, the noblewoman Elisabeth van Dam and others were found to be living together. So too there was a house in Walsteeg where Anneken van Raveswaey and others resided. In the house of the noblewoman Lootsen, many Catholic noblewomen were living together, including Johanna van Brienen and a woman named Wevelchoven.¹⁵² In the house of Thomas de Knijff, where Cornelia van de Kemp, Sophia van Erckel, and Maria van Vianen lived together in 1665,¹⁵³ forbidden Catholic assemblies were discovered to be taking place on at least three occasions {87} {96} {104} (Appendix 1). During visits to Utrecht, Apostolic Vicar Johannes van Neercassel and French Jansenists stayed with Sophia van Erckel.¹⁵⁴ Likewise, the noblewoman Aletta van Schendel, who lived around Mariahoek, hosted Catholic assemblies {78} {93} {103} (Appendix 1). In 1668 {93}, when the sheriff was informed of Catholics assembling in her house, he had the substitute sheriff go there. After ringing the doorbell, he was immediately able to enter the house. However, the room where Catholics were thought to be assembling was closed off, and he failed to catch even a single one of the participants, who managed to escape through the various entrances and exits. The substitute sheriff estimated that more than 200 participants had been in attendance there.¹⁵⁵

Mariahoek had been home to notable figures of the Dutch Catholic community, both clergy and laity, from of old, and functioned as an important Catholic stronghold even after Catholicism was outlawed. It was spatial practices conducted especially by Catholic Utrechters of the socio-economic elite, including lawyers and nobles, that shielded this centre of Dutch Catholicism from the Reformed.

Catholic spatial practices through houses and public streets became something of a cat-and-mouse game. Even though they lived under anti-Catholic legislation, Catholic Utrechters exercised initiatives in first developing new spatial practices to defend and create spaces in which they could live

151 HUA, KR, 8, 2 June 1662.

152 HUA, SAII, 616, 29 April 1665 (Hofman, 'Allerlei', p. 185).

153 HUA, SAII, 616, 29 April 1665 (Hofman, 'Allerlei', p. 184).

154 Forclaz, *Catholiques*, pp. 55–56.

155 HUA, SAII, 2244-126, 30 January, 13, 25, 27, 28 February 1668.

as devout Catholics, and then forcing the Reformed political authorities to promulgate new edicts and conduct new investigations of houses and public streets. The clashes steadily escalated over the course of the fifty years examined here. While scholars have consistently argued that Dutch Catholics were tolerated as long as they limited their religious expression to the space within the physical threshold of their houses, the politico-judicial authorities of Utrecht tried to regulate their assemblies and worship everywhere, including in private homes. However, Catholics challenged the authorities and the Reformed majority by repeatedly shifting the boundary of the public. Once again, their spatial survival tactics witness to both continuity and adjustment. Despite the prohibition, Utrecht's Catholics assembled in their private homes (including clandestine churches) and tried to continue their medieval parochial life, naming their four secular clandestine churches after the four parish churches now under Reformed control.¹⁵⁶ And they habituated themselves to the multi-confessional civic community and appropriated the urban space, adapting the inside of their homes while utilizing the spaces between their houses and the public streets to safeguard their new sacred spaces.

4.4. Conclusion

Utrecht's urban space changed drastically in the wake of the Protestant Reformation and the Dutch Revolt. Seventeenth-century Utrechters subjectively interpreted the objectively shared time and space, each in their own confessional style. Although physically they lived in the same city, psychologically they experienced the urban space in quite different ways. Cultivating their own confessional material culture after the outlawing of their faith, Catholics differentiated themselves from the Reformed who, at least in theory, had denied medieval Christianity as a material religion. Materials and sounds formed an essential part of a post-Reformation Catholic habitus in the Dutch Republic.¹⁵⁷ The urban tour above has demonstrated how Utrecht's Catholics actively created spaces for their pious Catholic way of life, contesting the discriminatory situation under the Reformed regime. They succeeded in preserving physical and material remnants of medieval

¹⁵⁶ St Gertrudis (the Geerte Church) in Mariahoek; Maria Minor (official name of the Buur Church) Achter Clarenburg; St Nicolaas (the Nicolai Church) Achter de Wal; and St Jacobus (St Jacob Church) in Drakenburgersteeg. Faber and Rommes, 'Op weg', pp. 255, 258.

¹⁵⁷ Lenarduzzi, *De belevingswereld*, pp. 143–244; Idem, 'Subcultuur en tegencultuur', pp. 173–284.

Catholicism in public facilities, even in the second half of the seventeenth century. Besides, they seem to have shifted their meeting places over the course of the century from public facilities to private homes. Using guerrilla tactics, as it were, Catholic Utrechters fought their strategic exclusion from the public sphere that was forced on them by the political authorities, appropriating urban spaces including public facilities, houses, and public streets. Members of the Catholic socio-economic elite, in particular, played a pivotal role in the survival of Catholic ways of life through spatial practices, adopting two tactical approaches: continuity with the medieval tradition, and adjustment to the early modern religious diversity.

To Catholics, the space of the public facilities, where they found material remnants of the medieval Catholic past until the late seventeenth century, still seemed more sacred than other spaces – a typical Catholic sensibility of gradation of sanctity maintained since medieval times. The pilgrimages to the Holy Cross Hospice, where Catholics were persistently able to appoint their trustees in spite of existing prohibitions, are a clear example of the continuity of Catholicism. Many owners of Catholic meeting places in Utrecht were of elevated socio-economic status; some held canonries, and others pursued a judicial career or hailed from noble families. They or their families retained a rich socio-economic capital, which in some cases pre-dated the Protestant Reformation and the Dutch Revolt. When Catholics gathered in their clandestine churches, they undoubtedly maintained a sense of continuity with Utrecht's medieval past, preserving the rhythm of their parochial life. On the other hand, Catholics adjusted themselves in a flexible manner to religious diversity in Utrecht under Reformed rule. They undertook such spatial practices as the new installation of doors and entrances or exits when they illegally crept into monasteries, convents, and hospices for worship. Catholics time and again re-installed and re-visualized their material objects in public facilities to counter the Protestant efforts to physically and symbolically exclude Catholic remnants there and to render them invisible. The discovery of the sarcophagus of St Bernulphus in St Pieter Church allowed Catholics to assign renewed confessional significance to the church and to mobilize the relics to validate Catholicism in the midst of heretics. Catholics created invisible spaces inside the public church of St Job by closing the doors whenever they practised their faith. To escape the notice of the politico-judicial authorities and Reformed neighbours, they sometimes assembled before sunrise or after sunset. Moreover, Catholics created new sacred spaces for themselves, and shielded laypeople and priests, by appropriating the urban space for their own confessional purposes: they 'publicly' established clandestine churches, lived together in spontaneous ghettos around the social elite – such

as canons, lawyers, and noblemen or noblewomen – in the districts surrounding Nieuwegracht and Mariahoek, installed special doors and entrances or exits connecting their houses and public streets for easy escape from judicial officers, posted sentries on public streets, etc.

Through their spatial practices, Catholic Utrechters managed both to preserve their traditional sacred spaces and to create new ones, thereby transforming the urban space. They tactically delimited the public in its spatial dimension and even shifted its boundary on their own initiative, continuing to use the urban space as they had in medieval times, and newly appropriating it in order to adjust themselves to the early modern environment of religious coexistence. They demarcated the physical public sphere, controlling the visibility and audibility of their collective worship as well as the external, material expression of their faith, while asserting Catholicism in the abstract public sphere, challenging the official, ‘public authority’ of the magistracy and the public Reformed Church. By doing so, they physically and symbolically undermined Reformed ascendancy and power in the urban public sphere of the Christian social community (*corpus christianum*). Giving the urban space both traditional and new meanings, Catholics in Utrecht created an early modern urban landscape of religious diversity. In doing so, they not only actively created room for their survival as devout Catholic Utrechters, but also played an indispensable role in transforming Utrecht’s urban space from a mono-religious medieval city to a multi-religious early modern city.

Abbreviations

- A.A.U. *Archief voor de geschiedenis van het aartsbisdom Utrecht*. Utrecht, 1875–1957.
- G.P.U. Water, Johan van de. *Groot Placaatboek vervattende alle de placaten [...] Staten ’s lands van Utrecht*, 3 vols. Utrecht, 1729.
- J.O.U. *Jaarboek Oud-Utrecht*.
- M.O.U. *Maandblad Oud-Utrecht*.
- N.N.B.W. Molhuysen, P. C., and P. J. Blok, eds. *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, 10 vols. Leiden, 1911–1937.
- HUA Het Utrechts Archief, Utrecht
- BA Bewaarde archieven
- HVU Hof van Utrecht

KR	Nederlandse Hervormde gemeente Utrecht, kerkeraad
NOT	Notarieel archief
SA	Stadsarchief

Bibliography

Archival Primary Sources

- HUA, Notarissen in de stad Utrecht 1560–1905 [NOT] (34-1)
- HUA, Kapittel van Sint Pieter (220)
- 114-a. Declaration of the secretary of the chapter on the discovery of the sarcophagus of St Bernulphus, 1656
- HUA, Hof van Utrecht [HVU] (239-1)
- 99-8. Sentences in criminal cases in the provincial court of Utrecht, 1638–1732
- HUA, Stadsarchief II [SAII] (702)
- 121-4 ~ 121-5, 121-8 ~ 121-30. Minutes of the city council, 1599/1600–1612/13 and 1619/20–1686/87
616. Reports on forbidden Catholic assemblies with lists of Catholic priests, 1664–1681
- 1825-1 ~ 1825-6. Minutes of the trustees of the municipal chamber of charity, 1628–1647 and 1657–1687
- 2236-2 ~ 2236-5. *Crimineele sententiën* of the city court of Utrecht, 1618–1657 and 1670–1684
- 2244-42 ~ 2244-140. *Crimineele stukken* of the city court of Utrecht, 1620–1679
- HUA, Bewaarde archieven II [BAII] (709)
- 1840-1. Minutes of the trustees of the Holy Cross Hospice, 1643–1695
- 1987-1. Minutes of the trustees of St Anthony Hospice, 1603–22 September 1722
- HUA, Nederlandse Hervormde gemeente Utrecht, kerkeraad [KR] (746)
- 3 ~ 10. Minutes of the Reformed consistory, August 1618–July 1690

Published Primary Sources

- Deelder, C. *Bijdragen voor de geschiedenis van de Rooms-Katholieke Kerk in Nederland*. 2 vols. Rotterdam, 1888–1892.
- Evers, G. A., ed. 'De sarcophaag van bisschop Bernulphus'. *M.O.U.* (1947), pp. 89–90.
- Hofman, J. H., ed. 'Allerlei, betreffende de stad Utrecht'. *A.A.U.* 5 (1878), pp. 180–238.
- Hoogland, A. J. J., ed. 'De gevangenneming van Pater Paulus van der Rijst te Utrecht'. *A.A.U.* 8 (1880), pp. 239–45.
- Hoogland, A. J. J., ed. 'Descriptio status, in quo anno 1638 erat religio Catholica [...]'. *A.A.U.* 12 (1884), pp. 189–213, 414–33.

- Klaveren, G. van, ed. 'Vergaderplaatsen der Roomsch-katholieken in 1647'. *M.O.U.* (1947), pp. 25–28.
- Lettres historiques de Monsieur Pellisson*, 3 vols. Paris, 1729.
- Lommel, Anthonius van, ed. 'Relatio visitationis reverendi patris Thomae Dekens provincialis provinciae Flandro-Belgicae S. J., A^o 1656'. *A.A.U.* 3 (1876), pp. 45–49.
- Lommel, Anthonius van, ed. 'Relatio seu descriptio status religionis Catholicae in Hollandia etc...'. *A.A.U.* 10 (1882), pp. 95–240.
- Muller, Samuel, ed. 'Raadsbesluiten van Utrecht betreffende geheime godsdienst oefeningen der Roomsch-Katholieken in 1652–55'. *A.A.U.* 14 (1886), pp. 236–40.
- Post, Regnerus, ed. 'Zes verslagen over de werkzaamheden door de Jezuieten der Hollandsche Missie verricht'. *A.A.U.* 59 (1935), pp. 79–196.
- Water, Johan van de. *Groot Placaat-Boek vervattende all de placaten [...] Staten 's lands van Utrecht*. 3 vols. Utrecht, 1729. [*G.P.U.*]

Secondary Literature

- Ackermans, Gian. *Herders en huurlingen. Bisschoppen en priesters in de Republiek (1663–1705)*. Amsterdam, 2003.
- Bogaers, Llewellyn. *Aards, betrokken, en zelfbewust. De verwevenheid van cultuur en religie in katholiek Utrecht, 1300–1600*. Utrecht, 2008.
- Corens, Liesbeth. 'Seasonable Coexistence: Temporality, Health Care and Confessional Relations in Spa, c.1648–1740'. *Past and Present* 256 (2022), pp. 129–64.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. 'The Sacred and the Body Social in Sixteenth-Century Lyon'. *Past and Present* 90 (1981), pp. 40–70.
- 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.
- Forclaz, Bertrand. *Catholiques au défi de la Réforme. La coexistence confessionnelle à Utrecht au XVIIe siècle*. Paris, 2014.
- 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. 'Competing Sacred Spaces in the Dutch Republic: Confessional Integration and Segregation'. *European History Quarterly* 51, no. 1 (2021), pp. 7–44.
- Hilhorst, G. 'Het kerspel Schalkwijk'. *A.A.U.* 12 (1884), pp. 1–104.
- Hoek, Frans van. *Schets van de geschiedenis der jezuieten in Nederland*. Nijmegen, 1940.

- Hoogland, A. J. J. 'De Dominicanen te Utrecht'. *A.A.U.* 9 (1881), pp. 178–246.
- Hulzen, A van. *Utrechtse kloosters en gasthuizen*. Baarn, 1986.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J. *Calvinists and Libertines: Confession and Community in Utrecht, 1578–1620*. Oxford, 1995.
- 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.
- Lommel, Anthonius van, ed. 'Lijst der aanwezige pp. jesuïeten in N.-Nederland in April A° 1628'. *A.A.U.* 6 (1879), pp. 223–35.
- Margry, Peter Jan, and Charles Caspers, eds. *Bedeavaartplaatsen in Nederland*, 4 vols. Amsterdam, 1997–2000.
- Molhuysen, P. C., and P. J. Blok, eds. *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, 10 vols. Leiden, 1911–1937. [*N.N.B.W.*]
- Mudde, Caroline Jacomine. 'Rouwen in de marge. De materiële rouwcultuur van de katholieke geloofsgemeenschap in vroegmodern Nederland'. PhD diss., Utrecht University, 2018.
- Naamlijst der pastoors van de Oud-Katholieke Kerk in Nederland*, 2nd ed. Amersfoort, 1979.
- Parker, Charles H. *Faith on the Margins: Catholics and Catholicism in the Dutch Golden Age*. Cambridge, MA and London, 2008.
- Pollmann, Judith. 'The Cleansing of the Temple: Church Space and Its Meanings in the Dutch Republic'. In *Religious Ceremonials and Images: Power and Social Meaning (1400–1750)*, edited by José Pedro Paiva. Coimbra, 2002, pp. 177–89.
- Pollmann, Judith. 'Burying the Dead; Reliving the Past: Ritual, Resentment and Sacred Space in the Dutch Republic'. 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. 84–102.
- Rengers Hora Siccama, Duco Gerrold. *De geestelijke en kerkelijke goederen onder het canonieke, het gereformeerde en het neutrale recht. Historisch-juridisch verhandeling, voornamelijk uit Utrechtsche gegevens samengesteld*. Utrecht, 1905.
- Rogier, Lodewijk J. *Geschiedenis van het katholicisme in Noord-Nederland in de 16e en de 17e eeuw*, 3 vols. Amsterdam, 1945–1947.
- 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.
- Tracy, James D. 'Public Church, *Gemeente Christi*, or *Volkskerk*: Holland's Reformed Church in Civil and Ecclesiastical Perspective'. In *Die Reformation in Deutschland*

und Europa. Interpretationen und Debatten, edited by H. R. Guggisberg and G. G. Krodel. Gütersloh, 1993, pp. 487–510.

Ven, Adrianus J. van de. 'Het huis Clarenburch te Utrecht'. *J.O.U.* (1952), pp. 32–61.

Ven, Adrianus J. van de. 'De driehoek van Sint Marie te Utrecht'. *J.O.U.* (1955), pp. 30–80.

5. Discourses of Self-Representation: Public, Private, and Conscience

Abstract: Discourses of self-representation constituted an indispensable component of the survival tactics deployed by Catholic Utrechters. Exploring the petitions which repressed and tolerated Catholics submitted to the politico-judicial authorities, this chapter sheds light on how they perceived and used the concepts of ‘public’, ‘private’, and ‘conscience’, paying attention to four rhetorical elements: denial and deceit, jurisdiction, social status, and conscience. It also identifies several factors that shaped potential discourses for Catholic survival, such as their social status and the amount of support they received from their defenders. In order to defy persecution and win toleration, Catholic Utrechters mobilized various discourses of self-representation, drawing on their continuity with medieval thought and adopting the new, early modern idea of freedom of conscience.

Keywords: discourse, self-representation, petition, jurisdiction, conscience, freedom

In his 1639 petition Johannes Wachtelaer begged Stadholder Frederick Henry for mercy for himself, his superior Philippus Rovenius, and Dutch Catholics more generally. He concluded the plea with this observation:

Catholics seek no other thing than to keep living in the land [the Northern Netherlands] in tranquillity of conscience and a moderate, lawful exercise of their religion under [the stadholder’s] protection. And that it shall please His Highness to make the best decision in regard to the various matters related above.¹

¹ HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, ‘Memorie’, p. 25): ‘Catholycquen niet anders en soecken, dan om met gerusticheyt van conscientien ende eenige matelicke toegestaene exercitie

Wachtelaer tried to remind the stadholder of his duty to defend his subjects' right to freedom of conscience, tacitly evoking article thirteen of the Union of Utrecht. Wachtelaer was hardly the only Catholic to submit written pleas to the politico-judicial authorities in an effort to defy persecution and win toleration, tactically mobilizing their own interpretations of the public/private distinction and freedom of conscience for the sake of their survival as observant Catholics and honourable citizens or residents in the multi-religious *corpus christianum*.

To shed light on survival tactics in Catholic discourses, this chapter examines petitions that repressed and tolerated Catholics submitted to the politico-judicial authorities. It will unveil the rhetorical dimension of the delimitation of the public, paying special attention to the way Catholic Utrechters perceived and used the concepts of 'public', 'private', and 'conscience'. In departure from previous studies, which only extract specific, intriguing parts of Dutch Catholic petitions in anecdotal fashion, it will offer a systematic analysis of their discourses of self-representation in the context of their own petitions, highlighting certain factors that determined their potential rhetorical tactics for survival, such as their social status and the amount of support they received from their defenders. It will therefore foreground a variety of discourses that individual Catholics mobilized. Petitions from prosecuted Catholics can be found for twenty-six of the 105 legal proceedings in the present study, most of them submitted before the final verdict, even though Wachtelaer and his defenders also submitted a number of their pleas after the city court had issued the sentence on 10 March 1640 {19}.² In terms of toleration, this chapter will focus on publicly recognized Catholics, who, in departure from their non-publicly connived counterparts, filed petitions before the magistracy. Such discourses for securing toleration were produced by thirty-four of the in total sixty-four recognized priests between 1630 and 1672,³ by the father of the recognized Teutonic Knight Willem de Wael van Vronesteyn, and by Maria van Pallaes, who was given recognition for the administration of her property. This chapter will first identify four elements found in discourses of Utrecht's Catholics: denial and

van hunne religie onder zijne protectie in de landen te moghen blijven woenen; ende dat daer over de selve Sijn Hoocheyt ten besten sal gelieven te duyden 't geene hier vorens in regarde van d'eene off d'andere verhaelt is'.

2 {1} {5} {8} {16} {17} {18} {19} {20} {39} {53} {64} {69} {74} {79} {80} {84} {85} {86} {87} {90} {91} {92} {93} {95} {98} {102} in Appendix 1.

3 <31> <32> <33> <34> <35> <38> <39> <41> <44> <50> <51> <52> <53> <59> <60> <63> <66> <69> <70> <71> <72> <74> <76> <77> <80> <85> <86> <87> <88> <89> <90> <91> <92> <93> in Appendix 2.

deceit, jurisdiction, social status, and conscience. Taking these rhetorical elements into consideration, it will then analyse the two well-documented cases involving Grietgen Janssen {53} and Wachtelaer {19}, whose petitions merit extensive analysis for their clear articulation of the four rhetorical elements identified. Once again, the Catholic survival tactics studied in this chapter will show two important features: continuity from the medieval past, and adjustment to the early modern religious diversity. I shall argue that Catholic Utrechters mobilized various discourses of self-representation, continuing to draw on traditional medieval thinking, while also adopting the new notion of freedom of conscience.

5.1. Four Rhetorical Elements

5.1.1. Denial and Deceit

In contrast with the heroic portrayal of martyrs and ‘recusants’ constructed by national church historians studying Catholicism in Protestant lands,⁴ not all Catholics in Utrecht faced the persecutions all that courageously. Govert van Moock {20}, a secular priest born in Nijmegen and the secretary to Apostolic Vicar Rovenius, confessed to his colleagues in a report on his interrogation by the city court that he did not have the ‘gift of bravery’. He begged to be pardoned for having ‘admitted many things that I could rather have forcefully denied’ during the prolonged examination, in the course of which he had been subjected to much ‘mockery [and] derision’. Whenever he heard clocks sounding in the city jail, he felt ‘as if a sword penetrated [his] heart’. When he and his brother Bernardus {21} were arrested, judicial officers mistook Govert for Rovenius, and it was only after a long verbal tug-of-war that they finally managed to identify him correctly. Govert tried to deny whatever the judicial officers asked on the basis of the ‘protocol’ which they had confiscated from him. Initially, he even pretended to be a cook at a monastery in Huissen. Soon, however, he caved under the pressure of the aggressive interrogations and mockery, acknowledging that he was a priest in Oldenzaal and lived there with a *klopje*.⁵ Remarkably, the judicial

4 For critiques of such nationalized constructions of heroism, see Kaplan and Pollmann, ‘Conclusion’, pp. 249–50.

5 His report was transcribed in Knuif and Jong, ‘Relaas van Godefridus van Moock’, pp. 387–401, here especially pp. 387–88: ‘donum fortitudinis’, ‘multa fassum esse quae magis fortiter negare potuerim’, ‘irrisionibus, ludibriis’, ‘quasi gladius cor meum penetraret’, and ‘coctorem’.

officers were keenly interested in the way Catholic priests used the term 'public' and in the connotations they assigned to it. They asked Govert what he had meant with the phrase 'for the public good' in letters to other clerics, including one to Wachtelaer in Cologne, a copy of which was preserved in the protocol. The officers suspected that 'public' had been used with a political connotation here, and assumed that the Catholic clergy were attempting to establish contact with the 'king's army'. They also suspected that the 'communal funds' were a means to raise money for the politico-religious cause. From Govert's own perspective, he had not responded well. After all, he had confessed that the priests were negotiating with the archbishop of Cologne, although he insisted that the negotiations were not a matter of the 'public good', avoiding a direct response to the question as to the intended meaning of the term 'public good'.⁶ After intensive interrogations lasting several months, in which he was repeatedly scolded and mocked as a 'liar', he finally wrote, with a degree of self-mockery: 'I am always a liar'.⁷ By this time, he had confessed to what would soon become a long list of criminal acts for which Rovenius and Wachtelaer would be indicted.

A number of other Catholics could not hold their own after facing prosecution. The petition which the farmer Wouter Woutersz submitted before the city court was inconsistent in its arguments. He was suspected of hosting an illegal assembly with 200 or 300 participants in his house in the suburb of Lageweide on Easter Sunday in 1646 {39}. On the one hand, the petition, which was signed by the city court solicitor Didolph van de Poel [66], argued that Woutersz had not held an assembly or caused any trouble and was therefore innocent. On the other hand, it complained about the fine (f. (florins) 1,200), arguing that it was too high for a farmer with a wife and children, while not effectively refuting the suspicion itself. In the end, the petition failed, as the city court levelled an even higher fine, ordering Woutersz to pay f. 4,800.⁸ In order to reduce the penalty or to assert their innocence, other prosecuted Catholics insisted that they had not been present at the scene of the crime. The citizen Splinter van Nijenrode claimed that his house, which was under construction at the time, had been used by unknown Catholics without his knowledge {1}. If he indeed was a Catholic, which is unclear, this discourse may have been purely tactical.⁹

6 Ibidem, pp. 390–91: 'pro bono publico', 'regiis militibus', 'aerarium pro communibus', and 'bonum publicum'.

7 Ibidem, p. 395: 'mendax' and 'semper sum mendax'.

8 HUA, SAII, 2244–95, 10 July 1646.

9 HUA, SAII, 2244–43, n.d. in 1621.

Other Catholics also denied the charges, but not in passive obedience. One such prosecuted Catholic, Maria Johanna van Amstel van Mijnden, alias the noblewoman Van Loenersloot, whose house functioned as the Jesuit clandestine church of St Martinus, submitted a petition to the city court signed by the city court solicitor Jacobus van Paddenburch [62]. Whereas the sheriff maintained that he had not had actual access to her house but had seen more than 100 people coming out of a back door, Van Loenersloot's petition argued that she had no idea what he was talking about and protested that she had been absent at the time of the raid {91}.¹⁰

Whether the reasons advanced in the petitions for stay or residence permits for priests were fake or genuine is unknown. A unique case is that of Henrick van Domselaer who, after three extensions, was given permission to stay in Utrecht for a total of some 145 days. He maintained that he had not been working as a Catholic priest for long. It is not certain whether this was true <37> (Appendix 2). For a number of other recognized clerics, it is clearer that they were attempting to deceive the political authorities. Servaes van der Nypoort, a son of the patrician Joost Willemsz, explained in 1645 and 1646 that he wanted to stay in Utrecht for reasons of health and for the medical care he needed <41ab>. On both occasions, he was granted permission to stay in his hometown for six months. He may well have fabricated this argument, as he had been serving the secular clandestine church of St Gertrudis in Utrecht since 1643. In 1648, he publicly obtained a permit for residence in the city until cancellation, although the purpose he submitted in his petition is unknown <41c> (Appendix 2). As all the recognized priests were required to observe the anti-Catholic edicts and were thus forbidden to exercise the Catholic faith, Van der Nypoort can hardly have been the only one who on paper concealed the real purpose for his stay or residence in Utrecht, which was to serve the city's Catholics. A Carthusian from Cologne named Arnoldus Rade(n) offered a surprising argument. On two occasions he publicly obtained permission to stay in Utrecht to visit and rent out the immovable property of unknown location in the Dutch Republic allegedly owned by the Carthusian order, and to see to its 'affairs' (*affaires*) <60ab> (Appendix 2).¹¹ The cases involving Rade(n) are remarkable because this regular priest appears to have been too honest to disguise the religious purpose of his stay, while the Reformed magistrates for their part seem to have been too lazy to prevent this regular priest from further infractions

¹⁰ HUA, SAII, 2244-125, 11 October 1667.

¹¹ In five other cases, priests were tolerated to visit Utrecht in order to execute their ('private' (*particuliere*)) 'affairs' (*affaires*). <66> <70b> <76> <90> <92> in Appendix 2.

of the edicts. After all, in the Dutch Republic every kind of revenue by and for Catholic ecclesiastical institutions had long been outlawed.

Not all the prosecuted Catholics stood up bravely to the politico-judicial authorities. Some of them timidly and/or compliantly denied the suspicions against them, offered inconsistent counter arguments, and presented far-fetched excuses. Although it is unclear whether the recognized priests were all dishonest in their applications for staying or residing in the city, at least some of them clearly intended to deceive the magistrates, concealing the real, confessional purpose of their visit to Utrecht.

5.1.2. Jurisdiction

In their petitions, a number of the prosecuted Catholics cast doubts upon the judicial competency of the city and provincial courts, knowing full well of the persistent conflict between the city and the province dating back to the Middle Ages under the prince-bishop of Utrecht.¹² According to the sentence pronounced by the provincial court, the influential Catholic nobleman Adriaen Ram, lord of Schalkwijk, whose castle had served as a battlefield between Catholics and the judicial authorities together with the provincial army in 1651, stated that ‘the Marshal was not allowed to come to a qualified House without a special commission from the [Provincial] States [of Utrecht]’.¹³ He and his Catholic backers were well acquainted with the ins and outs of jurisdiction. Among those supporters, there was an Utrecht citizen named Peter Lamberts van Schalckwijk {56}. According to the city court’s sentence against him, Lamberts was informed by a messenger in a tavern that the castle in Schalkwijk had been attacked by the marshal. On hearing the news, he and some farmers began preparations to rescue Ram, although other Catholics wished not to participate with the group, fearing captivity. Lamberts’s company took a pistol and a sword from the marshal’s servants, who attempted to check them, but it soon became clear that the amateurs roused by Lamberts would not be able to defeat the professional soldiers. After escaping from the sheriff of Schalkwijk, who held a pistol, Lamberts met a servant of the Utrecht provincial court in the meadows. According to the sentence, this servant said to Lamberts: ‘What are you

12 On the struggle over jurisdiction between the city and the province in general, see Bogaers, ‘Politieke verwickelingen’, pp. 56–57; Faber, ‘Politiek en bestuur’, pp. 221–23, 228; Idem and Rommes, ‘Op weg’, pp. 259, 279; Milo and Dongen, *Hof van Utrecht*, p. 37; Pollmann, *Religious Choice*, p. 152; Schaik, ‘Een nieuwe heer’, p. 208.

13 HUA, HVU, 99-8, 29 July 1651 (Hilhorst, ‘Het kerspel Schalkwijk’, p. 63): ‘den Maerschalcck sonder speciale Commissie van Staten op een gequalificeert Huys niet en vermochte te komen’.

doing here? Go home. People know you well. You are a citizen [of Utrecht]. You cannot [be] judged by us'. Despite this warning, Lamberts 'abused the edicts' of the Provincial States by attacking the marshal outside the city's jurisdiction, presumably in the hope that the provincial court would not be able to judge him as a citizen.¹⁴ After the army regained control, Ram and the other six were apprehended and judged in the provincial court,¹⁵ while Lamberts was tried in the city court {56}.¹⁶ Despite Ram's appeal to his seigneurial immunity, the sentence argued that 'by [the] known Edicts and daily practices [it is] clear that the officers were allowed to disturb the forbidden assemblies of the Roman believers and to levy fines'.¹⁷ It should be noted that whereas the politico-judicial authorities could justify their assault with an appeal to anti-Catholic edicts promulgated in early modern times, Ram relied on his seigneurial right originating from medieval times to assert his immunity from the province's jurisdiction.

Jurisdiction was a matter of significance in the legal procedure against Rovenius as well {18}. The numerous crimes alleged against him were explained in ninety-five clauses, and can be roughly classified into two categories: illegal clerical activities and connections with or loyalty to the king of Spain. Rovenius was accused of carrying out religious activities under the false title of 'archbishop of Utrecht', and his behaviour and statements were seen as hostile to the Dutch political authorities and favourable to the 'public enemy' or official enemy of the Protestant state.¹⁸ After escaping the raid on the house of Hendrica van Duivenvoorde, Rovenius went into exile in Cologne, even though the city court of Utrecht cited him to appear before it. In a letter to the Utrecht city court dated 9 October 1639, he tried to defend himself against the charges from Cologne. He argued that he had conducted his pastoral work in accordance with a legitimate title to which he had been 'publicly' appointed by the pope, denouncing the sheriff's interpretation of his title as ill-willed bias. His legitimate title in Latin was *Archiepiscopus Philippensis et Ultrajectensis, nec non Hollandiae, Zelandiae, caeterarumque confaederatarum Belgij Provinciarum atque Transisulaniae partium Vicarius*

14 HUA, SAI, 2236-4, 8 August 1651: 'wat doet ghij hier, gaet nae huys toe men kent u well ghij zijt een borger ghij moet ons niet moveren' and 'exploiteren vande placcaten'.

15 HUA, HVU, 99-8, 29 July 1651. The priest Dirck van der Horst was sentenced in absentia.

16 HUA, SAI, 2236-4, 8 August 1651.

17 HUA, HVU, 99-8, 29 July 1651 (Hilhorst, 'Het kerspel Schalkwijk', pp. 65-67): 'by bekende Placcaten ende dagelycx gebruyck notoir is, dat d'officieren op alle plaetsen de verboden vergaderingen der Roomsche-gesinde vermogen te verstooren ende te beboeten'.

18 For Rovenius's indictment, see Doedes, 'Intendit', pp. 278-97; HUA, OBC, 159; HUA, SAI, 2088; HUA, SAI, 2244-86: 'openbaer vyandt'.

Apostolicus. Utrecht's politico-judicial authorities interpreted this as a combination of 'archbishop of Philippi [in Macedonia] and Utrecht' and 'apostolic vicar of Holland etc.', whereas Rovenius insisted that it should be read as '(titular) archbishop of Philippi' and 'apostolic vicar of Utrecht, Holland etc.' He furthermore stated that if he had ever spoken or acted in a hostile manner towards the Dutch political authorities or contacted their Spanish counterparts, this would only have been before the fall of Groenlo in 1627, where Spanish troops had secured a stronghold in the Northern Netherlands. Surprisingly, Rovenius himself therefore acknowledged that he had once been known as a 'public enemy', while implying that he had since amended his ways. Moreover, citing canon law and Roman law, he questioned the jurisdiction of the city court of Utrecht, arguing that no one could be judged in a place where they did not legally reside.¹⁹ In the end, on 10 March 1640, Rovenius was tried in absentia and sentenced to banishment from the Dutch Republic.²⁰ His argument, which revolved around the matter of jurisdiction, is remarkable when it is compared with the petition which the Reformed synod of Utrecht submitted to the Provincial States in 1655/56. According to Catholic teaching, so the synod claimed, the pope was 'infallible and absolute' and elevated 'above all churches and polities'. This was why Catholic ecclesiastics were unwilling to swear an oath of loyalty before Reformed magistrates, claiming to be 'free and exempt' from the civil laws of their legitimate worldly rulers, even though they officially no longer represented a judicially separate order within Dutch society, as they had before the Protestant Reformation.²¹ Contrary to the synod's claims, Rovenius did not ignore but rather appropriate civil law, stressing his status as a socio-judicial 'outsider' so as to justify his non-appearance before the city court of Utrecht.

Jurisdiction was also at stake in the trial against the Dom canon Willem van Merode {64}, who was accused of violating an oath and transferring a canonry. The Van Merode family belonged to the nobility of Brabant, but one of its branches went on to acquire the seignury of Montfoort in the province of Utrecht and continued in the Catholic faith there until the family sold the seignury in 1649. Whereas Willem's sisters Maria and Agnes, who were also his heiresses, seem to have been Catholic, his young brother Reynhard was received into the Teutonic Order in Utrecht, which

19 HUA, SAI, 2088 (this letter was transcribed in Jong, 'Het Utrechtse vicariaat', pp. 103–4): 'publickelijk'.

20 Doedes, 'Intendit', pp. 298–300; HUA, OBC, 159, 10 March 1640; HUA, SAI, 2244–86, 10 March 1640.

21 HUA, VBB, 139, probably in 1655 or 1656: 'onfeylbaer ende absoluyt', 'boven alle kercken en politien', and 'vrij ende exempt'.

required its members to swear an oath to maintain the Reformed religion.²² In the lawsuit, two coalitions collided: the one coalition was at the civic level, uniting the sheriff, the city court, and the city council; the other was provincial, uniting the provincial court and the Provincial States. The latter coalition seemed sympathetic to the prosecuted canon.

Early in 1652 the sheriff insisted that Willem was unqualified to hold and transfer the canonry of the Dom, because he had converted to Catholicism and thus violated the 1615 provincial edict. Although the Provincial States of Utrecht had already approved Willem's resignation from the canonry and its transfer to Dirck Schaep [76], the son of a Remonstrant regent and the future secretary of Amsterdam (in office 1655–1697), the sheriff ordered the city council to forbid Willem to proceed with the case. According to the sheriff, the Provincial States probably did not know of Willem's conversion, since it would otherwise not have allowed a Catholic to keep and transfer the canonry. He continued by arguing that it was not the business of the Provincial States but the sheriff to decide on the penalty against Willem, who had committed his offence (i.e., violation of the oath) in a territory that fell under the sheriff's jurisdiction.²³ In a petition to the provincial court signed by an advocate named Ewijck [35], Willem insisted that the sheriff was not actually qualified to make a decision on canonries without a special commission from the Provincial States, which had exclusive rights for managing canonries.²⁴ Soon after Willem submitted a similar petition signed by the Reformed city court solicitor Henrick van Zuylen [100],²⁵ the Provincial States on 5 August 1652 reconfirmed Willem's right to transfer the canonry to Schaep.²⁶

In a letter to the city court dated 20 August, the sheriff claimed that when Ijsbrant van Merode had obtained the canonry of the Dom for his young son Willem on 11 June 1624, he had sworn that he would raise him as a Reformed believer. Should Willem ever convert to another faith, he would forfeit the canonry. Therefore, so the sheriff concluded, when Willem converted to the Catholic Church, he automatically forfeited the right to hold and transfer the canonry.²⁷ The next day Willem reacted by sending the sheriff

22 On the Van Merode family, see Forclaz, *Catholiques*, p. 116; Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', pp. 86, 150, 253, 257; Idem, *Patrons*, pp. 102, 183; HUA, *Familie des Tombes*, 354; Rogier, *Geschiedenis*, I, p. 482, II, p. 648; Ven, *Over den oorsprong*, pp. 41, 49.

23 HUA, SAII, 2095, fasc. A. On Dirck Schaep, see Frijhoff, 'Neglected Networks', pp. 164, 192–94.

24 HUA, SAII, 2095, fasc. B, 10 May 1652.

25 *Ibidem*, 1 August 1652.

26 *Ibidem*, fasc. C, 5 August 1652.

27 *Ibidem*, 20 August 1652. For a copy of Ijsbrant's oath, see *ibidem*, fasc. D, 11 June 1624.

another petition signed by Van Zuylen [100]. According to this petition, the sheriff should have known that Willem attended the ‘public sermons’ in the Reformed Church here in Utrecht before he had gone to Brabant. The petition supposed that the sheriff had deduced from the Reformed Willem’s move to Catholic Brabant that he had also converted to the Catholic faith. The petition found this deduction to be ‘unfounded’, claiming that the sheriff had to prove that Willem had really converted, and if so, when.²⁸ On 13 September he submitted yet another petition signed by Van Zuylen [100] to the sheriff, stating that ‘this matter is not a matter of justice but of government’, insisting once again on the sheriff and city court’s lack of jurisdiction. Since the Provincial States, which held sovereign power for the ‘matter of government’, had already decided that Willem could transfer the canonry to Schaep, it would be ‘absurd’ for an ‘ordinary judge’ – that is, the sheriff – to overturn this ruling.²⁹

Upon the request of the city magistracy, the city court came with a new judgment on 12 March 1653. The latter cited the oath that Willem had made when he had obtained the canonry, stating that he would promote the Reformed religion and exclude the ‘foreign usurped authority over the people’s conscience, body, and property’. Despite this oath, so the city court maintained, the accused had converted to Catholicism and continued to enjoy the benefits of the canonry by concealing his conversion – although it still had not produced any evidence for Willem’s conversion. The city court also anticipated that Willem would appeal to freedom of conscience, and might argue that a ‘change of religion is no crime, since the freedom of the Lands does not allow any compulsion of conscience, and [since] everyone is free to believe in his conscience as he finds fit’. Nevertheless, so the city court countered, Willem was not a criminal by his conversion as such but by his transgression of the provincial edicts, which required canons to swear an oath to promote the Reformed faith.³⁰ The city magistrates approved this argument.³¹

Willem passed away in 1653,³² but the criminal case had not been fully concluded when, in 1656, his sisters and heirs Maria and Agnes van Merode,

28 Ibidem, 21 August 1652: ‘publijcke predicatien’ and ‘ongefundeerde’.

29 Ibidem, 13 September 1652: ‘deze saecke niet en is een saecke van justitie maer van policije’, ‘absurd’, and ‘ordinaris rechter’.

30 Ibidem, fasc. F, 12 March 1652: ‘vreemde geusurpeerde autoriteyt over de mensche consciëntien, lichaemen ende goederen’ and ‘de veranderinge van religie geen crimen te sijn, vermits de vrijheyt der Landen niet toe en laet eenich dwonck der consciëntie, ende elck een vrije staet in sijn consciëntie te geloven soo als hij goet vindet’.

31 HUA, SAIL, 121-24, 14 March 1653; HUA, SAIL, 2095, fasc. G, 14 March 1653.

32 HUA, Familie des Tombes, 354, f. 11.

supported by the provincial court advocate Jacob van Dam [25] together with the aforementioned Van Zuylen [100], asked the city court to reach a settlement on their brother's case {74}. The city court decided that if Maria and Agnes paid a fine of f. 2,000, it would conclude the trial and remove the provisional embargo on the transfer of the canonry.³³ Remarkably, Willem van Merode justified his holding and transferring of the canonry by questioning the reasoning advanced by the politico-judicial authorities concerning his alleged conversion, and by seeking support from the provincial institutions that seemed favourable to him. He and his defenders were obviously well acquainted with the dispute over jurisdiction between the city and the province. It should also be noted that the city court recognized that it was impossible to prosecute someone for his or her conversion alone under the freedom of conscience guaranteed by the Union of Utrecht.

Another Catholic canon (St Jan), Gerard van der Steen, appealed to the former immunity of his chapter to insist that the city had no jurisdiction over his house since it belonged to the chapter {17}. When accused of hosting a Catholic assembly involving twenty-six participants, Van der Steen submitted a petition signed by the Reformed advocate Abraham van Kerckraad [45]. He begged the city court for mercy, alleging that the attendees were too poor, old, or young to be fined. This argument might be interpreted as an appeal to the non-political potential of the assembly. The twenty-six Catholics consisted of fourteen male participants, including five boys, and twelve female participants. Most of the adult men caught held modest jobs as carpenters, furniture makers, confectioner's servants, or the like, although Everard van der Schuer (Schuyr) [78] was an advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht. Moreover, the petition attempted to prove that the judicial officers had had no right to investigate the gathering in his house, reminding the city court that Van der Steen's house was the property of the collegiate chapter of St Jan. According to the petition, the assembly concerned a matter to be handled by Van der Steen's mother, Lucia van Esch, who was a 'private person'.³⁴ As such, Van der Steen claimed in his petition that, even though the immunities of the chapters in the city of Utrecht had officially been nullified after the Protestant Reformation, he as a canon should also have been exempt from the city's jurisdiction over the matter of a 'private person' within the former immunity, just as his medieval predecessors had been.

In this way, prosecuted Catholics and their defenders in Utrecht showed themselves well acquainted with the long-standing disputes over jurisdiction

33 HUA, SAI, 121-26, 23 January 1656; HUA, SAI, 2236-4, 24, 25 January 1656.

34 HUA, SAI, 2244-88, 2 November 1638: 'privé'.

between the city and the province. Some of them represented the accused as socio-judicial outsiders, or else appealed to the aid of the provincial institutions, which seemed sympathetic to Catholics. Others recalled the medieval legal tradition and asserted the immunity of the accused from the city's jurisdiction due to their rights as seigneurs or canons.

5.1.3. Social Status and Contribution to the Common Good

Since the immunity of the chapters had officially become void, Van der Steen's petition might be interpreted as indirectly implying that the authorities had better refrain from offending this Catholic notable who, together with his ancestors, had contributed to the well-being of Utrecht for decades. For, as has been made clear above, Van der Steen did indeed play an important role in the city. Until his death as the last Catholic canon in early modern Utrecht in 1680, Van der Steen undoubtedly was a powerful figure within the multi-confessional civic community. This reality of everyday life in Utrecht, where Catholic notables contributed significantly to the civic community under the Reformed regime, was at odds with the magistracy's efforts, through its legislation and prosecution, to discredit Catholics as potential criminals. Advocating the legalization of anti-Catholicism, in its petition to the Provincial States in 1655/56, the Reformed synod of Utrecht claimed that a 'Popish Son' (i.e., a Catholic) would not 'stand under the power of a heretical, that is, Reformed Father'. Such 'Roman Emissaries' easily reneged on their promises to the Reformed, and thus they 'were not only against the Piety of Christians, but also against all civic virtue'.³⁵ In vivid departure from this confessionalized notion of the 'civic', Catholics stressed and mobilized their social status or historical contributions to the common good of the civic community.

In their attempt to urge the politico-judicial authorities to favour them or their co-religionists, many of Catholic Utrechters not only hinted indirectly at their elevated social status or contribution to the civic community, but also referred directly to it. In his petition to the Utrecht city court, for instance, the other Catholic canon of the Dom, Diderick van Muylert, explicitly mobilized his elevated status in order to reject the sheriff's claim {16}. Diderick was publicly approved as a canon in 1603, but in 1625 asked Rovenius to grant him dispensation from apparent simony. Although

35 HUA, VBB, 139, probably in 1655 or 1656: 'Paepsch Sone', 'staet onder de macht van een ketterschen, dat is gereformeerden Vader', 'Roomsche Emissarissen', and 'strijdich niet alleen met de Godsaliqheyd der Christenen, maer oock tegen alle borgel[ijck]e erbaerheyd'.

Rovenius nominally re-ascribed the canonry to Diderick, on the official level virtually nothing changed. While Diderick's petition, which was signed by a city court solicitor named Cornelis van Clarenburch [20], asserted that he had neither known nor spoken to Rovenius (which was false), it also emphasized that Diderick was born in Lingen, which belonged to the prince of Orange, and had 'diverse noble and other properties from olden times'. According to the petition, when Lingen was under Spanish rule, Diderick left for 'neutral' territory and then moved to Utrecht in 1627. As 'a nobleman', he recognized the Provincial States as 'his lawful sovereign' and was subject to the stadholder. Yet, so the petition continued, contrary to 'all right reason and equity', the sheriff was trying to put the 'body and property' of this 'honourable person' in danger, labelling him as one of the 'enemies of the Lands'. It moreover maintained that, 'without boasting', he had been living in the city of Utrecht as a 'qualified nobleman' with a 'good reputation' and had contributed financially to the Provincial States so that it could afford its 'War against the enemy of the land'. The petition even added that he had been forced to 'totally alter' his view of Utrecht's authorities by the unjust nature of the prosecution to which he was subjected.³⁶

Diderick's brother Ernest [61], a nobleman in Grumsmühlen near Lingen, supported Diderick's claim. Diderick had visited Ernest in 1625, when Lingen still belonged to the Habsburgs, but the surrounding countryside, including Grumsmühlen, was controlled by the States General. The governor of Lingen, Lucas Cayro, learned that Diderick was a canon of the Utrecht chapter of the Dom and attempted to apprehend him. Diderick escaped the Spanish army and fled across the Ems to Emden. Enraged, Cayro tried to confiscate Diderick's property in Lingen. Warned by a priest about Cayro's plan, Ernest succeeded in defending his brother's interests.³⁷ Ernest's testimony was confirmed by a vice *drost* of Lingen, Silvester Danckelman [26]. According to Danckelman, Cayro attempted to capture Diderick in 1625 on the pretext that Diderick had received a command from the States General.³⁸ In this way, Ernest and the vice *drost* insisted that Diderick could not in fact be linked to the 'public enemy' or official enemy of the Republic; on the contrary, he had been under threat from the 'public enemy'. This Catholic canon therefore was represented in two different ways. The Protestant authorities

36 HUA, SAIL, 2244-84, 21, 22 November 1639: 'verscheydene adelijcke ende andere goederen van oudts', 'een edelman', 'sijn wettige souvereine', 'alle rechten redenen, ende billickheit', 'lijff ende goet', 'eerlijck p[er]soon', 'vijanden vanden Landen', 'sonder beroem', 'gequalificeert edelman', 'goede reputatie', 'Oorloge jegens s'lands vijande', and 'geheell anders'.

37 Ibidem, 14 December 1639, 10 January 1640.

38 Ibidem, 3, 10 January 1640.

in Utrecht represented Diderick as a potential traitor who conspired with the 'public enemy', noting that he was a Catholic with close ties to Rovenius. The Catholic governor of Lingen, on the other hand, represented him as a spy of his enemy – i.e., the Dutch Republic – because he was a canon officially appointed by the Provincial States of Utrecht. Although the outcome of the case is unknown (even if it is probable that the city court rejected the charges), Diderick continued to be a prominent figure in Utrecht. He was non-publicly appointed a trustee of St Bartholomew Hospice, and in 1656 he was mentioned by Jacobus de la Torre as one of the eleven remaining Catholic canons.³⁹

In their attempt to persuade the city magistrates to tolerate their residence in Utrecht, the recognized priests drew special attention to their relationships with the civic community. Indeed, in 1630 the city council declared that Catholic clerics who were sons of citizens could be permitted to come back to Utrecht on the condition that they observe the edicts.⁴⁰ After all, thirty-five of the sixty-four recognized priests had some connection or other with Utrecht.⁴¹ In twenty-four of these cases, the priests had family members who were Utrecht citizens.⁴² In six cases, recognized priests maintained that they intended to visit Utrecht to dispose of a deceased person's properties.⁴³ The secular priest Jacob Pieck's visit to Utrecht <32>, for instance, was tolerated as he was acting as an executor of the will of the late Jacob Bool, a registered secular priest <3>. Dirk Ferdinand de Ridder van Groenesteyn <74b>, who had been married and had children before entering the Society of Jesus, was publicly recognized to stay for two months to save his and his child's property in his hometown (Appendix 2). In seventeen cases, tolerated clerics mentioned family visits as the reason for their stay.⁴⁴ The secular priest Nicolaes Prins's return to his hometown was thus tolerated so that he could grieve with his family following the death of his brothers <51a> and could rescue their properties <51b>. On another, similar occasion <51c>, permission was requested on

39 HUA, BAI, 1604, c. 1653; Lommel, 'Relatio seu descriptio', p. 177.

40 HUA, SAI, 121-14, 15, 20 September 1630; HUA, VSOKN, 112, 20 September 1630.

41 <31> <32> <33> <34> <38> <39> <41> <43> <44> <45> <46> <50> <51> <52> <56> <59> <64> <69> <71> <72> <74> <75> <77> <79> <83> <84> <85> <87> <88> <89> <90> <91> <92> <93> <94> in Appendix 2.

42 <31> <33> <34> <38> <41> <43> <45> <46> <51> <52> <56> <59> <64> <69> <71> <77> <79> <83> <84> <90> <91> <92> <93> <94> in Appendix 2.

43 <32> <38a> <51b> <59bc> <74b> in Appendix 2.

44 <33a> <34> <38ae> <44> <51a> <52b> <59a> <69a> <72d> <77c> <85ab> <88> <89> <92> <93> in Appendix 2.

his behalf by Eva van Amerongen, the widow of his brother Gerard Prins [68], an advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht and a defender of Agatha Dierhout {58} (Appendices 1, 2, and 4). Willem de Munter, a son of the provincial court advocate Johan de Munter [60] and Walburga Both, was publicly tolerated so as to visit his sick mother <59a> and then dispose of his parents' property <59bc> (Appendix 2). In eleven cases, recognized ecclesiastics justified their stay or residence in Utrecht by declaring that they needed to receive medical care in Utrecht.⁴⁵ For instance, a first visit to Utrecht by Balthasar van de Kemp, a canon in Emmerich and a son of a citizen, was tolerated in 1641 so that he could dispose of his deceased father's property <38a>, and later, in 1658, to assist his elderly mother <38e>. Finally, in 1659 Van de Kemp received permission to reside in his hometown indefinitely in recognition of his advanced age and visual impairment <38f> (Appendix 2).

For the secular priest Godefroy van Vianen (c. 1642–1708), his family's elevated social status in Utrecht played an indispensable role when he obtained his residence permit. As noted above, the Van Vianens were well-connected through family bonds to many members of the Catholic social elite in Utrecht, especially lawyers. Born as the son of Valentijn van Vianen, provincial court advocate and secretary of the Teutonic Order, Godefroy had worked as a secular priest in Mons in the Southern Netherlands.⁴⁶ In 1668 his mother Anthonetta van der Eem pleaded with the city magistracy to permit her son to reside in Utrecht, stating that he wanted to avoid the ongoing war – i.e., the War of Devolution, 1667–68, when France invaded the Habsburg Netherlands – and the resulting inflation in Mons. Away from the battlefield, he needed to live quietly in his hometown. In the end, he was officially given permission to reside in Utrecht indefinitely, barring cancellation of his permit <91> (Appendix 2). The elevated social status of his family in Utrecht seems to have been necessary to win him public recognition. Had Van Vianen been a social outsider to the civic community, the magistrates may not have permitted this Catholic priest to escape the war between Catholic forces and to take refuge in their officially Protestant city.

Likewise, the Catholic painter Gerrit Hermansz van Honthorst effectively utilized his family's elevated status in the civic community and his close connection to the Protestant ruling elite. In 1631 Gerrit pleaded with Stadholder Frederick Henry, his patron, to permit his brother Herman, a secular priest, to reside in their hometown of Utrecht. According to Gerrit, Herman had

45 <38f> <41ab> <44> <50b> <51d> <80> <86> <87abc> in Appendix 2.

46 Ackermans, *Herders*, pp. 462–63.

been ordained in 1628, when he was staying in Antwerp with his parents to study sculpture, before secretly returning to Utrecht in 1630. In his petition Gerrit represented the Van Honthorst family as respected, obedient citizens of Utrecht. He noted that Gerrit, together with his ancestors, had always been 'faithful subjects and good patriots of Your Princely Excellency and these lands'. Appealing to his family's elevated social status, Gerrit insisted that Herman be given permission to stay with his aging parents in Utrecht. He argued that if Herman were required to leave, his elderly parents would become depressed. According to the painter, Herman was ready to live 'silently and modestly' alongside citizens and 'numerous other Religious persons'.⁴⁷ On 5 March 1632 the city council sent the ex-burgomaster Johan van Weede (in office 1626–1629; father of Everard van Weede van Dijkveld) as a representative to the prince of Orange. The magistracy was afraid that if Herman were allowed to stay, it would set a precedent that would make it hard to refuse entry to other priests who were 'noble and held more titles'.⁴⁸ Here the magistrates clearly felt the threat of Catholics of elevated social status, who might claim special privileges for the clergy members of their families. Several days later the city council received a disappointing report from Van Weede. According to the decision made back in 1631, Frederick Henry had once again declared that Herman was to be allowed to stay in Utrecht for six months. Yet the stadholder also acknowledged the fear of the Utrecht magistrates, assuring them that he would not extend the period of Herman's stay, to prevent further problems from arising <33a>.⁴⁹ Gerrit thus succeeded in winning toleration in the form of limited recognition for his brother to stay in their hometown.

However, in contravention of the conditions, Herman began working as a secular priest in Utrecht under the supervision of Gerrit Pelt in 1636, although it is unclear whether he had been staying in Utrecht continuously from 1632 onwards.⁵⁰ While the precise details of the negotiations remain unknown, in 1637 Herman once again managed to obtain a special permit for residence in Utrecht from the stadholder through Gerrit's mediation <33b>.⁵¹ In 1638 Herman was banished by the city council without trial before the city court,⁵² but he later returned, probably relying on the weight of the special permit

47 HUA, SAII, 121-15, 5 March 1632: 'getrouwe onderdanen ende goede patriotten van U Pr[inc] e Ex[celen]tie ende dese landen', 'stil ende modest', and 'veele andere Geestel[ijcke] personen'.

48 Ibidem, 5 March 1632: 'adelicke ende meer gequalificeerde'.

49 Ibidem, 19 March 1632.

50 Hofman, 'De Witte Vrouwen', pp. 147–49.

51 HUA, SAII, 121-19, 10 August 1641 (this entry was transcribed in Hofman, 'Het Kerspel buiten de Wittevrouwenpoort', p. 95).

52 HUA, SAII 121-18, 6 August 1638.

granted him by the stadholder in 1637. When Herman was found presiding at a Catholic assembly in 1641 {23}, the incumbent burgomaster Frederik Ruysch (in office 1639–1643 and 1650–1652) and ex-burgomaster Gijsbert van der Hoolck (in office 1634–1639) visited Frederick Henry at Gennepe to inform him of Herman's illegal activities. They sought to prevent Herman and his friends – and, probably, his brother Gerrit – from once again asking a favour from the prince, emphasizing the 'harm' that Herman had caused 'to this city and the Reformed religion'. After securing the cancellation of Herman's special residence permit from the prince, the city court sentenced him definitively to banishment from the city {25}.⁵³ These cases involving recognized priests demonstrate that they could exploit the elevated social status of their families in Utrecht, implicitly or explicitly reminding the authorities of their or their relatives' longstanding contribution to and outstanding reputation within the civic community. This is noteworthy given that most of the city's Reformed ministers were newcomers.⁵⁴

Gerard de Wael van Vronesteyn also mobilized his family's elevated social status and historical contribution to the 'fatherland'. In 1625, when Gerard sought to secure a future position for his son Willem in the Teutonic Order's bailiwick of Utrecht, he was troubled by the oath Willem would be required to swear, obliging him to raise his son in the Reformed religion. In a letter to Stadholder Frederick Henry in 1632, he claimed that this was contrary to 'his conscience'.⁵⁵ When he petitioned the city council in 1639 to grant Willem dispensation, he represented his family as patriots of the Republic, insisting that his ancestors had contributed their 'property and blood to the Fatherland'.⁵⁶ Gerard likewise showed the Provincial States of Utrecht how his family had experienced tribulations under the regime of the duke of Alba and reminded them that his forefather Adriaen had been executed by the Council of Troubles (*Raad van Beroerten*) in 1568. He used a comparable discourse in a letter to Frederick Henry, having his friends plead with the stadholder on his behalf. Representing Gerard as a 'pious nobleman', the prince declared in response that he was inclined to grant Willem dispensation from the oath of religion.⁵⁷ And indeed, at his

53 HUA, SAI, 121-19, 5, 26 June 1641, 5, 10, 16 August 1641 (Hofman, 'Het Kerspel buiten de Wittevrouwenpoort', pp. 94–96): 'nadeel van dese stadt ende Gereformeerde religie'. HUA, SAI, 2236-4, 5, 7 May 1641, 11 August 1641.

54 Duker, *Gisbertus Voetius*, III, pp. 108–22; Lieburg, *De Nadere Reformatie*, p. 151.

55 Geraerts, 'Dutch Test Acts', pp. 72–74.

56 HUA, SAI, 121-18, 4 May 1639: 'goet ende bloet aant Vaderlandt'.

57 Geraerts, 'The Catholic Nobility', p. 91; Idem, *Patrons*, p. 108. For similar arguments of Catholic nobles, see also idem, 'Competing Sacred Spaces', pp. 14–15.

appointment to the Teutonic Order, Willem was given public recognition and not required to swear the oath of religion.⁵⁸

When Maria van Pallaes bequeathed her extensive possessions, she showed her fidelity not only to the Catholic faith but also to the civic community of Utrecht. In her 'Foundation Letter of [the] Twelve Chambers' (*Fundatie Brief van XII Cameren*), dated 29 November 1662, she established rules for her free dwellings on Agnietenstraat. Residents of her almshouses could live there for free, receive certain amounts of commodities like butter and cheese every year, and their funerals would also be financed by the foundation. Van Pallaes 'preferred the Citizens of this City Utrecht and their widows over foreigners' as candidates for these dwellings, and they were to be 'old poor people, who up to now receive no support yet from the [Reformed] Diaconate, [the municipal] chamber of charity, or any others'.⁵⁹ Implicitly, impoverished Catholic citizens of an advanced age and their widows therefore had priority in Van Pallaes's free dwellings. This preference was indeed reflected in practice, as ten of the twelve residents in 1687 were of the Catholic faith.⁶⁰ An inscription in a gable stone above the entrance to the refectory of the free dwellings, which can still be seen from the public street today, reads as follows: 'Maria van Pallaes driven by / God's love / She, the widow of / Mr Schroyesteyn, has / Established These Chambers [and] / provided sustenance for them / Not considering worldly favour but / a Place in the Court of heaven'.⁶¹ This very Catholic notion of charity has been materialized and visualized for centuries in the public sphere of Utrecht. The coats of arms of both the Van Pallaes and Van Schroyesteyn families were placed above the doors of the twelve chambers, which likewise remain visible today. As such, the fame of both families was publicly and openly commemorated. In 1657 Van Pallaes commissioned the Catholic painter Hendrick Bloemaert to portray her and five of her six children, all of whom had already passed away; her oldest son Johan was omitted on the painting (Fig. 4), as he was omitted from her and her husband's testament in 1624. On the painting, which was hung above the hearth of the refectory, Van Pallaes and her children distribute alms to the needy in front of the

58 HUA, SAI, 121-19, 6 March 1640.

59 HUA, BAI, 692, 'Foundation Letter' (on 29 November 1662): 'prefererende de Borders deser Stadt Utrecht, en der selver wed[uw]en voor ijtheemsche' and 'oude arme luijden, dewelcke nochtans niet vande Diaconije, Aelmoessenierscamer, ofte ymant anders bedeylt worden'.

60 HUA, KR, 10, 18 July, 26 September 1687 (Klaveren, 'Vrijwoningen', p. 26).

61 'Y Maria van Pallaes door liefde / Goodts gedreven / Heeft doen sy weduw was van / d'Heere Schroyesteyn / Dees Cameren gesticht eenich / onderhout gegeven / Niet achtend 'swerels gonst maer / Plaets in s'hemel's Pleyn'.



Fig. 4 Hendrick Bloemaert, *The Annual Food Distribution to the Poor by Maria van Pallaes*, 1657, oil on canvas, 90.7 x 178.8 cm, Centraal Museum, Utrecht (on loan from van Maria van Pallaes Foundation)

Agnieten Convent and the Twelve Chambers with its refectory, both on Agnietenstraat.⁶² Through her free dwellings, Van Pallaes publicly and openly showed her allegiance to the city as well as to the Catholic cause, and she may have staked a claim for publicness for Utrecht's Catholics, questioning their exclusion from the public sphere.⁶³ In her eyes, devotion to the Catholic faith was fully compatible with loyalty to the civic community of Utrecht.

The repressed and tolerated Catholics therefore utilized their social status in their discourses, emphasizing their historical relationship with Utrecht through their families or ancestors from medieval times, their politico-social credibility in the local society, and their politico-financial contributions to the common good of the city and the Dutch Republic, at times in the context of the Eighty Years' War. These Catholics attempted to remind the politico-judicial authorities of their secular duty to protect their subjects' legitimate rights. Presumably, the non-publicly connived Catholics refrained from submitting official requests out of fear that they would only end up facing persecution if they provided the Protestant magistrates with their personal information. By appealing to their elevated social status as well as the civil services they performed, the publicly recognized Catholics, in contrast, questioned the legitimacy of what in their eyes was a confessionally driven persecution (which the magistrates for their part regarded as lawful

62 For the painting, see Offringa and Hidden, 'De fundatie'; Offringa and Hidden, *Fundatie*, especially pp. 5–30; Roethlisberger and Bok, *Abraham Bloemaert*, I, pp. 492–93.

63 See also Lenarduzzi, *De belevingswereld*, pp. 136–41, 290; Idem, 'Subcultuur en tegencultuur', pp. 167–69, 419.

prosecution), and encouraged the authorities to bestow toleration on their presence or activity in Utrecht. Therefore, for Catholics with an elevated social status it may well have been safer openly to submit official requests than secretly to commit illegal actions in the hope of connivance from the magistrates. Appealing to their social status, they claimed the rights that were legitimately theirs in the public sphere, reversing, whether openly or tacitly, their representation as ‘public enemies’ by the Reformed Church, and counter-representing themselves as ‘obedient citizens’, ‘trustful subjects’, and ‘good patriots’.

5.1.4. Conscience

Freedom of conscience was newly conceptualized in the context of early modern religious diversity.⁶⁴ During the debates that agitated the Dutch Reformed Church throughout the first decades of its existence, not only Libertines and Remonstrants but also Contra-Remonstrants (strict Calvinists) recognized the freedom of conscience guaranteed by the Union of Utrecht.⁶⁵ Yet the Dutch Republic had no legal system by which the state could enforce observance of the Union’s freedom of conscience clause. Moreover, the clause remained vague about what it meant to ‘be free in his or her conscience’, containing no concrete provisions for protection.⁶⁶ Therefore, while the Union stipulated a normative discourse on freedom of conscience, the political authorities, the public church, and dissenters, including Catholics, could deploy discourses for justifying their decision and behaviour by mobilizing their own interpretations of freedom of conscience.⁶⁷ As the city court noted in the trial against Willem van Merode {64},⁶⁸ Utrecht’s politico-judicial authorities indeed assumed that a reference to freedom of conscience could function as an effective discourse technique for Catholics to defend their rights. Accordingly, the Reformed Church found it necessary to elaborate discourses on conscience. In a 1649 petition to the city council, the Voetian consistory claimed that Catholics were ‘publicly’, openly mocking the Reformed faith. Priests and *klopjes* instilled Catholic ‘principles and maxims that tear them from obedience to their

64 Sorabji, *Moral Conscience*, pp. 97–165.

65 Gelderen, ‘Arminian Trouble’.

66 Deursen, ‘Tussen eenheid en zelfstandigheid’; Jong, ‘Unie en religie’.

67 On different connotations of freedom of conscience in the Dutch Republic, especially among the city magistrates, see Pettegree, ‘The Politics of Toleration’, pp. 186, 195.

68 HUA, SAII, 2095, fasc. F, 12 March 1652.

legitimate Government and bind their consciences to other Superiors'.⁶⁹ Another petition from the consistory to the city council, this one in 1670, denounced Catholics for bringing 'evident harm to God's church, and shame to the reformation'. Priests 'oblige them [Catholics] in conscience to be subject to the territory of foreign potentates, indeed the Pope of Rome'.⁷⁰ The consistory therefore problematized Catholic conscience in the context of political loyalty.

Two other petitions from the Reformed Church further illustrate its confessionalized understanding of the Catholic conscience. According to the petition which the Voetian consistory sent to the city council in February 1648, it would be impossible to win Catholic souls by 'connivance', since Catholics would only be satisfied once they had regained all ecclesiastical 'properties and public churches' as well as the city hall. If the magistrates were to permit the 'exercise of the popish religion', they would end up allowing the 'papists' 'exorbitant freedom' and show 'excessive connivance'. The petition argued that one could not deny that 'freedom of conscience is established in these lands, because people have to distinguish between freedom of conscience and freedom of conventicles for the papists'. It continued by insisting that 'some pretend that freedom of conscience cannot exist unless the papists have their priests and conventicles as they in conscience judge them to be necessary'. In the eyes of the Reformed consistory, this argument was flawed. What Catholics judge necessary in conscience ought not to be realized, since their consciences might order them to revolt against the legitimate Protestant government.⁷¹ In this way, the consistory, on the one hand, made a concession by referring to the distinction between freedom of conscience and freedom of 'conventicles', claiming that only the latter could be denied under the conditions of the Union of Utrecht. On the other hand, it not only rejected the broad interpretation of conscience, which would create room for some public

69 HUA, SAI, 121-23, 17 December 1649: 'opentlick' and 'fundamenten ende maximien, die haer afreken vande gehoorsaemheyt van haer wettige Overicheyt ende haer consciencien verbinden aen andere Opperhoofden'.

70 HUA, KR, 9, 6 June 1670: 'merckelycke schade van Gods kercke, en schande van de reformatie' and 'haer in consciencie verplicht en subject makende aen het gebied van vreemde potentaten, ja vande Paus van Romanen'. See also *ibidem*, 20 June 1670; HUA, SAI, 121-28, 20 June 1670.

71 HUA, KR, 5, 28 February 1648: 'conniventie', 'goederen ende publycke kercken', 'exorbitanten vryheyt', 'ongematichde conniventie', 'exercitium van de paepere religie', 'vryheyt der consciencie in dese landen es vastgesteld want men moet onderscheyt maecken tusschen vryheyt der consciencie en tusschen vryheyt van conventiculen van de papisten', and 'sommige voorgeven dat de vryheyt der consciencie niet en kan bestaen sonder dat de papisten hare papen ende conventiculen hebben alsoo sij in consciencie ordelen die haer nodich te sijn'.

Catholic presence in the form of clergy and worship, but also denounced Catholic consciences as being politically polluted and a danger to the Reformed public order.

Another petition from the Reformed Church, this one submitted by the synod to the Provincial States in 1655/56, likewise placed Catholic conscience in a political context, while recognizing the importance of distinguishing freedom of conscience from freedom of worship. One objection anticipated by the petition is that at the outset of the Revolt against Spain, 'people let those of the Roman faith preserve the free exercise of their Religion in every respect', referring to the bi-confessionalism of the 'religious peace' as it had been realized in Utrecht from 1579 to 1580. The imagined opponent then continues by problematizing how 'people nowadays are hardly willing to allow [Catholics] to maintain even a few Mass-priests to perform their service in private houses'. In response, the synod countered that 'such promises' had been made on the condition that Catholics would behave 'as Enemies of the Spanish and obedient Subjects of the State'. However, as the 'Netherlandish histories' showed, particularly in 1579 and 1580, Catholics had repeatedly dishonoured that condition. For this reason, one could not return to the bi-confessional system under which Catholics had enjoyed the right of public worship. Furthermore, the synod regarded the current practices of the Catholic faith, which they exercised inside their 'private houses', as 'public', claiming that Catholics now practised 'their Idolatry publicly [openly and externally] without any fear'.⁷² Another anticipated objection maintained that 'the banishment of the Roman clergy and the prevention of the free exercise of their Religion is a constraint of conscience'. Denying that this was the case, the synod insisted instead on the importance of 'distinguishing between freedom of conscience and freedom of exercise of Religion'. Once again, the synod alluded, obviously but tacitly, to the Union of Utrecht. The public church recognized that Catholics were entitled to freedom of conscience, by which 'they might freely be popish, profess [that] they are popish, feel and believe in their hearts [what they want], and read in their houses what they want'. At the same time, they must be denied the 'freedom of conventicles and exercise of Religion' and the 'public freedom of their Religion'. Even though magistrates in other Dutch cities might extend

72 HUA, VBB, 139, probably in 1655 or 1656: 'men de Roomsch-gesinden de vrye oeffeninge van hare Religie in allen deelen soude laten behouden', 'men haer nu nauwelicks eenige weynige Mis-priesters wil laten behouden om haren dienst in private huysen te doen', 'sulcke beloften', 'als Vyanden van Spagnien ende gehoorsame Subjecten vanden Staet', 'Nederlantsche historien', and 'sonder eenige vreesse hare Afgoderye openbaerlick'.

greater toleration to Catholics, Utrecht's magistrates were not to commit such a 'disgrace of God' and 'offence of their [Reformed] consciences'.⁷³

This Reformed confessionalized interpretation of the Catholic conscience may well have been what allowed the politico-judicial authorities to justify their raids on Catholic houses in the context of their judicial investigations. When the substitute sheriff explained his raid on a Catholic gathering in the house of Jasper Heyndricxz in 1624 {8}, he argued that such assemblies were prohibited, regardless of whether they took place 'in secret' or 'in public'.⁷⁴ In 1633 the sheriff complained about Catholic assemblies which, as he claimed, were at that time 'so public'.⁷⁵ Likewise, in 1661 the Reformed consistory accused Catholics of 'publicly [openly] going to [their clandestine] church',⁷⁶ and in 1665 the city court accused them of 'increasing licence' and 'public attendance at their churches or meeting-places'.⁷⁷ Similarly, the Voetian consistory complained in 1670 that many Catholic Utrechters were going 'freely in and out of' their assemblies, in which they 'freely and independently' practised their 'idolatry'. It was 'as public and with almost as much liberty as that [an assembly] of the public church'.⁷⁸ Another petition from the consistory, this one submitted in 1662, referred to Catholic gatherings as 'public and bold assemblies'. By closing their houses on their feast days, so the same petition continued, Catholic Utrechters were declaring 'publicly', openly, and externally that they deserved more freedom.⁷⁹ It is worth noting that the Reformed consistory claimed that Catholic initiatives to close their doors and remain inside their private homes on their holy days represented a public, open, and external expression of Catholicism.

In this way, by implicitly recalling the Union of Utrecht, the public church insisted on the importance of distinguishing between freedom of

73 Ibidem, probably in 1655 or 1656: 'het uytseggen van de Roomsche geestelickheyt ende het beletten vande vrye exercitie van hare Religie is conscientie-dwangh', 'onderscheyt maeckt tusschen vryheyt van conscientie, ende vryheyt van exercitie der Religie', 'sij mogen vryelick paepsch sijn ende seggen dat se paepsch sijn ende in hare herten gevoelen en geloven, ende in hare huysen lesen wat se willen', 'vryheyt van conventiculen en exercitie van Religie', 'publicke vryheyt van haer Religie', and 'oneere van God' and 'quetsinge van hare conscientie'.

74 HUA, SAI, 2244-55, n.d. in 1624: 'in het heymelick' and 'in het openbaer'.

75 HUA, SAI, 121-16, 4 November 1633: 'soo publycq'.

76 HUA, KR, 8, 12 August 1661: 't openbare kerck gaan'.

77 HUA, SAI, 616, 29 April 1665 (Hofman, 'Allerlei', p. 186): 'aengewassene licentie ende openbare toeloop na hare kercken ofte vergaderplaetsen'.

78 HUA, KR, 9, 18 April, 6 June 1670: 'vrij uijt en in', 'vrij en vranck', 'afgoden-diensten', and 'so opentlyck en byna met so veel libertyt als die van de publyqe kercke'.

79 HUA, KR, 8, 2 June 1662; HUA, SAI, 121-27, 2 June 1662: 'openbare en stoute bijeenkomsten' and 'openbaer'.

conscience and freedom of 'conventicles'. The Reformed Church together with the politico-judicial authorities understood the clandestine nature of the conventicles inside the houses as the concealment of contraventions of the Reformed public order. Moreover, they objected that Catholic consciences were firmly connected to and arbitrarily ruled by the pope through clerics and *klopjes*. As such, even though their consciences required some public Catholic presence in the form of ecclesiastics and sacraments, such demands were to be denied. In particular, the synod redefined freedom of conscience for Catholics as no more than being, professing, feeling, believing, and reading. Accordingly, the public church pushed the politico-judicial authorities to denounce the celebration of Mass as 'public', irrespective of where the Catholics were worshipping, even if it be in their private homes. By their use of the term 'public', the Reformed Church and the authorities emphatically condemned the Catholic violation of the public order, which, in the utopian vision of the Voetians, ought to be confessionalized. Three elements stood out here as criteria for 'public' in the eyes of the Reformed ecclesiastical authorities: the open transgression of the law, which was evident to them and other city dwellers through the visibility and audibility of Catholic gatherings; the communal nature of what went on inside Catholic private homes, where Catholics used altars and other objects, making Catholic worship a form of 'idolatry' that was offensive both to God and the consciences of the Reformed; and the presence of priests, who politico-religiously bound Catholic consciences to foreign 'public enemies'.

How, then, did Catholics deploy discourses on conscience? Closer investigation reveals that Utrecht's Catholics appropriated freedom of conscience for their own cause, attaching various connotations to it, most of which were inconsistent with the Reformed interpretation of conscience. One good example concerns the prosecuted canon of St Marie, Gijsbert Dirksz alias Gijsbert Junius {80}. According to the indictment drawn up in 1657, Junius's father Willem Dirksz had secured a canonry of St Marie for Junius by swearing on 22 August 1622 that he would raise his eleven-year-old son in the Reformed faith, and that Junius would forfeit the canonry if Willem ever violated this oath. In his indictment, the sheriff argued that Junius had in fact been educated as a Catholic, so that the canonry was to be forfeited.⁸⁰ Junius's side responded by submitting a petition signed by the Reformed city court solicitor Van Zuylen [100]. It first stated that Junius's canonry had not been acquired on 22 August 1622 by his father, but by his uncle, Gijsbert Willemsz de Roy, on 1 August 1622. For this reason, the alleged proviso had

80 HUA, Kapittel van Sint Marie te Utrecht, 90, 27 August 1657.

no judicial bearing. Sometime after 1 August 1622, Junius's grandmother in Germany had taken responsibility for raising Junius, since his family in Utrecht did not have the resources to care for their many children. The petition insisted that Junius had converted to Catholicism while still a minor in Germany, where he was not supervised by the family patriarch. Moreover, it asserted that 'according to article thirteen of the Union of Utrecht, every individual may be free in his religion'. It argued that by the time Junius returned to Utrecht at the age of majority and was appointed to the canonry anew in April 1634, his Catholic faith was 'publicly', openly known. Since then, Junius had been in undisputed possession of the canonry for over twenty years.⁸¹ Citing Roman law, the petition claimed that the oath allegedly sworn by Junius's father had become irrelevant, implicitly arguing that conversion was not a crime and in fact enjoyed protection under the provisions of the Union of Utrecht.⁸² In the end, the city court rejected the charges.⁸³ It is worth noting that Junius's petition referred to freedom of conscience, understood here as the right for 'every individual' to 'freely remain in his religion', while it also vindicated the traditional patriarchal right concerning the religious education of children.⁸⁴

There were also a number of recognized priests who explicitly referred to the Union of Utrecht and freedom of conscience. In 1630 a petition was sent to the city magistracy in the name of all the priests who had resided in the city before 1622, then left after the promulgation of the harsh anti-Catholic edict of 1622, and had since returned. The petition noted how in the past many Catholic notables and citizens had been expelled from the city for political reasons during the war, which had been fought against the 'rigorous edicts of the King of Spain' and for the 'liberty of the lands and of Religion'. Now, however, 'the union [of Utrecht] and [the] religious peace' prescribed that 'everyone in these lands, whether ecclesiastical or secular, should live in a religion by which he thinks he will be saved'. On the basis of this principle, the petition argued that people should be allowed to leave their hometown freely to study at universities abroad, regardless of their choice of subject of study, whether it be theology, law, or medicine. The petition maintained that the 1622 edict should be applied only to those who went to stay in 'enemy lands'. In contrast, 'obedient citizens', including the petitioners,

81 Ibidem, 11 September 1657: 'volgens de unie van Utrecht articule dertien een yeder particulier in sijn religie vrij mach blijven' and 'publicqulijck'.

82 Ibidem, 11 September 1657.

83 Ibidem, 21 August 1658.

84 For the absolute authority of early modern parents over their children in the matter of religious education, see, e.g., Roosenboom, *Ontvoerd of gevlucht?*, pp. 54–58, 133–35.

who had come back to Utrecht after studying abroad should be allowed to live in their 'paternal City'. This request was approved by the magistrates on the condition that the priests observe the anti-Catholic edicts.⁸⁵ On the basis of the freedom of conscience prescribed in the Union, the clerics therefore attempted to justify their right to study abroad and to return to live in their hometown by representing themselves as 'obedient citizens' with long-standing roots in Utrecht.

Prosecuted Catholics and their defenders likewise mobilized a discourse of conscience in cases of suspected illegal assembly. A tailor and citizen named Jan Dirxz, and another citizen named Elisabeth Hubertsdr, were accused of participating in a Catholic gathering in the house of Splinter van Nijenrode {1}. The notary Nicolaes Verduyn [84] collected testimonies on their behalf, all providing them with alibis for the time of the assembly. The petitions of both Dirxz and Hubertsdr, which were probably written by Verduyn [84], maintained in virtually the same language that the sheriff had 'unjustly accused' them and 'denied him [or her] in relation to conscience. [He or she] was oppressed in the matter of religion'. As such, the petitions obviously alluded to the Union of Utrecht, on whose basis they insisted that the city court should reject the sheriff's indictments. Hubertsdr's petition, in particular, argued that the city court should protect her so that she could 'enjoy her citizenship', reminding it of its civic duty as a secular court beyond all confessional prejudice.⁸⁶ The petitions therefore denounced the sheriff's prosecution on the basis of the principle of freedom of conscience guaranteed by the Union of Utrecht, which forbade judicial officers from prosecuting anyone with an alibi solely on religious grounds.

Other prosecuted Catholics defended their practice of the Catholic faith within their private homes without explicitly mentioning either the public/private distinction or the concept of conscience. In these cases, the key notion was that of 'silence', with visibility and audibility again playing an indispensable role. According to a petition which the city court solicitor Petrus van Halen [40] signed and submitted on behalf of the Catholic noblewoman Van Loenersloot, Maria Johanna van Amstel van Mijnden,

85 HUA, VSOKN, 112, 20 September 1630: 'rigereuse placaten vande Coninck van Spaengien', 'liberteyt vande landen, ende vande Religie', 'bij den unie ende religions vrede', 'een yder 'tzij geestelick ofte weerlick in dese landen in sulcke religie soude mogen leven, daer mede hij meenden salich te worden', 'vijanden Landen', 'gehoorsame borgers', and 'vaderlicke Stadt'. Catholic notables and citizens were purged in 1585 and 1586. Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, pp. 166, 175–76.

86 HUA, SAIL, 2244-43, 21, 22 February 1621: 'onrecht beschuldicht', 'ontken[nende] hem conscientie halven, In sake van religie beswaert heeft geworden', and 'genieten hare borgerr[echt]'.

the sheriff claimed that she had hosted a Catholic assembly in her house, which served as the Jesuit clandestine church of St Martinus. Although the indictment for this case cannot be found, the sheriff is said to have argued that he saw approximately thirty people coming out of a gate in Herenstraat near her home. Van Loenersloot's petition, however, maintained that the participants Van Outheusden and Johan Adriaen van Renesse van Baer were in her house 'in complete silence', together with other eight or ten friends, to practise their 'Religion'. It even went so far as to suggest that the sheriff had probably fabricated the part about observing thirty people coming out of the house, and that he had staged a group of people passing through the gate. Van Loenersloot's petition was so belligerent as to cast suspicion on the sheriff's testimony. Another remarkable feature of the petition is the way it draws a boundary line between a 'silent' and a 'non-silent' – that is, a tolerable and intolerable – assembly as lying somewhere between ten and thirty participants {92}.⁸⁷ Likewise, the petition of the noblewoman Maria Francken, which was signed by the provincial court advocate Johan van Deurkant [27], maintained that on the feast day of the Nativity of Mary, she had practised her 'Religion' 'in complete silence' with fifteen or sixteen 'simple, poor people', while the sheriff had insisted that he had found forty people in attendance at her house, whose front door he had smashed into pieces with a hammer. Here the dividing line between what does and does not constitute a 'silent', tolerable assembly was drawn somewhere between fifteen and forty participants {95}.⁸⁸ In comparison to the petition from Van Loenersloot, whose house the sheriff had failed to enter, the argument in Francken's discourse seems less aggressive since the sheriff had indeed witnessed the forbidden gathering inside the house. As such, Francken could not insist that the sheriff had invented the charges. A remarkable feature of these two petitions is that they acknowledged that Catholics had assembled for worship, while most of the other petitions studied avoid specifying the purpose of the gathering. Another significant feature is the distinction they draw between a 'silent' and a 'non-silent' assembly, implicitly appealing to freedom of conscience which, in their interpretation, ought to allow Catholics to conduct the 'silent' practice of their faith.

Yet another interpretation of conscience is presented in an anonymous pamphlet written in 1640 to justify Rovenius and other Catholic priests in the Dutch Republic. It drew a distinction between 'external forum' and

87 HUA, SAI, 2244-125, 5, December 1667: 'in alle stillichey' and 'Godsdienst'.

88 HUA, SAI, 2244-127, 28 November 1668: 'Godsdienst', 'in alle stillichey', and 'slechte geringe luijden'.

‘internal forum’; the former concerned the ‘public rule’ of the politico-judicial authorities, while the latter related solely to ‘conscience’. Regardless of the specific ‘external forum’ in which Catholics lived, they could not neglect their own ‘internal forum’, which required the religious services of Catholic bishops and priests. According to the pamphlet, the Dutch Catholic clergy were not hostile to ‘the Fatherland’ but were only concerned about ‘conscience, honour, and public harmony’. The pastoral activity of such priests was indispensable for the ‘internal forum’ of Catholic consciences, which required at least the ‘private’ exercise of their faith. In its concluding remark, the pamphlet insisted that ‘the moderate [...] exercise of Catholic Religion be privately allowed’, although it is not clear what constituted the ‘private’ and ‘moderate’ exercise of religion. The priests were thus represented as not only serving Catholic consciences and as being politically reliable, but also as contributing positively to public order in the multi-confessional state.⁸⁹

In direct opposition to the Reformed Church’s interpretation of freedom of conscience, Hans Vreeman, likely writing under a pseudonym, argued that freedom of conscience inherently included the freedom of public worship. Vreeman authored a pamphlet to counter the aforementioned remonstrance from Utrecht’s Reformed consistory to the Provincial States, published in 1651, which justified the ‘express exclusion of the Popish religion’ from the Dutch Republic. He insisted that Catholics were legitimately entitled to the ‘public exercise of the Catholic Roman Religion’ under ‘the freedom of conscience’, as guaranteed by many politicians’ letters as well as legal texts in the context of the Dutch Eighty Years’ War, including the Union of Utrecht and Utrecht’s religious peace of 1579. Moreover, Vreeman bolstered his argument by citing contemporary examples, such as Poland under the Warsaw Confederation (1573) and France under the Edict of Nantes (1598), where Protestant dissenters were allowed to practise their faith publicly. He also referenced the case of Switzerland, where both Catholics and Protestants used the same public church in rotation, a practice of church sharing known as *simultaneum*. Furthermore, Vreeman criticized the situation in which Dutch Catholics were prohibited from practising their faith publicly, despite being granted freedom of conscience. In arguing this point, he cited a plea submitted by John Casimir of the Palatinate-Simmern (1543–1592),

89 HUA, OBC, 168 (this pamphlet was transcribed in Broedersen, *Tractatus Historicus*, I, pp. 313–18): ‘forum externum’, ‘forum internum’, ‘publicum regimen’, ‘conscientiam’ ‘Patriam’, ‘conscientiam, & honestatem, concordiamque publicam’, and ‘moderato [...] exercitio Catholicae Religionis privatim concessio’.

a staunchly Calvinist prince, to King Charles IX of France (1550–1574) in 1570. Drawing on the prince's own words, Vreeman claimed that it was as if the king gave 'his subjects life' 'while depriving them of the food to live'. Vreeman concluded his pamphlet by urging the reader to 'Let Freedom [be granted] to our Nation / to exercise the Old Religion [Catholicism] / [and] also to teach [it] in public'.⁹⁰ In his perspective, freedom of the public practice of faith was an indispensable part of freedom of conscience.

The Reformed and Catholics interpreted freedom of conscience in quite different ways. Although the Reformed Church recognized the importance of distinguishing between freedom of conscience and freedom of conventicles, it also insisted that Catholic consciences were bound by priests and *klopjes* to foreign 'public enemies' and to the pope in particular. For the Reformed Church, freedom of conscience for Catholics was no more than the right to embrace an internalized belief individually and without the external and collective practice of the faith. Therefore, even though Catholic consciences demanded a certain public presence in the external form of priests and sacraments, these were not to be permitted them. Catholic worship inside 'private homes' was denounced as 'public' since it was a visual and audible open secret that idolatry was being communally presided over by priests who were controlled by the 'public enemies' there, to the harm of the Reformed consciences. Catholics, in turn, represented the clergy as necessary mediators for their conscience in search of salvation. They argued that Catholic clerics were even beneficial for the public good of the Dutch Republic since they oversaw the Catholic community with a view to maintaining public order in the multi-confessional society. For a number of Catholics, freedom of conscience meant the individual right to freely convert to, remain in, and study Catholicism, with the traditional patriarchal right of the religious education of children remaining intact. Some others insisted that if the sheriff prosecuted Catholics on insufficient evidence, he would be infringing upon their consciences in the matter of religion. Yet other Catholics presented original views on criteria based on visibility and audibility for determining which assemblies should be perceived as 'silent', 'modest', and 'non-public', and thus tolerable.⁹¹ Remarkably, Vreeman went a step further and justified

90 Vreeman, *Aen-merckingen*, pp. 3, 7–10, 16–19: 'expresse exclusive van de Pauselycke ghesindtheydt', 'publycke exercitie van de Catholycke Roomsche Religie', 'de vryheyd der conscientien', 'aen syn ondersaten het leve gaf', 'hen ondertusschen het voedsel om te leven benam', and 'Lieten Vryheyd aen ons Nacy / 't oud Geloove t'exerceren / Oock in 't openbaer te leeren'. I would like to thank Benjamin Kaplan for drawing my attention to this primary source.

91 For comparable findings on such criteria, see also Frijhoff, 'Dimensions', p. 230; Idem, *Embodied Belief*, p. 59; Kaplan, *Divided by Faith*, p. 191; Idem, 'Fictions of Privacy', pp. 1056–57;

the freedom of the public practice of Catholicism, which, according to him, had been guaranteed by the Dutch politico-legal arrangements in the name of the freedom of conscience.

5.2. Two Examples

5.2.1. Grietgen Janssen, an Immigrant Woman

On 15 December 1649, at 11 a.m., the sheriff with his subordinates forced their way into a house on Dorstige Hartsteeg where Grietgen Janssen rented a room and lived together with three other 'separate Families'. She was suspected of hosting a clandestine Mass and harbouring a priest. Although the sheriff may well have intended to raid the Dominican clandestine church of Onze Lieve Vrouw Rozenkrans established around the corner of Dorstige Hartsteeg around 1620, it is not known whether this clandestine church was the same as the house which the sheriff invaded in 1649. Janssen's petition to the sheriff begins by insisting that the following 'facts' should be understood as the 'truth' by both herself and the sheriff:

[I]n this province of Utrecht as well as in the other United Provinces, no one is forced to renounce the Roman Catholic religion in his heart, or to profess anything contrary to the prescriptions of his conscience. Thus, everyone is free to profess his faith, also in its private exercise. [However,] assemblies for the exercise of the aforementioned Roman Catholic religion are forbidden by edicts.⁹²

Based on this alleged consensus, the petition attempted to prove that the sheriff had unjustly investigated and prosecuted this Catholic woman. Its argument, as in the quotation above, seems to resonate with that of the anonymous 1640 pamphlet on the moderate, private exercise of the Catholic faith. Yet the question remains to what extent this tactic of conformity to

Idem, *Reformation*, pp. 194–95; Lenarduzzi, *De belevingswereld*, pp. 143–244; Idem, 'Subcultuur en tegencultuur', pp. 173–284.

92 HUA, SAIL, 2244-100, fasc. 14, n.d. in 1649/50: 'distincte Familien', 'feyten', 'waer', and 'in dese provincie van Utrecht als in andere geconfaedereerde provincie niemant in sijn gemoet geperst wort de Roomsche Catholijcke religie aff te gaen, ofte eenige contrarie tegens uytwijsen van sijn conscientie te belijden. Diensvolgens een yeder in die professie van sijn ghelooft vrije is, oock in sijn exercitie privé. [...] die vergaderingen tot het exercitie van die vers[zegde] Roomsche Catholijcke religie bij placaten verboden sijn'.

a public/private distinction can be generalized, and what factors pushed Janssen to deploy this particular discourse.

Addressing freedom of conscience as the individual right to choose his/her religion and the prohibition on Catholic assemblies, Janssen's petition emphasized that she had meticulously observed the existing border between public and private established by the political authorities. It then argued that, following this existing norm of the public/private distinction, no one could hinder this prosecuted woman, despite her Catholic faith, from coming from Holland to enjoy Utrecht's 'famous good Air' for her own health and probably that of her sick sister as well. By arguing that Holland was more moderate than Utrecht in relation to prosecuting those who exercised the Catholic faith, the petition attempted to persuade the city court that Janssen's motive for moving was not religious in nature, but medical. In addition, it represented her as a good neighbour of 'prominent people of the reformed religion'. Although the tone of her petition seems geared to compliance with the existing rules of the public/private distinction, above all it tried to depict Janssen as a law-abiding immigrant who happened also to be Catholic and lived in good standing with the local Reformed community. The petition thus sought to affirm the social reliability of this migrant.⁹³

The sheriff's raid on Janssen's room was violent and threatening. As soon as the sheriff arrived at the house, he smashed the front door to pieces with a hammer, without even ringing the bell. The chaos was so appalling that Janssen's sick sister 'lost consciousness', and that onlookers flocked to adjacent Nieuwstraat. Judicial officers searched the house from top to bottom, but, so the petition notes, could find neither priest nor altar, 'without which Roman Catholics do not exercise their religion'. Contrary to the sheriff's insistence, the priest in question was at that moment absent from the province of Utrecht, although it is unknown who he was and how Janssen or the writer of the petition obtained this information. The sheriff suspected forbidden spatial practices, assuming that a heavy door in the house was a 'door for retreat'. The petition argued in its turn that the door was a 'communal door' that had been designed as a fire exit, and that it had already been in place, in accordance with building regulations, when Janssen arrived there. The sheriff claimed that he had once seen twenty-five Catholics, including Janssen, leaving an adjacent house owned by Van Arckell, to which Catholics could flee from Janssen's room by climbing over a wall. However, the petition rejected this as a fabrication, noting that the

93 Ibidem, fasc. 14, n.d. in 1649/50: 'bekenden goeden Lucht' and 'eerl[ijcke] luyden van die gereformeerde religie'.

wall was too high for a woman to climb and adding that Van Arckell was in fact Reformed.⁹⁴

Based on these arguments, the petition claimed that malicious accusers had given the sheriff false testimony in order to demean Janssen. Citing prestigious works of medieval commentators on Roman law such as Bartolus de Saxoferrato (1314–1357) and Conradus Lancellottus (1520–1590), the petition argued that no one could act as a witness if he/she was a stakeholder in the matter. Furthermore, it claimed that the alleged accusers should be ‘publicly’, officially punished and banished, referring to the classics written by Tacitus (c. 55–c. 122) and Pliny the Younger (61–112). Here it drew a comparison between the ‘Tyrannical’ Roman Emperor Tiberius Julius Caesar (B.C. 42–A.D. 37), who trusted accusers (according to Tacitus’s *Annales*), and the ‘beloved’ Roman Emperor Marcus Ulpius Nerva Trajanus Augustus (53–117), who criticized the harmful effect of accusers (according to Pliny the Younger’s *Panegyricus*). Judging from the absence of a sentence against Janssen, it seems probable that the city court rejected the charges.⁹⁵

Utrecht’s Catholic community was not monolithic, and the diverse social status of its members should therefore be taken into consideration. Janssen was a social outsider of the civic community. Her lack of social resources in Utrecht defined the rhetorical potential of the petition, which served to confirm her fear of malicious accusers. Moreover, it seems unlikely that an early modern woman would herself have written a petition citing treatises on Roman law or the classics, all of them in Latin. Although the existing copy of the petition does not specify who supported her, as an immigrant woman Janssen may well have asked well-informed defenders to write a petition on her behalf. Besides, judging by the description in the petition and the absence of a sentence against her, the sheriff seems to have raided her residence on the basis of insufficient evidence. Accordingly, in order to win the case, it probably sufficed for her unknown defenders to demonstrate her compliance with the existing norm of the public/private distinction, and

94 *Ibidem*, fasc. 14, n.d. in 1649/50: ‘onmacht’, ‘deur van retraite’, ‘gemeene deur’, and ‘sonder t’welck de Roomsche Catholiken haer exercitie van religie niet en doen’. The 1655 investigation report, however, noted that Catholics lived in the house of an advocate named Henrick van Arckell in Nieuwstraat. HUA, SAII, 616, 29 April 1665 (Hofman, ‘Allerlei’, p. 185). If this advocate is to be identified as Janssen’s neighbour, he may not have been a Reformed believer, as Janssen’s petition insisted, or he may have allowed Catholics to use his house, even though he was Reformed.

95 HUA, SAII, 2244–100, fasc. 14, n.d. in 1649/50: ‘publijckelijck’, ‘Tyran’, and ‘beminden’. Although the petition only mentioned Bartolus’s name, Lancellottus’s work was cited by folio number. Lancellottus, *Tractatus de officio praetoris*, p. 158. I would like to thank Jan Hallebeek helping me with this reference to judicial texts.

to prove the unjust nature of the sheriff's charges. Alternatively, it is also possible that unknown defenders used her, an innocent female immigrant from the more lenient province of Holland, as a test case to nudge the court to grant local Catholics greater freedoms.

5.2.2. Johannes Wachtelaer, a Native Priest

Johannes Wachtelaer mobilized diverse discourses to defend not only himself but also Rovenius, and even attempted to expand the right of Dutch Catholics in the public sphere. It was the elevated social status of this native priest that made it possible for his arguments to be more aggressive than those presented by the unknown defenders of the immigrant woman Janssen. Wachtelaer and his numerous defenders, and in particular the 'special deputy' Johan de With [93], sent a number of different petitions to various recipients, including the city court,⁹⁶ the sheriff,⁹⁷ the provincial court,⁹⁸ and – through the Venetian ambassador – Stadholder Frederick Henry.⁹⁹ The charges against Wachtelaer were almost the same as those against his superior Rovenius: illegal clerical activities and connections with or loyalty to the Habsburg monarchy.¹⁰⁰

The petitions first attempted to dispel these charges. One key word here is conscience. Catholic priests in the Northern Netherlands, so the petitions stated, did not want to establish 'a state within the state or an order within the order'.¹⁰¹ Thus, punishing priests meant constraining the 'conscience' of those who trusted the clergy.¹⁰² The duties of Catholic clerics were related not to 'the government of these lands', but to 'the matter of conscience and religious matters' of Catholics,¹⁰³ which was unconnected to the 'detriment of our fatherland in its politics'.¹⁰⁴ According to a petition signed by De With, Wachtelaer engaged only the 'security of conscience'

96 HUA, MKOKN, 557, 19 September 1639, n.d. (before 10 March 1640).

97 Ibidem, 11, 26 November, 6 December 1639.

98 Ibidem, n.d. (after 24), 28 September, 10, 28 October 1639, n.d. (after 10 March 1640); HUA, SAII, 2244-87, 10 October 1639.

99 HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, 'Memorie', pp. 1-25).

100 For Wachtelaer's indictment, see HUA, OBC, 159; HUA, SAII, 2087; HUA, SAII, 2244-87.

101 HUA, MKOKN, 557, n.d. (after 10 March 1640), 11 September 1645: 'regnam in regno ofte ordinam in ordine'.

102 Ibidem, 11 September 1645.

103 Ibidem, n.d. (after 10 March 1640): 'de policie deser landen' and 'de saecke van conscientie en geestelicke saecken'. For comparable arguments, see also HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, 'Memorie', p. 14).

104 HUA, MKOKN, 557, 11 September 1645: 'ondienst van ons vaderlant int politicq'.

of Catholics, and therefore had nothing to do with the ‘public’ – in other words, political – matters of the states.¹⁰⁵ The petition to the stadholder asserted that Catholic priests were even ready to pray for Protestant political authorities, if indeed they permitted Catholics to enjoy ‘some freedom of the exercise’ of their religion.¹⁰⁶ Here, the petitions attempted to break the alleged connection between high politics and Catholic consciences, portraying ecclesiastics as only served the latter.

At the same time, the services and obligations of the Catholic clergy were understood within the national and international politico-religious contexts of the time. De With’s rebuttal to the indictment emphasized that Rovenius was working for the ‘consciences’ of Catholics, since ‘good Catholic subjects’ would otherwise be forced to take recourse to the nuncio in Brussels or the archbishop of Mechelen in order to receive the sacraments, the practice of border-crossing known as *Auslaufen* in German.¹⁰⁷ Wachtelaer’s petition to Frederick Henry argued that Stadholder Maurice had objected to Rovenius’s ordination as archbishop of Utrecht, but approved his ordination as archbishop of Philippi, and that Rovenius had only acted as apostolic vicar and archbishop of Philippi, not as archbishop of Utrecht. Hence, he conducted religious services under a legitimate title recognized by the prince of Orange.¹⁰⁸ Furthermore, the same petition maintained that it was the obligation of priests, especially those who, like Wachtelaer, had properly registered with the local magistracy, to keep ‘order and discipline’ within the Catholic community. In that context, it referred to an incident in Gooiland, where priests had settled a conflict between Catholics without the intervention of lawyers.¹⁰⁹ Rather, disorders could be caused by ‘foreign’ priests, regulars in particular, who had come ‘secretly’ after the expiration of the Twelve Years’ Truce in 1621. These regular priests only obeyed the orders of their own superiors and not of the apostolic vicar. This situation exposed the ‘native’ priests to the danger of ‘persecution’ or forced them to

105 HUA, Kapittel van Sint Marie te Utrecht, 93, 17 March 1640; HUA, SAIL, 2244-87, 17 March 1640: ‘securitatem conscientiae’ and ‘gemeen’.

106 HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, ‘Memorie’, p. 11): ‘eenighe vrijcheyt der exercitie’.

107 HUA, MKOKN, 557, n.d. (before 10 March 1640): ‘conscientien’ and ‘goede Catholijcke ingesetenen’. On *Auslaufen*, see Kaplan, *Cunegonde’s Kidnapping*, passim; Idem, *Divided by Faith*, pp. 144–71; Idem, *Reformation*, pp. 279–97; Idem, ‘Religious Encounters’.

108 HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, ‘Memorie’, p. 10). According to the same petition, Rovenius may have used the term ‘heretics’ (*ketters*) for the Protestant magistrates, but then in the sense of ‘electors’ (*verkiezers*); nevertheless, this argument seems far-fetched. HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, ‘Memorie’, p. 10).

109 HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, ‘Memorie’, pp. 5–6, 9, 14–15, 21–22): ‘ordre ende discipline’. See also HUA, MKOKN, 557, n.d. (before and after 10 March 1640).

pay heavier 'taxes' (probably a fine or the recognition fee). For this reason, leaders of 'native' priests, such as Rovenius and Wachtelaer, were in contact with the pope to prevent the harmful effects which the 'foreign' priests could bring to 'native' Catholics.¹¹⁰ Wachtelaer's petitions therefore drew a sharp distinction between trustworthy 'native' (secular) priests, including the apostolic vicar and Wachtelaer himself, and unreliable 'foreign' regular priests.

The petitions signed by De With in particular questioned whether the city court had the jurisdiction to judge Wachtelaer, noting that the matter was in dispute between the city and the province. According to these petitions, once the provincial court had accepted the appeal from Wachtelaer and prohibited the city court from proceeding with the trial, the sheriff and the city court were to be denied further jurisdiction.¹¹¹ The provincial court indeed ordered the city court to defer the lawsuit against Wachtelaer, and overturned the city court's decision. In addition, the provincial court fined the sheriff and attempted to summon him before it. The signatories to this resolution included the Catholic councillors Jacob de Wys and Pieter Dierhout.¹¹² The stadholder may have intentionally left his standpoint somewhat less than clear in this case. According to the report from the sheriff dated 19 October 1639, Frederick Henry approved the provincial court's judging of Wachtelaer, but advised the sheriff not to appear in the provincial court.¹¹³ The city court and the sheriff, who enjoyed the city council's support, regarded the provincial court's interference as an infringement upon the 'jurisdictions, privileges, and ancient customs of the City and its Court', which had all been enjoyed since medieval times.¹¹⁴ According to the rebuttal written by De With, the representative of the city of Utrecht in the Provincial States was unwilling to hear the position of the first and second estates in the Provincial States regarding Wachtelaer's petition to the stadholder.¹¹⁵ Wachtelaer's side was certainly aware that the

110 HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, 'Memorie', p. 15); HUA, Kapittel van Sint Marie te Utrecht, 93, 17 March 1640; HUA, MKOKN, 557, n.d. (before and after 10 March 1640); HUA, SAIL, 2244-87, 17 March 1640: 'vreemden', 'secretelick', 'inlandse', 'vervolging', and 'belasting'.

111 HUA, Kapittel Sint Marie te Utrecht, 93, 17, 18 March 1640; HUA, MKOKN, 557, n.d. (after 24 September), 26 November 1639, n.d. (after 10 March 1640); HUA, SAIL, 121-19, 26 March, 10 April, 13 November 1640; HUA, SAIL, 2244-87, 17, 28 March 1640.

112 HUA, MKOKN, 557, 28 September, 10 October 1639; HUA, SAIL, 2244-87, 8, 10 October 1639.

113 *Ibidem*, 19 October 1639.

114 HUA, MKOKN, 557, 28 November 1639; HUA, SAIL, 121-19, 24 October, 15 November 1639; HUA, SAIL, 2244-87, 10, 18, 19 October 1639: 'jurisdictionen, privilegien ende oude observantie vander Stadt ende Gerechte van dien'.

115 HUA, MKOKN, 557, n.d. (before 10 March 1640).

city and the province were fighting over jurisdiction, and that the official institutions at the provincial level, whose membership included Catholics, could be more sympathetic to Catholics than those at the civic level.

Moreover, the petitions also emphasized Wachtelaer's elevated social status and public reputation in Utrecht. Many insisted that he was 'an old citizen' and a member of one of the 'leading families' which had long been living in Utrecht and owned rich properties and a 'public house' there, probably meaning the house belonging to the collegiate chapter of St Marie, which had functioned as the clandestine church of St Gertrudis. For that reason, so it implied, he was deserving of respect. Wachtelaer was widely reputed to be 'always honest and pious', and to respect the politico-judicial authorities.¹¹⁶ And indeed, in 1622 he had duly registered with the magistrates in compliance with the edict <26> (Appendix 2). In his petition to the stadholder, Wachtelaer represented himself as a prominent figure who was an 'obliging and beloved person, not only among the Catholics, but also among the Reformed and all the others'. The same petition also stressed that his cousin Cornelis van Werckhoven worked in the Council of State as a representative of the province of Utrecht.¹¹⁷ In addition, he was a legitimate canon of St Marie. Among his colleagues in the chapter, it was known that Wachtelaer's tenure of the canonry was 'tolerated' despite his Catholic faith and he was trusted to observe the edicts.¹¹⁸ As such, the petitions tactically constructed an image of Wachtelaer as a law-abiding citizen, although on at least two occasions during the 1620s he had already appeared in court to pay a fine {2} {9}.¹¹⁹

Furthermore, Wachtelaer's petitions defended not only himself and Rovenius, but also all Dutch Catholics as a group, by underlining their elevated social status, political trustworthiness, remarkable contributions to the common good, and honourable piety, all of which were historically embedded in the Northern Netherlands. Numerous Catholics, the petition to the stadholder maintained, had been living in the United Provinces since

116 HUA, MKOKN, 557, 19 September 1639, n.d. (before and after 10 March 1640); HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, 'Memorie', pp. 20, 21–22): 'een oudt borger', 'voornaemste geslachten', 'domicilium publicum', and 'altijdt eerlick en vroom'.

117 HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, 'Memorie', p. 20): 'gedienstich ende bemint persoon, niet alleen bij de Catholycquen maer oock bij de Gereformeerden ende alle anderen'.

118 HUA, Kapittel van Sint Marie te Utrecht, 93, 17 March 1640; HUA, MKOKN, 557, n.d. (before and after 10 March 1640); HUA, SAI, 2244–87, 17 March 1640: 'getolereert'.

119 Wachtelaer once appeared in court because of an illegal assembly in 1621 {2}, and on another occasion in 1626 for unknown suspicions {9} (Appendix 1). In the latter case, he and another secular priest, Jacob Bool, paid a fine of f. 150, which they may have done on behalf of others.

olden times, and were 'the principal people, of both noble and bourgeois families'. Though excluded from public political offices, they were ready to obey the 'governments or magistracy' of the Reformed faith. Such politically trustworthy, native Catholics believed that the government would not force them to leave the Northern Netherlands on religious grounds.¹²⁰ Recalling the ongoing Eighty Years' War, the petition noted that Catholics and their ancestors 'have driven the Spanish out of the land', arguing that 'the war, which we undertake, is a war not of religion, but of the state'.¹²¹ This argument is remarkable when compared to that which the Reformed synod of Utrecht devised in 1655/56. While reluctantly recognizing that Catholics had taken up arms against the Habsburg monarch, the synod insisted that 'Papists' were not fighting 'for the freedom of Religion' since that freedom had not been denied them by the king of Spain. They were just fighting 'for the freedom of the Privileges and the Laws of the land, which they enjoy alongside others'.¹²² Here, the synod cast doubt on the political credibility of Catholics, problematizing the absence of religious motivations for the war against the Habsburg monarchy. Wachtelaer, in contrast, emphasized Catholics' contribution to the 'war of state', arguing that they too were indispensable members of the Dutch Republic alongside the Reformed and others. He tried to decouple confessional affiliation from the common good of the multi-confessional Republic, which Dutch Catholics had also been advancing. His petition to the stadholder also argued that Dutch Catholics followed the 'example of the early Christians', noting that the Catholic faith had existed in the Northern Netherlands since the Christianization of the pagans there by St Willibrord. The Reformed were just as heavily indebted as Catholics to these common origins of Christianity in the Low Countries. Netherlandish Catholicism had been a faith without which 'the Reformed would have had nothing to reform', and 'we all together, without difference of religion, would still have been heathens or idolaters to this very day'.¹²³ Given

120 HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, 'Memorie', p. 2): 'de principaelsten, soo adelijcke als burgerlicke familien' and 'overicheden of magistraet'. For a comparable argument, see also HUA, MKOKN, 557, n.d. (before 10 March 1640).

121 HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, 'Memorie', pp. 5, 7): 'de Spainjaerden uyt den lande gedreven hebben' and 'het oorloch, t'welck wij voeren, is een oorloch niet van religie, maer van staet'.

122 HUA, VBB, 139, probably in 1655 or 1656: 'voorde vryheyt van Religie' and 'voorde vryheyt vande Privilegien ende Rechten des lants, ende die genieten sij soo wel als eenige andere'.

123 HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, 'Memorie', pp. 2, 7): 'd'exempelen van de oude christenen', 'de gereformeerde geen subject en souden hebben gehad om yet te reformeren', and 'wij alle te samen sonder onderscheyt van religie tot op den huydighen dach noch heydenen ende affgodendieners souden geweest zijn'.

that other Dutch Catholics, such as the priest and poet Joannes Stalpert van der Wiele (1579–1630), reminded his co-religionists in a confessionalized way that the father of Christianity had been a Roman Catholic,¹²⁴ it is remarkable that Wachtelaer, in his attempt to beg the stadholder for mercy, tactically represented St Willibrord as a shared ancestor for Reformed and Catholic Christians in the Northern Netherlands alike.

Wachtelaer's petitions sought to preserve the rights of Dutch Catholics on the basis of these positive representations, tacitly but undoubtedly alluding to the Union of Utrecht. In his petition to the stadholder, he argued that 'in these lands, ever since the change of the public religion, it has been kept as a maxim and declared by various edicts and public decisions that every individual should be allowed to live freely in accordance with his conscience' and should not be coerced to practice the Reformed religion 'which is now exercised publicly [openly and officially] in the church'.¹²⁵ The rebuttal of the indictment, written by De With, even reminded the Provincial States of their secular and supra-confessional obligation to protect their subjects' right to freedom of conscience,¹²⁶ confirming at the same time that Catholics had enjoyed connivance.¹²⁷ Wachtelaer's petition to the stadholder in particular observed that 'thanks to the reasonable connivance' long exercised by Reformed magistrates, Catholics had come to believe that they had in practice been allowed to gather in their houses for the practice of the faith.¹²⁸ As such, he suggested that Catholics' trust in the political practice of connivance, which had been exercised in accordance with the freedom of conscience, was now being undermined or betrayed by the 'persecution' they were experiencing since the raids on Rovenius and on Wachtelaer himself.

Finally, like Vreeman, Wachtelaer even boldly demanded more rights for Catholics in the public sphere than, for instance, the anonymous pamphlet or Janssen's petition did; the latter two merely insisted on the freedom of the 'moderate' and 'private' exercise of the Catholic faith. In his petition to the stadholder, Wachtelaer maintained that 'it is not possible for the Catholics to live under the freedom of conscience without priests' to administer the

124 Parker, *Faith on the Margins*, p. 56.

125 HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, 'Memorie', p. 3): 'in dese landen altijt, zedert de veranderinge der publicque religie, voor een maxime gehouden ende oock bij verscheyden placaten ende publicque acten verclaert is, dat een yeder vrijelick mochte leven na zijn consciencie' and 'die nu, om in de kercke opentlick geexerceert te worden'.

126 HUA, MKOKN, 557, n.d. (before 10 March 1640): 'uyt de redelicke oochluycckinge'.

127 Ibidem, n.d. (after 10 March 1640).

128 HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, 'Memorie', pp. 4–5).

sacraments to them.¹²⁹ As shown above, in the argument of the petitions from Wachtelaer's side, the clergy engaged solely in pastoral activities that pertained to conscience. Wachtelaer here proposed a completely different view of the concept of 'conscience' than that advocated by the Reformed Church. The latter believed that Catholic consciences were religiously and politically ruled by the pope through priests and *klopjes*. Accordingly, Catholics were to content themselves with the 'toleration and connivance' to live in freedom of conscience, which meant living without priests, practices of faith, and external and collective expressions of Catholicism.¹³⁰ On the other hand, Wachtelaer was not satisfied with the existing situation of 'toleration and connivance', which he found instead to be a 'shame'. Referring somewhat vaguely to a remonstrance from the Huguenots to the French king, Wachtelaer insisted that it was as if people were telling Catholics that they 'would be allowed to live, but not to eat'.¹³¹ According to the rebuttal written by De With, 'no religion can exist without supervision or direction', through which the clergy could keep 'order and discipline' in the religious community.¹³² The petitions insisted that other dissenters in the Dutch Republic, such as the Anabaptists, Remonstrants, Lutherans, and Jews, were living under much more desirable circumstances. Jews in particular were allowed to perform 'many more ceremonies publicly [openly with official permission]' than Catholics.¹³³ The public church had depicted Catholics as a political threat by referring to the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre in France in 1572, the Catholic revolt in Ireland in 1641, and other similar events in contemporary European contexts.¹³⁴ In his petition to the stadholder, Wachtelaer, in contrast, pointed to several contemporary

129 HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, 'Memorie', p. 3): 'voor de Catholycken niet mogelijk sijnde, in vrijicheyt van conscientie te mogen leven, sonder van priesters'.

130 HUA, VBB, 139, probably in 1655 or 1656: 'tolerantie ende conniventien'. For a comparable argument delivered by the Reformed consistory of Utrecht, see HUA, KR, 5, 10, 17 December 1649; HUA, SAIL, 121-23, 17, 19 December 1649.

131 HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, 'Memorie', pp. 3-4): 'infamie' and 'souden moghen leven, maer niet eeten'. While Wachtelaer did not explicitly mention the source of the French Huguenots' argument, it is highly likely that he was referencing the same plea submitted by Casimir to King Charles IX in 1570, which was cited by Vreeman. I am grateful to Benjamin Kaplan for bringing this connection to my attention. For further insights into the prevalence of this metaphor in dissenter discourses within the Dutch Republic, see a forthcoming article co-authored by Kaplan and myself.

132 HUA, MKOKN, 557, n.d. (before 10 March 1640): 'geen religie bestaan kan sonder hooft opsicht off directie'.

133 Ibidem, n.d. (after 10 March 1640); HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, 'Memorie', pp. 6-7): 'veel meer ceremonien opentlick'.

134 E.g., HUA, VBB, 139, probably in 1655 or 1656.

Catholic states as ideal examples of religious coexistence. Referring to France under the Edict of Nantes and Poland under the Warsaw Confederation, his petition claimed that non-Catholic dissenters in these Catholic lands could 'live freely without any brand of dishonour'. They could conduct the 'free and public exercise of their religion' without being told that they had 'only freedom of conscience without exercise of religion'. Following these examples, Wachtelaer maintained that 'all impartial people' judged that Dutch Catholics should be enjoying similar freedoms, that is, legitimate rights for honourable citizens of early modern Europe, including not only freedom of conscience but also freedom of the public practice of their faith.¹³⁵

Janssen's petition showed her obedient conformity to the existing norm of the public/private distinction which the politico-religious authorities had already established and strategically tried to control. Its interpretation of freedom of conscience justified the withdrawal of Catholics from the public sphere occupied by the Reformed. However, her rhetorical tactics for survival should not be generalized, and we must reflect instead on the conditions under which certain discourses were mobilized. One such condition was the petitioners' social status. By contrast with this immigrant woman, Wachtelaer in his petitions drew upon his own and many co-religionists' elevated social status in order to defend himself as well as his colleagues, and even attempted to extend the rights of Dutch Catholics by shifting the boundary of the 'public'. According to Wachtelaer, 'conscience' was a-political and purely religious in nature, meaning that it required the ministrations of priests. Hence, freedom of conscience necessitated a certain public presence of the clergy, who could contribute to the maintenance of public order in the multi-confessional society. On the basis of this interpretation, Wachtelaer insisted that Catholics should also enjoy the right to maintain priests and also to practise their faith publicly and communally.

5.3. Conclusion

The repressed and tolerated Catholics tactically mobilized diverse discourses of self-representation in the public sphere of Utrecht for the sake of their survival. Through their petitions, they gave a supra-confessional reinterpretation of the responsibilities of the politico-judicial authorities, who

¹³⁵ HUA, OBC, 159, December 1639 (Rogge, 'Memorie', pp. 4, 7): 'vrijelick woonen sonder eenighe note van infamie', 'vrije ende oentlicke exercitie van hare religie', 'alleen [...] vrijheyt van conscientie buyten exercitie van religie', and 'alle onpartijdighe'.

were to prevent the unjust persecution of Catholic Utrechters and endorse their legitimate rights in the multi-confessional *corpus christianum*. Both continuity from medieval traditions and adjustment to the new notion of freedom of conscience shaped the rhetorical tactics for Catholic survival.

A number of Catholics simply denied the charges against them or intentionally misled the authorities, but others could not hold their own when they were accused and subjected to interrogation. The prosecuted Catholics and their defenders were well acquainted with canon law, Roman law, and the medieval legal tradition of the immunity of seigneurs and canons. They sometimes attempted to exploit the lingering antagonism between city and province over jurisdiction in the hope of support from the provincial court, which had shown itself to be more sympathetic to them. Relying on their own or their families' elevated social status, repressed and tolerated Catholics rejected negative representations of them by the Reformed, and affirmed their positive self-representation, stressing their historical ties with Utrecht, their politico-social reliability, and their politico-economic contributions to the city and the state. In doing so, they redefined the common good of the multi-religious society, in which Catholics had also played their part. Moreover, Utrecht's Catholics effectively utilized freedom of conscience in their discourses, defining this new notion differently than the Reformed did. According to the Reformed Church, freedom of conscience allowed Catholics to confess the Catholic faith individually and internally without collective, external practices of the faith supervised by the clergy. Even if the consciences of Catholics demanded a certain public presence of their faith in the external form of priests and sacraments, so the Reformed Church argued, this was to be categorically denied them since Catholic consciences were politically polluted by the pope through the mediation of priests and *klopjes*. Catholic worship inside private homes was denounced as 'public', since the idolatry collectively conducted there was openly known to others and presided over by priests who were controlled by foreign 'public enemies' or the official enemy of the Protestant Republic. On the other hand, although freedom of conscience was originally conceptualized in the Union of Utrecht in response to the imposition of the Catholic Inquisition upon Protestants by the Habsburg monarchy, Utrecht's Catholics now appropriated this concept for their own survival under Protestant rule. They argued that it was impossible for them to embrace the Catholic faith under freedom of conscience without priests and communal practices of their faith, which required external expressions of their material religion. Some Catholics defined freedom of conscience as the individual freedom to remain in or study the Catholic faith, immune from coerced conversion

or oppression on religious grounds. For others, conscience was a-political in nature, requiring the ministrations of the clergy, who contributed to the maintenance of public order in the multi-religious society. Yet there were also those, like Vreeman, who argued that the freedom to publicly practise Catholicism was an integral component of freedom of conscience.

Obedient conformity to the existing norm of the public/private distinction as it was displayed in Janssen's petition was, therefore, just one of the various rhetorical tactics deployed by Catholic Utrechters. In contrast with this immigrant woman, Vicar General Wachtelaer in his discourses could exploit his elevated social status. His broad or Catholic conception of conscience, which demanded public and external resources for salvation, departed from the narrow or Reformed confessionalized conception, according to which Catholic consciences had been politically polluted by the 'public enemy'. It also differs from the modern or liberal concept, which promotes privacy as a fundamental human right of autonomous individuals. Although the notion of freedom of conscience was itself an early modern product, the concepts of conscience endorsed by both Reformed and Catholics in Utrecht continued to entail traditional medieval ideas, and they cannot always be equated with the private, but on the contrary often related to the public. For them, conscience was not an internalized or privatized belief, but something that was politico-religiously ruled by public enemies (the Reformed confessionalized interpretation), or something that demanded a certain public presence of religion in the external form of ecclesiastics and communal rituals (the Catholic interpretation). Thus, it was not the private but the public that the Reformed and the Catholics in post-Reformation Utrecht managed to define in their discourses.

Deploying these discourses of self-representation in the public sphere, in which they combined traditional thoughts with new ideas, Utrecht's Catholics managed to defy persecution and win toleration. They tactically delimited the public in its rhetorical dimension and defined its boundary on their own initiative, continuing to embrace medieval concepts and newly appropriating the notion of freedom of conscience. In their discourses, they asserted their own definitions of the physical public sphere on the basis of their original visual and audial criteria, while asserting their legitimacy in the abstract public sphere by foregrounding their or their ancestors' contribution to public order and the common good of the shared *corpus christianum*, claiming their rightful honour and reinterpreting the duty of the politico-judicial authorities so as to allow Catholic Utrechters to enjoy greater religious liberties. By doing so, they resisted the Reformed monopoly of the physical and abstract public sphere. Seeking a way to live as devout

Catholics and respected citizens or residents under the Reformed regime, Catholic Utrechters contributed to the construction of the religiously diverse society by communicating and exchanging discourses of self-representation with the Reformed.

Abbreviations

<i>A.A.U.</i>	<i>Archief voor de geschiedenis van het aartsbisdom Utrecht.</i> Utrecht, 1875–1957.
<i>J.O.U.</i>	<i>Jaarboek Oud-Utrecht.</i>
<i>M.O.U.</i>	<i>Maandblad Oud-Utrecht.</i>
HUA	Het Utrechts Archief, Utrecht
BA	Bewaarde archieven
HVU	Hof van Utrecht
KR	Nederlandse Hervormde gemeente Utrecht, kerkeraad
MKOKN	Metropolitaan Kapittel van de Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland
OBC	Apostolische vicarissen van de Hollandse Zending
SA	Stadsarchief
VBB	Verzameling van Buchel-Booth
VSOKN	Verzamelde stukken van de oud-katholieke kerk in Nederland

Bibliography

Archival Primary Sources

- HUA, *Familie Des Tombes* (26)
 354. Genealogy of the family Merode
- HUA, *Verzamelde stukken van de oud-katholieke kerk in Nederland* [VSOKN] (88)
 112. Petitions from Catholic priests who had lived in the city since before 1622 to the Utrecht magistracy, 1630
- HUA, *Kapittel van Sint Marie te Utrecht* (221)
 90. Documents concerning the trials against Huybert de Roy and Gijsbert Junius, 1657–1658
 93. Documents concerning the trial against Johannes Wachtelaer, 1640
- HUA, *Hof van Utrecht* [HVU] (239-1)
 99-8. Sentences in criminal cases in the provincial court of Utrecht, 1638–1732

- HUA, Verzameling van Buchel-Booth [VBB] (355)
 139. Notes on the Reformed Church, especially in the province of Utrecht, by Cornelis Booth, 1579–1656, including a petition from the provincial synod of Utrecht to the Provincial States of Utrecht, 1655 or 1656
- HUA, Stadsarchief II [SAII] (702)
 121-4 ~ 121-5, 121-8 ~ 121-30. Minutes of the city council, 1599/1600–1612/13 and 1619/20–1686/87
 616. Reports on forbidden Catholic assemblies with lists of Catholic priests, 1664–1681
 2087. Documents concerning the trial against Johannes Wachtelaer, 1639
 2088. Documents concerning the trial against Philippus Rovenius, 1640
 2095. Documents concerning the trial against Willem van Merode, 1652
 2236-2 ~ 2236-5. *Crimineele sententiën* of the city court of Utrecht, 1618–1657 and 1670–1684
 2244-42 ~ 2244-140. *Crimineele stukken* of the city court of Utrecht, 1620–1679
- HUA, Bewaarde archieven I [BAI] (708)
 692. 'Foundation Book' (*Fundatie-boeck*) of the almshouses of Maria van Pallaes, 1665–1708
- HUA, Bewaarde archieven II [BAII] (709)
 1604. Lists of the trustees of St Bartholomew Hospice, c. 1651 and 1653
- HUA, Nederlandse Hervormde gemeente Utrecht, kerkeraad [KR] (746)
 3 ~ 10. Minutes of the Reformed consistory, August 1618–July 1690
- HUA, Apostolische vicarissen van de Hollandse Zending [OBC] (1003)
 159. Documents concerning the trials against Philippus Rovenius and Johannes Wachtelaer, 1639–1640
 168. Anonymous pamphlet on the free exercise of Catholic worship in the Dutch Republic, 1640
- HUA, Metropolitaan Kapittel van de Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland [MKOKN] (1835)
 557. Documents concerning the trial against Johannes Wachtelaer, 1639–1640 and 1645

Published Primary Sources

- Broedersen, Nicolaas. *Tractatus Historicus de rebus metropolitanae ecclesiae Ultrajectinae*, 4 vols. Delft, 1729–Utrecht, 1763.
- Doedes, J. I., ed. 'Intendit en sententie tegen Philippus Rovenius, zich noemende aartsbisschop van Utrecht'. *Jaarboeken voor wetenschappelijke theologie* 11 (1853), pp. 276–300.
- Hofman, J. H., ed. 'Allerlei, betreffende de stad Utrecht'. *A.A.U.* 5 (1878), pp. 180–238.
- Klaveren, G. van, ed. 'Vrijwoningen in 1687'. *M.O.U.* (1940), pp. 26–28.

- Knuif, Wilhelmus, and Johannes de Jong, eds. 'Relaas van Godefridus van Mookk'. *A.A.U.* 50 (1925), pp. 387–401.
- Lancellottus, Conradus. *Tractatus de officio praetoris tam in causis civilibus quam criminalibus, praetorium et curiale breviarium inscriptus*. Cologne, 1578.
- Lommel, Anthonius van, ed. 'Relatio seu descriptio status religionis Catholicae in Hollandia etc...'. *A.A.U.* 10 (1882), pp. 95–240.
- Rogge, H. C., ed. 'Memorie, in December 1639 door J. Wtenbogaert ingezonden aan de omgeving van Zijne Hoogheid Prins Frederik Hendrik'. *A.A.U.* 2 (1875), pp. 1–25.
- Vreeman, Hans. *Aen-merckingen op de Remonstrantie der E. Kercken-raedt van Utrecht aen de Ed. Mog. Heeren Staten 's Landts van Utrecht over-gelevert in 't jaer 1651*. Rotterdam, 1651.

Secondary Literature

- Ackermans, Gian. *Herders en huurlingen. Bisschoppen en priesters in de Republiek (1663–1705)*. Amsterdam, 2003.
- Bogaers, Llewellyn. 'Politieke verwickelingen'. In *Geschiedenis van provincie Utrecht*. 3 vols. edited by C. Dekker, Ph. Maarschalkerweerd, and J. M. van Winter, II. Utrecht, 1997, pp. 47–60.
- Deursen, Arie Th. van. 'Tussen eenheid en zelfstandigheid. De toepassing van de Unie als fundamentele wet'. In *De Unie van Utrecht. Wording en werking van een verband en een verbondsacte*, edited by Simon Groenveld and H. L. Ph. Leeuwenberg. The Hague, 1979, pp. 136–54.
- Duker, Arnoldus. *Gisbertus Voetius*, 3 vols. Leiden, 1897–1914.
- Faber, Dirk. 'Politiek en bestuur in een soeverein gewest (1581–1674)'. In *Geschiedenis van provincie Utrecht*. 3 vols. edited by C. Dekker, Ph. Maarschalkerweerd, and J. M. van Winter, II. Utrecht, 1997, pp. 213–34.
- 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.
- Forclaz, Bertrand. *Catholiques au défi de la Réforme. La coexistence confessionnelle à Utrecht au XVIIe siècle*. Paris, 2014.
- 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.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Neglected Networks: Director Willem Kieft (1602–1647) and His Dutch Relatives'. In *Revisiting New Netherland: Perspectives on Early Dutch America*, edited by Joyce D. Goodfriend. Leiden, 2005, pp. 147–204.

- Gelderen, Martin van. 'Arminian Trouble: Calvinist Debates on Freedom'. In *Freedom and the Construction of Europe*, 2 vols. edited by Quentin Skinner and Martin van Gelderen. Cambridge, 2013, pp. 21–37.
- Geraerts, Jaap. 'Dutch Test Acts: Oaths, Office Holding, and the Catholic Nobility in the Province of Utrecht, c. 1580–1700'. *Virtus. Journal of Nobility Studies* 20 (2013), pp. 61–83.
- 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.
- Geraerts, Jaap. 'Competing Sacred Spaces in the Dutch Republic: Confessional Integration and Segregation'. *European History Quarterly* 51, no. 1 (2021), pp. 7–44.
- Hilhorst, G. 'Het kerspel Schalkwijk'. *A.A.U.* 12 (1884), pp. 1–104.
- Hofman, J. H. 'Het Kerspel buiten de Wittevrouwenpoort te Utrecht bij zijn ontkiemen'. *A.A.U.* 26 (1900), pp. 91–96.
- Hofman, J. H. 'De Witte Vrouwen te Utrecht'. *A.A.U.* 32 (1907), pp. 117–230.
- Jong, O. J. de. 'Unie en religie'. In *De Unie van Utrecht. Wording en werking van een verband en een verbondsacte*, edited by Simon Groenveld and H. L. Ph. Leeuwenberg. The Hague, 1979, pp. 155–81.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J. *Calvinists and Libertines: Confession and Community in Utrecht, 1578–1620*. Oxford, 1995.
- 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. '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., 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.
- 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.

- Lieburg, Fred van. *De Nadere Reformatie in Utrecht ten tijde van Voetius. Sporen in de gereformeerde kerkeradsacta*. Rotterdam, 1989.
- Milo, J. M., and E. G. D. van Dongen. *Hof van Utrecht. Hoofdlijnen van het procederen in civiele zaken*. Hilversum, 2018.
- Offringa, Gerianne, and Warner Hidden. *Fundatie van Vrouwe Maria van Pallaes*. Utrecht, 1980.
- Offringa, Gerianne, and Warner Hidden. 'De fundatie van vrouwe Maria van Pallaes, door Hendrick Bloemaert, 1657'. *J.O.U.* (1983), pp. 14–17.
- Parker, Charles H. *Faith on the Margins: Catholics and Catholicism in the Dutch Golden Age*. Cambridge, MA and London, 2008.
- Pettegree, Andrew. 'The Politics of Toleration in the Free Netherlands, 1572–1620'. In *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation*, edited by Ole Peter Grell and Robert W. Scribner. Cambridge, 1996, pp. 182–98.
- Pollmann, Judith. *Religious Choice in the Dutch Republic: The Reformation of Arnoldus Buchelius (1565–1641)*. Manchester, 1999.
- Roethlisberger, Marcel, and Marten Jan Bok. *Abraham Bloemaert and His Sons: Paintings and Prints*, 2 vols. Doornspijk, 1993.
- Rogier, Lodewijk J. *Geschiedenis van het katholicisme in Noord-Nederland in de 16e en de 17e eeuw*, 3 vols. Amsterdam, 1945–1947.
- Roosenboom, Henk. *Ontvoerd of gevlucht? Religieuze spanningen in Brabant en de zaak Sophia Alberts (1700–1710)*. Hilversum, 2016.
- Schaik, A. H. M. van. 'Een nieuwe heer en een andere leer'. 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. 191–249.
- Sorabji, Richard. *Moral Conscience through the Ages: Fifth Century BCE to the Present*. Oxford, 2014.
- Ven, Adrianus J. van de. *Over den oorsprong van het Aartsbisschoppelijke Kapittel van Utrecht der Oude-Bisschoppelijke clerezij*. Utrecht, 1923.

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 goedt-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 Godvruchticheydt, 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–xxx1.

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 *kloppjes*, 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 Willemk

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 Roobroek, '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, nocte eenige andere diergelijcke 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. Cathalina 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. *Bedeavaartplaatsen 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.

Appendices

Appendix 1. Details of Legal Proceedings against Catholics in Utrecht, 1620-1672

	Legal record year (latest)	Incident date	Incident place	Number of Catholics noted	Names of Catholics noted (underlined for representative defendants)	
{1}	1621	17-Feb-1621 (Saturday)	house of Splinter van Nijenrode (empty, still under construction)	1 man	<u>Splinter van Nijenrode (?)</u>	
				1 man	Jan Dirxz	
				1 woman	Elisabeth Hubertsdr	
{2}	1621	-	-	2 men	<u>Nicolaes van Hijndersteijn</u> ; Johannes Wachtelaer	
{3}	1622	5-May-1622 (Ascension Day)	Abraham Dole Monastery	more than 200 people	-	
{4}	1622	9-Oct-1622 (Wednesday)	house of Ernst van Reede on Janskerkhof	10 men + 10 women	<u>Ernst van Reede van Drakestein (?)</u> ; Veron Corbesier; Aert Clemens; Jan Jans; Barbara G.; Gabries van Lingen; Beatrix Willems; Anneken van Door; Henricus Cesarius; Claesgen Jan van Walickendr; Jan Joris (living on Lauwerstraat); Bastiaen Weynaertsz; Rodloff Rijken; Hillichgen; Weyntgen Pelgrimsdr; Fijthgen Reijers; Maria Bruijnen; Maria van Suylen; Adriaen Jansz van Gorp; Claes Banderbynsz; Adriaen Jansz (living on Lauwerstraat)	
{5}	1624	22-Jan-1624 (Thursday)	Arkel Monastery	13 or 14 people	<u>Paulus (Pauwels) van der Rijst</u>	
{6}	1624	7-Feb-1624, at midnight	near the city hall	1 man	Gerrit van Raedt (alias Spaenschen Gerrit)	

	Profession / social status	Charges	Sentences	Defenders	Sources
	citizen	Catholic assembly (hosting)	unknown	-	HUA, SAll, 2244-43, n. d. in 1621
	tailor, citizen	Catholic assembly (attendance)	unknown	[18] [19] [52] [77] [84]	HUA, SAll, 2244-43, 21, 22-Feb-1621
	citizen	Catholic assembly (attendance)	unknown	[19] [47] [65] [77] [84]	HUA, SAll, 2244-43, 21-Feb-1621
	vicar general, canon of St Marie (native priest) (Johannes Wachtelaer)	Catholic assembly (hosting?)	fine (f. 1,800)	-	HUA, SAll, 2236-2, 19-Apr-1621
	mater (unknown); conventual (unknown)	Catholic assembly (attendance, practice of faith)	unknown	-	HUA, SAll, 2244-46, fasc. 11, 31-May-1622
	marshal of Overkwartier (Ernst van Reede van Drakestein); tailor (Jan Jans); wife of Sijmon Jans (Beatricx Willems); daughter of Jan Walicken (Claesgen Jan van Walickendr); wife of Jans Meerlingen (Hillichgen); wife of Jan Jans (Fijthgen Reijers); wife of Sert van Rhenen (Maria Bruijnen); widow of Beernt van Maesen (Maria van Suylen)	Catholic assembly (hosting... Ernst van Reede van Drakestein; attendance... others)	fine (f. 600= 24 x f. 25)	-	HUA, SAll, 2236-2, 23-Oct-1622
	Dominican (from Antwerp, non-native) (Paulus van der Rijst); beguine (unknown); conventual (unknown)	Catholic assembly (attendance), clerical activities	fine (f. 1,025, after negotiation) + legal costs	[46]	A.A.U. 8, 239-245; HUA, SAll, 2236-2, 5, 26-Mar-1624; HUA, SAll, 2244-53, fasc. 8, 22, 24-Jan, 20, 26-Feb, 5-Mar, 1-Apr-1624
	-	loyalty to Spain	banishment from the province	-	HUA, SAll, 2236-2, 13-Feb, 9-Mar-1624; SAll, 2244-53, fasc. 6, 13-Feb-1624

	Legal record year (latest)	Incident date	Incident place	Number of Catholics noted	Names of Catholics noted (underlined for representative defendants)	
{7}	1624	-	-	1 woman	<u>Helena van Sijll</u> (Zijl)	
{8}	1624	21-Sep-1624 (Tuesday, Feast of St Matthew the Evangelist)	house of Jasper Heyndericxz and Steven Ghijsbertsz near Bezembrug	11 men + 36 women	<u>Jasper Heyndricxz</u> ; Steven Ghijsbertsz; (perhaps Gerrit Cornelisz van) Broeckhuysen	
{9}	1626	-	-	2 men	Johannes Wachtelaer; Jacob Bool	
{10}	1629	-	-	1 woman	Anna van Rijnevelt	
{11}	1631	-	-	1 man	Rombout van Medenblick	
{12}	1635	22,25-Dec-1634	St Job Hospice outside the Catharijne gate	2 men + 3 women	<u>Pauwels van Geresteyn</u> (van der Straet); Weyntgen	
{13}	1636	-	-	1 man	Vincent Andriesz	
{14}	1636	15-Aug-1636 (Feast of the Assumption of St Mary)	Cecilia Convent	c. 200 people	-	
{15}	1638	-	-	1 woman	Maria Ruysch	

	Profession / social status	Charges	Sentences	Defenders	Sources
	wife of provincial court advocate Christiaen Bruyninge, sister of the Jesuit Otto van Zijl from 's-Hertogenbosch	loyalty to Spain	legal costs; banishment from the city	-	HUA, SAIL, 2236-2, 29-May-1624; HUA, SAIL, 2244-54, fasc. 20, 29-May-1624
	tax farmer of brandy (Jasper Heyndricxz); Jasper's brother-in-law (Steven Gijsbertsz)	Catholic assembly (hosting...Jasper Heyndericx and Steven Ghijsbertsz; attendance...others)	fine (f. 900, after negotiation)	[11] [39]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-2, 25-Sep, 12-Oct-1624; HUA, SAIL, 2244-55, 25-Sep, 1, 10-Oct-1624
	vicar general, canon of St Marie (native priest) (Johannes Wachtelaer); secular priest (Jacob Bool)	unknown	fine (f. 150) + legal costs	-	HUA, SAIL, 2236-2, 15-Dec-1626
	noblewoman, widow of the nobleman Johan de Huyter	Catholic assembly (hosting, practice of faith)	fine (f. 1,100) + legal costs (f. 25)	-	HUA, SAIL, 2236-2, 14-Jan-1629
	secular priest (native)	clerical activities	banishment from the city	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-15, 6, 12-Feb, 21-Mar-1631
	secular priest (native) (Pauwels van Geresteyn); <i>klopje</i> (one of the three women)	Catholic assembly (attendance, practice of faith), clerical activities	unknown	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-17, 29-Dec-1634; HUA, SAIL, 2244-80, 30-Jan-1635
	Dominican (non-native)	clerical activities	fine (f. 600) + legal costs	[37] [78]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-3, 10, 19-Nov-1636, 3-Dec-1636
	-	Catholic assembly (attendance)	fine (f. 600)	[21] [78]	HUA, SAIL, 121-17, 15-Aug-1636, 12-Sep-1636; HUA, SAIL, 2236-3, 31-Dec-1636
	patrician	illegal transfer of property (inheritance from Maria Ruysch's deceased brother Henrick)	confiscation of Henrick's property, forfeiture of the right of inheritance	-	HUA, SAIL, 2244-83, 25-Oct-1638

	Legal record year (latest)	Incident date	Incident place	Number of Catholics noted	Names of Catholics noted (underlined for representative defendants)	
{16}	1640	-	-	1 man	Diderick Muylert (Mulart)	
{17}	1640	15-Aug-1638 (Feast of the Assumption of St Mary)	house of Gerard van der Steen on Janskerkhof	14 men (including 5 boys) + 12 women	<u>Gerard van der Steen</u> ; Lucia van Esch; Everard van der Schuer	
{18}	1640	-	house of Hendrica van Duivenvoorde on Plompetorengracht	1 man	Philippus Rovenius	
{19}	1640	-	house of Johannes Wachtelaer (secular clandestine church of St Gertrudis in Mariahoek)	1 man	Johannes Wachtelaer	
{20}	1640	-	house of Hendrica van Duivenvoorde on Plompetorengracht	1 man	Govert van Moock	

	Profession / social status	Charges	Sentences	Defenders	Sources
	canon of the Dom (lay), member of a noble family in Lingen	aiding Philippus Rovenius, illegal transfer of property (unlawful possession of prebend through Rovenius)	unknown	[20] [26] [61]	HUA, OBC, 153; HUA, SAll, 2244-84, 21-Nov, 14-Dec-1639, 4, 10-Jan-1640
	canon of St Jan (secular) Gerard van der Steen); his mother (Lucia van Nesch); advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht (Everard van der Schuer); adult men with humble jobs (including handmaid, carpenter, furniture-maker, confectioner's servant); widows and boys	Catholic assembly (hosting...Gerard van der Steen; attendance... others)	fine (f. 550) + legal costs (f. 75)	[45]	HUA, SAll, 2236-3, 22, 25-Feb-1640; HUA, SAll, 2244-83, 6-Oct-1638, HUA, SAll, 2244-88, 2-Nov-1638
	apostolic vicar (non-native)	clerical activities, treason, illegal transfer of property	banishment from the Dutch Republic, confiscation of property	-	HUA, OBC, 159; HUA, SAll, 2088; HUA, SAll, 2244-86, passim
	vicar general, canon of St Marie (native priest)	clerical activities, treason, aiding and abetting Philippus Rovenius, illegal transfer of property	banishment from the city, suspension from the canonry, fine (f. 6,000) + legal costs	[10] [34] [45] [48] [50] [59] [60] [78] [86] [87] [93]	HUA, OBC, 159; HUA, MKOKN, 557; HUA, SAll, 2087; HUA, SAll, 2244-87, passim
	secretary to the apostolic vicar (non-native)	clerical activities, treason, aiding and abetting Philippus Rovenius, illegal transfer of property	banishment from the Dutch Republic, fine (f. 2,500), confiscation of the property	[21]	HUA, MKOKN, 557, n.d., passim; HUA, SAll, 2236-3, 8-May-1640; HUA, SAll, 2244-84, passim; HUA, SAll, 2244-86, passim

	Legal record year (latest)	Incident date	Incident place	Number of Catholics noted	Names of Catholics noted (underlined for representative defendants)	
{21}	1640		house of Hendrica van Duivenvoorde on Plompetorengracht	1 man	<u>Bernardus van Moock</u>	
{22}	1640	-	-	1 man	Gerrit Pelt	
{23}	1641	24-Apr-1641 (Easter Sunday)	house of Eelgis Gerritsz outside the Wittevrouwen gate	36 people	<u>Eelgis Gerritsz</u> ; Cornelis Willemsz; Willemgem Aerts; Herman van Honthorst	
{24}	1641	-	-	1 man	Cornelis van der Hout	
{25}	1641	-	-	1 man	Herman van Honthorst	
{26}	1641	-	-	1 man	Joannes Boshouwer	

	Profession / social status	Charges	Sentences	Defenders	Sources
	secular priest (non-native)	clerical activities, treason, aiding and abetting Philippus Rovenius, illegal transfer of property	unknown	[21]	HUA, MKOKN, 557, 5-Nov-1639; HUA, SALL, 2244-84, passim
	secular priest (native)	clerical activities, treason, aiding and abetting Philippus Rovenius, illegal transfer of property	banishment from the Dutch Republic, confiscation of the property, legal costs	[21] [45] [64]	HUA, SALL, 2086; HUA, SALL, 2244-86, passim
	gardener (Eelgis Gerritsz); wheelwright (Cornelis Willemsz); secular priest (native) (Herman van Honthorst)	Catholic assembly (hosting...Eelgis Gerritsz; attendance...others)	fine	-	HUA, SALL, 121-19, 5, 26-Jun-1641, 5, 10, 16-Aug-1641; HUA, SALL, 2236-4, 5, 7-May-1641 (see also A.A.U. 26, 94-96; A.A.U. 32, 147-149)
	priest	clerical activities	bail (f. 750) + legal costs	[42]	HUA, SALL, 2236-4, 21-Jul-1641
	secular priest (native)	clerical activities	banishment from the city	-	HUA, SALL, 121-19, 5, 26-Jun-1641, 5, 10, 16-Aug-1641; HUA, SALL, 2236-4, 11-Aug-1641 (see also A.A.U. 32, 147-149)
	immigrant (from Germany), shoemaker	insulting the Reformed religion	unknown	-	HUA, SALL, 2244-89, 15-Oct-1641

	Legal record year (latest)	Incident date	Incident place	Number of Catholics noted	Names of Catholics noted (underlined for representative defendants)	
{27}	1642	23-Jul-1642 (Saturday)	house of Anna Catharina Mom near Lollestraat etc. (secular clandestine church of St Nicolaas Achter de Wal)	1 woman	<u>Anna Catharina Mom</u>	
{28}	1642	-	-	1 man	<u>Jan Jansz van Beda</u>	
{29}	1643	-	house of Melchior van Schoonhoven	1 man	<u>Melchior van Schoonhoven</u>	
{30}	1643	-	house of Michiel Jacobsz	1 man + 4 women	<u>Michiel Jacobsz</u>	
{31}	1643	-	house of De Gouda	1 woman	<u>De Gouda</u>	
{32}	1644	-	house of Van Borculo	1 woman	<u>Van Borculo</u>	
{33}	1644	2-Feb-1644 (Candlemas)	house of Frederik van Deurn	1 man + some	<u>Frederik van Deurn</u>	
{34}	1644	-	house of Emeretiana van Gessel	1 woman	<u>Emeretiana van Gessel</u>	
{35}	1644	19-Jun-1644 (Wednesday), at 23:30	house of Adriaen Ram van Schalkwijk (secular clandestine church of Maria Minor Achter Clarenburg)	2 men	<u>Adriaen Ram van Schalkwijk; Anthoni(s) Pelt</u>	
{36}	1645	-	house of Gerard de Wael van Vronesteyn	1 man	<u>Gerard de Wael van Vronesteyn</u>	
{37}	1646	-	house of Adriana van Gent	1 woman	<u>Adriana van Gent</u>	
{38}	1646	-	-	1 man	<u>Leonard Joosten Brems</u>	

	Profession / social status	Charges	Sentences	Defenders	Sources
	daughter of the nobleman Jacob Mom, widow of Assuerus (Zweder) van Brakel van Blikkenburg	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 1,000) + legal costs (f. 60)	[79]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 23-Sep-1642; HUA, SAIL, 2244-90, 23-Sep-1642
	Dominican (non-native)	clerical activities	unknown	-	HUA, SAIL, 2244-90, 29, 30-Apr-1642, 20, 27-May-1642
	-	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 650) + legal costs (f. 50)	[74] [99]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 13-Mar-1643
	-	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 300 = f. 200 + 4 x f. 25)	-	HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 6-Jul-1643
	noblewoman	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 725) + legal costs (f. 50)	[12] [28] [34] [53]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 19, 22-Aug-1643
	noblewoman	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 475) + legal costs (f. 50)	[80] [81]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 11, 12-Jan-1644
	-	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 650) + legal costs (f. 100)	-	HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 3, 5-Feb-1644
	caretaker of house of the nobleman Amerongen	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 600) + legal costs (f. 50)	[7] [53] [83] [92] [94]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 27, 29-Mar-1644
	nobleman (Adriaen Ram); physician (Anthoni(s) Pelt)	Catholic assembly (hosting...Adriaen Ram van Schalkwijk; attendance... Anthoni(s) Pelt)	fine (f. 750) + legal costs (f. 50)	[53]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 24, 27-Jun-1644
	nobleman	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 330) + legal costs (f. 50)	[16]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 20, 21-Jan-1645
	widow of Johan Sem	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 700) + legal costs (f. 60)	[73] [98]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 12-Jun-1646
	priest (non-native)	clerical activities	fine (f. 800) + legal costs (f. 140)	[36] [37] [58]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 20-Aug-1646

	Legal record year (latest)	Incident date	Incident place	Number of Catholics noted	Names of Catholics noted (underlined for representative defendants)	
{39}	1641	22-Mar-1646 (Easter Sunday)	(ware)house of Wouter Woutersz in the suburb of Lageweide	c. 200~300 'anonymous and indigent' people	<u>Wouter Woutersz</u>	
{40}	1647	-	house of Ursula Gerrits	1 woman	Ursula Gerrits	
{41}	1647	-	house of Peter Jansz van Loenen in the suburb of Bethlem	1 man	Peter Jansz van Loenen	
{42}	1648	-	house of Anna Catharina Mom near Lollestraat etc. (secular clandestine church of St Nicolaas Achter de Wal)	1 woman	Anna Catharina Mom	
{43}	1648	15-May-1648 (Monday)	house of Adriaen Willemsz outside the Tollesteeg gate	1 woman + 1 man	<u>Maychgen Peters; Peter Willemsz</u>	
{44}	1648	-	house of Mechtelt de Lange	1 woman	Mechtelt (or Mechtildis) de Lange	
{45}	1649	15-Apr-1649 (Sunday), in the morning	near the Dom	1 man	Jean Morier	
{46}	1649	-	-	1 man + 1 woman	<u>Jan Claesz; his wife</u>	
{47}	1649	-	house of Van Gessel	1 man	Van Gessel (perhaps Peter van Gessel)	

	Profession / social status	Charges	Sentences	Defenders	Sources
	farmer	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 4,800, after negotiation)	[66]	HUA, SAll, 2244-95, 10-Jul-1646
	-	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 650) + legal costs (f. 60)	[37]	HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 14-Jun-1647
	gardener	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 800) + legal costs (f. 100)	[64]	HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 4, 6-Aug-1647
	daughter of Jacob Mom, widow of Assuerus (Zweder) van Brakel van Blikkenburg	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 600) + legal costs (f. 60)	[53] [99]	HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 15-Apr-1648
	widow of Adriaen Willemsz (Maychgen Peters); their son (Peter Willemsz)	insulting the Reformed religion, sedition	banishment from the city	-	HUA, KR, 5, 9, 15-May-1648; HUA, SAll, 121-22, 19-May-1648; HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 20, 25-May-1648
	widow of Anthonis (or Anthonius Cornelisz) van Schaick	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 860) + legal costs (f. 60)	[53] [95] [98]	HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 9-Jun-1648
	garrison soldier	'public violence' against a 'betrayed', sedition and insurrection	public exposure on scaffold, banishment from the city for 10 years	-	HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 21-Apr-1649
	millier (Jan Claesz)	religious education (resisting school superintendents)	fine (12 <i>stuivers</i>) + legal costs (18 <i>stuivers</i>)	-	HUA, SAll, 338, 8, 10-May-1649
	patrician, wine merchant	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 675) + legal costs (f. 60)	-	HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 27-Jun-1649

	Legal record year (latest)	Incident date	Incident place	Number of Catholics noted	Names of Catholics noted (underlined for representative defendants)	
{48}	1649	2-Sep-1649 (Sunday)	stall or house of Puyt (Poeyt) near St Hieronymus School on Kromme Nieuwegracht	14~16 people	<u>Puyt (Poeyt)</u>	
{49}	1650	-	house of Anthonis van Schaick	1 man	Anthonis van Schaick	
{50}	1650	23-Jun-1650 (Sunday)	house of Aert Willemsz Peerboom in the suburb of Abstede (secular clandestine church of St Martinus?)	1 man	Aert Willemsz Peerboom (Pereboom)	
{51}	1650	-	house of Mailjert Schepen	1 man	Mailjert Schepen	
{52}	1650	-	house of Johan van Vianen van Jaersfelt	1 man	Johan van Vianen van Jaersfelt	
{53}	1650	15-Dec-1649 (Saturday), at 11:00	house of Grietgen Janssen on Dorstige Hartsteeg (where the Dominican clandestine church of Onze Lieve Vrouw Rozenkrans stood)	25 people	<u>Grietgen Janssen</u>	
{54}	1651	-	house of Peter van Gessel	1 man	Peter van Gessel	
{55}	1651	-	house of Claesgen van der Tiell	1 woman	Claesgen van der Tiell	

	Profession / social status	Charges	Sentences	Defenders	Sources
	nobleman	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 200, after negotiation) + legal costs (f. 50)	[53] [99]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 8, 11-Sep-1649; HUA, SAIL, 2244-98, 3, 8, 11-Sep-1649
	baker (HUA, NOT, U036a004, 79, 16-Aug-1649)	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 500) + legal costs (f. 60)	-	HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 9-Feb-1650
	-	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 490) + legal costs (f. 60)	[72] [99]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 29-Jun-1650
	carpenter	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 800) + legal costs (f. 60)	[53] [99]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 17, 20-Aug-1650
	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht (HUA, NOT, U028a010, 47, 22 May 1644)	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 550) + legal costs (f. 60)	[53] [99]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 19-Nov-1650
	immigrant (from Holland), lessee	Catholic assembly (hosting)	unknown	-	HUA, SAIL, 2244-100, fasc. 14, n. d.
	patrician, wine merchant (HUA, NOT, U018a002, 208, 8-Oct-1644)	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 850) + legal costs (f. 60)	[58]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 11-Jan-1651
	widow of Carell de Hooch	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 460) + legal costs (f. 60)	[22] [99]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 21-Jan-1651

	Legal record year (latest)	Incident date	Incident place	Number of Catholics noted	Names of Catholics noted (underlined for representative defendants)	
{56}	1651	1-Jun-1651 (Sunday)	castle of Adriaen Ram in Schalkwijk	1 man	<u>Peter Lamberts van Schalckwijck</u>	
{57}	1651	2-Nov-1651 (All Souls' Day)	house of Ursula and Maria Godaerts	2 women	<u>Ursula Godaerts</u> ; <u>Maria Godaerts</u>	
{58}	1651	-	house of Agatha Dierhout on Nieuwgracht (Jesuit clandestine church of St Catharijne)	1 woman	Agatha Dierhout (Derout)	
{59}	1651	4-Jun-1651 (same day as Adriaen Ram was brought to the city jail), early afternoon or evening	Wittevrouwen Convent	1 man	Henrick Pieck van Wolffsweert	
{60}	1652	-	house of Van der Cloes	1 woman	Van der Cloes	
{61}	1652	-	house of a sick woman in the suburb of Weerd	1 man	Wilhelmus van Wenckum	
{62}	1652	10-Aug-1652 (Tuesday)	house of Willem van der Burch on Nieuwegracht	50 people	<u>Willem van der Burch</u> ; <u>Jordaen Puyt (Poeyt)</u>	
{63}	1652	26-Nov-1652 (Friday)	house of Willem van der Burch on Nieuwegracht	2 men	<u>Willem van der Burch</u> ; <u>Jordaen Puyt (Poeyt)</u>	

	Profession / social status	Charges	Sentences	Defenders	Sources
	citizen	Catholic assembly (attendance), 'public violence' against the authorities, sedition and insurrection	public exposure on scaffold, banishment from the city and the province for 10 years	-	HUA, SALL, 2236-4, 8-Aug-1651 (see also A.A.U. 12, 53-73; HUA, HVU, 99-8, f.117v-127v; HUA, SALL, 121-24, 2, 3, 20, 21-Jun, 8, 10, 14-Jul, 6-Sep, 10-Dec-1651)
	-	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 825) + legal costs (f. 60)	[43] [99]	HUA, SALL, 2236-4, 7-Nov-1651
	noblewoman	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 600) + legal costs (f. 60)	[7] [50] [68]	HUA, SALL, 2236-4, 12-Dec-1651
	nobleman	loyalty to Spain	unknown	-	HUA, SALL, 2244-103, 8, 9, 10-Jun-1651
	noblewoman	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 275) + legal costs (f. 60)	[99]	HUA, SALL, 2236-4, 24-Sep-1652
	patrician	practice of faith	fine (f. 100) + legal costs	-	HUA, SALL, 2236-4, 13-Oct-1652
	noblemen	Catholic assembly (hosting...Willem van der Burch; attendance... Jordaen Puyt (Poeyt))	fine (f. 700, after negotiation)	-	HUA, SALL, 2244-104, 10-Sep-1652
	noblemen	Catholic assembly (hosting...Willem van der Burch; attendance... Jordaen Puyt (Poeyt))	fine (f. 625) + legal costs (f. 60)	-	HUA, SALL, 2236-4, 4-Dec-1652

	Legal record year (latest)	Incident date	Incident place	Number of Catholics noted	Names of Catholics noted (underlined for representative defendants)	
{64}	1653	-	-	1 man	Willem van Merode	
{65}	1653	-	house of Cornelis Fransz in the suburb of Nieuwe Weerd	1 man	Cornelis Fransz	
{66}	1653	-	-	1 man	Robert Redinge	
{67}	1653	-	house of Everhard van Doyenburch	1 man	Everhard van Doyenburch	
{68}	1653	-	house of Aaltgen Schijven	1 woman	Aaltgen Schijven	
{69}	1654	-	-	2 women	<u>Willem van Beckbergen's wife</u> and daughter	
{70}	1655	23-May-1655 (Trinity Sunday)	house of Anna Catharina Mom near Lollestraat etc. (secular clandestine church of St Nicolaas Achter de Wal)	1 woman	Anna Catharina Mom	
{71}	1655	-	house of Peter Bolle	1 man	Peter Bolle	
{72}	1655	-	house of Anna Catharina Mom near Lollestraat etc. (secular clandestine church of St Nicolaas Achter de Wal)	1 woman	Anna Catharina Mom	

	Profession / social status	Charges	Sentences	Defenders	Sources
	canon of the Dom (lay)	violation of oath, illegal transfer of canonry	rejection of transfer of canonry from defendant to Dirck Schaepe	[14] [35] [71] [76] [88] [100]	HUA, SAll, 2095
	-	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 700) + legal costs (f. 100)	[34]	HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 6-Jan-1653
	priest (probably)	clerical activities	banishment from the province	-	HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 5-Mar-1653
	-	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 840) + legal costs (f. 60)	[2] [6] [56] [85]	HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 13-May-1653
	-	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 600) + legal costs (f. 60)	[69] [97]	HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 3-Sep-1653
	Willem van Beckbergen's wife and daughter	religious education	child (nephew) was to be left to the Reformed	[4]	HUA, SAll, 2899
	daughter of Jacob Mom, widow of Assuerus (Zweder) van Brakel van Blikkenburg	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 850) + legal costs (f. 60)	[4] [13] [31]	HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 11, 12-Jun-1655
	-	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 700) + legal costs (f. 50)	[58] [70]	HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 21-Jul-1655
	daughter of Jacob Mom, widow of Assuerus (Zweder) van Brakel van Blikkenburg	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 940) + legal costs (f. 60)	[79] [99]	HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 11-Aug-1655

	Legal record year (latest)	Incident date	Incident place	Number of Catholics noted	Names of Catholics noted (underlined for representative defendants)	
{73}	1655	-	-	1 man	<u>Anthonis de Rhode (Rode)</u>	
{74}	1656	-	-	2 women	<u>Maria van Merode; Agnes van Merode</u>	
{75}	1656	31-Jul-1655 (Tuesday)	house of Agatha Dierhout on Nieuwgracht (Jesuit clandestine church of St Catharijne)	1 woman	Agatha Dierhout (Derout)	
{76}	1656	1-Jun-1656 (Trinity Sunday)	house of Geertruyd van der Heyden in Achter Clarenburg (rented from Gijsbert van Duren)	1 woman	Geertruyd van der Heyden	
{77}	1656	-	house of Margareta Jans	1 woman	Margareta Jans	
{78}	1656	-	house of Aletta (Aeltgen, Alidt) van Schendel in Achter Clarenburg	1 woman	Aletta (Aeltgen, Alidt) van Schendel	
{79}	1658	-	-	1 man	Huybert de Roy	
{80}	1658	-	-	1 man	Gijsbert Junius	
{81}	1660	21-Dec-1659 (Wednesday)	house of René van Renesse van Wilp	1 man	René van Renesse van Wilp	

	Profession / social status	Charges	Sentences	Defenders	Sources
	priest (non-native)	clerical activities	fine (f. 625) + legal costs (f. 100)	[9] [13] [24] [31]	HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 24-Sep-1655
	noblewomen	violation of oath, illegal transfer of canonry	fine (f. 2,000) + legal costs (f. 500)	[25] [100]	HUA, SAll, 121-26, 28-Jan-1656; HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 24, 25-Jan-1656
	noblewoman	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 500) + legal costs (f. 100)	-	HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 14-Mar-1656
	lessee	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 500) + legal costs (f. 60)	[28] [98]	HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 6, 8-Aug-1656
	-	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 700) + legal costs (f. 60)	-	HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 15, 16-Aug-1656
	noblewoman (HUA, NOT, U077a004, 98, 1-May-1678)	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 540) + legal costs (f. 60)	[8] [63] [100]	HUA, SAll, 2236-4, 3, 4-Dec-1656
	canon of St Marie (lay)	violation of oath	unknown	[100]	HUA, Kapittel van Sint Marie, 90
	canon of St Marie (lay)	violation of oath	court rejected the charges	[100]	HUA, Kapittel van Sint Marie, 90
	nobleman	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 640) + legal costs (f. 60)	[82]	HUA, SAll, 2244-114, 28-Dec- 1659, 5, 6-Jan-1660

	Legal record year (latest)	Incident date	Incident place	Number of Catholics noted	Names of Catholics noted (underlined for representative defendants)	
{82}	1663	31-May-1662 (Saturday)	house of Laurentia Duck	1 man + 1 woman	<u>Cornelis Duck</u> ; <u>Laurentia Duck</u>	
{83}	1664	5-Jun-1664 (Sunday, Feast of Corpus Christi)	house of Petertgen op Bedlehem	'uncountable' people (more than 100)	<u>Petertgen op Bedlehem</u> (Petertje Gerrits?); Jan Jansz Dons	
{84}	1664	17-Jul-1664 (Sunday)	house of Maria van Sanen on Nieuwegracht?	more than 100 people (40 or 50 people were seen by the sheriff)	<u>Maria van Sanen</u> ; Cornelis Claesz van Duynkerken; unknown Wijckerslooth	
{85}	1664	-	house of Maria van Coddenoort on Servaashek (secular clandestine church of St Servaas Onder de Linden?)	1 woman	Maria van Coddenoort	
{86}	1665	14-May-1665 (Pentecost)	house of Maria van Sanen on Nieuwegracht?	few people	<u>Maria van Sanen</u>	
{87}	1655	27-Aug-1665 (Sunday)	house of Thomas de Knijff (Cnijff) near St Marie Church	'uncountable' people (more than 100)	<u>Thomas de Knijff</u> (Cnijff)	
{88}	1666	26-Apr-1666	house of Van Loenersloot (Maria Johanna van Amstel van Mijnden) on Nieuwegracht (Jesuit clandestine church of St Martinus)	1 man	Aloysius Ballast	

Profession / social status	Charges	Sentences	Defenders	Sources
secular priest (native) (Cornelis Duck); his sister (Laurentia Duck)	clerical activities	French wine and Rhenish wine, after negotiation (originally pecuniary fine) + legal costs (f.10)	[22] [33]	HUA, SAIL, 2244-116, 5, 6, 10, 13, 18-Jun-1662, 5-Feb, 15, 21-Mar-1663
fuse maker in the suburb of Weerd (Jan Jansz Dons: HUA, NOT, U070a003, 8, 17-Jan-1669)	Catholic assembly (hosting...Petertgen op Belehem; attendance... Jan Jansz Dons)	fine (f. 265, after negotiation) + legal costs (f. 60)	[29]	HUA, SAIL, 2244-119, 28-Jun, 1-Jul, 20, 23-Aug-1664
noblewoman (Maria van Sanen)	Catholic assembly (hosting...Maria van Sanen; attendance... others)	fine (f. 350, after negotiation) + legal costs (f. 60)	[22] [32] [80]	HUA, SAIL, 2244-119, 15, 17, 22, 24, 27-Sep-1664
-	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 380) + legal costs (f. 60)	[5] [17] [44] [49] [75]	HUA, SAIL, 2244-119, 25-Nov, 17, 22, 23-Dec-1664
noblewoman	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 375) + legal costs (f. 60)	[22] [51]	HUA, SAIL, 2244-122, 9, 11-Aug, 5, 12-Sep-1665
-	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 400, after negotiation) + legal costs (f. 60)	[22] [80] [99]	HUA, SAIL, 2244-122, 27, 29-Sep, 2, 6, 9, 13, 20, 21, 27-Oct-1665
Jesuit (non-native)	clerical activities	bail (f. 1,200)	[3] [15]	[Forclaz 2014, 122-123] [Hoeck 1940, 73]

	Legal record year (latest)	Incident date	Incident place	Number of Catholics noted	Names of Catholics noted (underlined for representative defendants)	
{89}	1666	21-Sep-1665 (Thursday)	house of Gerard Moliaert van Zirckzee on Oudemunsterkerkhof	50~60 people	<u>Gerard Moliaert van Zirckzee</u>	
{90}	1667	16-May-1667 (Thursday)	house of Marichge (Maria) Jacobs on Oudegracht (formerly owned by the late Anthoni(s) Pelt)	more than 100 people	<u>Marichge (Maria) Jacobs</u>	
{91}	1667	8-Sep-1667 (Sunday)	house of Van Loenersloot (Maria Johanna van Amstel van Mijnden) on Nieuwegracht (Jesuit clandestine church of St Martinus)	more than 100 people	<u>Van Loenersloot (Maria Johanna van Amstel van Mijnden)</u>	
{92}	1667	28-Oct-1667 (Monday)	house of Van Loenersloot (Maria Johanna van Amstel van Mijnden) on Nieuwegracht (Jesuit clandestine church of St Martinus)	around 30 people	<u>Van Loenresloot (Maria Johanna van Amstel van Mijnden)</u> ; Van Oudheusden; Johan Adriaen van Renesse van Baer	
{93}	1668	1-Nov-1667 (All Saints' Day)	house of Aletta (Aeltgen, Alidt) van Schendel in Achter Clarenburg	more than 200 people	<u>Aletta (Aeltgen, Alidt) van Schendel</u>	
{94}	1668	22-May-1668 (Whit Tuesday)	house of Agatha Dierhout on Nieuwgracht (Jesuit clandestine church of St Catharijne)	between 50 and 60 people	<u>Agatha Dierhout (Derout)</u>	

	Profession / social status	Charges	Sentences	Defenders	Sources
	nobleman	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 275, after negotiation) + legal costs (f. 60)	[22] [38] [67]	HUA, SAll, 2244-122, 7, 8, 17-Nov, 22, 23-Dec-1665, 6-Jan-1666
	-	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 575, after negotiation) + legal costs (f. 60)	[33] [41] [49]	HUA, SAll, 2244-125, 19, 20, 21, 24, 28-Jun, 15, 16-Aug-1667
	noblewoman (Van Loenersloot (Maria Johanna van Amstel van Mijnden))	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 540, after negotiation) + legal costs (f. 60)	[62] [96]	HUA, SAll, 2244-125, 21, 29-Sep, 11-Oct, 1, 5-Nov-1667
	noblewoman (Van Loenersloot (Maria Johanna van Amstel van Mijnden)); nobleman (Johan Adriaen van Renesse van Baer)	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 260) + legal costs (f. 60)	[40] [51] [54]	HUA, SAll, 2244-125, 5, 19, 27, 28-Dec-1667
	noblewoman (HUA, NOT, U077a004, 98, 1-May-1678)	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 350, after negotiation) + legal costs (f. 60)	[62] [63] [89]	HUA, SAll, 2244-126, 30-Jan, 13, 25, 27, 28-Feb-1668
	noblewoman	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 380, after negotiation) + legal costs (f. 60)	[15] [38] [67]	HUA, SAll, 2244-127, 1, 2, 3, 25, 26, 29-Sep-1668

	Legal record year (latest)	Incident date	Incident place	Number of Catholics noted	Names of Catholics noted (underlined for representative defendants)	
{95}	1668	8-Sep-1668 (Nativity of Mary)	house of Maria Francken near Dorstige Hartsteeg (where the Dominican clandestine church of Onze Lieve Vrouw Rozenkrans stood)	30 people (according to the sheriff), 15 or 16 people (according to the defendant's side)	<u>Maria Francken</u>	
{96}	1670	30-Nov-1669 (Tuesday)	house of Thomas de Knijff (Cnijff) near St Marie Church	1 man	Thomas de Knijff (Cnijff)	
{97}	1670	-	-	1 man	Dirck Bastiaens	
{98}	1670	8-May-1670 (Ascension Day), in the afternoon	house of Anna van Heymenbergh	more than 100 people	<u>Anna van Heymenbergh (Heymenberch)</u>	
{99}	1670	-	house of Petertje Gerrits in the suburb of Bethlem	1 woman	Petertje Gerrits (Petertgen op Bedlehem?)	
{100}	1671	18-Sep-1670 (Sunday)	house of Marichge (Maria) Jacobs	1 woman	Marichge (Maria) Jacobs	
{101}	1671	30-Oct-1670 (Sunday)	house of Therese de Fie	1 woman	Therese de Fie	

	Profession / social status	Charges	Sentences	Defenders	Sources
	noblewoman	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 250, after negotiation) + legal costs (f. 60)	[27] [55] [63]	HUA, SAIL, 2244-127, 18, 19, 28-Nov, 5, 7, 8-Dec-1668
	-	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 50) + legal costs (f. 60)	[80]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-5, 10-Feb-1670
	-	practice of faith	fine (f. 200) + legal costs (f. 200 and 5 <i>stuivers</i>)	-	HUA, SAIL, 2236-5, 19-Apr-1670
	widow of Gysbert van Wijckerslooth (HUA, NOT, U100a001, 47, 1-Sep-1678)	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 400, after negotiation) + legal costs (f. 60)	[22] [27] [80]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-5, 7-Jul-1670; HUA, SAIL, 2244-129, 2, 7, 12-Jun-1670; HUA, SAIL, 2244-129, 2, 7, 15, 17-Jun-1670
	-	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 275) + legal costs (f. 60)	[30] [33]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-5, 13-Oct-1670
	-	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (100 silver <i>dukaten</i>) + legal costs (f. 60)	[1] [41] [90]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-5, 16-Jan-1671; HUA, SAIL, 2244-130, 6-Dec-1670, 16-Jan-1671
	noblewoman	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 265) + legal costs (f. 60)	[57] [63]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-5, 28-Jan-1671; HUA, SAIL, 2244-130, 26, 28-Jan-1671

	Legal record year (latest)	Incident date	Incident place	Number of Catholics noted	Names of Catholics noted (underlined for representative defendants)	
{102}	1671	25-Dec-1670 (Christmas)	house of Cornelia van de Kemp on Servaashek (secular clandestine church of St Servaas Onder de Linden?)	1 woman	<u>Cornelia van de Kemp</u>	
{103}	1671	-	house of Aletta (Aeltgen, Alidt) van Schendel in Achter Clarenburg	1 woman	<u>Aletta (Aeltgen, Alidt) van Schendel</u>	
{104}	1671	20-Aug-1671 (Sunday)	house of Thomas de Knijff (Cnijff) near St Marie Church	1 man	<u>Thomas de Knijff (Cnijff)</u>	
{105}	1672	10-Dec-1671 (Sunday)	house of Agatha Dierhout on Nieuwgracht (Jesuit clandestine church of St Catharijne)	1 woman	<u>Agatha Dierhout (Derout)</u>	

	Profession / social status	Charges	Sentences	Defenders	Sources
	niece of the defenders	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 200) + legal costs (f. 60)	[23] [44] [67]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-5, 20-May-1671; HUA, SAIL, 2244-130, 24-Mar, 18, 20-May-1671
	noblewoman (HUA, NOT, U077a004, 98, 1-May-1678)	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 280) + legal costs (f. 60)	[63] [89]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-5, 16-Aug-1671; HUA, SAIL, 2244-131, 12, 16-Aug-1671
	-	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 260) + legal costs (f. 60)	[91] [99]	SAIL, 2236-5, 25-Oct-1671; HUA, SAIL, 2244-131, 21, 25-Oct-1671
	noblewoman	Catholic assembly (hosting)	fine (f. 300) + legal costs (f. 60)	[38] [67]	HUA, SAIL, 2236-5, 14-Feb-1672

Appendix 2. Recognized priests in Utrecht, 1620-1672

	Permit year	Name	Position in the Catholic Church	Length of permit	
<1>	1622	Jan Alexander Axilius	secular priest	indefinite	
<2>	1622	Joost de Voocht van Rijnveld	priest and canon of St Jan in Utrecht	indefinite	
<3>	1622	Jacob Bool	secular priest	indefinite	
<4>	1622	Anthonis Vossius	priest	indefinite	
<5>	1622	Gerrit Stevensz Pelt	secular priest	indefinite	
<6>	1622	Hendrick van der Steen	secular priest	indefinite	
<7>	1622	Jan Jansz van Becum	priest	indefinite	
<8>	1622	Herman Strick	priest	indefinite	
<9>	1622	Jan van Hom	priest	indefinite	
<10>	1622	Jacobus de Gouda	Jesuit and canon of St Pieter in Utrecht	indefinite	
<11>	1622	Bruno Foeck	priest and canon of St Marie in Utrecht	indefinite	
<12>	1622	Niclaes van der Burch	priest	indefinite	
<13>	1622	Folphert Claesz	priest	indefinite	
<14>	1622	Willem Acrijnsz	priest	indefinite	
<15>	1622	Evert van Alphen	priest	indefinite	
<16>	1622	Pauwels van Geresteyn	secular priest	indefinite	
<17>	1622	Henrick van Sijll	priest	indefinite	
<18>	1622	Thomas Otto Haeffacker	priest	indefinite	
<19>	1622	Jan Willemsz van Abcauw	priest	indefinite	
<20>	1622	Adriaen van Oirschot	priest	indefinite	
<21>	1622	Johan van Cuyck	priest	indefinite	
<22>	1622	Joost van Haeften	priest	indefinite	

	Permit year	Name	Position in the Catholic Church	Length of permit	
<23>	1622	Dirck van der Houve	priest	indefinite	
<24>	1622	Lubbert Cornelisz Cuyman	priest	indefinite	
<25>	1622	Peter Cammaker	priest	indefinite	
<26>	1622	Johannes Wachtelaer	vicar general and canon of St Marie in Utrecht	indefinite	
<27>	1622	Dirck de With	priest	indefinite	
<28>	1622	Goidschalck Augustijn de Wolff	priest	indefinite	
<29>	1622	Wouter Dircxz Keyt	priest	indefinite	
<30>	1622	Philips Jolijns	priest and canon of St Pieter in Utrecht	indefinite	
<31>	1630	Rombout van Medenblick	secular priest	indefinite	
<32>	1631	Jacob Pieck	secular priest	4 weeks	
<33>	(a) 1632; (b) 1637	Herman van Honthorst	secular priest	(a) 6 months (inextensible); (b) indefinite	
<34>	1632	Benedictus (Jacobus) van Haeften	abbot of Affligem Abbey of the Benedictine Order in Brabant	1 month	
<35>	1640	Nicolaes Collaert	secular priest in Emmerich	unknown (possibly a short stay)	
<36>	1641	Gijsbert van Emmelaer	regular priest	14 days (inextensible)	
<37>	1641	Henrick van Domselaer	(ex-)priest	145 days (after three extensions)	
<38>	(a) 1641; (b) 1645; (c) 1646; (d) 1654; (e) 1658; (f) 1659	Balthasar van de Kemp	secular priest and canon in Emmerich	(a) 1 month (from the day he notified the secretary of the city, inextensible); (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 months; (d) 1 month; (e) 2 months; (f) until cancellation	
<39>	(a) 1644; (b) 1646	Georgius Oom	secular priest in Dordrecht	(a) 14 days; (b) 14 days	
<40>	1645	N (unknown) Duyck	priest	6 days	
<41>	(a) 1645; (b) 1646; (c) 1648	Servaes van der Nypoort	secular priest in Utrecht	(a) 6 months (after an extension); (b) 6 months; (c) until cancellation	

	Relationships between the priest and the Utrecht city or citizens	Reasons	Sources
	lawful and constant residence in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
	lawful and constant residence in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
	lawful and constant residence in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
	lawful and constant residence in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 13-Mar-1622
	lawful and constant residence in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 13-Mar-1622
	lawful and constant residence in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 13-Mar-1622
	lawful and constant residence in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 13-Mar-1622
	lawful and constant residence in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 13-Mar-1622
	son of citizen	registration after coming back to the city from Leiden	HUA, SAIL, 121-14, 15-Sep-1630
	son of a noble family	to dispose of the property of Jacob Bool as testament executor	HUA, SAIL, 121-15, 12-Sep-1631
	brother of the painter Gerrit Hermansz van Honthorst	(a) to stay with his elderly parents; (b) -	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-15, 5, 7, 19-Mar-1632; (b) A.A.U. 26, 91-97; A.A.U. 32, 147-149; HUA, SAIL, 121-19, 5, 26 June 1641, 5, 10, 16 August 1641; HUA, SAIL, 2236-4, 5, 7 May 1641, 11 August 1641
	son of the nobleman Anthonius van Haeften	to visit his father Anthonis van Haeften	HUA, SAIL, 121-15, 28-May-1632
	-	to obtain a passport for Holland	HUA, SAIL, 121-19, 20-Mar-1640
	-	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-19, 22-Feb-1641
	-	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-19, 3-May, 7-Jun, 10, 15-Oct-1641
	son of a citizen	(a) to visit his mother, to care for his brother's children, to dispose of his deceased father's property; (b) -; (c) -; (d) -; (e) to visit and assist his elderly mother; (f) for his advanced age and visual impairment	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-19, 12-Jul-1641; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-21, 22-Sep-1645; (c) HUA, SAIL, 121-21, 15-Jun-1646; (d) HUA, SAIL, 121-25, 28-Aug-1654; (e) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 30-Aug-1658; (f) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 11-Apr-1659
	friend of citizens/residents	(a) to visit his friends; (b) -	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-20, 11-Jul-1644; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-21, 9-Mar-1646
	-	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-21, 8-Apr-1645
	son of the patrician Joost Willemsz van der Nypoort (cloth-merchant) and Maria Servaes Peters de Goude (Ackermans 2003, p. 407)	(a) to receive medical care, to improve his health; (b) to improve his health; (c) -	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-21, 29-Sep-1645, 5-Jan-1646; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-21, 24-Aug-1646; (c) HUA, SAIL, 121-22, 23-May-1648

	Permit year	Name	Position in the Catholic Church	Length of permit	
<42>	1646	Jacob Olye	priest in Amsterdam	14 days	
<43>	(a) 1647; (b) 1649	Cornelis Duck	secular priest in Leiden (Ackermans 2003, p. 353)	(a) 14 days; (b) 1 month	
<44>	1648	Jacobus Heer(e)man(s)	secular priest in Amsterdam	6 months (from day of arrival)	
<45>	1649	Henrick van der Kerckhoff	monk of a monastery in Cleves	1 month (from day of arrival)	
<46>	(a) 1650; (b) 1651; (c) 1656; (d) 1659	Steven (Stephano) Canter(t)	(a) (b) regular priest in Maaseik; (c) regular priest in Heyen in Cleves; (d) priest in Asperen in Cleves	(a) 14 days; (b) 14 days; (c) 1 month; (d) 1 month (from 10-Jan-1659) + 6 weeks (from 14-Feb-1659) + 6 weeks (from 28-Mar-1659)	
<47>	1650	Dirck Reyniersz	regular priest in Maaseik	14 days	
<48>	1650	N (unknown) Butgens	regular priest in Antwerp	8 or 10 days	
<49>	1651	Johan (Johannes Hortensius) van Wevelinckhoven	secular priest in Gorinchem	14 days	
<50>	(a) 1652; (b) 1658	Floriz (Florentius) van Vianen	secular priest in Laren (Ackermans 2003, p. 462)	1 month	
<51>	(a) 1653; (b) 1655; (c) 1659; (d) 1668	Nicolaes Prins	(a) (b) (d) priest in Maaseik; (c) priest in Roermond	(a) 14 days; (b) 14 days; (c) 14 days; (d) 6 weeks	
<52>	(a) 1653; (b) 1654	Franck van Cuyck	canon of St Donaas in Bruges	(a) 1 month; (b) occasional short stays	
<53>	(a) 1653; (b) 1653; (c) 1654; (d) 1654	Cornelis van der Hout	priest	(a) 3 days; (b) 3 days; (c) 3 days; (d) 3 days	
<54>	(a) 1654; (b) 1657	Peter van Millingen	regular priest of St Agatha Monastery of the Order of the Holy Cross in Emmerich	(a) 14 days; (b) 6 weeks	
<55>	1654	Theodorus Mesmecker	prior of regular canons of the Gaasdonk Monastery of the Order of St Augustine in Goch	14 days	
<56>	1655	Sefker van Borcken	priest in Wesel	3 weeks	
<57>	1655	Peter Vermeulen	regular priest in St Agatha Monastery of the Crutched Friars in Cuijk	1 month	

	Relationships between the priest and the Utrecht city or citizens	Reasons	Sources
	nothing (Ackermans 2003, pp. 409–410)	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-21, 21-Jul-1646
	son of the citizen Jan Jansz Duck and Maria Bool (Ackermans 2003, p. 353), friend of a citizens/residents	-	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-22, 20-May-1647; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-23, 13-Aug-1649
	brother of a citizen	to improve his health, to visit his sister	HUA, SAIL, 121-22, 28-Feb-1648
	brother-in-law of the citizen Jacob van der Veen	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-23, 15-Jun-1649
	son of a citizen	-	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-23, 11-Feb-1650; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-23, 13-Aug-1649; (c) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 4-Aug-1656; (d) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 10-Jan-1659
	-	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-23, 11-Feb-1650
	-	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-23, 9-Jul-1650
	nothing (Ackermans 2003, p. 471)	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-24, 1-Nov-1651
	son of the citizen/resident Cornelis van Vianen	(a) -; (b) to receive medical care	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-24, 21-Oct-1652; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 2-Aug-1658
	brother of the provincial court advocate Gerard Prins [68]	(a) to mourn the death of his brothers who were living in the city; (b) to rescue his brothers' property; (c) -; (d) to cure his leg	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-24, 1-Aug-1653; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-25, 19-May-1655; (c) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 27-Jun-1659; (d) HUA, SAIL, 121-28, 22-Jun-1668
	son of churchwarden of St Catharijne (the late Jan van Cuyck), brother of widow of Peter van Sanen	(a) to visit his friends; (b) to visit his sister, widow of Peter van Sanen	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-24, 15-Aug-1653; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-25, 6-Mar-1654
	-	(a) (b) (c) (d) to appear in the city court for his lawsuit against Aert van der Gorp	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-25, 10-Oct-1653; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-25, 5-Dec-1653; (c) HUA, SAIL, 121-25, 23-Jan-1654; (d) HUA, SAIL, 121-25, 16-Oct-1654
	-	-	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-25, 7-Apr-1654; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 28-Feb-1657
	-	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-25, 13-Jul-1654
	uncle of the citizen Frederick Beerninck	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-25, 9-Feb-1655
	-	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-25, 8-Jun-1655

	Permit year	Name	Position in the Catholic Church	Length of permit	
<58>	1655	Anthoni de Rode (Rhode)	priest	unknown (might be short stay)	
<59>	(a) 1656; (b) 1656; (c) 1656; (d) 1657; (e) 1657; (f) 1658	Willem (de) Munter	priest in Dordrecht	(a) 1 month + 6 weeks + 6 weeks; (b) 1 month; (c) 2 months; (d) 6 weeks; (e) 14 days; (f) 14 days	
<60>	(a) 1656; (b) 1657; (c) 1658; (d) 1659; (e) 1660	Arnoldus Rade(n)	regular priest and procurator of a Carthusian monastery in Cologne	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 2 weeks	
<61>	1656	Henrick Hoeffslach	priest in Huissen	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 3 weeks	
<62>	1656	Peter van Sijpenesse	regular priest of St Bernard Abbey near Antwerp (probably in Hemiksem)	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 4 weeks	
<63>	(a) 1656; (b) 1657; (c) 1658; (d) 1666	Dirck (Theodorus) (Boelisz) van Ba(e)r(e)n	secular priest in Amsterdam	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 5 weeks	
<64>	1657	Reynier Govertsz van Eyndhoven	priest	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 6 weeks	
<65>	1657	Johannes Snep	priest in Emmerich	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 7 weeks	
<66>	1657	Andreas Vloers	Dominican	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 8 weeks	
<67>	1658	Johan Backer	dean in Eindhoven (living in The Hague)	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 9 weeks	
<68>	1658	Willem van Sevender	Capuchin prior in Cleves	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 10 weeks	
<69>	(a) 1658; (b) 1659; (c) 1660	Gerardus van Honthorst	canon in Xanten (HUA, NOT, U034a004, 213, 26 July 1658)	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 11 weeks	
<70>	(a) 1658; (b) 1667	Frederick van Cranevelt	canon of St Servaas in Maastricht, secular priest	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 12 weeks	

Relationships between the priest and the Utrecht city or citizens	Reasons	Sources
-	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 22-Oct-1655
son of the provincial court advocate Johan de Munter [60] and Walburga Both (Ackermans 2003, p. 404)	(a) to visit his sick mother; (b) (c) to dispose of his parents' property; (d) (e) (f) -	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 7-Jan, 25-Feb, 14-Apr-1656; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 14-Jul-1656; (c) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 27-Oct-1656; (d) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 16-May-1657; (e) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 7-Sep-1657; (f) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 4-Oct-1658
-	(a) to visit and rent out the immovable property of unknown location in the Dutch Republic allegedly owned by the Carthusian order; (b) to execute 'affairs' regarding the Carthusian monastery; (c) (d) (e) -	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 17-Mar-1656; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 11-May-1657; (c) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 19-Jul-1658; (d) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 25-Apr-1659; (e) HUA, SAIL 121-26, 7-May, 23-Jul-1660
-	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 2-Jun-1656
-	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 14-Jul-1656
nothing (Ackermans 2003, p. 318)	(a) (b) (c) -; (d) to continue his legal procedure	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 4-Aug-1656; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 7-Dec-1657; (c) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 2-Aug-1658; (d) HUA, SAIL, 121-27, 22-Oct-1666
born in Utrecht	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 12-Jan-1657
-	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 12-Jun-1657
-	to execute his 'private affairs'	HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 2-Nov-1657
-	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 22-Mar-1658
-	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 7-May-1658
son of the painter Gerrit Hermansz van Honthorst and Sophia Coopmans	(a) to visit his elderly, invalid mother (Sophia Coopmans, d. June 1658); (b) (c) -	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 1-Jun, 20-Sep-1658; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 21-Feb-1659; (c) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 2-Jan-1660
-	(a) -; (b) to execute his 'affairs'	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 20-Jun-1658; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-27, 24-Jun-1667

	Permit year	Name	Position in the Catholic Church	Length of permit	
<71>	1658	Jacob Verhaer	priest in Muiden (with residence permit there)	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 13 weeks	
<72>	(a) 1658; (b) 1659; (c) 1660; (d) 1663	Philips Dimmer	(a) (b) (c) priest in Cologne; (d) priest in IJsselstein	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 14 weeks	
<73>	1658	Johan van de(r) Cloes	regular priest in Cologne	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 15 weeks	
<74>	(a) 1658; (b) 1663	Dirk Ferdinand de Ridder van Groenesteyn	Jesuit in Antwerp (Wittert van Hoogland 1913, p. 332; Hoeck 1940, pp. 89, 202, 260)	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 16 weeks	
<75>	1658	Cornelis de Ridder van Groenesteyn	Jesuit in Flanders (Wittert van Hoogland 1913, pp. 97, 334)	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 17 weeks	
<76>	1659	Willem van Wely	priest in Culemborg	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 18 weeks	
<77>	(a) 1658; (b) 1659; (c) 1668	Johan(ni) Cloeting	priest in Holland	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 19 weeks	
<78>	1659	Jan van Aelst	priest	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 20 weeks	
<79>	1659	Josephus van der Steen	Carmelite in Brabant (Brom 1980, p. 183)	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 21 weeks	
<80>	1660	Theodoro Duding	priest in Dinslaken	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 22 weeks	
<81>	1660	Vincentio Ferdinando Kochelio	priest in Brabant	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 23 weeks	
<82>	1660	Cornelis Vermeulden	priest in Gennep	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 24 weeks	
<83>	1660	Gosuinus ter Lau	priest and canon in Cologne	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 25 weeks	
<84>	1661	Johan van Wijckerslooth	priest in Weesp	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 26 weeks	

Relationships between the priest and the Utrecht city or citizens	Reasons	Sources
son of the citizen Steven Gisbertsz Verhaer and Geertgen Wttenbogert (Ackermans 2003, p. 460)	to cure his illness	HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 5-Jul-1658
brother of a citizen/resident	(a) (b) (c) -; (d) to visit his sister	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 19-Jul-1658; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 30-May-1659; (c) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 2-Jan-1660; (d) HUA, SAIL, 121-27, 19-Oct-1663
-	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 26-Jul-1658
born in Utrecht (Wittert van Hoogland 1913, p. 332), son of a noble family in Holland (Geraerts 2015, p. 101)	(a) -; (b) to save his and his child's property in the city	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 23-Aug-1658; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-27, 22-Jun-1663
born in Utrecht (Wittert van Hoogland 1913, p. 334), son of a noble family in Holland (Geraerts 2015, pp. 78, 291)	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 4-Sep-1658
-	to execute his 'private affairs'	HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 18-Apr-1659
son of a citizen (Ackermans 2003, p. 337)	(a) -; (b) -; (c) in consideration of his brothers' sickness	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 18-Oct, 13-Dec-1658, 7-Feb-1659; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 26-Sep-1659; (c) HUA, SAIL, 121-28, 20-Apr-1668
-	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 3-Oct-1659
son of a patrician family	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 10-Oct-1659 (see also HUA, KR, 7, 24-Oct-1659)
-	to meet a 'foreign doctor' and cure his illness or wound	HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 24-Apr-1660
-	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 3-Sep-1660
-	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-26, 24-Sep-1660
nephew of the noblewoman Deliana van Wijckerslooth (over 90 years old)	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-27, 4-Oct-1660
son of a patrician family (Wittert van Hoogland 1908, p. 187)	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-27, 22-Apr-1661

	Permit year	Name	Position in the Catholic Church	Length of permit	
<85>	(a) 1661; (b) 1663	Antoni van der Cloes	priest in Cologne	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 27 weeks	
<86>	1661	Ernestus Rotius	priest, chief butler, and pedagogue for the petitioners	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 28 weeks	
<87>	(a) 1661; (b) 1662; (c) 1663	Reynier van Wijtfelt (Wytvelt)	priest	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 29 weeks	
<88>	1662	Willem van Cruysbergen	priest in IJsselstein (Ackermans 2003, p. 345)	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 30 weeks	
<89>	1667	Johan van der Meer	priest	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 31 weeks	
<90>	1667	Otto (van) Lichtenberch	priest	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 32 weeks	
<91>	1668	Godefroy de (van) Vianen	secular priest in Mons	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 33 weeks	
<92>	1668	Joannes Pelt	secular priest in Stompwijk (Ackermans 2003, p. 415; Ven 1960, pp. 126–127, 130–131, 135, 138–141)	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 34 weeks	
<93>	1670	Jacobus van Doorn	priest	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 35 weeks	
<94>	1671	Isidorus van (der) Veen	secular priest	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 36 weeks	

	Relationships between the priest and the Utrecht city or citizens	Reasons	Sources
	son of a citizen/resident	(a) (b) to visit his elderly mother	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-27, 7-Aug-1661; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-27, 3-Aug-1663
	-	to stay with his masters (petitioners) whose (family?) members wanted to stay in Utrecht to cure their illness, lit. 'weakness'	HUA, SAIL, 121-27, 14-Oct-1661
	son of the citizen/resident Maria van Wijtfelt	(a) (b) (c) due to his illness	(a) HUA, SAIL, 121-27, 28-Oct-1661; (b) HUA, SAIL, 121-27, 4-Aug-1662; (c) HUA, SAIL, 121-27, 21-Sep-1663
	son of the citizen/resident Adriaentjen Jans van Toorn	to visit his elderly mother	HUA, SAIL, 121-27, 15-Dec-1662
	brother of citizens/residents	to care for his young sister, to care for the children of his deceased brothers and sisters as their guardian	HUA, SAIL, 121-27, 7-Jan-1667
	son of the citizen Gerrit Lichtenberch (hat maker) and Hillegonda van Royen (Ackermans 2003, pp. 393–394)	to execute his 'private affairs'	HUA, SAIL, 121-27, 12-Aug-1667
	son of the provincial court advocate Valentijn de Vianen and Anthonetta van der Eem (Ackermans 2003, p. 462)	in consideration of the war and inflation in Mons, to quietly live in Utrecht	HUA, SAIL, 121-28, 10-Feb-1668
	son of Anthoni(s) Pelt {35} [64]	to execute his and his minor brother's affairs	HUA, SAIL, 121-28, 30-Mar-1668
	son of citizen	to visit his invalid parents	HUA, SAIL, 121-28, 2-May-1670
	son of the provincial court advocate Simon van (der) Veen and Divera van der Eem (Ackermans 2003, p. 456)	-	HUA, SAIL, 121-28, 23-Jan-1671

Appendix 3. Connived priests in Utrecht, 1620-1672

	Name	Place of birth / former residence	Position in the Catholic Church	
<001>	Abraham van Brienen	Utrecht (baker's son)	secular priest (vicar general in Utrecht) at the clandestine church of St Gertrudis	
<002>	Servaes van der Nyport	Utrecht (patrician cloth merchant's son)	secular priest at the clandestine church of St Gertrudis	
<003>	Albertus Wijnen	Mechelen (dispatched to Utrecht in 1665)	Dominican at the clandestine church of St Dominicus	
<004>	Teeckelenbergh	-	secular priest in Schalkwijk	
<005>	Anthonius van der Plaet	Leiden (carpenter's son)	secular priest at the clandestine church of Maria Minor Achter Clarenburg	
<006>	Jacobus Vlugh	Utrecht	secular priest in Mijdrecht and Wilnis	
<007>	Reinier	-	-	
<008>	Chrsitophorus Flores (Floris)	Lier (at least in 1659)	Dominican at the clandestine church of Onze Lieve Vrouw Rozenkrans	
<009>	Lambert van Dilsen	Nijmegen (dispatched to Utrecht in 1661)	Jesuit at the clandestine church of St Catharijne	
<010>	Aloysius Ballast	-	Jesuit at the clandestine church of St Martinus	
<011>	Joan van Hoven	-	Augustinian at the clandestine church of St Augustinus	
<012>	Cornelis van Velthuysen	Utrecht (patrician's son)	secular priest at the clandestine church of St Servaas Onder de Linden	
<013>	Johannes Putkamer	Utrecht	secular priest at the clandestine church of St Nicolaas Achter de Wal	
<014>	Johannes Lindeborn	Utrecht	secular priest at the clandestine church of St Nicolaas Achter de Wal	
<015>	De Roy (probably Clemens de Roy)	Utrecht	secular priest at the clandestine church of St Marie op de Kamp (alias Soli Deo Gloria)	
<016>	Johannes Roos	Rotterdam	secular priest at the clandestine church of Maria Minor Achter Clarenburg	

	Address in Utrecht	Cohabitants	Primary sources or secondary literatures apart from HUA, SAII, 616, probably in 1665
	Mariahoek	some <i>klopjes</i> and <41> <002> Van der Nypoort	Ackermans 2003, passim (esp. p. 331); Ven 1955, pp. 52–53, 56, 72–74, 80.
	Mariahoek	some <i>klopjes</i> and <001> Van Brienen	Ackermans 2003, pp. 407–408
	Walsteeg	his mother	Hoogland 1981, p. 214
	Walsteeg	his sister	-
	Mariahoek	-	Ackermans 2003, pp. 47, 187, 396, 417; Ven 1952, p. 61
	Mariahoek	-	Ackermans 2003, pp. 464–465
	Mariahoek	-	-
	Lange Nieuwstraat, two doors down from Dorstige Hartsteeg	his mother	Hoogland 1981, pp. 209–210
	Nieuwegracht, next to Agatha Dierhout	-	Hoeck 1940, pp. 73, 167; <i>N.N.W.B.</i> III, col. 288; Post 1939, p. 150
	Herenstraat, over De Kamp	-	Hoeck 1940, p. 73; Lommel 1876, p. 80
	Hieronymussteeg, two or three doors down from the house of the Reformed minister Arnoldus Teekmans	-	-
	Nieuwegracht, over St Servaas Abbey	-	Ackermans 2003, p. 458
	Achter de Wal near Lollestraat, next to the house of Van Blikkenburg	Lindeborn <014> and <i>klopjes</i>	Ackermans 2003, p. 422
	Achter de Wal near Lollestraat, next to the house of Van Blikkenburg	Putkamer <013> and <i>klopjes</i>	Ackermans 2003, pp. 394–395
	-	-	Ackermans 2003, p. 430
	Nieuwegracht	-	Ackermans 2003, pp. 427–428

	Name	Place of birth / former residence	Position in the Catholic Church	
<017>	Dirck de Roy	-	-	
<018>	-	-	-	
<019>	Godefridus	-	working for 'the new church behind' the house of Agatha Dierhout on Nieuwegracht	

	Address in Utrecht	Cohabitants	Primary sources or secondary literatures apart from HUA, SAI, 616, probably in 1665
	Nieuwegracht, over 'the bridge of the Pope's House'	-	-
	next to the house of Schoonhoven	-	-
	-	-	-

Appendix 4. Defenders of prosecuted Catholics in Utrecht, 1620-1672

	Name	Legal proceeding number	Profession / social status	
[1]	Frederick Roelofsz Aerdigeman	{100}	baker (HUA, NOT, U038a001, 356, 15-Apr-1669)	
[2]	Christiaan van Alkemade	{67}	nobleman	
[3]	Willem Baerle	{88}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[4]	Cornelis Bak (Baeck)	{69} {70}	solicitor of the city court of Utrecht	
[5]	Jan Lambertsz van der Beeck	{85}	button maker (HUA, NOT, U077a001, 59, 13-Nov-1668)	
[6]	Peter van Beest	{67}	-	
[7]	Anthoni van Blockland	{34} {58}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[8]	Frederick Bloemaert	{78}	painter	
[9]	Anthonis van Bodegen (Bueghem)	{73}	-	
[10]	Lambert van Boort	{19}	solicitor of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[11]	Gerrit Cornelisz van Broeckhuysen	{8}	-	
[12]	Diderick van der Burch	{31}	nobleman	
[13]	Willem van der Burch	{70} {73}	nobleman	
[14]	Hu(y)bert van Bu(y)ren van Amelisweerd	{64}	nobleman	
[15]	Balthasar van Bu(e)ren van Zuidoort (Suydoort)	{88} {94}	nobleman	
[16]	Van Bu(e)ren	{36}	nobleman	
[17]	Jacob van Bylevelt	{85}	plumber (HUA, NOT, U038a001, 122, 9-Feb-1664)	
[18]	Maria Clafsd	{1}	daughter of the militia captain Cornelis Calf	
[19]	Peter van Causteren	{1}	-	
[20]	Cornelis van Clarenburch	{16}	solicitor of the city court of Utrecht	
[21]	Richard van Coesfelt (Coesvelt)	{14} {20} {21} {22}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[22]	Gijsbert de Coten	{55} {82} {84} {86} {87} {89} {98}	solicitor of the city court of Utrecht (HUA, NOT, U035a005, 161, 31-Jan-1664), notary	
[23]	Nicolaes de Cruyff	{102}	notary	
[24]	Arnold van Cuylenborch	{73}	solicitor of the city court of Utrecht	
[25]	Jacob van Dam	{74}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[26]	Silvester Danckelman	{16}	vice <i>drost</i> of Lingen	

	Name	Legal proceeding number	Profession / social status	
[27]	Johan van Deurkant	{95} {98}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht (HUA, NOT, U077a001, 118, 24-Nov-1669)	
[28]	Nicolaes Dierhout (Derout)	{31} {76}	uncertain (advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht (Dudok van Heel 1988, p. 112) or painter (Bok and Wijburg 2012, p. 42))	
[29]	Henrick Jansz Doel	{83}	fuse maker (HUA, NOT, U055a001, 564, 5-Sep-1665)	
[30]	Jan Jansz Dons	{99}	fuse maker (HUA, NOT, U070a003, 8, 17-Jan-1669)	
[31]	Jacob van der Dussen	{70} {73}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[32]	Cornelis Claesz van Duynkerken	{84}	-	
[33]	Floris van Ewijck	{82} {90} {99}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[34]	Joost (Justus) van Ewijck	{19} {31} {65}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[35]	Ewijck	{64}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[36]	Johan van Galen	{38}	notary, secretary of Leckendijck	
[37]	Willem van Galen	{13} {38} {40}	notary	
[38]	Clemens van Gessel	{89} {94} {105}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[39]	Steven Gijsbertsz	{8}	-	
[40]	Petrus van Halen	{92}	solicitor of the city court of Utrecht (HUA, NOT, U056a004, 57, 8-Apr-1667)	
[41]	Aert van der Horst	{90} {100}	wine merchant	
[42]	Cornelis Dircksz van der Hout	{24}	plumber	
[43]	Geerloff van Jaersfelt	{57}	warrant executor of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[44]	Gisbert Junius	{85} {102}	canon of St Marie	
[45]	Abraham van Kerckraad	{17} {19} {22}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[46]	Johan van Leeuwen	{5}	solicitor of the city court of Utrecht (HUA, NOT, U016a001, 153, 21-Jul-1625)	
[47]	Maria Le Petit	{1}	wife of Peter Wttenbogaert	
[48]	Gerard van Lienden	{19}	solicitor of the Provincial court of Utrecht	
[49]	Johan van Lienden	{85} {90}	solicitor of the city court of Utrecht (HUA, NOT, U025a001, 548, 2-May-1662)	
[50]	Dirck (Theodorus) Lommetzum	{19} {58}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[51]	Cornelis Arnout van der Marsche	{86} {92}	nobleman	
[52]	Annasen Matheusdr	{1}	wife of Abraham Alingh	

	Prosecuted in	Family / relatives	Confessional affiliation
	-	-	-
	-	the patrician Dierhout family, brother (advocate) or uncle (painter) of Agatha Dierhout {58} {75} {94} {105}	Catholic
	-	-	-
	{83}	-	Catholic
	-	-	Reformed
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	Reformed
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	the patrician Van Gessel family	Catholic
	-	-	-
	-	-	-
	-	-	Catholic
	-	relative of the priest Cornelis van der Hout {24}	-
	-	-	-
	{80}	-	Catholic
	-	-	Reformed
	-	-	-
	-	-	Reformed
	-	-	-
	-	-	Catholic
	-	-	-
	-	-	-

	Name	Legal proceeding number	Profession / social status	
[53]	Nicolaes van Merkerck	{31} {34} {35} {42} {44} {48} {51} {52}	solicitor of the city court of Utrecht	
[54]	Adriaen Moll	{92}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[55]	Gualterus Moll	{95}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[56]	Isaak Moll	{67}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[57]	Wouther Moll	{101}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[58]	Adriaen Moll van Vianen	{38} {54} {71}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[59]	Moll	{19}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[60]	Johan de Munter	{19}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[61]	Ern(e)st Muylert	{16}	nobleman in Grumsmühlen	
[62]	Jacobus van Paddenburch	{91} {93}	solicitor of the city court of Utrecht (HUA, NOT, U038a001, 282, 20-Dec-1667)	
[63]	Albert van Pallaes	{78} {93} {95} {101} {103}	medical doctor	
[64]	Anthoni(s) Pelt	{22} {41}	medical doctor	
[65]	Cunera Petersdr	{1}	-	
[66]	Didolph van de Poel	{39}	solicitor of the city court of Utrecht (HUA, NOT, U034a001, 157, 2-Mar-1646)	
[67]	Cornelis Portengen	{89} {94} {102} {105}	sub-clerk of the provincial court of Utrecht (<i>G.P.U.</i> , II, p. 1063)	
[68]	Gerard Prins	{58}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[69]	Adriaan Puyt (Poeyt)	{68}	patrician	
[70]	Jordaan Puyt (Poeyt)	{71}	patrician	
[71]	Adriaen de Raedt	{64}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[72]	Andries van Raveswaey	{49}	hat merchant, citizen	
[73]	Philips Reynegom	{37}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[74]	Hillebrant van Rossum	{29}	solicitor of the city court of Utrecht	
[75]	Jan Jansz van Rossum	{85}	cloth merchant (HUA, NOT, U080a001, 6, 25-Mar-1668)	
[76]	Dirck Schaep	{64}	patrician in Amsterdam, secretary of Amsterdam (in office 1655–1697)	
[77]	Henrick Schaep	{1}	-	
[78]	Everard van der Schuer (Schuyr)	{13} {14} {19}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	

Prosecuted in	Family / relatives	Confessional affiliation
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	brother-in-law of Peter van Gessel {54}	-
-	-	-
-	-	Catholic
-	brother of the canon Diderick Muylert {16}	(probably) Catholic
-	-	-
-	the patrician Van Pallaes family	Catholic
{35}	the patrician Pelt family, brother of Gerrit Pelt {22}, husband of a cousin of Herman Honthorst {23} {25}	Catholic
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	Catholic
-	brother of the priest Nicolaes Prins <51> from Roermond	-
{48}?	probably a relative of Puyt {48}, probably a relative of Jordaen Puyt {62} {63} [70]	(probably) Catholic
{62} {63}	probably a relative of Puyt {48}, probably a relative of Adriaan Puyt [69]	Catholic
-	-	-
-	the patrician Van Raveswaey family	-
-	-	-
-	the patrician Van Rossum family	-
-	the patrician Van Rossum family	-
-	-	(probably) Remonstrant
-	-	-
{17}	-	Catholic

	Name	Legal proceeding number	Profession / social status	
[79]	Cornelis van Spangen	{27} {72}	nobleman	
[80]	Gerard van der Steen	{32} {84} {87} {96} {98}	canon of St Jan	
[81]	Mauritius Steenwijck	{32}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[82]	Petrus Tucker	{81}	solicitor of the city court of Utrecht	
[83]	Bruno Verdoes	{34}	surgeon	
[84]	Nicolaes Verduyn	{1}	notary	
[85]	Peter Vuysting	{67}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[86]	brother of Johannes Wachtelaer	{19}	patrician	
[87]	sister of Johannes Wachtelaer	{19}	patrician, (probably) widow of Cornelis van der Heyden	
[88]	Everard van Weede	{64}	notary	
[89]	Nicolaes van Wenckum	{93} {103}	wine merchant	
[90]	Gerard van Wijck	{100}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[91]	Cornelis van Wijckerslooth	{104}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[92]	Cornelis Wijngaerden	{34}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[93]	Johan de With	{19}	advocate of the provincial court of Holland	
[94]	Johan Flockersz Wtenbogaert	{34}	wine merchant	
[95]	François de Wys	{44}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[96]	Godert Jacobsz de Wys	{91}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[97]	Johan Zaal	{68}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[98]	Johan Zael van Vianen	{37} {44} {76}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[99]	Berent (Bernhardt) van Zutphen	{29} {42} {48} {50} {51} {52} {55} {57} {60} {72} {87} {104}	advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht	
[100]	Henrick van Zuylen	{64} {74} {78} {79} {80}	solicitor of the city court of Utrecht	

Prosecuted in	Family / relatives	Confessional affiliation
-	the noble Van Spangen family, son-in-law of Anna Catharina Mom {27} {42} {72}	Catholic
{17}	the patrician Van der Steen family	Catholic
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	husband of Aleyda van Beest, stepdaughter of the Catholic founder of the Grondsvelt free dwellings, Johan van Gronsvelt (Adriani 1929, pp. 115–116)	-
-	-	-
-	-	Catholic
-	brother of Johannes Wachtelaer {2} {9} {19}	(probably) Catholic
-	sister of Johannes Wachtelaer {2} {9} {19}	(probably) Catholic
-	-	-
-	the patrician Van Wenckum family	Catholic
-	-	Catholic
-	the patrician Van Wijckerslooth family	Catholic
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	the patrician De Wys family	-
-	the patrician De Wys family	Catholic
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	brother-in-law of the <i>klopje</i> Anna van Voorst and the Catholic painter Dirck van Voorst, Berent's daughter Cornelia van Zutphen was also a Catholic (HUA, NOT, HUA, NOT, U093a019, 4, 24-Jul-1690)	Catholic
-	-	Reformed

Bibliography

Archival Primary Sources

- HUA, Doop- Trouw- en Begraafboeken [DTB]HUA, Nederlandse Hervormde classis Utrecht (24-1)
3. Minutes of the Reformed consistory, 1644–1659
 265. List of schoolmasters and mistresses of *bijtscholen* in the city of Utrecht, c. 1663
 369. Copies of the minutes of the provincial synod and the classes in Utrecht, including a plan for the prevention of Popery formulated by the provincial synod, 1652
- HUA, Familie Des Tombes (26)
354. Genealogy of the family Merode
- HUA, Notarissen in de stad Utrecht 1560–1905 [NOT] (34-1)
- HUA, Verzamelde stukken van de oud-katholieke kerk in Nederland [VSOKN] (88)
109. Summary of the resolutions of the Provincial States of Utrecht concerning the appointment of the land commander of the Teutonic Order, 1615
 112. Petitions from Catholic priests who had lived in the city since before 1622 to the Utrecht magistracy, 1630
 205. Documents concerning the sale of Catholic vestments originating from St Jan Church, 1581 and 1603
 206. List of vestments and relics originating from St Jan Church, 1622, 1623, 1629, and 1637
 - 590-a. Biographies written by Maria van der Steen of Arnold van Esch and Gerard van der Steen, late seventeenth century
- HUA, Kapittel van Sint Pieter (220)
- 114-a. Declaration of the secretary of the chapter on the discovery of the sarcophagus of St Bernulphus, 1656
- HUA, Kapittel van Sint Marie te Utrecht (221)
90. Documents concerning the trials against Huybert de Roy and Gijsbert Junius, 1657–1658
 93. Documents concerning the trial against Johannes Wachtelaer, 1640
 2201. Bill of the treasury of the chapter signed by treasurer Johan de Goijer and ‘curator of the poor’ Gisbert Junius, 1663
- HUA, Staten van Utrecht [SVU] (233)
- 232-36. Minutes of the Provincial States of Utrecht, 5 March 1673–9 November 1673
- HUA, Hof van Utrecht [HVU] (239-1)
- 99-8. Sentences in criminal cases in the provincial court of Utrecht, 1638–1732

HUA, Verzameling van Buchel-Booth [VBB] (355)

139. Notes on the Reformed Church, especially in the province of Utrecht, by Cornelis Booth, 1579–1656, including a petition from the provincial synod of Utrecht to the Provincial States of Utrecht, 1655 or 1656

HUA, Stadsarchief II [SAII] (702)

- 121-4 ~ 121-5, 121-8 ~ 121-30. Minutes of the city council, 1599/1600–1612/13 and 1619/20–1686/87

338. List of schoolmasters and mistresses of the *bijsholen*, who gained recognition in accordance with the edict issued on 23 December 1631 and documents concerning the modification of the authority of the school superintendents, 1647–1649

- 414-1. Register of various permits given by the city council, part I, 1654–1679

616. Reports on forbidden Catholic assemblies with lists of Catholic priests, 1664–1681

1824. Documents concerning the establishment of the municipal chamber of charity, 1627–1751

- 1825-1 ~ 1825-6. Minutes of the trustees of the municipal chamber of charity, 1628–1647 and 1657–1687

2086. Documents concerning the trial against Gerrit Pelt, 1639

2087. Documents concerning the trial against Johannes Wachtelaer, 1639

2088. Documents concerning the trial against Philippus Rovenius, 1640

2095. Documents concerning the trial against Willem van Merode, 1652

- 2236-2 ~ 2236-5. *Crimineele sententiën* of the city court of Utrecht, 1618–1657 and 1670–1684

- 2244-42 ~ 2244-140. *Crimineele stukken* of the city court of Utrecht, 1620–1679

2899. Documents concerning the lawsuit between Metgen van Heymenberch and Willem van Beckbergen, 1654

HUA, Bewaarde archieven I [BAI] (708)

692. 'Foundation Book' (*Fundatie-boeck*) of the almshouses of Maria van Pallaes, 1665–1708

694. Request of Maria van Pallaes to the Provincial States of Utrecht concerning her testament, 1649

701. Testament of Hendrick van Schroyesteyn and Maria van Pallaes, 1624

HUA, Bewaarde archieven II [BAII] (709)

1254. Documents concerning the appointment of new trustees in St Barbara and St Laurens Hospice, 1616–1631

1258. Minutes of the trustees of St Barbara and St Laurens Hospice, 1615–1765

1604. Lists of the trustees of St Bartholomew Hospice, c. 1651 and 1653

- 1606-1. Minutes of the trustees of St Bartholomew Hospice, 1626/27, 1647 and 1651/52

- 1840-1. Minutes of the trustees of the Holy Cross Hospice, 1643–1695

- 1987-1. Minutes of the trustees of St Anthony Hospice, 1603–22 September 1722

- 2205-1. Minutes of the trustees of the plague hospice Leeuwenberch, 1579–1678

- HUA, Nederlandse Hervormde gemeente Utrecht, kerkeraad [KR] (746)
 3 ~ 10. Minutes of the Reformed consistory, August 1618–July 1690
- HUA, Oude rooms-katholieke aalmoezenierskamer te Utrecht [ORKA] (794-1)
 1. Minutes of the trustees of the Catholic chamber of charity, 1674–1693, January 1707 and February 1708–June 1715
 23. List of the trustees of the Catholic chamber of charity, 1674–1721
- HUA, Nederlandse Hervormde gemeente te Utrecht, diaconie (816)
 1. Minutes of the Reformed diaconate, 1623–1625
- HUA, Metropolitana Kapittel van de Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland [MKOKN] (1835)
 557. Documents concerning the trial against Johannes Wachtelaer, 1639–1640 and 1645
 625. Excerpt of the establishment of dioceses in 1559, and a plan for the re-establishment of the Dom chapter in 1659

Published Primary Sources

- Bekeeringe van P. de la Faille, predikant te Koudekerk, uyt de Calvinissche ketterye, tot het H. Katholyk geloof der H. Katholyke Roomsche Kerke door het lesen der Oud-vaders.* Antwerp, 1764.
- Broedersen, Nicolaas. *Tractatus Historicus de rebus metropolitanae ecclesiae Ultrajectinae*, 4 vols. Delft, 1729–Utrecht, 1763.
- Brom, Gisbert, ed. 'Neerkassels bestuur van 1662 tot 1676'. *A.A.U.* 18 (1890), pp. 172–294.
- Brom, Gisbert, ed. 'Kerksieraden van Oud-Munster'. *A.A.U.* 27 (1901), pp. 377–99.
- Cau, Cornelis. *Groot Placaet-boek inhoudende de placaten ende ordonnantien vande Hoogh-Mog Heeren Staten Generael [...]*. 16 vols. The Hague, 1658.
- 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.
- Cornelissen, J. D. M., R. R. Post, and P. Polman, eds. *Romeinsche bronnen voor den kerkelijken toestand der Nederlanden onder de apostolisch vicarissen, 1592–1727*. 4 vols. The Hague, 1932–1952. [R.B.]
- Deelder, C. *Bijdragen voor de geschiedenis van de Roomsche-Katholieke Kerk in Nederland*. 2 vols. Rotterdam, 1888–1892.
- Dotd van Flensburg, Jens Jenssen, ed. *Archief voor kerkelijke en wereldsche geschiedenissen, inzonderheid van Utrecht*. 7 vols. Utrecht, 1838–1848.
- Doedes, J. I., ed. 'Intendit en sententie tegen Philippus Rovenius, zich noemende aartsbisschop van Utrecht'. *Jaarboeken voor wetenschappelijke theologie* 11 (1853), pp. 276–300.

- Dupac de Bellegarde, Gabriël. *Histoire abrégée de l'Église métropolitaine d'Utrecht principalement depuis la révolution arrivée dans les sept Provinces-Unies des Pays-Bas sous Philippe II jusqu'à l'an 1784*. Utrecht, 1852.
- Evers, G. A., ed. 'De sarcophaag van bisschop Bernulphus'. *M.O.U.* (1947), pp. 89–90.
- Gompertz Pr., L. P. A., ed. 'Brief van Johan Breijer namens de synode aan de Staten van Utrecht'. *A.A.U.* 9 (1881), pp. 463–64.
- Heussen, Hugo Franciscus van. *Batavia Sacra sive res gestae apostolicorum virorum qui fidem Bataviae primi intulerunt*. Brussels, 1714.
- Hofman, J. H., ed. 'Allerlei, betreffende de stad Utrecht'. *A.A.U.* 5 (1878), pp. 180–238.
- Hoogland, A. J. J., ed. 'De gevangenneming van Pater Paulus van der Rijst te Utrecht'. *A.A.U.* 8 (1880), pp. 239–45.
- Hoogland, A. J. J., ed. 'Descriptio status, in quo anno 1638 erat religio Catholica [...]'. *A.A.U.* 12 (1884), pp. 189–213, 414–33.
- Jacobsz, Hillebrand. *Sententiën over Jacob Mom, gewesene amptman in Maes en Wael, ende Elbert van Botbergen, beyde als Edelen gecompareert hebbende opt Landt-dagen van Gelderlant: Mitsgaders Adriaen van Eynthouts, Schout des Over-ampts vanden Lande van Kuyck*. The Hague, 1621.
- Klaveren, G. van, ed. 'Vrijwoningen in 1687'. *M.O.U.* (1940), pp. 26–28.
- Klaveren, G. van, ed. 'Vergaderplaatsen der Rooms-katholieken in 1647'. *M.O.U.* (1947), pp. 25–28.
- Knuif, Wilhelmus, and Johannes de Jong, eds. 'Brief van Gravius aan de la Torre'. *A.A.U.* 50 (1925), pp. 383–87.
- Knuif, Wilhelmus, and Johannes de Jong, eds. 'Relaas van Godefridus van Moock'. *A.A.U.* 50 (1925), pp. 387–401.
- Lancellottus, Conradus. *Tractatus de officio praetoris tam in causis civilibus quam criminalibus, praetorium et curiale breviarium inscriptus*. Cologne, 1578.
- Lap van Waveren, J. 'Memorie van sommigen en verscheyden Provens, Ghasthuysen en Godtsameren, die binnen de stad van Utrecht, den armen gehantreyckt ende gedeelyt worden'. *Kronijk van het historisch genootschap* 15 (1859), pp. 87–109. *Lettres historiques de Monsieur Pellisson*, 3 vols. Paris, 1729.
- Lommel, Anthonius van, ed. 'Verslag van den toestand der Hollandsche Missie ten jare 1616'. *A.A.U.* 1 (1875), pp. 59–117.
- Lommel, Anthonius van, ed. 'Relatio visitationis reverendi patris Thomae Dekens provincialis provinciae Flandro-Belgicae S. J., A^o 1656'. *A.A.U.* 3 (1876), pp. 45–49.
- Lommel, Anthonius van, ed. 'Bouwstoffen voor de kerkelijke geschiedenis van verschillende Parochiën thans behoorende tot het Bisdom van Haarlem'. *B.G.B.H.* 9 (1881), pp. 1–42. 321–407.
- Lommel, Anthonius van, ed. 'Relatio seu descriptio status religionis Catholicae in Hollandia etc...'. *A.A.U.* 10 (1882), pp. 95–240.

- 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.
- Muller, Samuel, ed. 'Getuigenis van een afvalligen priester over de organisatie der rooms-katholieke kerk in Nederland omstreeks 1630'. *A.A.U.* 14 (1886), pp. 241–44.
- Muller, Samuel, ed. 'Lijst van Rooms-Katholieke priesters, wien door de vroedschap der stad Utrecht in 1657 en 1658 verlof («geleyde») gegeven is om in de stad te komen. Afschrift Rijksarchieven van Utrecht'. *A.A.U.* 14 (1886), pp. 245–46.
- Muller, Samuel, ed. 'Raadsbesluiten van Utrecht betreffende geheime godsdienstoefeningen der Rooms-Katholieken in 1652–55'. *A.A.U.* 14 (1886), pp. 236–40.
- Post, Regnerus, ed. 'Zes verslagen over de werkzaamheden door de Jezuïeten der Hollandsche Missie verricht'. *A.A.U.* 59 (1935), pp. 79–196.
- Remonstrantie der E. Kerckenraedt van Utrecht. Aende Ed. Mog. Heeren Staten s'Landts van Utrecht*. Rotterdam, 1651.
- Remonstrantie der Predikanten van Wtrecht, overgelevert Aen de Ed. Mogende Heeren Staten s'Landts van Utrecht, Raeckende het poinct van Religie*. 1647.
- Rogge, H. C., ed. 'Memorie, in December 1639 door J. Wtenbogaert ingezonden aan de omgeving van Zijne Hoogheid Prins Frederik Hendrik'. *A.A.U.* 2 (1875), pp. 1–25.
- 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.
- Visser, W. J. A., ed. 'Relieken van den H. Willibrordus, die te 1301 aan de Oudmunster te Utrecht ten geschenke zijn gegeven'. *A.A.U.* 57 (1933), pp. 137–210.
- Visser, W. J. A., ed. 'Een inventaris van kerksieraden uit 1609, toebehoorende aan Oudmunster te Utrecht'. *A.A.U.* 58 (1934), pp. 207–9.
- Vreeman, Hans. *Aen-merckingen op de Remonstrantie der E. Kercken-raedt van Utrecht aen de Ed. Mog. Heeren Staten s' Landts van Utrecht over-gelevert in 't jaer 1651*. Rotterdam, 1651.
- Water, Johan van de. *Groot Placaat-Boek vervattende all de placaten* [...]. *Staten s' lands van Utrecht*. 3 vols. Utrecht, 1729. [G.P.U.]
- Wicquefort, Abraham de. *Journael, of dagelijksch verhael van de handel der Franschen in de steden van Uytrecht en Woerden* [...]. Amsterdam, 1674.

Secondary Literature

- Aa, A. J. van der. *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*. 26 vols. Haarlem, 1852–1878. [B.W.N.]
- Abels, Marieke. *Tussen sloer en heilige. Beeld en zelfbeeld van Goudse en Haarlemse kloppen in de zeventiende eeuw*. Utrecht, 2010.

- 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.
- Ackermans, Gian. *Herders en huurlingen. Bisschoppen en priesters in de Republiek (1663–1705)*. Amsterdam, 2003.
- Adriani, Johannes H. *De Stads-Aalmoezenierskamer te Utrecht 1628–1928*. Utrecht, 1928.
- Adriani, Johannes H. 'De Gronsvelt-kameren'. *J.O.U.* (1929), pp. 113–28.
- 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.
- Andriessen, Jozef. *De jezuiten en het samenhorigheidsbesef der Nederlanden, 1585–1648*. Antwerp, 1957.
- Arblaster, Paul. *Antwerp and the World: Richard Verstegen and the International Culture of Catholic Reformation*. Leuven, 2004.
- Arblaster, Paul. 'The Southern Netherlands Connection: Networks of Support and Patronage'. 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. 123–38.
- 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.
- Begheyn, Paul. *De Nederlandse jezuiten. Een geschiedenis in 50 voorwerpen*. Nijmegen, 2019.
- Bergsma, Wiebe. 'Church, State and People'. In *A Miracle Mirrored: The Dutch Republic in European Perspective*, edited by Karel Davids and Jan Lucassen. Cambridge, 1996, pp. 196–228.
- Berkvens-Stevelinck, Christiane, Jonathan I. Israel, and G. H. M. Posthumus Meyes, eds. *The Emergence of Tolerance in the Dutch Republic*. Leiden, 1997.
- 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.

- Bogaers, Llewellyn. 'Een kwestie van macht? Onderzoek naar de trend in de wetgeving aangaande rituele en sociale ontmoetingen in de stad Utrecht in de periode 1528–1713'. MA thesis, Utrecht University, 1983.
- Bogaers, Llewellyn. 'Geleund over de onderdeur. Doorkijkjes in het Utrechtse buurtleven van de vroege Middeleeuwen tot in de zeventiende eeuw'. *Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden* 112, no. 3 (1997), pp. 336–63.
- Bogaers, Llewellyn. 'Politieke verwikkelingen'. In *Geschiedenis van provincie Utrecht*. 3 vols. edited by C. Dekker, Ph. Maarschalkerweerd, and J. M. van Winter, II. Utrecht, 1997, pp. 47–60.
- Bogaers, Llewellyn. *Aards, betrokken, en zelfbewust. De verwevenheid van cultuur en religie in katholiek Utrecht, 1300–1600*. Utrecht, 2008.
- Bok, Marten Jan. 'Gerard Hermansz. van Honthorst, 1592–1656'. In *Nieuw licht op de Gouden Eeuw. Hendrick ter Brugghen en tijdgenoten*, edited by Albert Blankert and Leonard J. Slatkes. Utrecht, 1986, pp. 276–79.
- Bok, Marten Jan. 'Vraag en aanbod op de Nederlandse kunstmarkt, 1580–1700'. PhD diss., Utrecht University, 1994.
- Bok, Marten Jan. 'Laying Claims to Nobility in the Dutch Republic: Epitaphs, True and False'. *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 24 (1996), pp. 209–26.
- Bok, Marten Jan, and Guido Jansen. 'De Utrechtse schilder Johannes van Wijcker-sloot en zijn "Allegorie" op de Franse invasie, 1672'. *Bulletin van het Rijksmuseum* 43, no. 4 (1995), pp. 337–49.
- Bok, Marten Jan, and W. A. Wijburg. 'De nakomelingen van de Utrechtse kunstschilder Jan van Scorel'. In *Utrechtse Parentelen vóór 1650*, 8 vols. edited by Casper van Burik, Bob Kemp, and Denis Verhoef, III. Rotterdam, 2012, pp. 10–56.
- Boon, Els, and Han Lettinck, *Joods Utrecht*. Utrecht, 2021.
- Booy, Engelina de. 'Een stad vol scholen. Utrechtse scholenhouders in 1663'. *M.O.U.* (1972), pp. 21–23.
- Booy, Engelina de. *Kweekhoven der wijsheid. Basis- en vervolgonderwijs in de steden van de provincie Utrecht van 1580 tot het begin der 19^{de} eeuw*. Zutphen, 1980.
- Boukema, Niek. 'Geloven in het geloof. Een onderzoek naar de positie van de katholieken en de katholieke seculiere zielzorg binnen de stad Utrecht gedurende de periode 1580–1672, met accent op de eerst helft van de 17e eeuw'. MA thesis, Utrecht University, 1982.
- Bossy, John. *The English Catholic Community, 1570–1850*. London, 1975.
- Boxer, Charles Ralph. *The Christian Century in Japan, 1549–1650*. Berkeley, 1951.
- Broeyer, Frits. 'Ijkpunt 1650 – "Andre gezintheneden met tollerantie getolereert"'. In *Vervreemding en verzoening. De relatie tussen katholieken en protestanten in*

- Nederland 1550–2000*, edited by Cornelis Augustijn and Eugène Honée. Nijmegen, 1998, pp. 35–67.
- Broeyer, Frits. 'Een mislukt streven naar theocratie. De Utrechtse gereformeerde gemeente van 1660 tot 1680'. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Kerkgeschiedenis* 10 (2007), pp. 2–7.
- Broeyer, Frits. *Het verleden van Utrecht als remonstrantse stad, 1610–1618. Maurits' zwaard*. Utrecht, 2018.
- Brown, Wendy. *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire*. Princeton, 2006.
- Bruin, Renger de. 'De ridderlijke Duitse Orde balije van Utrecht. Een adelijk distinctie-instrument in de Republiek der Verenigde Nederlanden gedurende de achttiende eeuw'. *Virtus. Journal of Nobility Studies* 16 (2009), pp. 34–53.
- Bruin, Renger de. 'Religious Identity of the Teutonic Order Bailiwick of Utrecht, 1560–2006'. *Ordines Militares Colloquia Toronesia Historica: Yearbook for the Study of the Military Orders* 23 (2018), pp. 235–71.
- Bruin, Renger de, Mieke Heurneman, and Frank van Veeke. *Van aalmoes tot AOW. Zes eeuwen ouderenzorg in een Nederlandse Stad*. Utrecht, 1996.
- Bruun, Mette Birkedal. 'Towards an Approach to Early Modern Privacy: The Retirement of the Great Condé'. In *Early Modern Privacy: Sources and Approaches*, edited by Michaël Green, Lars Cyril Nørgaard, and Mette Birkedal Bruun. Leiden, 2022, pp. 12–60.
- Burik, Casper van, Bob Kemp, and Denis Verhoef, eds. *Utrechtse Parentelen vóór 1650*, 8 vols. Rotterdam, 2010–2019.
- Butler, Judith, Jürgen Habermas, Charles Taylor, and Cornel West. *The Power of Religion in the Public Sphere*. New York, 2011.
- Calhoun, Craig, ed. *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge, 1992.
- Campen, J. W. C. van. 'Stichting en status van het Wittevrouwenklooster te Utrecht'. *A.G.K.K.N.* 17 (1975), pp. 101–30.
- Caspers, Charles, and Peter Jan Margry. *Identiteit en spiritualiteit van de Amsterdamse Stille Omgang*. Hilversum, 2006.
- Caspers, Charles, and Peter Jan Margry. *Het mirakel van Amsterdam. Biografie van een betwiste devotie*. Amsterdam, 2017.
- Certeau, Michel de. *L'Invention du quotidien, 1. Art de faire*. Paris, 1980.
- Châtellier, Louis. *The Religion of the Poor: Rural Missions in Europe and the Formation of Modern Catholicism, c.1500–c.1800*. Cambridge, 1997.
- Christ, Martin. *Biographies of a Reformation: Religious Change and Confessional Coexistence in Upper Lusatia, 1520–1635*. Oxford, 2021.
- Clark, J. C. D. 'Secularization and Modernization: The Failure of a 'Grand Narrative''. *Historical Journal* 55, no. 1 (2012), pp. 161–94.

- 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.
- Coster, Will, and Andrew Spicer, eds. *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge, 2005.
- Dane, Jacques, ed. *1648. Vrede van Munster. Feit en verbeelding*. Zwolle, 1998.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. *Society and Culture in Early Modern France: Eight Essays*. Stanford, 1975.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. 'The Sacred and the Body Social in Sixteenth-Century Lyon'. *Past and Present* 90 (1981), pp. 40–70.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. *The Return of Martin Guerre*. Cambridge, MA, 1984.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France*. Stanford, 1987.
- Desilva, Jennifer Mara, ed. *The Sacralization of Space and Behavior in the Early Modern World: Studies and Sources*. Farnham, 2015.
- Deursen, Arie Th. van. *Bavianen en slijkgeuzen. Kerk en kerkvolk ten tijde van Maurits en Oldenbarnevelt*. Assen, 1974.
- Deursen, Arie Th. van. 'Tussen eenheid en zelfstandigheid. De toepassing van de Unie als fundamentele wet'. In *De Unie van Utrecht. Wording en werking van een verband en een verbondsacte*, edited by Simon Groenveld and H. L. Ph. Leeuwenberg. The Hague, 1979, pp. 136–54.
- Diefendorf, Barbara. 'Religious Conflict and Civic Identity: Battles over the Sacred Landscape of Montpellier'. *Past and Present* 237 (2017), pp. 53–91.
- Dinges, Martin. 'The Uses of Justice as a Form of Social Control in Early Modern Europe'. In *Social Control in Europe*, vol. I, 1500–1800, 2 vols. edited by Herman Roodenburg and Pieter Spierenburg. Columbus, 2004, pp. 159–75.
- Dirkse, Paul. *Begijnen, pastoors en predikanten. Religie en kunst in de Gouden Eeuw*. Leiden, 2001.
- Dirkse, Paul, and Robert Schilleman. 'Dirck van Voorst (ca. 1610/1615–1658). Een onbekend Utrechts schilder uit het atelier van Abraham en Hendrick Bloemaert'. *J.O.U.* (1993), pp. 5–18.
- Dixon, C. Scott. 'Introduction: Living with Religious Diversity in Early-Modern Europe'. In *Living with Religious Diversity in Early-Modern Europe*, edited by C. Scott Dixon, Dagmar Freist, and Mark Greengrass. Aldershot, 2009, pp. 1–20.
- Dixon, C. Scott, Dagmar Freist, and Mark Greengrass, eds. *Living with Religious Diversity in Early-Modern Europe*. Aldershot, 2009.

- Dudok van Heel, Sebastien A. C. 'Een Amsterdamse burgemeester in Athene. Symon Marten Dirckszn gez. van de Ruwiel (1504–1574) en zijn nakomelingen'. *Jaarboek van het Centraal Bureau voor Genealogie* (1988).
- Dudok van Heel, Sebastien A. C. 'Amsterdamse schuil- of huiskerken?'. *Holland, regionaal-historisch tijdschrift* 25 (1993), pp. 1–10.
- Dudok van Heel, Sebastien A. C. 'De rol van de katholieke elite bij ontstaan der staties'. In *Putti en cherubijntjens. Het religieuze werk van Jacob de Wit (1695–1754)*, edited by Guus van den Hout and Robert Schillemans. Haarlem, 1995, pp. 35–53.
- Dudok van Heel, Sebastien A. C. *Van Amsterdamse burgers tot Europese aristocraten*. The Hague, 2008.
- Duke, Alastair. 'The Ambivalent Face of Calvinism in the Netherlands, 1561–1618'. In *International Calvinism 1541–1715*, edited by M. Prestwich. Oxford, 1985, pp. 109–34.
- Duke, Alastair. *Reformation and Revolt in the Low Countries*, London, 1990.
- Duker, Arnoldus. *Gisbertus Voetius*, 3 vols. Leiden, 1897–1914.
- Ebben, Maurits. *Lodewijck Huygens' Spaans journaal. Reis naar het hof van de koning van Spanje, 1660–1661*. Zutphen, 2005.
- Eck, Xander van. 'From Doubt to Conviction: Clandestine Catholic Churches as Patrons of Dutch Caravagesque Painting'. *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 22 (1993–1994), pp. 217–34.
- Eck, Xander van. *Kunst, twist en devotie. Goudse katholieke schuilkerken 1572–1795*. Delft, 1994.
- Eck, Xander van. 'The Artist's Religion: Paintings Commissioned for Clandestine Catholic Churches in the Northern Netherlands, 1600–1800'. *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 27 (1999), pp. 70–94.
- Eck, Xander van. 'Dreaming of an Eternally Catholic Utrecht during Protestant Rule: Jan van Bijlert's Holy Trinity with Sts Willibrord and Boniface'. *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 30 (2003), pp. 19–33.
- Eck, Xander van. *Clandestine Splendor: Paintings for the Catholic Church in the Protestant Republic*. Zwolle, 2008.
- Eck, Xander van. 'Paintings for Clandestine Catholic Churches in the Republic: Typically Dutch?'. 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. 216–29.
- Eck, Xander van, Corinne van Dijk, Paul Schnabel, and Joke Spaans, eds. *Vormen van verdraagzaamheid. Religieuze (in)tolerantie in de Gouden Eeuw*. Zwolle, 2013.
- Elliott, J. P. 'Protestantization in the Northern Netherlands, a Case Study: The Classis of Dordrecht, 1572–1640'. PhD diss., Columbia University, 1990.
- Enno van Gelder, Herman A. 'Nederland geprotestantiseerd?'. *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* 81 (1968), pp. 445–64.

- Enno van Gelder, Herman A. *Getemperde vrijheid. Een verhandeling over de verhouding van kerk en staat in de Republiek der Verenigde Nederlanden*. Groningen, 1972.
- 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. 'Dirck van Baburen, His Commissioner and His Motifs'. In *Hendrick ter Brugghen und die Nachfolger Caravaggios in Holland*, edited by Rüdiger Klessmann. Braunschweig, 1988, pp. 143–49.
- Faber, Dirk. 'Politiek en bestuur in een soeverein gewest (1581–1674)'. In *Geschiedenis van provincie Utrecht*. 3 vols. edited by C. Dekker, Ph. Maarschalkerweerd, and J. M. van Winter, II. Utrecht, 1997, pp. 213–34.
- 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.
- Faber, J. A., A. M. van der Woude, H. K. Roessingh, and J. A. de Kok. 'Numerieke aspecten van de protestantisering in Noord-Nederland tussen 1656 en 1726'. *Afdeling Agrarische Geschiedenis. Bijdragen* 13 (1965), pp. 149–80.
- Fagel, Raymond, and Joke Spaans. *Nonnen verdreven door geuzen. Cathalina 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. "'Rather French than Subject to the Prince of Orange". The Conflicting Loyalties of the Utrecht Catholics during the French Occupation (1672–73)'. *Church History and Religious Culture* 87 (2007), pp. 509–33.
- Forclaz, Bertrand. 'The Emergence of Confessional Identities: Family Relationships and Religious Coexistence in Seventeenth-Century Utrecht'. In *Living with Religious Diversity in Early-Modern Europe*, edited by C. Scott Dixon, Dagmar Freist, and Mark Greengrass. Aldershot, 2009, pp. 249–66.
- Forclaz, Bertrand. *Catholiques au défi de la Réforme. La coexistence confessionnelle à Utrecht au XVIIe siècle*. Paris, 2014.
- Forst, Rainer. *Toleration in Conflict: Past and Present*. Cambridge, 2013.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'La fonction du miracle dans une minorité catholique. Les Provinces-Unies au XVII^e siècle'. *Revue d'histoire de la spiritualité* 48 (1972), pp. 151–77.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'De paniek van juni 1734'. *A.G.K.K.N.* 19 (1977), pp. 170–233.

- Frijhoff, Willem. 'La coexistence confessionnelle. Complicités, méfiances et ruptures aux Provinces-Unies'. In *Histoire vécue du peuple chrétien*, 2 vols. edited by Jean Delumeau, II. Toulouse, 1979, pp. 229–57.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Van "histoire de l'Eglise" naar "histoire religieuse". De invloed van de "Annales"-groep op de ontwikkeling van de kerkgeschiedenis in Frankrijk en de perspectieven daarvan voor Nederland'. *Nederlands Archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 61 (1981), pp. 113–53.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Katholieke toekomstverwachting ten tijde van de Republiek: structuur, en grondlijnen tot een interpretatie'. *Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden* 98, no. 3 (1983), pp. 430–59.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Identiteit en identiteitsbesef. De historicus en de spanning tussen verbeelding, benoeming en herkenning'. *Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden* 107, no. 4 (1992), pp. 614–34.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Toeïgening: 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.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Religious Toleration in the United Provinces: From "Case" to "Model"'. In *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, edited by Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia and Henk van Nierop. Cambridge, 2002, pp. 27–52.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Neglected Networks: Director Willem Kieft (1602–1647) and His Dutch Relatives'. In *Revisiting New Netherland: Perspectives on Early Dutch America*, edited by Joyce D. Goodfriend. Leiden, 2005, pp. 147–204.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Overlevingsstrategieën van rooms-katholieken in Zutphen na de Hervorming'. In *Lebuïnus en Walburgis bijeen. Deventer en Zutphen als historische centra van kerkelijk leven*, edited by E. H. Bary, C. M. Hogenstijn, H. J. Selderhuis, and J. D. Snel. Delft, 2006, pp. 203–19.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Catholic Apocalypticism in a Protestant Commonwealth? The Dutch Republic (1579–1630)'. In *Konfessioneller Fundamentalismus. Religion als politischer Faktor im europäischen Mächtesystem um 1600*, edited by Heinz Schilling. Munich, 2007, pp. 247–72.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Strategies for Religious Survival outside the Public Church in the United Provinces: Toward a Research Agenda'. In *Wege der Neuzeit. Festschrift*

- für Heinz Schilling zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by S. Ehrenpreis. Berlin, 2007, pp. 177–94.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Was the Dutch Republic a Calvinist Community? The State, the Confessions, and Culture in the Early Modern Netherlands'. In *The Republican Alternative: The Netherlands and Switzerland Compared*, edited by André Holenstein, Thomas Maissen, and Maarten Prak. Amsterdam, 2008, pp. 99–122.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'How Plural Were the Religious Worlds in Early-Modern Europe? Critical Reflections from the Netherlandic Experience'. In *Living with Religious Diversity in Early-Modern Europe*, edited by C. Scott Dixon, Dagmar Freist, and Mark Greengrass. Aldershot, 2009, pp. 21–51.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'Shifting Identities in Hostile Settings: Towards a Comparison of the Catholic Communities in Early Modern Britain and the Northern Netherlands'. 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. 1–17.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 'The Oratory in the Seventeenth-Century Low Countries'. *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 107, no. 1 (2012), pp. 169–220.
- Frijhoff, Willem, and Marijke Spies. *1650. Bevochten eendracht*. The Hague, 1999.
- Gelderens, Martin van. 'Arminian Trouble: Calvinist Debates on Freedom'. In *Freedom and the Construction of Europe*, 2 vols. edited by Quentin Skinner and Martin van Gelderen. Cambridge, 2013, pp. 21–37.
- Gennip, Joep van. *Controversen in Context. Een comparatief onderzoek naar de Nederlandstalige controversepublicaties van de jezuiteten in de zeventiende-eeuwse Republiek*. Hilversum, 2014.
- Gennip, Joep van. "'Nu hebben wij je, misdadige paap, geef je over!'" Katholieke overlevingsstrategieën in het zeventiende-eeuwse Nijmegen, 1591–1793'. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Kerkgeschiedenis* 19, no. 4 (2016), pp. 141–48.
- Geraerts, Jaap. 'Dutch Test Acts: Oaths, Office Holding, and the Catholic Nobility in the Province of Utrecht, c. 1580–1700'. *Virtus. Journal of Nobility Studies* 20 (2013), pp. 61–83.
- Geraerts, Jaap. 'The Catholic Nobility in Utrecht and Guelders, c. 1580–1702'. PhD diss., University College London, 2015.
- Geraerts, Jaap. 'Early Modern Catholicism and Its Historiography: Innovation, Revitalization, and Integration'. *Church History and Religious Culture* 97 (2017), pp. 381–92.
- Geraerts, Jaap. 'Contested Rights: Clerical and Lay Authority in the Holland Mission'. *Early Modern Low Countries* 2, no. 2 (2018), pp. 198–225.
- Geraerts, Jaap. *Patrons of the Old Faith: The Catholic Nobility in Utrecht and Guelders, c. 1580–1702*. Leiden, 2018.

- Geraerts, Jaap. 'Caught Between Canon and Secular Law: Catholic Marriage Practices in the Dutch Golden Age'. *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 111 (2020), pp. 246–88.
- Geraerts, Jaap. 'Competing Sacred Spaces in the Dutch Republic: Confessional Integration and Segregation'. *European History Quarterly* 51, no. 1 (2021), pp. 7–44.
- Geyl, Pieter. *Verzamelde opstellen*, 4 vols. Utrecht, 1978.
- Gijswijt-Hofstra, Marijke. 'Een schijn van verdraagzaamheid. Proeven uit vijf eeuwen Nederlands verleden'. In *Een schijn van verdraagzaamheid. Afwijking en tolerantie in Nederland van de zestiende eeuw tot heden*, edited by Marijke Gijswijt-Hofstra. Hilversum, 1989, pp. 9–40.
- Ginzburg, Carlo. *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller*. Translated by John Tedeschi and Anne Tedeschi. Baltimore, 1980.
- Goodman, Dena. 'Public Sphere and Private Life: Toward a Synthesis of Current Historiographical Approaches to the Old Regime'. *History and Theory* 31 (1992), pp. 1–20.
- Gootjes, Albert. 'The *Collegie der Sçavanten*: A Seventeenth-Century Cartesian Scholarly Society in Utrecht'. In *Enlightened Religion: From Confessional Churches to Polite Piety in the Dutch Republic*, edited by Joke Spaans and Jetze Touber. Leiden, 2019, pp. 156–82.
- Green, Michaël, Lars Cyril Nørgaard, and Mette Birkedal Bruun, eds. *Early Modern Privacy: Sources and Approaches*. Leiden, 2022.
- Grell, Ole Peter, and Robert W. Scribner, eds. *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation*, Cambridge, 1996.
- Groenveld, Simon. *Huisgenoten des geloofs. Was de samenleving in de Republiek der Verenigde Nederlanden verzuild?* Hilversum, 1995.
- Groenveld, Simon, and H. L. Ph. Leeuwenberg, eds. *De Unie van Utrecht. Wording en werking van een verband en een verbondsacte*. The Hague, 1979.
- Groenveld, Simon, H. L. Ph. Leeuwenberg, and H. B. van der Weel. *Unie – Bestand – Vrede. Drie fundamentele wetten van de Republiek der Verenigde Nederlanden*. Hilversum, 2009.
- Groot, Arie de. 'Beelden in de Dom van Utrecht in de zestiende eeuw'. *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 45 (1994), pp. 39–97.
- Groot, Arie de. 'Internal Arrangements in the Utrecht Cathedral before and after the Reformation'. In *Utrecht, Britain and the Continent: Archaeology, Art and Architecture*, edited by Elisabeth de Bièvre. Leeds, 1996, pp. 253–69.
- 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.
- Habermas, Jürgen, and Joseph Ratzinger. *The Dialectics of Secularization: On Reason and Religion*. San Francisco, 2006.

- Haitsma, M. A. *De rooms-katholieken te Leiden van ongeveer 1650 tot de tweede helft van de achttiende eeuw*. Amersfoort, 1977.
- Hallebeek, Jan. 'Godsdienst(on)vrijheid in de Gouden Eeuw? Het proces tegen Johan Wachtelaer (1583–1652)'. *Trajecta* 23 (2014), pp. 123–44.
- Heerma van Voss, Lex. 'Introduction'. In *Petitions in Social History*, edited by Lex Heerma van Voss. Cambridge, 2001, pp. 1–10.
- Heerma van Voss, Lex, ed. *Petitions in Social History*. Cambridge, 2001.
- Heijden, L. J. van der. *Het kerspel Loenerslooth*. Utrecht, 1913.
- Hewett, Margaret, and Jan Hallebeek. 'The Prelate, the Praetor and the Professor: Antonius Matthaeus II and the *Crimen Laesae Majestatis*, Utrecht 1639–1640'. *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis* 66, no. 1 (1998), pp. 115–50.
- Hilhorst, G. 'Het kerspel Schalkwijk'. *A.A.U.* 12 (1884), pp. 1–104.
- Hoek, Frans van. *Schets van de geschiedenis der jezuïeten in Nederland*. Nijmegen, 1940.
- Hofman, J. H. 'Woerden II'. *A.A.U.* 1 (1875), pp. 420–40.
- Hofman, J. H. 'Wilger van Moerendael en zijn studiebeurs in het Pauscollege te Leuven'. *A.A.U.* 24 (1897), pp. 165–72.
- Hofman, J. H. 'Het Kerspel buiten de Wittevrouwenpoort te Utrecht bij zijn ontkiemen'. *A.A.U.* 26 (1900), pp. 91–96.
- Hofman, J. H. 'De Witte Vrouwen te Utrecht'. *A.A.U.* 32 (1907), pp. 117–230.
- Hoogland, A. J. J. 'De Dominicanen te Utrecht'. *A.A.U.* 9 (1881), pp. 178–246.
- Hsia, Ronnie Po-Chia. *The World of Catholic Renewal 1540–1770*. Cambridge, 1998.
- Hsia, Ronnie Po-Chia, and Henk van Nierop, eds. *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*. Cambridge, 2002.
- Hulshof, A., and P. S. Breuning. 'Zes brieven van Joh. de Wit aan Arend van Buchel'. *Bijdragen en Mededelingen van het Historisch Genootschap* 61 (1940), pp. 60–96.
- Hulzen, A. van. *Utrechtse kerken en kerkgebouwen*. Baarn, 1985.
- Hulzen, A. van. *Utrechtse kloosters en gasthuizen*. Baarn, 1986.
- Israel, Jonathan I. *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477–1806*. Oxford, 1995.
- Israel, Jonathan I. 'The Intellectual Debate about Toleration in the Dutch Republic'. 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. 3–36.
- Israel, Jonathan I. *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650–1750*. Oxford, 2002.
- Israel, Jonathan I. 'Religious Toleration and Radical Philosophy in the Later Dutch Golden Age (1668–1710)'. In *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, edited by Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia and Henk van Nierop. Cambridge, 2002, pp. 148–58.

- Jacobs, Jan Y. H. A. *Joan Christiaan van Erckel (1654–1734). Pleitbezorger voor een locale kerk*. Amsterdam, 1982.
- Jacques, Émile. *Les années d'exil d'Antoine Arnauld (1679–1694)*. Leuven, 1976.
- Janson, Carol. 'Public Places, Private Lives: The Impact of the Dutch Revolt on the Reformed Churches in Holland'. In *The Public and Private in Dutch Culture of the Golden Age*, edited by Arthur K. Wheelock and Adele F. Seeff. Newark, 2000, pp. 191–205.
- 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 Dutchness of the Dutch Golden Age'. *Historical Journal* 53, no. 3 (2010), pp. 805–17.
- Janssen, Geert H. 'Quo Vadis? Catholic Perceptions of Flight and the Revolt of the Low Countries, 1566–1609'. *Renaissance Quarterly* 64 (2011), pp. 472–99.
- 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.
- Janssen, Geert H. 'Migration'. In *The Cambridge Companion to the Dutch Golden Age*, edited by Helmer J. Helmers and Geert H. Janssen. Cambridge, 2018, pp. 49–66.
- Jong, Johannes de. 'Het Utrechtse vicariaat en de strijd over de hiërarchische orde in de 17e eeuw'. *De Katholiek* 164 (1923), pp. 73–104, 146–86.
- Jong, O. J. de. 'Unie en religie'. In *De Unie van Utrecht. Wording en werking van een verband en een verbondsacte*, edited by Simon Groenveld and H. L. Ph. Leeuwenberg. The Hague, 1979, pp. 155–81.
- Judson, J. Richard, and Rudolf E. O. Ekkart. *Gerrit van Honthorst, 1592–1656*. Ghent, 1999.
- Jürgens, Hanco. 'Habermas for Historians: Four Approaches to his Works'. *Forschungsberichte aus dem Duitsland Instituut Amsterdam* 5 (2009), pp. 1–13.
- Kalveen, C. A. 'De vijf adellijke vrouwenkloosters in en om de stad Utrecht'. In *De kerk en de Nederlanden. Archieven, instellingen, samenleving*, edited by C. Dekker and E. S. C. Erkelens-Buttinger. Hilversum, 1997, pp. 152–67.
- Kam, René de. 'Voor de armen alhier'. *De geschiedenis van vijf Utrechtse fundaties en hun vrijwoningen*. Utrecht, 1998.
- Kamen, Henry. *The Rise of Toleration*. London, 1967.
- 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. 'Confessionalism and Its Limits: Religion in Utrecht, 1600–1650'. In *Masters of Light: Dutch Painters in Utrecht during the Golden Age*, edited by Joaneath A. Spicer and Lynn Federle Orr. New Haven, 1997, pp. 60–71.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J. 'A Clash of Values: The Survival of Utrecht's Confraternities after the Reformation and the Debate over Their Dissolution'. *De zeventiende eeuw* 16 (2000), pp. 100–17.
- 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. "'Dutch" Religious Tolerance: Celebration and Revision'. In *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, edited by Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia and Henk van Nierop. Cambridge, 2002, pp. 8–26.
- 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. 'Integration vs Segregation: Religiously Mixed Marriage and the "Verzuiling" model of Dutch Society'. 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. 48–66.
- 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 Jaap Geraerts, eds. *Early Modern Toleration: New Approaches*. Abington and New York, 2024.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J., Bob Moore, Henk van Nierop, and Judith Pollmann, eds. *Catholic Communities in Protestant States: Britain and the Netherlands, c. 1570–1720*. Manchester, 2009.
- 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.
- Kemp, M. S. F. 'De oorsprong van het adellijke geslacht De Wijckerslooth'. *D.N.L.* 105 (1988), col. 101–46.
- Kistmaker, R. E. 'The Public and the Private: Public Space in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Amsterdam'. In *The Public and Private in Dutch Culture of the Golden Age*, edited by Arthur K. Wheelock and Adele F. Seeff. Newark, 2000, pp. 17–23.
- Klaveren, G. van. 'Jans kameren van der Meer'. *J.O.U.* (1930), pp. 114–49.
- Knuif, Wilhelmus, and Johannes de Jong. 'Philippus Rovenius en zijn bestuur der Hollandsche Zending'. *A.A.U.* 50 (1925), pp. 1–425.
- Knuttel, Willem Pieter Cornelis. *De toestand der Nederlandsche Katholieken ten tijde der Republiek*, 2 vols. The Hague 1892.
- Kok, J. A. de. *Nederland op de breuklijn Rome-Reformatie: Numerieke aspecten van protestantisering en katholieke herleving in de noordelijke Nederlanden, 1580–1880*. Assen, 1964.
- Kooi, Christine. 'Popish Impudence: The Perseverance of the Roman Catholic Faithful in Calvinist Holland, 1572–1620'. *Sixteenth Century Journal* 26, no. 1 (1995), pp. 75–85.
- Kooi, Christine. 'Katholieken en tolerantie in de Gouden Eeuw'. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Kerkgeschiedenis* 2, no. 4 (1999), pp. 112–17.
- Kooi, Christine. *Liberty and Religion: Church and State in Leiden's Reformation, 1572–1620*. Leiden, 2000.
- Kooi, Christine. 'Sub Jugo Haereticorum: Minority Catholicism in Early Modern Europe'. In *Early Modern Catholicism: Essays in Honour of John W. O'Malley, S.J.*, edited by Kathleen M. Comerford and Hilmar Pabel. Toronto, 2001, pp. 147–62.
- 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. 'Religious Tolerance'. In *The Cambridge Companion to the Dutch Golden Age*, edited by Helmer J. Helmers and Geert H. Janssen. Cambridge, 2018, pp. 208–24.
- Kooi, Christine. 'Catholic Women in the Dutch Golden Age'. In *Embodiment, Identity, and Gender in the Early Modern Age*, edited by Amy E. Leonard and David M. Whitford. London and New York, 2020, pp. 148–59.
- Kooi, Christine. *Reformation in the Low Countries, 1500–1620*. Cambridge, 2022.
- Kort, J. C. *Wassenaer, de oudste. Het archief van de familie Wassenaer van Duvenvoorde*. Hilversum, 2002.

- Koselleck, Reinhart. *Critique and Crisis: Enlightenment and the Pathogenesis of Modern Society*. Cambridge, MA, 1988.
- Kossmann, Ernst H. *Politieke theorie en geschiedenis*. Amsterdam, 1987.
- Kossmann, Ernst H. 'Freedom in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Thought and Practice'. In *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and Its World Impact*, edited by Jonathan I. Israel. Cambridge, 1991, pp. 281–98.
- Koyama, Satoshi. *Warushawa renmei kyōyaku, 1573 nen (Warsaw Confederation, 1573)*. Tokyo, 2013.
- Kriegeseisen, 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.
- Kruijf, Anique C. de. *Miraculeus bewaard. Middeleeuwse Utrechtse relieken op reis: de schat van de Oud-Katholieke Gertrudiskathedraal*. Zutphen, 2011.
- Kuijpers, Erika. *Migrantenstad. Immigratie en sociale verhoudingen in zeventiende-eeuws Amsterdam*. Hilversum, 2005.
- Kuiken, Kees. 'Henrica van Duivenvoorde en Wassenaar (1595–1658)'. In *1001 vrouwen uit de Nederlandse geschiedenis*, edited by Els Kloek. Nijmegen, 2013, pp. 307–8.
- Kuys, Jan. *Repertorium van collegiale kapittels in het middeleeuwse bisdom Utrecht*. Hilversum, 2014.
- Kümin, Beat. 'The Uses of Space in Early Modern History – An Afterword'. In *The Uses of Space in Early Modern History*, edited by Paul Stock. Basingstoke, 2015, pp. 227–34.
- Leeuwen, Charles van. *Hemelse voorbeelden. De heiligenliederen van Johannes Stalpart van der Wiele, 1579–1630*. Nijmegen, 2001.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*, translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford, 1991.
- Lenarduzzi, Carolina. 'De religieuze spagaat van katholieke studenten in de Republiek rond 1600'. *De zeventiende eeuw* 31, no. 2 (2015), pp. 267–83.

- 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.
- Le Roy Ladurie, Emmanuel. *Montaillou: The Promised Land of Error*, translated by Barbara Bray. New York, 1978.
- Lieburg, Fred van. *De Nadere Reformatie in Utrecht ten tijde van Voetius. Sporen in de gereformeerde kerkeeraadsacta*. Rotterdam, 1989.
- Lieburg, Fred van. 'De receptie van de Nadere Reformatie in Utrecht'. *De zeventiende eeuw* 5 (1989), pp. 120–28.
- Lieburg, Fred van. 'De Voetiaanse kring. Over groepsvorming onder de vertegenwoordigers der Nadere Reformatie'. *Documentatieblad Nadere Reformatie* 14 (1990), pp. 32–43.
- 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.
- Lommel, Anthonius van, ed. 'Lijst der aanwezige pp. jesuïeten in N.-Nederland in April A^o 1628'. *A.A.U.* 6 (1879), pp. 223–35.
- 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.
- Lotz-Heumann, Ute. 'Confessionalization'. In *The Ashgate Research Companion to the Counter-Reformation*, edited by Alexandra Bamij, Geert H. Janssen, and Mary Laven. Farnham, 2013, pp. 33–53.
- Lourens, Piet, and Jan Lucassen. "'Zunftlandschaften" in den Niederlanden und im benachbarten Deutschland'. In *Zunftlandschaften in Deutschland und den Niederlanden im Vergleich*, edited by Wilfried Reininghaus. Münster, 2000, pp. 11–43.
- Luecke, 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.
- Mannheim, Karl. *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*, translated by Louis Wirth and Edward Shils. London, 1936.
- 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. *Bedeavaartplaatsen 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.
- Mendus, Susan. *Toleration and the Limits of Liberalism*. Basingstoke, 1989.
- Milo, J. M., and E. G. D. van Dongen. *Hof van Utrecht. Hoofddlijnen van het procederen in civiele zaken*. Hilversum, 2018.
- Moeller, Bernd. *Imperial Cities and the Reformation: Three Essays*, translated and edited by H. C. Erik Midelfort and Mark U. Edwards. Minneapolis, 1972.
- Mol, Johannes A. 'Trying to Survive: The Military Orders in Utrecht, 1580–1620'. In *The Military Orders and the Reformation: Choices, State Building, and the Weight of Tradition*, edited by Johannes A. Mol, Klaus Miltzer, and Helen J. Nicholson. Hilversum, 2006, pp. 181–207.
- Molhuysen, P. C., and P. J. Blok, eds. *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, 10 vols. Leiden, 1911–1937. [N.N.B.W.]
- 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.
- Mörke, Olaf. "'Konfessionalisierung" als politisch-soziales Prinzip? Das Verhältnis von Religion und Staatsbildung in der Republik der Vereinigten Niederlande im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert'. *Tijdschrift voor sociale geschiedenis* 16, no. 1 (1990), pp. 31–60.
- Mudde, Caroline Jacomine. 'Rouwen in de marge. De materiële rouwcultuur van de katholieke geloofsgemeenschap in vroegmodern Nederland'. PhD diss., Utrecht University, 2018.
- Mullaney, Steven, Angela Vanhaelen, and Joseph Ward. 'Religion inside out: Dutch House Churches and the Making of Publics in the Dutch Republic'. In *Making*

- Publics in Early Modern Europe: People, Things, Forms of Knowledge*, edited by Bronwen Wilson and Paul Yachnin. London, 2010, pp. 25–36.
- Munier, W. A. J. *Het simultaneum in de landen van Overmaas. Een uniek instituut in de Nederlandse kerkgeschiedenis (1632–1878)*. Leeuwarden, 1998.
- Muschart, R. T. 'Onjuiste namen en wapens van Nederlandsche geslachten in het *Armorial Général* van J.B. Rietstap'. *D.N.L.* 51 (1933), col. 17–22, 55–58, 117–23, 347–50, 412–16.
- Naamlijst der pastoors van de Oud-Katholieke Kerk in Nederland*, 2nd ed. Amersfoort, 1979.
- Nierop, Henk van. 'Private Interests, Public Policies: Petitions in the Dutch Republic'. In *The Public and Private in Dutch Culture of the Golden Age*, edited by Arthur K. Wheelock and Adele F. Seeff. Newark, 2000, pp. 33–39.
- Nierop, Henk van. 'Sewing the Bailiff in a Blanket: Catholics and the Law in Holland'. In *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, edited by Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia and Henk van Nierop. Cambridge, 2002, pp. 102–11.
- Nijenhuis, Andreas. 'Appartenance et tolérance confessionnelles aux Provinces-Unies à la lueur des récits de voyageurs français catholiques (1600–1650)'. In *Identité et appartenance dans l'histoire du Christianisme*, edited by Grado Giovanni Merlo, F. Meyer, Christian Sorrel, and Paola Vismara. Milan, 2005, pp. 179–207.
- 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.
- Offringa, Gerianne, and Warner Hidden, *Fundatie van Vrouwe Maria van Pallaes*. Utrecht, 1980.
- Offringa, Gerianne, and Warner Hidden. 'De fundatie van vrouwe Maria van Pallaes, door Hendrick Bloemaert, 1657'. *J.O.U.* (1983), pp. 14–17.
- 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.
- O'Malley, J. W. *Trent and All That: Renaming Catholicism in the Early Modern Era*. Cambridge, 2000.
- 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. 'In partibus infidelium: Calvinism and Catholic Identity in the Dutch Republic'. In *John Calvin and Roman Catholicism: Critique and Engagement, Then and Now*, edited by Randall C. Zachmann. Grand Rapids, 2008, pp. 119–44.
- Parker, Charles H. 'Cooperative Confessionalisation: Lay-Clerical Collaboration in Dutch Catholic Communities during the Golden Age'. 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. 18–32.
- Parker, Charles H. 'Heretics at Home, Heathens Abroad: The Revival of Dutch Catholicism as Global Mission'. *Trajecta* 26 (2017), pp. 89–106.
- Parker, Charles H. 'Reformed Protestantism'. In *The Cambridge Companion to the Dutch Golden Age*, edited by Helmer J. Helmers and Geert H. Janssen. Cambridge, 2018, pp. 189–207.
- Pettegree, Andrew. 'The Politics of Toleration in the Free Netherlands, 1572–1620'. In *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation*, edited by Ole Peter Grell and Robert W. Scribner. Cambridge, 1996, pp. 182–98.
- Pinter, Andrej. 'Public Sphere and History: Historians' Response to Habermas on the "Worth" of the Past'. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 28, no. 3 (2004), pp. 217–32.
- Plummer, Marjorie Elizabeth, and Victoria Christman, eds., *Topographies of Tolerance and Intolerance: Responses to Religious Pluralism in Reformation Europe*. Leiden, 2018.
- Polkowski, Marcin. 'De twee Unies, Lublin (1569) en Utrecht (1579), en andere "tweelingen" uit de cultuur en geschiedenis van de Poolse en Nederlandse Gouden Eeuw'. In *De Nederlanden met buitenlandse ogen*, edited by Bas Hamers and Muriel Waterlot. Lublin, 2015, pp. 53–71.
- Pollmann, Judith. *Religious Choice in the Dutch Republic: The Reformation of Arnoldus Buchelius (1565–1641)*. Manchester, 1999.

- Pollmann, Judith. 'The Bond of Christian Piety: The Individual Practice of Tolerance and Intolerance in the Dutch Republic'. In *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, edited by Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia and Henk van Nierop. Cambridge, 2002, pp. 53–71.
- Pollmann, Judith. 'The Cleansing of the Temple: Church Space and Its Meanings in the Dutch Republic'. In *Religious Ceremonials and Images: Power and Social Meaning (1400–1750)*, edited by José Pedro Paiva. Coimbra, 2002, pp. 177–89.
- Pollmann, Judith. 'Public Enemies, Private Friends: Arnoldus Buchelius's Experience of Religious Diversity in the Early Dutch Republic'. In *The Public and Private in Dutch Culture of the Golden Age*, edited by Arthur K. Wheelock and Adele F. Seeff. Newark, 2000, pp. 181–90.
- Pollmann, Judith. 'From Freedom of Conscience to Confessional Segregation? Religious Choice and Toleration in the Dutch Republic'. In *Persecution and Pluralism: Calvinists and Religious Minorities in Early Modern Europe 1550–1700*, edited by Richard Bonney and D. J. B. Trim. Oxford, 2006, pp. 123–48.
- Pollmann, Judith. 'Burying the Dead; Reliving the Past: Ritual, Resentment and Sacred Space in the Dutch Republic'. 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. 84–102.
- Pollmann, Judith. 'Catholics in Community in the Revolt of the Netherlands'. In *Living with Religious Diversity in Early-Modern Europe*, edited by C. Scott Dixon, Dagmar Freist, and Mark Greengrass. Aldershot, 2009, pp. 183–202.
- Pollmann, Judith. *Catholic Identity and the Revolt of the Netherlands, 1520–1635*. Oxford, 2011.
- Pollmann, Judith. 'Being a Catholic in Early Modern Europe'. In *The Ashgate Research Companion to the Counter-Reformation*, edited by Alexandra Bamij, Geert H. Janssen, and Mary Laven. Farnham, 2013, pp. 165–82.
- Pollmann, Judith. 'Het Utrechtse tuchthuis of de grenzen van het gezag in de Gouden Eeuw'. In *Het Gelijk van de Gouden Eeuw. Recht, onrecht en reputatie in de vroegmoderne Nederlanden*, edited by Michiel van Groesen, Judith Pollmann, and Hans Cools. Hilversum, 2014, pp. 91–106.
- Pollmann, Judith. *Memory in Early Modern Europe, 1500–1800*. Oxford, 2017.
- 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.

- Prak, Maarten. *The Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century: Golden Age*. Cambridge, 2005.
- Prak, Maarten. *Citizens without Nations: Urban Citizenship in Europe and the World, c. 1000–1789*. Cambridge, 2018.
- Prak, Maarten. 'Urbanization'. In *The Cambridge Companion to the Dutch Golden Age*, edited by Helmer J. Helmers and Geert H. Janssen. Cambridge, 2018, pp. 15–31.
- Prak, Maarten. *Nederlands Gouden Eeuw. Vrijheid en geldingsdrang*. Amsterdam, 2020.
- Questier, Michael. *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England: Politics, Aristocratic Patronage and Religion, c. 1550–1640*. Cambridge, 2006.
- Regteren Altena, J. Q. 'Jan van den Bergh'. *Oud Holland* 76 (1961), pp. 69–86.
- Reinboud, J. M. 'Van Blocklant'. *D.N.L.* 73 (1956), col. 215.
- Reinhard, Wolfgang. 'Pressures towards Confessionalization?: Prolegomena to a Theory of the Confessional Age'. In *The German Reformation: The Essential Readings*, edited by in C. Scott Dixon. Oxford, 1999, pp. 169–92.
- Reinhard, Wolfgang. 'Reformation, Counter-Reformation, and the Early Modern State'. *Catholic Historical Review* 75 (1989), pp. 383–404.
- Rengers Hora Siccama, Duco Gerrold. *De geestelijke en kerkelijke goederen onder het canonieke, het gereformeerde en het neutrale recht. Historisch-juridisch verhandeling, voornamelijk uit Utrechtsche gegevens samengesteld*. Utrecht, 1905.
- Roethlisberger, Marcel, and Marten Jan Bok. *Abraham Bloemaert and His Sons: Paintings and Prints*, 2 vols. Doornspijk, 1993.
- Rogier, Lodewijk J. *Geschiedenis van het katholicisme in Noord-Nederland in de 16e en de 17e eeuw*, 3 vols. Amsterdam, 1945–1947.
- Rommès, Ronald. *Oost, west, Utrecht best? Driehonderd jaar migratie en migranten in de stad Utrecht (begin 16^e–begin 19^e eeuw)*. Amsterdam, 1998.
- 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.
- Rooden, Peter van. *Religieuze regimes. Over godsdienst en maatschappij in Nederland, 1570–1990*. Amsterdam, 1996.
- Roorda, Daniel Jeen. 'Prins Willem III en het Utrechtse regeringsreglement. Een schets van gebeurtenissen, achtergronden en problemen', In *Van standen tot staten. 600 jaar Staten van Utrecht, 1375–1975*, edited by Huib Leeuwenberg and Louise van Tongerloo. Utrecht, 1975, pp. 99–133.
- Roosenboom, Henk. *Ontvoerd of gevlucht? Religieuze spanningen in Brabant en de zaak Sophia Alberts (1700–1710)*. Hilversum, 2016.
- 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.
- Safley, Thomas M. 'Multiconfessionalism: A Brief Introduction'. In *A Companion to Multiconfessionalism in the Early Modern World*, edited by Thomas M. Safley. Leiden, 2011, pp. 1–19.
- Safley, Thomas M., ed. *A Companion to Multiconfessionalism in the Early Modern World*. Leiden, 2011.
- Saito, Junichi. *Kōkyōsei (Publicness)*. Tokyo, 2000.
- Sande, Anton van de. 'Roomse buitenbeentjes in een protestantse natie? Tolerantie en antipapisme in Nederland in de zeventiende, achttiende en negentiende eeuw'. In *Een schijn van verdraagzaamheid. Afwijking en tolerantie in Nederland van de zestiende eeuw tot heden*, edited by Marijke Gijswijt-Hofstra. Hilversum, 1989, pp. 85–106.
- Schaik, A. H. M. van. 'Een nieuwe heer en een andere leer'. 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. 191–249.
- Schaik, Ton H. M. van, and Karin Strengers-Older Kalter. *Het arme roomse leven. Geschiedenis van de katholieke caritas in de stad Utrecht*. Hilversum, 2016.
- Schilling, Heinz. 'Confessional Europe'. In *Handbook of European History 1400–1600, Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation*, 2 vols. edited by Thomas A. Brady, Heiko A. Oberman, and James D. Tracy, II. Leiden, 1995, pp. 641–81.
- Schilling, Heinz. *Early Modern European Civilization and its Political and Cultural Dynamism: the Menahem Stern Jerusalem Lectures*. Hanover and London, 2008.
- Schilfgaarde, A. P. van. 'd'Everdinge van der Nypoort'. *D.N.L.* 58 (1940), col. 147–53.
- Schimmel, J. A. *Burgerrecht te Nijmegen 1592–1810. Geschiedenis van de verlening en burgerlijst*. Tilburg, 1966.
- Schoon, Dick. *Een aartsbisschop aangeklaagd in Rome. Dagboeken over het verblijf van Petrus Codde te Rome, 1700–1703*. Hilversum, 2019.
- Schulte van Kessel, Elisja. *Geest en vlees in godsdienst en wetenschap. Vijf opstellen over gezagsconflicten in de 17^{de} eeuw*. The Hague, 1980.
- Schwartz, Gary, and Marten Jan Bok. *Pieter Saenredam: The Painter and His Time*. The Hague, 1990.
- Silva Perez, Natália Da. 'Privacy and Social Spaces: An Introduction'. *TSEG – The Low Countries Journal of Social and Economic History* 18 (2021), pp. 5–16.
- Slokker, Nico. *Ruggengraat van de stad. De betekenis van gilden in Utrecht, 1528–1818*. Amsterdam, 2010.
- Soen, Violet. 'De verzoening van Rennenberg (1579–1581). Adellijke beweegredenen tijdens de Opstand anders bekeken'. *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* 122, no. 3 (2009), pp. 319–33.

- Soen, Violet, and Anne-Laure Van Bruaene. 'Sacrale ruimtes in de vroegmoderne Nederlanden. Perspectieven en dwarsverbanden'. In *Sacrale ruimte in de vroegmoderne Nederlanden*, edited by Liesbeth Geevers and Violet Soen. Leuven, 2017, pp. 7–27.
- Soja, Edward W. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London, 1989.
- Solove, Daniel J. *Understanding Privacy*. Cambridge, MA and London, 2008.
- Sorabji, Richard. *Moral Conscience through the Ages: Fifth Century BCE to the Present*. Oxford, 2014.
- Spaans, Joke. *Haarlem na de Reformatie: Stedelijke cultuur en kerkelijk leven, 1577–1620*. The Hague, 1989.
- Spaans, Joke. 'De Reformatie in de Nederlandse steden'. *Kerktijd. Contactblad van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse kerkgeschiedenis* 2, no. 3 (1990), pp. 1–8.
- Spaans, Joke. 'Katholieken onder curatele. Katholieke armenzorg als ingang voor overheidsbemoeyenis in Haarlem in de achttiende eeuw'. *Trajecta* 3 (1994), pp. 110–30.
- Spaans, Joke. *Armenzorg in Friesland 1500–1800. Publieke zorg en particuliere liefdadigheid in zes Friese steden. Leeuwarden, Bolsward, Franeker, Sneek, Dokkum en Harlingen*. Hilversum, 1997.
- Spaans, Joke. 'De katholieken in de Republiek na de Vrede van Munster'. *De zeventiende eeuw* 13 (1997), pp. 253–60.
- Spaans, Joke. 'Zeventiende-eeuwse kerkgeschiedenis en interdisciplinariteit'. *De zeventiende eeuw* 14 (1998), pp. 206–17.
- Spaans, Joke. 'Catholicism and Resistance to the Reformation in the Northern Netherlands'. In *Reformation, Revolt and Civil War in France and the Netherlands, 1555–1585*, edited by Philip Benedict, Guido Marnef, Henk van Nierop, and Marc Venard. Amsterdam, 1999, pp. 149–63.
- Spaans, Joke. 'Religious Policies in the Seventeenth-Century Dutch Republic'. In *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, edited by Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia and Henk van Nierop. Cambridge, 2002, pp. 72–86.
- Spaans, Joke. 'Paragons of Piety: Representations of Priesthood in the Lives of the Haarlem Virgins'. *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 83 (2003), pp. 253–46.
- Spaans, Joke. 'Violent Dreams, Peaceful Coexistence: On the Absence of Religious Violence in the Dutch Republic'. *De zeventiende eeuw* 18 (2003), pp. 149–66.
- 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. 'Orphans and Students: Recruiting Boys and Girls for the Holland Mission'. 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. 183–99.
- 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.
- Spaans, Joke, and Trudeliën van 't Hof. 'Het beroerde Rome'. *Spotprenten op de paus in een pleidooi voor een 'Nederlandse' katholieke kerk, 1705–1724*. Hilversum, 2010.
- Spicer, Andrew, and Sarah Hamilton, eds. *Defining the Holy: Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. Farnham, 2005.
- Spiertz, Mathieu G. *L'Église catholique des Provinces Unies et le Saint-Siège pendant la deuxième moitié du XVIIe siècle*. Leuven, 1975.
- Spiertz, Mathieu G. 'Priest and Layman in a Minority Church: The Roman Catholic Church in the Northern Netherlands 1592–1686'. In *The Ministry: Clerical and Lay*, edited by W. J. Shields and D. Blackwood. Oxford, 1989, pp. 287–301.
- Spiertz, Mathieu G. 'Anti-jansenisme en jansenisme in de Nederlanden in de achttiende en negentiende eeuw'. *Trajecta* 1 (1992), pp. 233–51.
- Spiertz, Mathieu G. 'Jansenisme in en rond de Nederlanden 1640–1690'. *Trajecta* 1 (1992), pp. 144–67.
- Spiertz, Mathieu G. 'De katholieke geestelijke leiders en de wereldlijke overheid in de Republiek der Zeven Provinciën'. *Trajecta* 2 (1993), pp. 3–20.
- 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.
- Spohnholz, Jesse, and Mirjam G. K. van Veen. 'Calvinists vs. Libertines: A New Look at Religious Exile and the Origins of "Dutch" Tolerance'. In *Calvinism and the Making of the European Mind*, edited by Gijsbert van den Brink and Harro M. Höpfl. Leiden, 2014, pp. 76–99.
- 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.
- Sterk, J. J. B. M. M. 'Johannes de Witt Stevenszoon'. *J.O.U.* (1974), pp. 108–62.
- Stock, Paul. 'History and the Uses of Space'. In *The Uses of Space in Early Modern History*, edited by Paul Stock. Basingstoke, 2015, pp. 1–18.
- Stock, Paul, ed. *The Uses of Space in Early Modern History*. Basingstoke, 2015.

- Tans, J. A. G., and M. Kok. *Rome-Utrecht. Over de historische oorzaken van de breuk tussen de rooms-katholieke en de oud-katholieke kerken en de huidige beoordeling van die oorzaken*. Hilversum, 1966.
- Teeuwen, Daniëlle. "Vande groote swaricheyt der armen dezer stadt". De reorganisatie van de armenzorg in Utrecht, 1580–1674'. *J.O.U.* (2010), pp. 47–65.
- Temminck Groll, Coenraad Liebrecht. 'De Beyerskameren te Utrecht'. *J.O.U.* (1960), pp. 103–18.
- Terpstra, Nicholas. *Religious Refugees in the Early Modern World: An Alternative History of the Reformation*. Cambridge, 2015.
- Theissing, Eugenie E. A. J. M. 'Over kloppes en kwezels'. PhD diss., Utrecht University, 1935.
- Thoomes, W. *Hoffes in Utrecht: 'aldaer ewelick fundere'. Godskameren te Utrecht*. Utrecht, 1984.
- Tracy, James D. 'With and without the Counter-Reformation: The Catholic Church in the Spanish Netherlands and the Dutch Republic, 1580–1650'. *Catholic Historical Review* 71 (1985), pp. 547–75.
- Tracy, James D. 'Public Church, *Gemeente Christi*, or *Volkskerk*: Holland's Reformed Church in Civil and Ecclesiastical Perspective'. In *Die Reformation in Deutschland und Europa. Interpretationen und Debatten*, edited by H. R. Guggisberg and G. G. Krodel. Gütersloh, 1993, pp. 487–510.
- Tracy, James D. 'Public Space: Restriction of Non-Calvinist Religious Behavior in the Province of Holland, 1572–1591'. In *Continuity and Change: The Harvest of Late Medieval and Reformation History*, edited by Robert J. Bast and Andrew C. Gow. Leiden, 2000, pp. 98–110.
- Troost, Wout. *William III, The Stadholder-King: A Political Biography*. Aldershot, 2005.
- Troeltsch, Ernst. *Protestantism and Progress: A Historical Study of the Relation of Protestantism to the Modern World*, translated by W. Montgomery. London and New York, 1912.
- 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. 'Utrecht's Transformations: Claiming the Dom through Representation, Iconoclasm and Ritual'. *De zeventiende eeuw* 21 (2005), pp. 354–74.
- Vanhaelen, Angela. *The Wake of Iconoclasm: Painting the Church in the Dutch Republic*. University Park, PA, 2012.

- Vanhaelen, Angela. 'Painting the Visible Church: The Calvinist Art of Making Publics'. In *Making Space Public in Early Modern Europe: Performance, Geography, Privacy*, edited by Angela Vanhaelen and Joseph Ward. London, 2013, pp. 223–40.
- Vanhaelen, Angela. 'Public and Private Intercourse in Dutch Genre Scenes: Soldiers and Enigmatic Women / Painters and Enigmatic Paintings'. In *Forms of Association: Making Publics in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Paul Yachnin and Marlene Eberhart. Amherst, 2015, pp. 115–32.
- Vanhaelen, Angela, and Joseph Ward, eds. *Making Space Public in Early Modern Europe: Performance, Geography, Privacy*. London, 2013.
- Ven, Adrianus J. van de. *Over den oorsprong van het Aartsbisschoppelijke Kapittel van Utrecht der Oude-Bisschoppelijke clerezij*. Utrecht, 1923.
- Ven, Adrianus J. van de. 'Het huis Clarenburch te Utrecht'. *J.O.U.* (1952), pp. 32–61.
- Ven, Adrianus J. van de. 'Het huis Clarenburch te Utrecht. Een aanvulling'. *J.O.U.* (1953), pp. 37–39.
- Ven, Adrianus J. van de. 'De driehoek van Sint Marie te Utrecht'. *J.O.U.* (1955), pp. 30–80.
- Ven, Adrianus J. van de. 'Een Utrechtse familie uit de 17^e eeuw'. *J.O.U.* (1960), pp. 119–41.
- Vennes, H. van de. 'Zes gelegenheidsgedichten van Utrechtse lofdichters. Adrianus Vander-Burchius, Petrus Dierout en Antonius Everdingius'. In *De Utrechtse Parnas. Utrechtse Neolatijnse dichters uit de zestiende en de zeventiende eeuw*, edited by J. Bloemendal. Amersfoort, 2003, pp. 127–58.
- Verheggen, Evelyne M. F. *Beelden van passie en hartstocht. Bid en devotieprenten in de Noordelijke Nederlanden, 17^e en 18^e eeuw*. Zutphen, 2006.
- Verheggen, Evelyne M. F. 'Religieuze kunst als verzet en troost in de Tachtigjarige Oorlog. Een portret van de Utrechtse patriciërfamilie Van Haeften'. *Volkskunde. Tijdschrift over de cultuur van het dagelijks leven* 122, no. 2 (2021), pp. 261–313.
- Verhey, H. J. W. *300 jaar aalmoezenierszorg. Geschiedenis van de Rooms-Katholieke Aalmoezenierskamer te Utrecht, (1674–1746) en van de Oude Rooms-Katholieke Aalmoezenierskamer te Utrecht, (1746–1974)*. Rotterdam, 1974.
- Verleyn, H. *Dom Benedictus van Haeften proost van Affligem 1588–1648. Bijdragen tot de studie van het kloosterleven in de zuidelijke Nederlanden*. Brussels, 1983.
- 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. 'Roomgezinden 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.
- Vries, Jan de. *European Urbanization, 1500–1800*. London, 1984.
- Vries, Jan de. 'Searching for a Role: The Economy of Utrecht in the Golden Age of the Dutch Republic'. In *Masters of Light: Dutch Painters in Utrecht during the Golden Age*, edited by Joaneath A. Spicer and Lynn Federle Orr. New Haven, 1997, pp. 49–59.
- Vries, Jan de, and Ad van der Woude. *The First Modern Economy: Success, Failure, and Perseverance of the Dutch Economy, 1500–1815*. Cambridge, 1997.
- 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 and "the Disenchantment of the World" Reassessed'. *Historical Journal* 51 (2008), pp. 497–528.
- Walsham, Alexandra. *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland*. Oxford, 2011.
- Walsham, Alexandra. 'Sacred Topography and Social Memory: Religious Change and the Landscape in Early Modern Britain and Ireland'. *Journal of Religious History* 36 (2012), pp. 31–51.
- Walsham, Alexandra. 'The Sacred Landscape'. In *The Ashgate Research Companion to the Counter-Reformation*, edited by Alexandra Bamij, Geert H. Janssen, and Mary Laven. Farnham, 2013, pp. 203–23.
- Walsham, Alexandra. *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain*. London, 2014.
- Walzer, Michael. *On Toleration*. New Haven, 1997.
- Watson, Elise. 'The Jesuitesses in the Bookshop: Catholic Lay Sisters' Participation in the Dutch Book Trade, 1650–1750'. *Studies in Church History* 57 (2021), pp. 163–84.
- Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, translated and edited by Stephen Kalberg. Roxbury, 2002.
- Weintraub, Jeff, and Krishan Kumar, eds. *Public and Private in Thought and Practice: Perspectives on a Grand Dichotomy*. Chicago, 1997.
- Wheelock, Arthur K., and Adele F. Seeff, eds. *The Public and Private in Dutch Culture of the Golden Age*. Newark, 2000.
- Wijnrandts, H. 'De oudere generaties van de Leerdamsch-Gorcumsche familie Dirout-Dierhout'. *D.N.L.* 54 (1936), col. 29–33.

- Wilders, Coen. *Patronage in de provincie. Het Utrechtse netwerk van stadhouder Willem III*. Amsterdam, 2015.
- Wilson, Bronwen, and Paul Yachnin, eds. *Making Publics in Early Modern Europe: People, Things, Forms of Knowledge*. London, 2009.
- Wingens, Marc. *Over de grens. De bedevaart van katholieke Nederlanders in de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw*. Nijmegen, 1994.
- Wittert van Hoogland, E. B. F. F. 'Aanteekeningen betreffende Utrechtsche geslachten van Wijckersloot, Van Duynkercken'. *Genealogische en heraldische bladen* 3 (1908), pp. 145–256.
- Wittert van Hoogland, E. B. F. F. 'Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van eenige Utrechtsche Geslachten'. *Genealogische en heraldische bladen* 5 (1910), pp. 193–319.
- Wittert van Hoogland, E. B. F. F. 'Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis der Utrechtsche ridderhofsteden en heerlijkheden'. *Genealogische en heraldische bladen* 8 (1913), pp. 1–480.
- Woltjer, Juliaan J. 'De Vrede-makers'. In *De Unie van Utrecht. Wording en werking van een verband en een verbondsacte*, edited by Simon Groenveld and H. L. Ph. Leeuwenberg. The Hague, 1979, pp. 56–87.
- Woltjer, Juliaan J. 'De plaats van de calvinisten in de Nederlandse samenleving'. *De zeventiende eeuw* 10 (1994), pp. 3–23.
- Würgler, Andreas. 'Voices from among the "Silent Masses": Humble Petitions and Social Conflicts in Early Modern Central Europe'. In *Petitions in Social History*, edited by Lex Heerma van Voss. Cambridge, 2001, pp. 11–34.
- Yachnin, Paul, and Marlene Eberhart, eds. *Forms of Association: Making Publics in Early Modern Europe*. Amherst, 2015.
- Yasuhira, Genji. 'Shūhakankei 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.
- Yasuhira, Genji. 'Delimitation of the "Public" and Freedom of Conscience: Catholics' Survival Tactics in Legal Discourses in Utrecht, 1630–1659'. *Early Modern Low Countries* 3, no. 1 (2019), pp. 81–114.
- Yasuhira, Genji. 'A Swarm of "Locusts": Pro/Persecution and Toleration of Catholic Priests in Utrecht, 1620–1672'. *Church History and Religious Culture* 99, no. 2 (2019), pp. 183–227.
- Yasuhira, Genji. '1592: Hollandse Zending en katholieke vernieuwing'. In *Nog meer wereldgeschiedenis van Nederland*, edited by Leo Lucassen, Lex Heerma van

- Voss, Marjolein 't Hart, Manon van der Heijden, and Nadia Bouras. Amsterdam, 2022, pp. 167–73.
- Yasuhira, Genji. 'Transforming the Urban Space: Catholic Survival through Spatial Practices in Post-Reformation Utrecht'. *Past and Present* 255 (2022), pp. 39–86.
- Zagorin, Perez. *How the Idea of Religious Toleration Came to the West*. Princeton, 2003.
- 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.

Index

- Aachen 138
Aarlanderveen 174
Abcoude 92
Abraham Dole Monastery 27 (M6), 60, 83
n. 114, 207, 326 {3}
Abstede, Utrecht suburb of 27, 218, 338
Achter Clarenburg 27, 120, 161, 165, 178, 181,
224, 226, 228, 334, 344, 348, 352, 366
advocates 91, 128, 130, 134, 155–60, 167, 170–84,
187, 212, 221, 224–26, 243, 245, 249, 261, 266
n. 94, 329, 331, 339, 359, 361, 365, 370, 372–74,
376 *see also* jurists; lawyers; solicitors
Adrian VI, pope 104, 174
Affligem Abbey 168
Agnietenstraat 183, 252–53
Agniten Convent 80, 183, 200, 253
Alba, duke of 71, 251
Alexander II, pope 209
Alkmaar 23, 302, 303 n. 66
Aloysius, Petrus 182
Alticolle college 104, 205 *see also*
education
Amerongen 175
Amersfoort 82, 92, 137, 163, 172
Amsterdam 25, 106, 135, 137–38, 154 n. 2, 155,
177, 243, 293, 302, 358, 360, 374
Amstel van Mijnden, Maria Johanna (noble-
woman Van Loenersloot) 164, 164 n. 58,
175, 223, 239, 260–61, 346, 348 {91} {92}, 349
Anabaptists 26, 273, 299
Andriesz, Vincent 214, 328 {13}
anti-Catholicism 23, 38, 55, 64–65, 75, 79,
94, 142
edicts, legislation, legalization, policies,
prohibitions, and regulations 29, 29
n. 40, 31 n. 47, 38, 38 n. 71, 55–56, 59,
61–78, 80–82, 87, 93–94, 101, 103–04, 106,
109, 111–12, 115, 118, 120–22, 130, 135, 139,
142–43, 157, 187, 199, 201, 206, 208, 210,
227–29, 239, 241, 246, 259–60, 265, 286,
288, 292–93, 299, 305
prosecutions of, trials against, and
proceedings against Catholics 38–39,
40, 55–56, 76–94, 107, 109, 141, 156, 158,
160, 162, 164, 167, 170–72, 181, 186–87,
199, 214–15, 220–21, 223 n. 134, 236, 238,
242, 245–47, 250, 254, 260, 269, 288–89,
291–93, 299, 301, 307, 326–53, 370–77
Antwerp 105, 137, 164, 171–72, 183, 250, 327,
358, 360, 362
Apostle Hospice 27 (H7), 132, 132 n. 168, 134, 168
apostolic vicars 24–26, 55, 63, 74, 78–79, 82, 86,
102–05, 116, 131, 164, 169, 177, 185, 197, 205, 211,
214, 223, 227, 237, 242, 268–69, 299–300, 331
Arckell, Henrick van 265–66, 266 n. 94
Arendt, Hannah 313, 313 n. 103, 315
Arkel Monastery 27 (M9), 83 n. 114, 207, 326 {5}
Arminians *see* Remonstrants
Arnauld, Antoine 186
Arnhem 124, 155
Augsburg 137, 287
Peace of 288–89, 291, 294, 307
Augustinians 27, 110, 112, 220, 222, 300, 366
Auslaufen 268, 268 n. 107, 306
Axilius, Jan Alexander 103, 105, 354 <1>
Baerle, Willem 223, 370 [3]
Ballast, Aloysius 113–14, 114 n. 60, 157, 222, 222
n. 129, 223, 346 {88}, 366 <010>
baptism 63, 119
Beckbergen, Willem van 87, 342–43 {69}
Bedlehem, Petertgen (Petertgen Gerrits)
op 157–58, 219 n. 116, 346 {83}, 350 {99}
Beguinage 27 (M3), 115, 120, 200, 227
beguines 115, 183, 199, 207, 209, 327
bequests by Catholic women 67, 71, 85, 102,
123–25, 161, 163, 169–71, 173, 175–76, 179, 183,
185, 188, 252
Bergen op Zoom 296, 296 n. 31
Bergschenhoek 174
Bernulphus, bishop of Utrecht 185, 205, 229
Bertramus, Bernardus 109
Bethlem Convent 219
Bethlem, Utrecht suburb of 157, 219, 350
bi-confessionalism 23 n. 14, 68, 256, 290, 301
see also multiconfessionalism
administrative systems 23, 64, 132–33, 133
n. 173, 256
families 176, 186
bijsholen (private schools) 63, 66, 87, 120–23
see also elementary education
Blockland, van, family 170–71, 371
Anthoni 133 n. 173, 162, 170–71, 180, 221,
370 [7]
Geertruid 170–71, 221
Gerard (lord of Emmikhoven) 171
Jacob van 179
Johan Diderick (lord of Giessen) 184, 184
n. 187
Petrus Anthonius 171
Philippus Ignatius 171
Bloemaert, family 371
Frederick 18, 167, 370 [8]
Hendrick 174, 252–53
Bockel, Evert 82
Bois, Jan Jacob du 121
Boll, Anselm (Anselmus Bolle) 80, 80 n. 105
Boniface, missionary saint 283
Bool, Jacob 103, 105, 248, 270 n. 119, 328–29,
354 <3>, 357

- Boot, family
 Arnoldus 161
 Johan Godfried 161
 Booth, Cornelis 73, 90
 Borculo, van, family
 Assuerus 215, 215 n. 94, 220–21
 unknown 170, 334 {32}
 Boshouwer, Joannes 86, 119, 332 {26}
 Both, Walburga 249, 361
 Both, Wilhelmina 173
 Brabant 109, 113, 136, 168, 182, 242, 244, 287, 356, 362
 Brakel, family 164–66, 165 nn. 63–64
 Assuerus (Zweder) (lord of Blikkenburg) 133 n. 173, 165–66, 224, 335, 337, 343
 Henrica (concubine of Jan van Haeften's concubine) 168
 Henrica (wife of Cornelis van Spangen) 165–66
 Jaspar 165
 Maria 166
 Brandenburg 185
 bribes 79, 88 *see also* recognition fees
 Brienen, Abraham van (Abraham van der Matt) 64, 82, 113, 113 n. 57, 114, 114 n. 61, 173, 186, 226, 226 n. 150, 366–67 <001>
 Brigittenbrug 220
 Brink 81
 British Isles 21 *see also* England
 Catholics 302
 Broedersen, Nicolaas 130 n. 153
 Brown, Wendy 295
 Bruges 298, 358
 Brussels 24, 103, 163, 186, 268, 298
 Bruyn, Gualtherus de 86, 218
 Bruyninge, Christiaan 91, 329
 Buchelius, Arnoldus 63, 121, 126
 Buddhists and Buddhism 297, 302, 304, 315
 Buijs, Anna 183
 Burch, van der, family 161, 161 n. 38, 188, 371
 Diderick 370 [12]
 Frans 161
 Lambert 161–62
 Mechteld 174
 Niclaes 162, 174, 354 <12>
 Willem 133 n. 173, 162, 220, 340–41 {62} {63}, 370 [13]
 Buren (Bueren), van, family
 Balthasar (lord of Zuidoort) 157, 223, 223 n. 134, 370 [15]
 Hieronymus 130, 133 n. 173, 134
 Jacobus 130
 Buur Church, public church of 27 (P5), 137, 180, 213 n. 82, 228 n. 156

 Caen 298
 Calvinists and Calvinism 22–24, 26, 28–30, 33, 56, 59, 61, 65, 76, 142–43, 254, 263, 284, 287, 290, 292, 294, 298, 306 *see also* Contra-Remonstrants; Reformed and Reformed Protestantism; Voet, Gisbertus
 Calvinists-Libertine conflict 22–24
 Cambrai, archbishop of 161–62
 Capuchins 180–81, 360
 Carmelites 82, 112–13, 171, 183, 185, 362
 Casimir of the Palatinate-Simmern, John 262, 273 n. 131
 Castro Tartas, Isaac de 307
 Catharijne, Utrecht suburb of 208, 218, 328
 Catharijnesteeg 27, 220
 Catholics and Catholicism 17, 21, 23, 29, 32–34, 39, 55, 57, 60, 66–67, 70, 87, 110, 115, 125 n. 117, 169, 177, 177 n. 137, 181, 183, 200, 203, 223, 227, 229–30, 237, 243–44, 257, 263–64, 273, 276, 284, 303–04, 310
 assemblies, gatherings, Mass, practices of faith, and worship 82–84, 197–230, 327, 329, 331, 333, 335, 337, 339, 341, 343, 345, 347, 349, 351, 353
 Dutch and Netherlandish 32–33, 223, 227, 271, 299
 early modern 104, 302
 medieval 199, 205, 213
 nobility, social status and networks of 153–69, 176–89
 outlawing of 29, 57, 61–76, 93, 103, 115, 161, 166, 201, 206, 228, 289, 298 *see also* anti-Catholicism
 patriciate, social status and networks of 153–60, 169–89
 priests, toleration of 103–15, 354–69
 Tridentine 167, 300
 women, toleration of 115–25
 Cats, Judocus 168
 Cecilia Convent 27 (M5), 60, 83 n. 114, 156, 207, 328 {14}
 Cellebroederstraat 165, 215
 Certeau, Michel de 36 n. 65, 41 n. 75, 285
 chapter (Haarlem) 168, 299
 chapters, canons, and canonries (Utrecht) 26, 57–58, 90, 103, 126, 129–31, 154, 160–63, 166–69, 176, 180, 187–88, 229–30, 245–46, 286, 296, 306
 Dom 85–86, 131, 242–48, 331, 343, 345
 Oudmunster 184
 St Jan 131, 156, 159, 168, 185–86, 200, 213, 245, 331, 354, 376
 St Marie 90, 90 n. 143, 107, 130, 161–62, 167–69, 172, 223, 225–26, 258, 270, 327, 329, 331, 345, 354, 356
 St Pieter 109, 130–31, 166–67, 205, 354
 charity 63–64, 64 nn. 29–30, 166, 176 *see also* hospices; poor relief; public welfare
 Catholic 64, 133, 157, 166–67, 169–70, 176, 180–81, 184–88, 215 n. 94, 252–53
 municipal chamber of charity 64, 72, 132, 132–35, 157, 162, 165–67, 171–72, 175–76, 178–79, 181–82, 185–86, 252

- Charles II, king of England 69
 Charles IX, king of France 263, 273 n. 131
 Charles V, emperor 58
 Church of England 287–88
 church papists 297
 citizenship 40, 67, 72, 91, 101–02, 118, 136
 n. 191, 136–41, 143, 153, 165–66, 174, 188, 260,
 292–93, 306
 civic concord 35, 294
 civic honour 126, 135, 187, 189, 236, 274,
 284, 286, 306, 315
 Claesz, Adriaen 165
 Claesz, Jan 87–88, 141, 336–37 {46}
 clandestine churches (house churches) 27–
 28, 28 n. 35, 31–33, 41, 82–83, 119–20, 170,
 174, 197, 201–03, 213–14, 219–20, 228–29, 257,
 300–01, 305–06 *see also* Maria Minor Aether
 Clarenburg, secular clandestine church of;
 Onze Lieve Vrouw Rozenkrans, Dominican
 clandestine church of; St Augustinus,
 Augustinian clandestine church of; St
 Catharijne, Jesuit clandestine church of;
 St Dominicus, Dominican clandestine
 church of; St Gertrudis, secular clandestine
 church of; St Jacobus Buiten de Weerd,
 secular clandestine church of; St Jacobus
 in Drakenburgersteeg, secular clandestine
 church of; St Marie Op de Kamp (Soli Deo
 Gloria), secular clandestine church of; St
 Martinus, Jesuit clandestine church of; St
 Nicolaas Achter de Wal, secular clandestine
 church of; St Servaas Onder de Linden,
 secular clandestine church of
 Clarenburch, Cornelis van 247, 370 [20]
 Clarendon Code 308 n. 85
 Clement VIII, pope 24
 clergy *see* Catholicism
 clerical activities 77, 82, 84, 88, 90 n. 140,
 105, 115, 184, 214, 241, 267, 292, 327, 329,
 331, 333, 335, 343, 345, 347
 clerical clothing 60, 103, 109
 Cock, Anna Maria de 121–23
 Codde, Petrus 185, 205, 300
 Coddenoort, Maria van 222, 346 {85}
 Coesfelt, Richard van 156, 158 n. 21, 160, 370
 [21]
 coexistence, confessional and religious *see*
 also governing strategies; public/private
 distinction; survival tactics
 definition 36
 Cologne 24, 79, 104–05, 109, 138, 179 n. 152, 186,
 205, 238–39, 241, 299, 360, 362, 364
 archbishop of 21, 238
 university of 104, 162
 common good 38, 188, 246, 253, 270–71,
 275–76
 communal funds 62–63, 86, 156, 238
 confessional formation (*Konfessionsbil-*
dung) 30, 31
 confessionalism 298
 confessionalization (*Konfession-*
alisierung) 29–31, 33, 38, 55–56, 71, 76,
 93–94, 101–02, 112, 114–15, 119, 126, 135, 137,
 139, 141, 143, 203, 246, 255, 257–58, 272, 276,
 287–88, 290, 294, 305, 307
 cooperative confessionalization 33
 deconfessionalization 143, 143 n. 215
 internal confessionalization 31 *see also* con-
 fessional formation (*Konfessionsbildung*)
 Congregation of *Propaganda Fide* 24, 104, 131
 connivance 101–43 *see also* limited recogni-
 tion; toleration
 definition 39–40, 102
 Contra-Remonstrants 24, 254
 conversion 62, 66, 87, 106 n. 20, 116, 120–22,
 138, 167, 176–77, 177 n. 137, 180–81, 201,
 243–45, 259, 263, 275, 283, 297, 304
 Coopmans, Sophia 185, 361
 Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz 308
corpus christianum (Christian social com-
 munity) 19, 30, 38, 40, 56, 67, 72, 91, 93, 102,
 114, 135, 139, 141–42, 155, 187, 198, 230, 236,
 275–76, 284–85, 294, 313
 Council of Troubles 251
 credibility, politico-social 57, 93, 155, 253,
 271, 284
 Cruyff, Nicolaes de 185, 370 [23]
 Cruysbergen, Willem van 108, 113, 364 <88>
 Culemborg 92, 362
 Dam, Jacob van 245, 370 [25]
 Danckelman, Silvester 247, 370 [26]
 D'Avaux, Claude de Mesmes, comte 68, 70
 d'Edell, Maria 213 n. 82
 defenders 155–60, 370–77
 Dejima 314
 Delft 79 n. 101, 178, 182 n. 176
 delimitation of the public 20, 37–43, 92–94,
 142–43, 187–89, 197–98, 228–30, 235–37,
 274–77, 283–86, 309–16 *see also* public
 sphere, the public, and publicness
 definition 20, 35–38, 41–42, 309
 rhetorical dimension 42, 197–230, 285
 spatial dimension 41, 235–77, 285
 Deurkant, Johan van 261, 372 [27]
 Dierhout (Derout), family 170–72, 188, 373
 Agatha 157, 162, 171, 174, 184, 220–23, 223
 n. 134, 249, 340 {58}, 344 {75}, 348 {94},
 352 {105}, 367, 368, 371, 373
 Anna Cornelia 172
 Cornelis (father of Pieter, the councillor) 171
 Cornelis Bonaventura 172
 Cornelis Pietersz (lord of Ganswijk) 171,
 184, 221
 Franciscus Cornelius 172
 Geertrudis Maria 172
 Henricus 172
 Nicolaes 133 n. 173, 172, 212, 372 [28]

- Petrus Nicolaus 172
 Pieter (councillor of the provincial court of Utrecht) 128, 159, 170–71, 221, 269, 371
 Pieter Cornelisz (lord of Ganswijk) 172, 184
 Suzanna 171
 Dilsen, Lambert van 114, 114 n. 61, 222, 366 <009>
 Dirxz, Jan 260, 326 {1}
 Disaster Year (*Rampjaar*) 56
 French occupation of Utrecht 77, 113–14, 131, 133, 135, 139, 173, 175, 177, 179, 181, 301–02, 314
 discourses of self-representation 235–77 *see also* social status and networks; spatial practices; survival tactics
 definition 41–42, 236–37
 discrimination 19, 29, 55, 57, 93–94, 284, 295, 314
 dishonour and shame 38, 91, 255, 273–74, 310, 315 *see also* honour and fame
 Doel, Henrick Jansz 158, 372 [29]
Dolhuis 27 (H4), 132, 209–10
 Dom cathedral 27 (P1), 60, 85, 200, 243, 246–47, 331, 336, 343
 Dominicans 27, 105, 184, 207, 214, 214 n. 86, 226, 264, 327, 329, 335, 338, 350, 360, 366
 Domkerkhof 121
 Domselaer, Henrick van 108, 239, 356 <37>
 Dons, Jan Jansz 157–58, 346–47 {83}, 372 [30]
 Dordrecht 108, 173, 298, 356, 360
 Synod of 24, 63, 120
 Dorstige Hartsteeg (Hendrick de Royensteeg) 27, 214, 264, 338, 350, 367
 Douai
 university 104
doujukus 304
 Duck, Cornelis 113, 346–47 {82}, 358 <43>
 Duifhuis, Hubert 22
 Duivenvoorde, family 164 n. 59
 Hendrica 27 (O6), 78–79, 109, 164, 164 n. 59, 197, 214, 241, 330, 332
 Johan 164
 Dupac de Bellegarde, Gabriël 130 n. 153
 Dusseldorpheus, Franciscus 59
 Dutch Golden Age 19, 137, 139, 293
 Dutch Eighty Years' War *see* Dutch Revolt
 Dutch Republic
 and religious coexistence 19–35, 283–316
 Dutch Revolt 21–28, 33, 56, 58–69, 75, 77–78, 84–85, 87, 90, 103, 109, 111, 136, 154, 161, 164, 176, 182, 188, 212, 228–29, 253, 262, 271, 284, 289, 298
 ecumenicity of everyday life 31–35, 37, 43, 158, 188, 291
 education *see also* *bijsscholen* (private schools); elementary education and schools; universities
 clerical 104, *see also* Alticolleense college; Pope's College; Pontifical Urban College; Pulcheria college
 Jesuit Colleges 62 *see also* Jesuits
 religious 63, 87, 93, 104, 119–23, 125, 259, 259 n. 84, 263, 331, 337, 343
 Eem, van der, family 173–76
 Anthonetta 174, 249, 365
 Cornelis 173,
 Divera 174–76, 226, 365
 Geertruyd 174
 Margaretha 174
 elementary education and schools 63, 66, 88, 93, 120–23, 142, 292 *see also* *bijsscholen* (private schools)
 Elizabeth I, queen of England 70
 Emden 247
 Emmerich 108, 122, 249, 356, 358, 360
 England 68, 104–06, 286–88, 297, 300, 304–05, 307, 308 n. 85, 311, 313 *see also* British Isles
 Catholics 287–88, 297, 300, 304–05, 307
 Erasmianism
 regents 19, 29, 31, 285
 Erastianism 22–23
 Erckel, van, family
 Franciscus 134
 Hendrick (Henricus) 134
 Johan Christiaan 134
 Lambertus 134
 Nicolaus 134
 Sophia 227
 Esch, van, family
 Arnold 185
 Dirk 185
 Lucia 245, 330 {17}
 Ewijck, van, family
 Floris 372 [33]
 Joost (Justus) van 158, 372 [34]
 unknown advocate 243, 372 [35]
 Faille, Petrus de la 106, 106 n. 20
 Falkenstein, Anna Elisabeth van 186
 feasts 66, 199, 209, 212, 222, 257
 All Saints' Day 348
 Ascension Day 207, 326 {3}, 350 {98}
 Assumption of Mary 207, 213, 328 {14}, 330 {17}
 Christmas 208, 213, 352 {102}
 Corpus Christi 173, 346 {83}
 Easter 217–18, 238, 332 {23}, 336 {39}
 Holy Cross 210–12, 218
 Nativity of Mary 261, 350 {95}
 Pentecost 346 {87}
 St Matthew the Evangelist 328 {8}
 Whit Tuesday 204, 222, 348 {94}
 Ferdinand II, emperor 171
 fictions of privacy 32–35, 37, 43, 291, 300–01, 305, 309–16 *see also* private sphere, the private, and privacy

- Flanders 105, 136, 362
 Floris, Christophorus 214, 366 <008>
 Foeck, Bruno 162, 162 n. 40, 354 <11>
 Forclaz, Bertrand 34–35
 Foucault, Michel 285, 295
 France 68, 71, 75–76, 104, 107, 181, 183, 249,
 262–63, 273–74, 286–87, 289 n. 11, 296–97,
 301, 305–07, 313, 315 n. 111
 Franciscans 27, 112
 Francisci, Rudolphus 62–63, 63 n. 22, 79, 105,
 116, 120, 201
 Francken, Maria 214, 261, 350 {95}
 Franeker 62
 Fransz, Cornelis 219, 342 {65}
 free dwellings (God's chambers) 166, 166
 n. 68, 183, 252–53, 377
 freedom
 of assembly 214
 of autonomous religious choice 258–59,
 307, 311
 of conscience 22, 29, 42, 235–37, 244–45,
 254–65, 272–76, 285, 289, 289 n. 11, 290,
 298, 307–08, 311–12
 of conventicles 255–56, 258, 263
 of exercise of religion 75, 256, 268
 of private, modest practice of faith 260–
 62, 264, 272
 of privileges and laws 271
 of public practice of faith 263–64, 272–74
 of religion 271
 of study 259–60
 of worship 256
 Friesland 23
 Frijhoff, Willem 31–34, 36 n. 64, 38, 143 n. 215
 funerals 204, 252, 306
 Geerte Church, public church of 27 (P8), 228
 n. 156
 Geertekerkhof 122
 Gelderland 61, 164, 286
 Generality Lands 25, 180, 287, 296, 296 n. 31,
 301
 Gennep 251, 362
 Geraerts, Jaap 34
 Geresteyn, Paulus van 119, 132, 208, 328–29
 {12}, 354 <16>
 Germany 68, 86, 104–05, 107–08, 136–38, 140,
 143, 259, 294, 299, 302, 333, 372
 Gerritsz, Eelgis 83–84, 218, 332–33 {23}
 Gessel, van, family 174–75, 188, 373
 Arnoud 175
 Clemens 174–75, 372 {38}
 Cornelis 174
 Cornelis Clemensz 174–75
 Hendrick 174–75
 Johan 174–75
 Otto Jacobus 175
 Peter 175, 336 {47}, 338 {54}, 375
 Timotheus 174
 Ghent 85 n. 119
 bishop of 161
 Treaty of 22
 Gomarists *see* Contra-Remonstrants
 Gooiland 268
 Gorkum 23, 171, 289
 Gouda 79 n. 101, 171, 301–03, 305
 Gouda, de, family 166–67
 Dirk Jansz (Theodorus) 167
 Jacobus 109, 109 n. 38, 166–67, 214, 354 <10>
 Johannes 166–67
 unknown man 109, 334 {31}
 governing strategies 43, 53–150, 284, 286–95
see also coexistence, confessional and
 religious; repression; survival tactics;
 toleration
 definition 36, 38–40
 Great Assembly 56, 69–72, 77, 80, 94, 111
 Gregory XIII, pope 23
 Grisons 71
 Groenlo 242
 Groningen 23–24, 37 n. 68, 163, 172, 186, 286,
 292–93, 300–01, 303–04
 Grumsmühlen 247, 374
 guilds 26, 58, 58 n. 6, 59, 63, 134, 136–39, 158
 Gunpowder Plot 71
 Haarlem 24–25, 30, 138, 161, 204, 299, 303
 Habermas, Jürgen 38, 312, 312 n. 99
 Habsburg
 monarchy 21, 84, 267, 271, 275, 289, 292 *see*
also Spain
 Netherlands 25, 33, 56, 61, 70, 111, 183, 249,
 310, *see also* Southern Netherlands
 rule 61–62, 84–85, 247
 territories 182
 Haeften, van, family 167–68
 Anthonius 168, 178, 357
 Benedictus (Jacob) 168, 356 <34>
 Hadewich 174
 Jan 168
 Joost 354 <22>
 Maria 177–78
 Otto Jansz 168
 Hague, The 61, 92, 155, 164, 174, 360
 Halen, Petrus van 260, 372 [40]
 Hamel, Nicholaas 73–74
 Hardenbroek, Peter van 126, 126 n. 122,
 181–82, 204
 Herenstraat 27, 220–23, 261, 367
 Hertogenbosch, 's 85, 85 n. 119, 137–38, 204,
 302, 329
 Heyden, Geertruyd van der 226, 344 {76}
 Heyndricxz, Jasper 257, 328–29 {8}
 Hieronymusplantsoen 166
 Hieronymussteeg 27, 220, 367
 Hijndersteijn, Nicholaes van 83, 326 {2}
 Hilversum 177
 Hoeffslach, Henrick 107, 360 <61>

- Holland 30, 37 n. 68, 58, 74, 134, 136, 138–39, 157, 162, 165, 241–42, 265, 267, 283, 292–93, 315 n. 111, 339, 357, 362–63
 provincial court 155, 159, 305, 376
 Provincial States 69, 71 n. 61, 286
- Holland Mission 24–25, 79, 103–04, 114, 164, 285, 299–300
- Holy Cross Hospice 27 (H3), 132, 132 n. 166, 168, 171–72, 175–76, 178, 200, 210–12, 217, 218 n. 110, 229
- Holy Roman Empire 68, 289, 289 n. 11, 305–07, 313
 emperor 29, 58, 68, 86, 134, 171
- honour and fame 38, 73, 93, 126, 135, 155, 187–89, 236, 247, 252, 262, 274, 276, 284, 286, 306, 311, 315 *see also* dishonour and shame
- Honthorst, van, family 184–85, 249–50, 375
 Anthoni 172, 184–85
 Gerardus 185, 360–61 <69>
 Gerrit Hermansz 172, 184–85, 188, 249–51, 357
 Hendrick 184
 Herman 83–84, 91, 110, 184, 218, 249–51, 332–33 {23} {25}, 356 <33>, 375
 Maria 181
 Peter 184
- Hoornbeeck, Johannes 314–15
- Horst, Dirck van der 80–81, 241 n. 15
- hospices 21, 23, 41, 60, 70, 83, 119, 131–32, 132 n. 168, 133, 163, 197–98, 200, 203, 208–13, 229, 302 *see also* Apostle Hospice; *Dolhuis*; Holy Cross Hospice; Leeuwenberch, plague hospice; St Anthony Hospice; St Barbara and St Laurens Hospice; St Bartholomew Hospice; St Job Hospice
- Hout, van der, family
 Cornelis (priest) 108, 113, 159, 332 {24}, 358 <53>, 373
 Cornelis Dirksz 158, 372 [42]
- Hoven, Joan van 222, 366 <011>
- Hubertsdr, Elisabeth 260, 326 {1}
- Huguenots 273, 273 n. 131, 287, 289–91, 296–98, 301, 306–07, 310–11, 314
- Huisen 107, 237, 360
- human perceptibility 38
 visibility and audibility 38, 41, 198, 214, 230, 258, 260, 263, 308–09
- Huygens, family
 Constantijn 185
 Lodewijck 185
- iconoclasm, iconoclasts 22, 80, 185, 198
- identities 30–36
- Ijsselstein 108, 362, 364
- Inquisition and Inquisitors 22, 275
- Ireland 68, 104–05, 140, 296, 300
 Catholic revolt in 68, 71, 75, 273
 resident bishops 300
- irmãos* 304
- Jacobs, Marichge (Maria) 217, 348 {90}, 350 {100}
- James I, king of England 70
- James II, king of England 69
- Jansenius, Cornelius 104 n. 6, 168
 Jansenist controversy 104
 Jansenists and Jansenism 104, 104 n. 6, 186, 227
- Janskerkhof 126, 213, 326, 330
- Janssen, Geert 33
- Janssen, Grietgen 214, 216, 237, 264–66, 266 n. 94, 267, 272, 274, 276, 338 {53}
- Japan 289, 297, 301–02, 304, 314–15
- Jeruzalem Convent 27 (M7), 206
- Jeruzalemsteeg 27, 122
- Jeruzalemstraat 220–21
- Jesuits 27, 62, 85, 103, 105, 109–12, 114, 114 n. 60, 118, 131, 157, 162–64, 166, 168, 171–72, 206, 220, 222–23, 239, 261, 283, 297, 300, 304, 329, 340, 344, 346–48, 352, 354, 362, 366
- Jews 273, 290, 293–94, 294 n. 22, 307–08
 Ashkenazi 293–94
 Sephardic 293–94
- Jong, Johannes de 130 n. 153
- Junius, Gisbert (Gijsbert Dirksz) 167, 188, 258–59, 344 {80}, 372 [44]
- jurists 137, 154, 169–77, 184, 186, 188, 220, 223–25, 306, 311 *see also* advocates; lawyers; solicitors
- jus emigrandi* 291, 397
jus reformandi 289, 291
jus patronatus 127
- Jutphaas 141
- Kaplan, Benjamin 30–34, 38, 71 n. 61, 263 n. 90, 273 n. 131, 289 n. 11, 312 n. 99, 313 n. 106
- Kemp, van de, family
 Balthasar 108, 249, 356 <38>
 Cornelia 222, 227, 352
- Kerckraad, Abraham van 156, 158, 158 n. 21, 245, 372 [45]
- Kirishitan*s 289, 297, 301–02
- klopjes* 63, 66–67, 69–71, 75, 81, 109, 111, 115–125, 142, 157, 170, 172–73, 183, 185–88, 202, 204, 208, 226–27, 237, 254, 258, 263, 273, 275, 284, 292, 296, 303–04, 329, 367, 377
- Knighthood 57, 60, 80 n. 105, 115, 126, 181, 204, 206–07, 286
- Knijff, Thomas de 179, 227, 346 {87}, 350 {96}, 352 {104}
- Kockengen 174
- Kooi, Christine 19 n. 4, 30–31, 31 n. 47, 315 n. 111
- Koselleck, Reinhard 31 n. 47, 312
- Lageweide, Utrecht suburb of 217, 238, 336
- Lalaing, George de, count of Renneberg 23
- Lamberts van Schalkwijck, Peter van 81, 240–41, 340 {56}
- Lancellottus, Conradus 266, 266 n. 95

- Lange Nieuwstraat 214, 367
 Lange Smeestraat 209
 Lange, Mechtelt de 176, 336 {44}
 Lau, Gosimus ter 179 n. 152, 362 <83>
 Lauwerrecht, Utrecht suburb of 218
 lawyers 42, 153, 155, 158–59, 169–76, 180, 187, 227, 230, 249, 297 *see also* advocates; jurists; solicitors
 Leeuw, Willem de 206, 220
 Leeuwenberch, plague hospice 27 (H6), 180, 184
 Leeuwarden 24
 Leiden 59, 79 n. 101, 106, 107 n. 22, 301, 357–58, 366
 university 314
 Lenarduzzi, Carolina 33
 Leuven 62, 104–05, 163, 174
 university 104, 104 n. 6, 107, 168
 liberalism 19–20, 39
 Libertines 22–24, 26, 254
 Liège 182, 186
 prince-bishop of 287
 Lienden, Gerard van 158, 158 n. 21, 372 [48]
 Lienden, Metgen van 87
lieux de mémoire 213, 302
 limited recognition 101–43 *see also* connivance; toleration
 definition 39–40, 102
 Lindeborn, Johannes 121, 121 n. 97, 366–67 <014>
 Lingen 247–48, 331, 370
 Lisbon 307
 Loenen, Peter Jansz van 181, 218, 336 {41}
 Loenerslooth 164 n. 58 *see also* Amstel van Mijnden, Maria Johanna (noblewoman Van Loenersloot)
 Lollestraat 119, 165, 215, 334, 336, 342, 367
 Lommetzum, family 172
 Adriaen 172
 Dirck (Theodorus) 162, 170, 221, 372 [50]
 Elisabeth 172
 Lodewijk 172
 Margareta Maria 172
 London 71, 310
 Loots, Reynier 226–27
 Louis XIV, king of France 69, 179
 Low Countries 21–22, 23 n. 14, 33, 137, 143, 166, 169, 186, 189, 271, 298 *see also* Netherlands
 loyalty, political 29, 62, 68, 76, 83–84, 91, 111, 241–42, 255, 267, 287, 292, 311, 327, 329, 341
 Lusatia, Upper 294 n. 26
 Luther, Martin 21
 Lutherans 26, 273, 288, 294, 299

 Maastricht 163, 185, 287, 301, 360
 Maria Minor Achter Clarenburg, secular clandestine church of 27 (C2), 161, 165, 178, 181, 224, 228 n. 156, 334 {35}, 366
 Mariahoek 113, 119–20, 169–70, 172–73, 173 n. 110, 175, 179, 181, 197–98, 202, 213, 223–27, 228 n. 156, 230, 330, 367,
 marriage 106, 128, 140–41, 164, 171, 173–74, 176 n. 134, 292
 martyrs 23, 56, 237, 289, 302 *see also* Alkmaar; Gorkum; Nagasaki; Roermond
 Matthaues II, Anthonius 91 n. 148
 Mechelen 168, 268, 366
 Medenblick, Rombout van (Rumoldus Batavus) 79 n. 101, 91, 106, 107 n. 22, 110, 328 {11}, 356 <31>
 Merkerck, Nicolaes van 158, 158 n. 21, 374 [53]
 Merode, van, family 242, 242 n. 22
 Agnes 85, 242, 244–45, 344 {74}
 Ijsbrant 242, 242 n. 27
 Maria 85, 242, 244–45, 344 {74}
 Reynhard 242–43
 Willem 85 n. 121, 242–45, 254, 342 {64}
 Middelburg 24
 Mijdrecht 163, 174, 366
 militia 57–59, 63, 71, 119, 129, 135–36, 202, 215, 370
 missionaries 24–25, 103, 297, 300, 304
 modernity 19, 19 n. 2, 30, 312–13
 modernization theses 19, 19 n. 4, 20, 29, 30, 34, 39, 43, 312, 314, 316
 confessionalization *see* confessionalization (*Konfessionalisierung*)
 privatization of beliefs 19, 34, 125 n. 117, 314, 316
 Protestantization 29, 29 n. 41, 34, 285, 314
 rise of toleration 19, 31, 39, 316
 secularization 19, 143 n. 215, 314, 316
 state formation 30
 Mom, family 164–65, 165 n. 64, 165–66
 Anna Catharina (noblewoman Van Blikkenburg, lady of Huis te Beest) 162, 165–66, 215, 224, 334 {27}, 336 {42}, 342 {70} {72}, 377
 Jacob 61, 91–92, 164–66, 288, 288 n. 9, 335, 337, 343
 monasteries, convents, and abbeys 21, 23, 41, 60, 65, 83–85, 115, 138, 164, 197–200, 203, 205–08, 229, 237, 302, 327, 358, 360–61 *see also* Abraham Dole Monastery; Affligem Abbey; Agniten Convent; Arkel Monastery; Bethlem Convent; Cecilia Convent; Jeruzalem Convent; St Nicolaas Monastery; St Servaas Abbey; Wittevrouwen Convent
 Mons 174, 249, 364–65
 Montfoort 180, 242
 Montpellier 296–97, 306
 Moock, van, family
 Bernardus 79, 237, 332 {21}
 Govert 79, 86, 91, 160, 180, 237–38, 330 {20}
 Moreelse, Hendrick 181
 multi-confessionalism 31 *see also* bi-confessionalism; multi-religiosity
 city, society, and state 19, 29, 34–35, 40–41, 43, 94, 124–25, 141, 143, 154, 167,

- 176, 187, 199, 203, 228, 246, 262–63, 271,
274–75, 294 n. 23, 304, 311
- corpus christianum* (Christian social
community) 155, 187, 275
- Europe 31
- reality 40, 212
- multi-religiosity *see also* bi-confessionalism;
multi-confessionalism
- reality 312
- city and society 20, 153, 189, 197, 230, 276,
283, 285–86
- corpus christianum* (Christian social
community) 236
- Münster 305
- prince-bishop of 75, 294, 305
- Peace of 56, 67–70, 72, 80, 85–86, 94, 111,
113, 137, 185, 202, 207 *see also* Westphalia
- Munster, Jan Jansz van 86, 119
- Munter, de, family
- Johan 173, 225, 249, 361, 374 [60]
- Willem 108, 249, 360 <59>
- Muslims 24, 290
- Muydert, family 246–48
- Diderick 85–86, 86 n. 123, 134, 246–48,
330 {16}
- Ernest 247, 374 [61]
- Nagasaki 289, 314
- Nantes
- Edict of 68, 262, 274, 287, 289–90, 297, 301,
305, 307–08, 310–11
- Nederkwartier 217
- Neercassel, Johannes van 74, 81–82, 116, 131,
171, 173, 177–78, 184, 227
- Neerlangbroek 113
- Netherlands *see also* Low Countries
- Northern 17, 20–25, 33, 61, 69, 79, 103,
108, 116, 136, 140, 153–54, 154 n. 2, 176,
235, 242, 267, 270–72, 283, 285–86,
298, 310
- Southern 33, 104, 106, 108, 140, 167–68,
180–81, 186, 199 n. 3, 220, 249, 283, 294
- Nicolai Church, public church of 27 (P7), 228
n. 156
- Nieuwegracht 78, 119, 162, 164, 167, 170–72,
184, 198, 202, 213, 219–23, 225, 227, 230, 338,
340, 346, 348, 367–69
- Nieuwstraat 111, 204, 214, 265, 266 n. 94
- Nijenrode, Splinter van 238, 260, 326 {1}
- Nijmegen 138, 237, 293, 299, 366
- Nijpoort, Johan Florisz van der 64
- nuncio and internuncio, papal 24, 103, 182,
268
- nuns 67, 115, 129, 168, 183, 199, 206, 298
- Nypooort, van der, family 367
- Joost Willemsz 239, 357
- Servaes 103, 110, 113, 113 n. 57, 114, 226, 239,
356 <41>, 366 <002>
- Willem 130, 131 n. 154
- oaths 68, 71, 83, 112, 115, 127–29, 167, 242–43,
243 n. 27, 244, 251–52, 258–59, 311, 343, 345
- Oda, Nobunaga 297
- Odulphus, medieval canon in Utrecht 185
- Oldenbarnevelt, Johan van 23, 61
- Oldenzaal 237
- Onze Lieve Vrouw Rozenkrans, Dominican
clandestine church of 27 (C10), 214, 214
n. 86, 264, 338 {53}, 350 {95}, 366
- Orange, prince of 188, 247 *see also* stadholders
- Frederick Henry 80 n. 105, 85 n. 122,
101–02, 126, 128, 153–54, 181, 184, 186,
235–36, 249–51, 267–73, 305
- Maurice 23, 57, 59, 126, 268
- William I 23, 57–58
- William II 69
- William III 184, 186
- Oratorians and Oratory 104, 181
- Orthodox Christians 290
- Oud-Bisschoppelijke Clerezij* 130, 134
- Oudegracht 216–17, 217 n. 104, 348
- Oudemunsterkerkhof 161, 348
- Oudemunsterstrans 173
- Oudwijk, Utrecht suburb of 218
- Overijssel 23
- Overkwartier 80, 129, 129 n. 143, 327
- Overmaas 302
- Paddenburch, Jacobus van 239, 374 [62]
- Pallaes, van, family 182–84, 252–53, 375
- Johan 182
- Johanna Maria 183
- Lubbert Jansz 182
- Maria 124–25, 171, 182–84, 188, 236, 252–53
- Paris 296
- Parker, Charles 32–33
- patronages 21, 28, 127, 153, 187, 297, 299
- Paul IV, pope 21
- Peerboom (Pereboom), Aert Willemsz 141,
338 {50}
- Pelt, family 180, 180 n. 159, 181, 375
- Adam 180
- Anthoni 181, 216–17, 217 n. 104, 224, 334–35
{35}, 348, 365, 374 [64]
- Gerardus 181
- Gerrit 91, 160, 180–81, 250, 332 {22}, 354
<5>, 375
- Joannes 181, 364 <92>
- Johan 161, 180
- Petrus 180
- Petrus Anthonisz 181
- Steven 180
- Steven Anthonisz 181, 181 n. 169
- Theodorus (advocate of the provincial court
of Utrecht) 181
- Theodorus Anthonisz 181
- persecution 17, 19, 39, 41, 55–56, 65, 68, 74, 78,
88, 93, 235–37, 253, 268, 272, 275–76, 289,
302, 304, 307–08

- Peters, Maychgen 86, 91, 218, 336–37 {43}
- Philip II, king of Spain 21–22, 308
- Pieck, family
 Henrick (lord of Wolfsweert) 81, 85, 340 {59}
 Jacob 248, 356 <32>
- Piedmont 71, 75
- pilgrimages 186, 210–11, 229, 296, 302
- Plaet, Antonius van der 173, 173 n. 113, 226, 366 <005>
- Plompstorengracht 78, 164, 330, 332
- Poel, Didolph van de 156, 238, 374 [66]
- Poland and Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth 262, 274, 290, 302, 308
- Pollmann, Judith 33
- Pontifical Urban College 104 *see also* education
- poor relief 72, 167 *see also* charity; public welfare
- Poort, van der, family
 Margaretha 134
 Nicolaus Henricus 157
- popes 21, 24, 62, 68, 103, 241–42, 258, 263, 269, 273, 275, 299, 304,
- Pope's College 104, 174 *see also* education
- Pope's House 27 (05), 369
- Portengen, family
 Antonia Paulina 181
 Cornelis 128, 157, 374 [67]
 Elisabeth 173
- Prins, family
 Gerard 170, 249, 359, 374 [68]
 Nicolaes 170, 248–49, 358 <51>, 375
- private homes and houses 17, 41, 62, 83, 94, 119, 198, 212–13, 215, 228–29, 256–58, 260, 263, 275, 291, 300–01, 310–13
- private sphere, the private, and privacy 31–35, 35 n. 63, 36–38, 43, 204, 276, 285, 291, 309, 312, 312 n. 102, 313–16 *see also* fictions of privacy; modernization theses
- protocol of Govert van Moock 79, 79 n. 101, 86, 86 n. 123, 180, 237–38
- public appearance 313–15
- public churches and public church buildings 23, 41, 60, 197–201, 203–05, 209, 219, 255, 262, 287, 291, 301–02, 306 *see also* Buur Church, public church of; Dom, cathedral; Geerte Church, public church of; Nicolai Church, public church of; St Catharijne, public church of; St Jacob Church, public church of; St Jan, collegiate church of; St Marie, collegiate church of; St Pieter, collegiate church of
- public facilities 83, 197–201, 203–13, 229, 302 *see also* hospices; monasteries, convents, and abbeys; public churches and public church buildings
- public offices 23, 29, 60, 68, 93, 101–02, 125–35, 176, 180, 182, 287, 290, 292, 297, 305
- public order 19, 22, 34, 38, 66, 90, 118, 123–25, 142, 256, 258, 262–63, 274, 276, 284, 297, 310–11
- public sphere, the public, and publicness 17–19, 20 n. 5, 21, 31–38, 55–56, 63, 65, 69, 72, 76, 93–94, 101–02, 116, 125, 135, 142–43, 153, 155, 187–89, 199, 203, 212, 229–30, 252–54, 267, 272, 274, 276, 284–87, 296, 302–03, 306, 308–10, 312–15 *see also* delimitation of the public; modernization theses
 abstract aspect 37–38, 40, 65, 93, 143, 230, 276, 285–86, 311–13, 315
 modern rational public sphere 312
 physical aspect 37–38, 40, 65, 93, 143, 209, 230, 276, 285–86, 309–11, 313, 315
 representative publicness 38, 312
- public streets 41, 116, 125, 197–98, 201–03, 213, 216–17, 227–30, 252, 303
- public welfare 64, 166 *see also* charity; poor relief
- public/private distinction 17, 20, 28–36, 41, 43, 236, 260, 265–66, 274, 276, 283, 285, 299, 309, 312–313, 313 nn. 103–05, 315 *see also* delimitation of the public; fictions of privacy; private sphere, the private, and privacy; public sphere, the public, and publicness
- Pulcheria college 104 *see also* education
- Purmerend, family
 Petrus 79 n. 101
 Suibertus 79 n. 101
- Putkamer, Johannes 216, 366–67 <013>
- Pylsweert, van, family
 Emerentiana 124
 Willem 107–08, 108 n. 27
- Quint, Cornelis 73
- Rade(n), Arnoldus 239, 360 <60>
- Raedt, Gerrit van (Spaenschen Gerrit, Spanish Gerrit) 84, 91, 326 {6}
- Ram, family
 Adriaen (lord of Schalkwijk) 71, 80–81, 85, 127, 161, 178, 219, 224, 240–41, 334 {35}, 340, Everhardt 127
- Raveswaey, van, family 141, 375
 Andries 141, 172, 374 [72]
 Anneken 227
 Herbert 141
 Mechtelt 172
- recognition fees 79, 88–89, 269, 293, 305 *see also* bribes
- recusants 237, 287, 294
- Redinge, Robert 113, 342 {66}
- Reede, van, family
 Ernst (lord of Drakesteyn) 129, 129 n. 142, 326–27 {4}
 Maria Johansdr van 182
- Reformations 19, 21, 42, 298
 Catholic Reformation 19, 21, 24, 168
 Counter-Reformation 19, 21–22, 24, 33, 104, 168, 296

- Protestant Reformation 19, 21–22, 30, 57–58, 103, 130–31, 137, 154, 164, 168–69, 176, 178, 188, 212, 228–29, 242, 245, 284, 299–300
 urban Reformation 30–32, 36
 Reformed and Reformed Protestantism 29, 177, 201 *see also* Calvinists and Calvinism
 anti-Catholic discourses and proposals to the magistracy 61–76, 103–40, 199–203, 254–58
 insults by Catholics 91, 119, 218, 292, 333, 337
 refugees and exiles 33, 79, 105, 241, 283, 298, 298 n. 40, 299
 relics 185–86, 205, 210, 215, 229
 religious peace 23, 68, 256, 259, 262, 291, 302
 Remonstrant controversy 23–24
 Remonstrants 23–24, 26, 59, 181, 212, 243, 254, 273, 298–99, 375
 Renesse van Baer, van, family 163, 163 n. 52
 Adriaen 163
 Adriaen (Jesuit) 163
 Agnes 129, 129 n. 142
 Frederick Ignatius 163
 Jacob (Frederick) 163
 Jacob Willem 163
 Johan Adriaen 163, 261, 348–49 {92}
 repression 55–94 *see also* anti-Catholicism; governing strategies; toleration
 definition 38–39
 Republicans 56, 59, 69, 71–77, 80–82, 94, 112–14, 123, 127, 138–42, 284, 292
 Reyniersz, Jelis 140, 358 <47>
 Rhode, Anthonis de 113, 162, 344 {73}, 360 <58>
 Ridder van Groenesteyn, de, family 162, 162 n. 43, 163
 Aegidius 163
 Anthoni 180
 Cornelis 162, 362 <75>
 Cornelis Frederik 162
 Daniel 162–63, 221
 Dirk Ferdinand 162, 248, 362 <74>
 Rijser (Ryserius), Joannes 220
 Rijst, Paulus van der 90 n. 140, 91, 207, 326–27 {5}
 Roermond 85 n. 119, 303, 358, 375
 Rome 24, 55, 64, 74, 81, 104–05, 110, 211, 255
 Roos, Johannes 222, 366 <016>
 Rosweyde, Heribertus 283–84
 Rotterdam 165, 177, 366
 Rouen 296
 Roenius, Philippus 26, 63–64, 67–68, 71, 78, 78 n. 98, 79, 81, 84, 84 n. 117, 86, 86 n. 123, 90–91, 94, 102–03, 104 n. 6, 105, 109, 112, 154, 164, 169, 197, 211 n. 78, 214, 235, 237–38, 241, 241 n. 18, 242, 246–48, 261, 267–68, 268 n. 108, 269–70, 272, 330–31 {18}, 333
 Roy, de, family
 Clemens 167, 173, 366 <015>
 Dirck 167, 222, 368 <017>
 Gijsbert Willemsz 258
 Henricus 167, 173
 Hugo 167
 Huybert 167, 244 {79}
 Ruempst, Maria van 226
 Ruysch, family 176–77, 188
 Frederik 73, 82, 176, 251
 Henrick 176, 329
 Johannes (Ignatius) 177
 Maria 85, 176, 328–29 {15}
 Nicolaes 177
 Rysenburch, Jacob van 131
 sacred spaces 17, 21, 176, 197–98, 203, 206, 208, 212, 215, 219, 223, 225, 228–30, 296, 302, 306, 310–11
 Sanen, Maria van 222, 346–47 {84} {86}
 Saxofferato, Bartolus de 266
 Scandinavia 105
 Schade, family 177–78
 Anthonius 178
 Arnoldus (Franciscus) 178, 224–25
 Dirck 178, 178 n. 147
 Ernestus 178
 Gaspar 177
 Johannes 131, 178, 212
 Pieter 133 n. 173, 177–78, 212
 Schaep, Dirck 243, 243 n. 23, 244, 343, 374 [76]
 Schaick, Anthonis van 176, 337, 338 {49}
 Schalkwijk 80, 127, 161, 219, 224, 226, 240, 340, 366
 Schendel, van, family
 Aletta 161, 227, 344 {78}, 348 {93}, 352 {103}
 Stephanie 161
 Schepens, Frans (François) 165–66
 school superintendents 63, 66, 87–88, 120, 122, 337
 Schorrenberg, Dirk van 135
 Schrassert, family
 Gerard Otto 161
 Otto 128, 159, 182
 Schroyesteyn, van, family 182–84, 252–53
 Adriana 183
 Hendrick Hendricksz 182
 Hendrick 133 n. 173, 182, 252
 Johan 182, 252
 Schuer (Schuyr), Everard van der 156, 158, 245, 330 {17}, 374 [78]
 secularization of ecclesiastical property and institutions 23, 26, 57–58, 60, 85, 107, 143, 205–06, 208
 Servaashek 220, 222, 346, 352
 Sijl, van, family *see* Zijl, van, family
simultaneum 262, 302
 social status and networks 153–89 *see also* Catholics and Catholicism; discourses of self-representation; spatial practices; survival tactics
 definition 40–41, 154–55
 Soest, Jan Jansz van 119, 208–09

- solicitors 128, 156, 159–60, 168, 180, 238–39, 243, 247, 258, 370, 372, 374, 376 *see also* advocates; jurists; lawyers
- Solms, Johan Albert van 186, 186 n. 199
- Spaans, Joke 30, 38 n. 70, 315 n. 110
- Spain 56–57, 67, 69, 76–77, 85 n. 121, 93, 136, 185, 256, 286
- army 84, 242, 247, 271
 - empire 24
 - king of 21–23, 60, 62, 68–69, 84–85, 91, 241, 256, 271 *see also* Habsburg monarchy
 - loyalty to the king of, political inclination to 62, 83–84, 91, 241, 256, 267, 327, 329, 341
 - negotiators for peace 68
 - political authorities 242
 - rule 247
 - territories 123
- Spangen, van, family 164–65, 165 n. 64, 166, 377
- Assuerus Hendrik (lord of Terlist) 166
 - Cornelis 165, 165 n. 64, 166, 376 [79]
- spatial practices 197–230 *see also* Catholics and Catholicism; clandestine churches (house churches); discourses of self-representation; hospices; monasteries, convents, and abbeys; public church and public church buildings; public streets; sacred spaces; social status and networks; survival tactics
- definition 41, 198
- St Anthony Hospice 27 (H8), 108 n. 27, 132, 132 n. 168, 174, 180–81, 186, 200, 208–09, 215 n. 94, 217
- St Augustinus, Augustinian clandestine church of 27 (C9), 220, 366
- St Barbara and St Laurens Hospice 27 (H1), 108 n. 27, 162–3, 184
- St Bartholomew Hospice 27 (H2), 132, 132 n. 168, 134, 162, 177, 186, 209, 248, 273
- St Bartholomew's Day Massacre 71, 273
- St Catharijne, Jesuit clandestine church of 27 (C7), 171, 220, 222, 340 {58}, 344 {75}, 348 {94}, 352 {105}, 366
- St Catharijne, public church of 204, 359
- St Dominicus, Dominican clandestine church of 27 (C11), 226, 366
- St Gertrudis, secular clandestine church of 27 (C1), 80, 113, 169, 173, 175, 197–98, 224–26, 228 n. 156, 239, 270, 330 {19}, 366
- St Hieronymus School 165, 168, 215, 215 n. 95, 338
- St Jacob Church, public church of 22, 27 (P6), 164, 210, 218
- St Jacobus Buiten de Weerd, secular clandestine church of 27 (C12), 218
- St Jacobus in Drakenburgersteeg, secular clandestine church of 27 (C4), 180, 228 n. 156
- St Jan, collegiate church of 27 (P3), 90, 200
- St Job Hospice 27 (H5), 83 n. 114, 119, 132, 132 n. 168, 208–09, 229, 328 [12]
- St Marie Op de Kamp (Soli Deo Gloria), secular clandestine church of 27 (C5), 220, 366
- St Marie, collegiate church of 27 (P4), 200, 224–26, 346, 350, 352
- St Martinus, Jesuit clandestine church of 27 (C8), 164, 220, 222–23, 239, 261, 338 {50}, 346 {88}, 348 {91} {92}, 366
- St Nicolaas Achter de Wal, secular clandestine church of 27 (C3), 165, 215–16, 228 n. 156, 334 {27}, 336 {42}, 342 {70} {72}, 366
- St Nicolaas Monastery 27 (M4), 210
- St Pieter, collegiate church of 27 (P2), 201, 204–05, 205 n. 45, 229
- St Servaas Abbey 27 (M1), 60, 207, 267
- St Servaas Onder de Linden, secular clandestine church of 27 (C6), 113, 220, 346 {85}, 352 {102}, 366
- stadholders 23, 60, 187, 247, 286 *see also* Orange, prince of
- Stalpert van der Wiele, family
- Joannes 272
 - Vincent 184
- state church 28, 287, 297
- stations (*staties*) 28, 203, 214, 301 *see also* clandestine churches (house churches)
- Stavelot 106
- Steen, van der, family 185–86, 377
- Gerard 58, 131, 133 n. 173, 156, 158, 185–86, 188, 213, 245–46, 330–31 {17}, 376 [80]
 - Hendrick 185, 354 <6>
 - Josephus 113, 185, 362 <79>
 - Maria 185–86
- Strasbourg 137
- survival tactics 43, 151–281, 284–85, 295–308 *see also* coexistence, confessional and religious; discourses of self-representation; governing strategies; social status and networks; spatial practices
- definition 36, 40–42
- Switzerland 262
- sympathizers (*liefhebbers*) of the Reformed Church 26, 26 n. 31, 28, 210
- Teekmans, Arnoldus 222, 367
- Teellinck, Johannes 74
- testaments 161, 173, 182–83, 183 n. 179, 184–86, 252, 357
- Teutonic Order 27 (O4), 128–29, 157, 163, 174, 236, 242, 249, 251–52
- Thirty Years' War 288, 290, 307
- Tibbel, Joanna 205
- toleration 101–43 *see also* connivance; governing strategies; limited recognition; repression
- definition 39–40
- Tollesteeg, Utrecht suburb of 86, 120, 218, 336
- Torre, Jacobus de 55, 64, 78, 88, 102, 110, 112, 131, 197, 211, 211 n. 78, 248

- Trent
 Council of 21, 103, 177 *see also* Catholicism
 Twelve Years' Truce 56, 61, 85, 268
- Union of Utrecht 22, 29, 60, 161, 236, 245,
 254–57, 259–60, 262, 272, 275, 289–91, 298,
 307–08
- United Provinces *see* Dutch Republic
- universities 26, 104, 107, 259–60, *see also*
 Cologne, Duai, Leiden, Leuven, Utrecht
- Utrecht, city
 1610 riot 58–59
 as the political and ecclesiastical centre in
 the medieval Northern Netherlands 21
 citizenship and the urban
 population 136–37
 development as the stage of religious
 coexistence 21–28
 development as the stronghold of outlawed
 Catholicism 24–26
 development as the stronghold of Reformed
 orthodoxy 22–24
 jurisdiction 218–19, 240, 240 n. 12, 241–46,
 269–70, 275, 306
 politico-judicial structure 57–61
 religious affiliation of the urban
 inhabitants 26
 university 24, 59, 60, 73, 90, 314
- Utrecht, province 24–25, 29 n. 39, 70, 81, 92,
 111, 118, 154 n. 2, 169, 242, 264–65, 284, 285
 n. 1
 dispute over jurisdiction between the city
 and the province 90, 240, 240 n. 12,
 241–45, 269–70, 275, 305
 sympathy of the provincial institutions
 towards Catholics 159–60, 242–46,
 269–70, 286
- Utrecht, archbishop, archbishopric,
 bishop, bishopric of, and church province
 of 23–25, 63, 84, 103–04, 112, 185, 205, 214,
 240–42, 268, 283, 284 n. 1, 305
- Utrecht Schism 104, 134
- Valckenaer, Henrick 77, 80
- Valignano, Alessandro 304
- Veen, van, family 174–75
 Catharina Lucia 175
 Isidorus Franciscus 175, 364 <94>
 Simon (lord of Drakensteyn) 174–75,
 225–26, 365
- Velde, Abraham van der 74
- Velsen, van, family
 Claes Simonsz 172
 Richardus 172
 Simon Claesz 172
- Velthoen, Henricus 205, 205 n. 46
- Velthuysen, Cornelis van 113, 113 n. 57, 222,
 366 <012>
- Velthuysen, Lambert van 74, 74 n. 83, 94
- Verduyn, Nicolaes 260, 376 [84]
- Vianen 172
- Vianen, van, family 174, 249
 Cornelis 174, 359
 Elisabeth 178
 Florentius (Floris) 174, 358 <50>
 Franciscus 174
 Gisbertus 174
 Godefroy (Godefridus) 174 n. 115, 249, 364
 <91>
 Maria 178, 227
 Valentijn 174, 174 n. 115, 249, 365
 vicar general 24, 26, 43, 102, 113, 169, 226, 327,
 329, 331, 356, 366
- Vicariaat* 26, 79, 86, 106, 131, 178, 180, 299
- Vlugh, Jacobus 226, 366 <006>
- VOC (Dutch East India Company) 314
- Voetius, Gisbertus 24, 24 n. 19, 59, 64–65, 67,
 72–73, 76, 94
 Voetians 59, 65, 69, 71–74, 76–77, 94,
 109–13, 119, 121–22, 126, 134, 137, 139–43,
 200, 202, 204, 209, 212, 216, 225, 254–55,
 257–58, 284, 287, 292, 314
- Voorburg 175
- Voorst, van, family
 Anna 173, 377
 Dirck 377
 Maria 173
- Vosmeer, Sasbout 25, 103, 105, 169
- Vreeman, Hans 262–64, 272, 273 n. 131, 276,
 308, 311–12
- Vuysting, Peter 170, 221, 376 [85]
- Wachtelaer, family
 Jan 168
 Johannes (Vigilius) 17–20, 26, 43, 55–56,
 58, 71, 78, 78 n. 98, 79–81, 83, 85 n. 122, 86,
 88, 90, 90 n. 143, 91–92, 94, 101–02, 105,
 107, 109–10, 131, 153–56, 158–60, 160 n. 33,
 167–69, 173, 188, 197–98, 214, 225–26,
 235–38, 267, 267 n. 100, 268–70, 270 n. 119,
 271–73, 273 n. 131, 274, 276, 284, 293, 308,
 311, 326–27 {1}, 328–29 {9}, 330 {19}, 356
 <26>, 376–77
- Wael van Vronesteyn, de, family 163, 163
 n. 49, 188
 Beatrix 157
 Ermgard 163
 Gerard 128–29, 163, 251–52, 334 {36}, 371
 Willem (Jesuit) 163
 Willem (Teutonic knight) 128–29, 157, 163,
 221, 236, 251
- Waldensians 71
- Wall, Johan van de 214
- Walloons 121
- Walsteeg 27, 225–27, 367
- Wanray, Willemken van 298–99
- Warendorf 305
- Warsaw

- Confederation 262, 274, 290–91, 307–08
 Weede, van, family
 Everard (lord of Dijkveld) 183–84, 250
 Johan 250
 Johanna 184
 Weerd, Utrecht suburb of 27, 120, 208–09, 218–19, 340, 342, 347
 Weesp 174, 179, 362
 Weeze, Theodorus de 220
 Wenckum, van, family 377
 Anthonius 157
 Elisabeth 157
 Gertruda 157
 Nicolaes 157, 376
 Wilhelmus 340
 Werckhoven, van, family
 Marijke Dircksd'r 168
 Cornelis 169, 270
 Wesel 37 n. 66, 294, 299, 358
 Westphalia 294, 305–06
 Peace of 290–91, 305, 307–08 *see also*
 Münster
 Wevelinckhoven, van, family 171
 Anthonie 178
 Balthasar 178
 Johan (Johannes Hortensius) 358 <49>
 Weyman, Heindrick Gijsbertsz 205
 Wijck, van, family
 Gerard 376 [90]
 Gerrichje 216
 Wijckerslooth, van, family 178, 178 n. 148, 179–80, 188, 377
 Abraham Gijsbertsz 178–79
 Aert 179–80
 Aleydis 179
 Anthoni 179
 Cornelis 179, 179 n. 153, 376 [91]
 Deliana 179, 179 n. 152, 363
 Geertruid 179
 Gijsbert 178
 Giovanni 179, 179 n. 155
 Johan 179, 362 <84>
 Thomas 180, 180 n. 158
 unknown 346 {84}
 Wijnen, Albertus 226, 366 <003>
 Willemsz, Adriaen 86, 336–37
 Willemsz, Peter 87, 91, 336–37 {43}
 Willibrord, missionary saint 21, 186, 271–72, 283
 With, Johan de 91, 155, 159–60, 160 n. 33, 267–69, 272–73, 376 [93]
 Witt, Johan de 69
 Wittevrouwen Convent 27 (M2), 60, 81, 85, 200, 340 {62}
 Wittevrouwen, Utrecht suburb of 27, 210–11, 218, 218 n. 110, 226, 332
 Woutersz, Wouter 156, 217, 238, 336 {39}
 Wys, de, family 175–76, 377
 François 175, 376 [95]
 Godert (Godard) Jacobsz 175–76, 376 [96]
 Jacob 128, 159, 176, 269
 Xanten 185, 360
 Zael van Vianen, Johan 173, 376 [98]
 Zevenhoven 157
 Zijl, van, family
 Helena 84–85, 91, 328 {7}
 Otto 85, 85 n. 119, 168, 329
 Zirckzee, Gerard Moliaert van 161, 174, 348 {89}
 Zuidoort 157, 370 [15]
 Zutphen 34
 Zutphen, van, family 173
 Berent (Bernhardt) 155, 173, 173 n. 110, 225, 376–77 [99]
 Cornelia 173, 377
 Zuylen van Nyevelt, Willem van 126, 126 n. 122
 Zuylen, Henrick van 158, 158 n. 21, 243–45, 258, 376 [100]
 Zwolle 293

