Exile memories and the Dutch Revolt : the narrated diaspora, 1550 – 1750

Müller, J.M.

Introduction

The revelation of the past

In 1725, Johannes Lehnemann, elder of the Netherlandish congregation of the Augsburg Confession in Frankfurt, wrote a history of his congregation in the city of Antwerp from where his Lutheran ancestors had migrated 140 years earlier.[1] In this work, titled *Historische Nachricht*, he described the establishment of the Lutheran congregation in early sixteenth-century Antwerp, its persecution by the Catholic Habsburg authorities and the migration of its members to Frankfurt in 1585. In that year Antwerp, which had been ruled by a Calvinist-dominated magistrate for almost seven years, was taken over by Habsburg forces after a long siege, and all dissenters, Reformed, Lutherans and Mennonites, were forced either to leave within four years or to convert to Catholicism if they wished to stay. The Habsburg takeover of Antwerp and many other rebel towns in the Southern Low Countries led to a mass exodus of Protestants to the Dutch Republic, the Holy Roman Empire and England.[2] In May 1585, three months before the city surrendered to its besiegers, a group of Antwerp Lutherans, among whom the converted Sephardi minister Cassiodorus da Reina, founded their own congregation in Frankfurt.[3]

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

---

[1] Johannes Lehnemann, *Historische Nachricht von der vormahls im sechzehenden Jahrhundert berühmten evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche in Antorff: und der daraus entstandenen niederländischen Gemeinde Augspurgischer Confession in Franckfurt am Mayn*, Frankfurt a.M. 1725. The office of elder, which represented a typical Reformed institution, was exceptional in Lutheran churches, and the Netherlandish Church of the Augsburg Confession in Frankfurt was one of the few congregations with both elders and deacons. Members of the Lehnemann family served their congregation in these functions from 1644 until 1762. (Institut für Stadtgeschichte Frankfurt am Main, Niederl. Gemeinde Augs. Confession I, inv.nr. 1004).

[2] See e.g.: Gustaaf Asaert, *1585. De val van Antwerpen en de uittocht van Vlamingen en Brabanders*, Tielt 2004, pp. 33ff.

[3] The Netherlandish congregation of the Augsburg Confession in Frankfurt was in fact never recognized as an independent congregation, but was part of the Luthern Church of Frankfurt. In 1593 the Antwerp migrants were allowed to hold their own church services, led by Cassiodorus da Reina and Anton Serarius, a French Lutheran from Montbéliard. (Lehnemann, *Historische Nachricht*, p. 163).

who was burned at the stake in Antwerp in 1568, Lehnemann used the past to remind his fellow believers that the struggle was still going on.[4] While in the present everything seemed to be safe, Satan was in fact still raging against the godly and would unleash new bloody persecutions in the present and future unless the hand of God prevented him from doing so.[5] In its apocalyptic visions the past allowed a glimpse into the eschatological nature of the Christians' position in a hostile world: until the fulfillment of all things, believers would always have to suffer hostility and persecution. In order for people to become aware of this fact the past needed to be remembered and used as a mirror for those living in the present – the history of the forefathers was not dead but revealed what was yet to come. As Lehnemann asked his readers:

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

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

[4] Schobland Bartels was in fact not a direct ancestor of Lehnemann but an uncle of his grandmother. Not only Lehnemann, but also his wife Rebecca von Heyden descended from the Bartels family.
[5] Lehnemann, *Historische Nachricht*, 'Zuschrift' (unpaginated foreword).
[6] 'Nun wer wolte zweifflen, daß die Leiden und schwere Glaubens=Prüffungen, so über jene kommen waren, aus Gottes Verhängniß nicht auch solten ihren Nachkommen begnen können? Denn Babel ist wohl truncken vom Blut der Heiligen, aber noch nicht gesättiget, und machte gern, daß, welche nicht des Thiers Bild anbeten, ertödtet würden, wo es eine höhere Hand nicht daran verhinderte. Wenn man sich am wenigsten versiehet, so kan die Zeit am nechsten seyn, in welcher man den Glaubigen [sic] zu ihrem Trost und Aufmunterung im Leiden muß zuruffen.' (Ibid., 'Zuschrift' [unpaginated foreword]).

Austrian coreligionists.[7] In the seventeenth century the Netherlandish Lutheran congregation of Frankfurt already served as place of refuge for Lutheran believers who had fled their Catholic home territories. During the Thirty Years' War ministers from re-catholicized parts of the Holy Roman Empire fled to Frankfurt and received assistance from the Netherlandish Lutherans, who still cultivated their identity as religious refugees.[8] This tradition of charity for persecuted coreligionists was continued until the mid-eighteenth century when Lutheran clerics who had been expelled because of their attempts to proselytize in Catholic territories were welcomed into the congregation and supported by its relief fund.[9] While the early modern culture of martyrdom had deep roots in all Christian confessions, not only martyrs but also exiles had their place in the confessional memory canons.[10] In Lehnemann's narrative the exiled forefathers are celebrated as exemplary Christians who should be imitated by their descendants. As Lehnemann argues, not only the martyrs needed to commemorated but also those 'who in all kinds of afflictions consequently confessed the name of Jesus, and therefore left their fatherland, their possessions and goods, rather than to deny it.'[11] The moral example of the exiled forefathers should be cherished among the members of the congregation since they taught contemporaries about the sacrifices which religious steadfastness could demand.

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

---

[7] Institut für Stadtgeschichte Frankfurt am Main, Niederl. Gemeinde Augs. Confession I, inv.nr. 890, fol. 365.

[8] Hermann Dechent, *Kirchengeschichte von Frankfurt am Main seit der Reformation*, vol. 2, Leipzig/Frankfurt a. M. 1921, p. 29. See also: Lehnemann, *Historische Nachricht*, p. 112.

[9] The most famous case was the admittance of the minister Johann Philipp Fresenius in 1752, who was forced to flee several times in his life because of his polemic pamphlets against Jesuits and the conversion of Catholics (Institut für Stadtgeschichte Frankfurt am Main, Niederl. Gemeinde Augs. Confession I, inv.nr. 1.027).

[10] On the early modern culture of martyrdom see: Brad Gregory, *Salvation at Stake. Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge/MA 2001.

[11] '[…] die Bekenner aber, welche unter allerley Drangsahlen den Namen Jesu beständig bekennet haben, und lieber ihr Vatterland, Haab und Gut, ja das Leben selbsten verlassen haben, als solchen zu verleugnen wollen.' (Ibid.).

given up for the similar German in 1636, and many church members belonged to the well-established elite of Frankfurt. In order to remember their Netherlandish past, Lehnemann recommended that his coreligionists study the original sources of the congregation:

> From those we can learn about some of the old Netherlandish families, who have been forgotten by many due to the length of time and the changing customs. For the Netherlanders in this town clung to their mother tongue, their native manners of food and clothing and other customs for a long time, through which they could easily be distinguished from other burghers and inhabitants. Yet, by and by, they gradually adopted German customs and lost those of their homeland.[12]

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

While the preservation of memories of persecution and migration persisted longer in the Netherlandish Church of the Augsburg Confession than in many other Netherlandish 'stranger' congregations in Germany, England and the Dutch Republic, it was in itself not exceptional. The Dutch Revolt (ca. 1572-1648) and the religious persecutions preceding it had not only led to one of the earliest and largest mass migrations in early modern Europe but also to a memory culture that surpassed the boundaries of the Low Countries and informed the various memory canons of transnational Post-Reformation Protestantism. The persecution of dissenting believers in the Low Countries by the courts of the Habsburg regime and later the devastating acts of war had forced between sixty thousand and one hundred thousand people into exile, most of whom fled to the Northern Netherlands, to

[12] 'Woraus man unterschiedene von den alten Niederländischen Familien erkennen lernet, welche bey vielen durch die Länge der Zeit und Veränderung der Sitten ins Vergessen kommen sind. Denn die Niederländer hatten lange Zeit in dieser Stadt ihre Landes=Sprach, Manier in Speiß und Kleidung und andern Gebräuchen gehalten, durch welche man sie leicht von den andern Burgern und Einwohnern hat unterscheiden können, welches aber alles nach und nach abkommen, und in die hiesige Teutsche Manieren verändert worden ist.' (Lehnemann, *Historische Nachricht*, p. 121).

England and the coastal and western parts of the Holy Roman Empire.[13] These migrants formed long-lasting and close-knit diasporic networks, which, as this study will show, continued to exist for at least 150 years and were bound together by shared memories of war and persecution as well as the consciousness of a common origin. This diaspora represented new social identities and generated religious and political discourses that were often adopted by groups and individuals outside the actual migrant communities. The historical narrative of religious persecution, martyrdom and exile became a constitutive element in the national and transnational memory cultures of European and American Protestantism and is in fact still disseminated today. While such memories were strongly fueled by later migration movements, such as the exodus of Huguenots from France after 1685 and the expulsion of Lutherans from Salzburg after 1731, the mass migration during the Dutch Revolt, along with the experiences of the English Marian exiles in the mid-sixteenth century, laid a foundation for the grand narrative of persecution and exile for the sake of the Protestant faith.[14]

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

---

[13] See for the various estimates on the numbers of migrants: Briels, *Zuid-Nederlanders in de Republiek*, p. 80; J.J. Woltjer, 'Zuid-Nederlanders in de Republiek, 1572-1630' (book review), in: *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 66 (1986), pp. 264-268; Geoffrey Parker, *The Dutch Revolt*, Harmondsworth 1985, pp. 118-19; Jonathan Israel, *The Dutch Republic. Its Rise, Greatness and Fall, 1477-1806*, Oxford 1998, pp. 160, 219.

[14] On the commemoration of Hugenuenots and other Protestant exiles since the nineteenth century, see e.g.: Etienne Francois, 'Die Traditions- und Legendenbildung des deutschen Refuge', in: Heinz Duchhardt, *Der Exodus der Hugenotten*, Keulen/Wenen 1985, pp. 177-193; Rudolf von Thadden, 'Vom Glaubensflüchtling zum preußischen Patrioten', in: Rudolf von Thadden, Michelle Magdelaine, *Die Hugenotten 1685-1985*, München 1985, pp. 186-197; Etienne Francois, 'Vom preußischen Patrioten zum besten Deutschen', in: Von Thadden, Michelle Magdelaine, *Die Hugenotten*, pp. 198-212; Bertrand Cortrett, 'Frenchmen by birth, Huguenots by the grace of God', in: Bertrand van Ruymbeke and Randy J. Sparks, *Memory and Identity. The Huguenots in France and the Atlantic Diaspora*, Columbia/South Carolina 2003, pp. 310-324; David van der Linden, *Experiencing Exile. Huguenot Refugees in the Dutch Republic. 1680-1700*, (Doctoral dissertation, Utrecht University 2013). For examples of the contemporary commemoration of the Protestant mass migration from the Low Countries, see e.g.: Torben W. Telder, Ursula Wegner, *Jubiläumsfestschrift zur 400-jährigen Wiederkehr des ersten Gottesdienstes in der Wallonischen Kirche*, Hanau 2009; Armin Bansa, *Festschrift der Niederländischen Gemeinde Augsburger Confession zum Gründungstag vor 400 Jahren,* Frankfurt a. M. 1985; Paul Majer, *Flüchtlingsschicksal unserer Vorfahren, Zum 375jährigen Jubiläum der Niederländischen Gemeinde Augsburger Confession in Frankfurt am Main,* Frankfurt a. M. 1960; Werner Schmidt-Scharff, *350 Jahre Niederländische Gemeinde Augsburger Konfession in Frankfurt am Main*, Frankfurt a. M., 1935.

Low Countries and the sixteenth century wars of religion in France, which belonged to the canon of Huguenot memory, were the most iconic.[15] Not only did the Huguenot diaspora incorporate memories of Netherlandish exiled Protestants, but it even experienced an institutional symbiosis with the French-speaking Netherlandish stranger churches in the Dutch Republic, England and the Holy Roman Empire. The Walloon Reformed Churches in Holland, Zeeland and other Northern Netherlandish provinces, as well as the French Reformed congregations in London, Frankfurt and other important exile towns of Netherlandish refugees were originally formed by fugitives from the Low Countries but eventually became populated by Huguenots from France, who after 1685 often outnumbered the migrants of Dutch origin. These new members of the stranger churches inscribed their own memories into the historical narrative of the already-existing Protestant diaspora.

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

[15] For the development of a Huguenot memory canon between the wars of religion and the Edict of Nantes, see: Philip Benedict, 'Shaping the memory of the French wars of religion. The first centuries', in: Erika Kuijpers, Judith Pollmann e.a. (eds), *Memory before Modernity. Memory cultures in Early Modern Europe*, Leiden 2013, pp. 111-125.

and families but also institutions, such as the Dutch stranger churches in the North Sea and Rhine regions, a special status. The nature of this status and the changing functions of the disseminated exile identities demand an analysis that takes into consideration the specific political and religious circumstances in the various new hometowns of the refugees and their descendants.[16]

Yet, side by side with this rather local approach, the transnational and transregional component of the memory cultures of religious persecution and exile require a thorough analysis. Therefore, this study will also explore the ways in which the international diasporic networks were shaped and constituted by memories and a common sense of the past. While the various local stranger communities and churches in the cities of the Dutch Republic, England and Germany have already been studied as units, the question of how all these local communities were connected to each other and preserved a sense of belonging to a wider and transnational network has been addressed only quite recently.[17] In particular, the more recent work of Ole Peter Grell has reminded us of the fact that the individual Reformed stranger churches did not see themselves as individual entities but as part of an international diaspora of 'brethren of Christ'.[18] According to Grell, the transnational networks of Calvinist exiles and their descendants

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

[17] For existing studies on Netherlandish refugee communities, see e.g.: Schilling, *Niederländische Exulanten*; Heinz Schilling, 'Die frühneuzeitliche Konfessionsmigration', in: Klaus J. Bade (ed.), *Migration in der europäischen Geschichte seit dem späten Mittelalter* (IMIS-Beiträge 20), Osnabrück 2002, 67-89; M. Backhouse, *The Flemish and Walloon communities at Sandwich during the reign of Elizabeth I*, 1561-1603, Brussels 1995; A. Dünnwald, *Konfessionsstreit und Verfassungskonflikt: die Aufnahme der Niederländischen Flüchtlinge im Herzogtum Kleve 1566-1585*, Bielefeld 1998; Raingard Esser, *Niederländische Exulanten im England des 16. und frühen 17. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 1996; J. Briels, *Zuid-Nederlanders in de Republiek 1572-1630. Een demografische en cultuurhistorische studie*, Sint-Niklaas 1985; Peter Ole Grell*, Calvinist Exiles in Tudor and Stuart England, Aldershot 1996;* Andrew Pettegree*, Emden and the Dutch revolt. Exile and the Development of Reformed Protestantism*, Oxford 1992; Lien Bich Luu, *Immigrants and the Industries of London*, 1500-1700, Aldershot 2005. On the economic role of Southern Netherlandish merchants for Amsterdam as the most important staple port of the Low Countries, see: Oscar Gelderblom, *Zuidnederlandse kooplieden en de opkomst van de Amsterdamse stapelmarkt*, Hilversum 2000. For an overview of the scholarly literature up to 1994 on early modern Netherlandish exiles, see: *Janssens*, '"*Verjaagd uit Nederland*". Zuidnederlandse emigratie in de zestiende eeuw. Een historiografisch overzicht (ca. 1968- 1994)', in: *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 75 (1995), pp. 102-119.

[18] Ole Peter Grell, *Brethren in Christ. A Calvinist Network in Reformation Europe*, Cambridge 2011; Ole Peter Grell, 'The Creation of a Transnational, Calvinist Network and its Significance for Calvinist Identity and Interaction in Early Modern Europe', in: *European Revue of History* 16/5, 619-636.

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

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

[19] Grell, *Brethren in Christ*, p. 301.
[20] See chapter 4 of this book.

that rely on the logic of belonging either to the new host society or the lost homeland.

Memories and the continuation of the diaspora

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

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

---

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

[22] Anne-Marie Fortier, 'Diaspora', in: David Atkinson, Peter Jackson e.a., *Cultural Geography. A Critical Dictionary of Key Concepts*, London/New York 2005, p. 184.

[23] In the case of the early modern Calvinist diaspora, see e.g.: Grell, *Brethren in Christ*; Grell, 'The Creation of a Transnational, Calvinist Network'; Niek Al and Clé Lesger, 'Twee volken besloten binnen

that assume fundamental distinction between a 'here' and a 'there' and a monolithic and stable concept of a homeland that is opposed to the new host society. When we look at the memories and identity constructions that are transmitted within a diaspora, the problems of such an approach become visible. Not only is the memory of the homeland highly flexible and subject to changes of perspective in each new generation, but from the earliest recollections onwards it is always a highly imaginary place.[24] Its very being is already adjusted not only by looking back in time but also by a re-imagination from abroad. The continuity between the place of origin and its commemoration in the diaspora is not linear, and the opposition between homeland and the new host society is not a mere given but in first instance a reproduction of the specific circumstances in which migrants live among their new neighbors. Looking for a point in which the memory of the homeland is abandoned to make way for full integration into a new society relies on a rather mechanical and essentialist understanding of what a diaspora is and on what Rogers Brubaker has criticized as 'groupism', or the 'tendency to take sharply bounded putatively homogenous groups as basic constituents of social life, chief protagonists of social conflict, and fundamental units of social analysis.'[25]

To overcome such notions, which have often clouded the analytical clarity of a wide range of migration research, this study will depart from a different notion of diaspora. My starting point is that individuals are not merely born into a stable migrant community that shapes all aspects of their lives but always have to negotiate and re-imagine their migrant identities and thereby continually reinvent the existing diaspora. To employ the famous definition by Stuart Hall, their cultural identity is 'not an essence but a positioning'.[26] Being part of a diaspora is not an allegiance that

---

Amstels wallen'? Antwerpse migranten in Amsterdam omstreeks 1590', *Tijdschrift voor Sociale Geschiedenis* 21, nr. 2 (1995), pp. 129-144; Gerard van Gurp, 'Bosschenaars in de verstrooiing. Emigratie tussen 1579 en 1629', *Tijdschrift voor Sociale Geschiedenis* 23, nr. 4 (1997), pp. 401-427 and to certain the degree also the works of Briels who departs from a categorical distinction between Northern and Southern Netherlandish culture. See: J. Briels, *De Zuidnederlandse immigratie in Amsterdam en Haarlem omstreeks 1572-1630. Met een keuze van archivalische gegevens*, Utrecht 1976, especially pp. 39f. and Briels, *Zuid-Nederlanders in de Republiek* , especially pp. 266ff.

[24] See on the re-imagination of the homeland: Robert Cohen, 'Solid, ductile and liquid: Changing notions of homeland and home in diaspora studies', in Eliezer Ben-Raffael and Ytzhak Sternberg (eds), *Transnationalism. Diasporas and the Advent of a New (Dis)order*, Leiden 2009, pp. 117-134, esp. p. 132.

[25] Rogers Brubaker, 'Neither Individualism nor 'Groupism'. A Reply to Craig Calhoun', in: *Ethnicities* 3 (December 2003), p. 553. See also: Rogers Brubaker, *Ethnicity without Groups*, Cambridge/MA 2004.

[26] See e.g.: Stuart Hall, 'Cultural Identity and Cinematic Representation', in: Mbye Cham (ed.), *Ex-iles. Essays on Caribbean Cinema*, Trenton/NJ 1992, pp. 224f.

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

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

---

[27] Ibid., pp. 234, 222.
[28] See e.g. the Martens and Van Panhuys families described in chapter 4 of this book.
[29] This understanding of diaspora is related to that of Rogers Brubaker, who conceives of the concept of diaspora as 'a category of practice, which is used to make claims, to articulate projects, to formulate expectations, to mobilize energies, to appeal to loyalties'. Brubaker, however, goes even further and proposes to abandon the notion of 'a diaspora' and rather speak of 'diasporic stances, projects, claims, idioms, practices, and so on'.
(Rogers Brubaker, 'The 'Diaspora' Diaspora', in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28 no. 1 [2005], pp. 12, 13.)

lives of individuals in their new host societies we will have to explore the various meanings of the transmitted exile memories and the discourses in which they could be articulated and integrated into historical narratives of the migrants' neighbors.

As the perceived and lived connections between dispersed populations, diasporas rely for a great part on narrative structures and motifs which construe the bonds and ties between the various groups in their new host societies. Literary scholar Esther Peeren has employed Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of the 'chronotope' in the study of diasporas. While this concept was originally developed by Bakhtin as an analytical tool in the study of narrative texts, Peeren argues that it can be fruitful in the cultural analysis of diasporic memories. In Bakhtin's work a chronotope signifies the unity of time and space that guides and organizes the plot in a textual or oral narrative. While personal memories always consist of such chronotopes, far-reaching interruptions in one's biography such as the sudden loss of a home undermine their linear sequence. The life-world of migrants, especially those who were subject to forced expulsions, does not consist of closed sequences of chronotopes but hybridizes both the 'here' and 'there' and the 'now' and 'then'. As Peeren argues: 'Diasporic subjects are never wholly part of either the home or the host chronotope: they do not move from one to the other without the interference of memory, but are always in negotiation with both'.[30] While this negotiation and fusion between the 'here' and the 'there' may appear as a commonplace, Peeren's observations offer some enlightening insights into the nature of diasporic memories and identities. Instead of assuming a 'true self' of migrants that posits them either in their host society or their remembered lost homes, Peeren asserts that diaspora members always participate in and, at the same time, transcend both chronotopes. This 'dischronotopicality' creates plural identities and positionings that refer not only to the remembered past but also to the anticipated future.[31]

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

[30] Esther Peeren, 'Through the Lens of the Chronotope', in: Marie-Aude Baronian, Stephen Besser e.a. (eds), *Diaspora and Memory. Figures of Displacement in Contemporary Literature, Arts and Politics*, Amsterdam/New York 2007, p. 74.
[31] Ibid., p. 75.

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

Migration and memory

Even though diasporic networks intrinsically rely on shared memories, the field of social and cultural memory studies has traditionally shown little interest in the phenomenon of migration and dispersion. It is rather surprising that this topic has only recently been addressed by students of memory.[32] Since its emergence in the first half of the twentieth century but even more since its revival in the 1980s, the field of memory studies has primarily been concerned with the constructions of the

[32] See e.g. the various conference volumes that have appeared during the last six years: Irial Glynn and J. Olaf Kleist (eds), *History, Memory and Migration. Perceptions of the Past and the Politics of Incorporation*, Houndsmills, Basingstoke/New York 2012; Julia Creet and Andreas Kitzmann (eds), *Memory and Migration. Multidisciplinary Approaches to Memory Studies*, Toronto/London 2011; Kuah-Pearce Khun Eng and Andrew P. Davidson, *At Home in the Chinese Diaspora. Memories, Identities and Belongings*, Houndsmills, Basingstoke/New York 2008; Baronian, Besser e.a. (eds), *Diaspora and Memory*; E. Boesen and F. Lentz (eds), *Migration und Erinnerung. Konzepte und Methoden der Forschung*, Münster 2010. All these studies treat only modern and contemporary cases. The nexus between memory and migration in early modern history is examined in very few modern studies, e.g. in: David Trim (ed.), *The Huguenots. History and Memory in Transnational Context*, Leiden 2011 and: Van Ruymbeke and Sparks, *Memory and Identity The Huguenots in France*.

past of modern nation states as well as memories of violence and war.[33] The field has often referred to the concept of the 'sites of memory', largely due to the influence of the French historian Pierre Nora. While this concept did not exclusively refer to spatial sites, the notion of a primarily place-bound memory seemed helpful in order not to further blur the often-discussed distinction between memory and history[34], with the result that other forms of memory, such as the travelling memories of migrants and nomads were long neglected. However, on a world-historical scale it is arguable 'that migration rather than location is the condition of memory', as Julia Creet asserts.[35] While, of course, collectively shared memories often have a clearly identifiable location as their narrative stage, only very few memories do in fact remain local. Typically, narratives about the past soon start to 'travel', not only with migrants but also with temporary travelers and, perhaps more importantly, through media with a wider reach. This is not only the case in the contemporary world but also in pre-modern times.

Recent studies on memory cultures among migrants and displaced groups sometimes argue that such people develop exclusive discourses about their past, which are clearly distinguishable from the memory cultures of their host societies. In many cases, migrant communities even form isolated 'memory ghettos' into which their members seclude themselves and which, as Maggi Leung asserts, can provide a private 'comfort zone'.[36] These exclusive memory cultures set their members apart from the rest of society and cannot easily be shared with people outside one's own minority group. In many cases the discourses in which images of the past are articulated within a migrant community may prove incompatible with the collective memories of their host society and its imagination of the past. In such cases the distinctive diasporic identity is reproduced and marks a clear difference between the

---

[33] See e.g.: Aleida Assmann, *Der lange Schatten der Vergangenheit. Erinnerungskultur und Geschichtspolitik*, Munich 2006; Aleida Assmann, *Erinnerungsräume. Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*, Munich 1999; Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nünning (eds), *Cultural Memory Studies. An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, Berlin 2008.

[34] Pierre Nora, 'Between *Memory* and *History*. Les Lieux de Mémoire', in: *Representations* 26 (1989), p. 7.

[35] Julia Creet, 'Introduction', in: Creet and Kitzmann (eds), *Memory and Migration.*, p. 9.

[36] Maggi H.W. Leung, 'Memories, Belonging and Homemaking. Chinese Migrants in Germany', in: Khun Eng and Davidson, *At Home in the Chinese Diaspora*, p. 173. See also: Andreas Kitzmann, 'Frames of Memory. WWII German expellees in Canada', in: Creet and Kitzmann (eds), *Memory and Migration*, pp. 93-119; Lauren Guyot, 'Locked in a Memory Ghetto. A Case Study of a Kurdish Community in France', in: Creet and Kitzmann (eds), *Memory and Migration*, pp. 135-155.

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

Without denying the existence of 'memory ghettos' that provide boundaries between migrants and local populations, this book will examine to what extent migrant experiences of the past relied on sharply drawn boundaries between their own memory cultures and those of their local neighbors in their new hometowns. As I will argue, the numerous Southern Netherlandish refugees who left their homelands during the second half of the sixteenth century did not live in such isolated memory ghettos at all. Even though they developed very lively memory cultures and preserved their identity as religious exiles for centuries, the discourses in which their memories were articulated and transmitted were never totally separated from the memory canons of their host societies. On the contrary, exile memories and identities incorporated collectively shared narratives about the past as told by the original inhabitants of their new hometowns. For individuals belonging to the transnational diaspora of Reformed migrants from the Southern Netherlands their diasporic identity was not an all-encompassing narrative but rather one that could coexist and be combined with memories of the various host societies in which they found themselves. In many cases, migrants could also benefit from the fashioning of distinctive exile identities as the examples in chapter 4 of this book show. The gains of the cultivation of the refugee past depended, of course, on the specific situation in the migrants' host societies. In places where their religious confession or political conviction was shared by the local population descent from people who had suffered for the 'true faith' could bring considerable prestige. Such

[37] See e.g.: John A. Armstrong, 'Proletarian and Mobilized Diasporas', in: *American Political Science Review* vol. 70, no. 2 (1976), p. 394.

was often the case in the Reformed circles of the Dutch Republic and also among English Puritans, who honored Huguenots and Dutch Calvinist as persecuted coreligionists who had been steadfast enough to leave their homes for the sake of their convictions. In such surroundings, remembering the history of confessional persecution was not an issue that divided migrants and native Protestants but rather one that united them in their collective identification with a shared religious cause. When members of the Netherlandish stranger churches organized commemorative meetings to remember their persecuted ancestors, these gatherings were frequented by English Puritans as well as the descendants of Flemish refugees, and it is no coincidence that they were often held on the coronation day of Queen Elizabeth I of England, who was already celebrated as a champion of Protestantism and had long been commemorated as a loyal host by Netherlandish exiles.[38] In this environment belonging to a persecuted minority had a status that appealed to many locals and the memory cultures of the migrants were much more easily combined with the historical narratives of their host societies than in other places. But even in surroundings where the descendants of Netherlandish exiles did not find many sympathizers their memories did not remain isolated and were shaped and informed by the memory canons of their neighbors.

Transmigration and its multiple ties

The incorporation of multiple local and regional narratives into the diasporic memory cultures of Netherlandish migrants was partly due to the structure of the migration processes from the Low Countries. We must not forget that the vast majority of the migrants who fled religious violence and military devastation did not migrate directly from their hometowns to their new places of permanent residence but often relocated several times before settling down permanently. Many of the first-generation migrants continued to move hence and forth for decades, and sometimes their children and grandchildren retained this pattern. During the second half of the sixteenth century, this migration pattern could be attributed to the direct

[38] See chapter 4 of this book. On the commemoration of Queen Elizabeth by Netherlandish refugees, see also: Simeon Ruytinck, 'Gheschiedenissen ende handelingen die voornemelick aengaen de Nederduytsche natie ende gemeynten, wonende in Engelant ende int bysonder tot Londen, vergadert door Symeon Ruytinck, Caesar Calandrinus ende Aemilius van Culenborgh, dienaren des Godlicken Woords', in J.J. van Toorenenbergen (ed.), *Werken der Marnix-vereeniging,* 3d series, nr.1., Utrecht 1873, p. 162.

military situation in the Low Countries and the political change that was brought about in the various provinces. Some exiles, especially clerics such as IJsbrand Balck or Gaspar van Heyden, were exiled three times or more and lived a life of constant peregrination.[39] The great migration from the Low Counties was not a one-directional 'exodus' but a complicated process that can be roughly subdivided into three major migration waves: one that started in the 1530s and reached its height in the 1540s and 1550s, one between 1566 and the early years of the Dutch Revolt in the 1570s, and the last one in the mid-1580s, when the so-called 'Calvinist Republics', Antwerp, Brussels, Ghent, Bruges, Ypres and Mechelen were one by one taken over by the Habsburg armies. Outside of these major migration waves there was an almost continuous stream of Flemish and Brabant migrants from war-torn rural areas who moved to the Dutch Republic, England and Germany especially during the 1590s and the 1630s.

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

The Habsburg authorities in the Low Countries expected local town authorities and magistrates to assist in the struggle against heresy and to take severe measures to punish heretics. These measures were highly unpopular among the town

[39] See chapter 1 in this book.
[40] The most prominent advocate of this view is Andrew Pettegree. See: Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London,* Oxford 1986; Pettegree*, Emden and the Dutch Revolt*, Oxford 1992.
[41] On this first major wave of migration, see: Johan Decavele, *De dageraad van de Reformatie in Vlaanderen*, Brussels 1975, pp. 577ff.

magistrates who feared social unrest, and they were often willing to connive at suspicions of heresy. In 1566, a storm of iconoclastic fury shocked the Catholic authorities in virtually all provinces of the Netherlands, and the Habsburg government reacted in 1567 with the institution of the so-called Council of Troubles, a central law court that dealt with the prosecution of the iconoclasts and those who were held responsible for having permitted such actions.[42] The Council of Troubles, initially under the direction of the notorious Duke of Alba, sentenced thousands of Protestants and dissidents to death, though often in absentia.[43] The Council's institution, along with the arrival of Alba's 'Army of Flanders' from Spain, launched the second major migration wave to England and the Holy Roman Empire. Among the refugees of the 1560s were not only staunch Protestants but also many who feared they might be associated with heresy and rebellion. The extreme measures and the 'broad sweep' of the Council of Troubles disturbed many who still saw themselves as loyal Catholics but felt that Alba's approach to the problem of heresy was disproportional. Nevertheless, direct action against the new measures of the Habsburg regime was not yet successful. In 1568, William of Orange, who had fled to his own territories in Germany, launched a military campaign against the Habsburg forces in the Low Countries, but it failed after only a few weeks.[44] People who saw themselves suspected of support for Orange and disloyalty to the authorities fled their hometowns and went to the western parts of Germany, especially to the coastal town of Emden, which had become an important safe haven for persecuted Protestants from the Low Countries since the 1550s.[45]

In addition to the persecution of dissenters the Habsburg government's general disrespect for the tradition of provincial and civic particularism as well as Alba's plans to increase taxes, especially his levy of the 'Tenth Penny', which was demanded in 1569, were major sources of discontent in the towns of the Low

[42] Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, pp. 156f.
[43] Approximately 1100 people were executed after being condemned by the Council of Troubles. See: M. Dierickx, 'Lijst der veroordeelden door de Raad van Beroerten.', in: *Revue belge de philologie et 'd histoire* 40 (1962), pp. 415-422, William *Maltby*, *Alba. A Biography of Fernando Alvarez de Toledo, Third Duke of Alba, 1507–1582*, Berkeley/CA, p. 140.
[44] K.W. Swart, 'Wat bewoog Willem van Oranje de strijd tegen de Spaanse overheersing aan te binden?', in: *BMGN* 99 (1984) p. 561.
[45] Pettegree, *Emden and the Dutch Revolt*, pp. 57ff.

Countries.[46] While most towns were not willing to join Orange's revolt in 1568, the situation changed during the following years. In 1572, a second campaign, which combined the pillage of coastal towns and villages by the so-called 'Sea beggars' with an attack by Orange's troops, encouraged a number of towns, especially in Holland and Zeeland, to openly revolt against the Habsburg government. As a result, many Protestant exiles returned to the Netherlands while at the same time thousands of Catholics fled the rebel towns and went to Amsterdam, which remained loyal to the king until 1578, as well as to Antwerp and Cologne.[47] After 1576, when the Pacification of Ghent was signed, the prosecution of heretics also ceased in the important Flemish and Brabant towns, such as Ghent, Brussels and Antwerp, with the result that great numbers of exiles returned, eager to build a 'godly' society. New magistrates were soon installed and eventually dominated by Calvinists. These newly formed 'Calvinist Republics' became centers of the Reformation in the Netherlands and cultivated a particularly radical form of Reformed Protestantism, which again forced many Catholics into exile in Germany and loyal cities in the Low Countries. Besides Antwerp, Ghent had become an especially important town for Netherlandish Calvinism and harbored a theological academy where Reformed clerics were trained and prepared to serve their congregations all over the Low Countries.[48] The 'Calvinist Republics' had only a short lifespan, and between 1580 and 1585 they were one by one taken over by Alexander Farnese, the new General Governor of the Netherlands. The surrender of Antwerp, in particular, which was the most important trading town in the South of the Netherlands, launched a large exodus of Protestants to the Dutch Republic, Germany and, to a lesser degree, England. Even though the inhabitants were not punished for their heretical beliefs by the Catholic victors, they were forced to convert to Catholicism or to leave the town within a few years.[49] The 'reconciliation' of the Southern rebel towns marked the end of the period of mass migration, even though the migration from the Habsburg-

[46] Henk van Nierop, '*De troon van Alva.* Over de interpretatie van de Nederlandse Opstand', in: *BMGN* 110 (1995), pp. 215f.
[47] Geert Janssen, 'The Counter-Reformation of the Refugee. Exile and the Shaping of Catholic Militancy in the Dutch Revolt', in: *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 63 (2012), pp. 671-92; Geert Janssen, 'Exiles and the Politics of Reintegration in the Dutch Revolt', in: *History*, 94 (2009), pp. 37-53.
[48] Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, p. 196.
[49] Ibid., p. 219.

ruled Flemish and Brabant countryside continued on a smaller scale until the early seventeenth century.

Exact numbers of migrants who left their homes due to the religious persecution and the war are hard to come by. As already mentioned, estimations vary between sixty thousand and one hundred thousand people not including Catholic refugees.[50] In the first years of the 'Calvinist Republic' of Antwerp, about eight thousand people left the town, many of whom most probably left for religious reasons. Also virtually all the Northern rebel towns produced their own Catholic refugees although the numbers vary from city to city.[51] However, even the numbers of those refugees who fled because of their Protestant sympathies are anything but clear. Those cities where reliable numbers are available, for example Antwerp or Mechelen, where the populations decreased by one half during the mid-1580s, do not offer a complete picture because many of those who left had been living in these towns as migrants.[52] In earlier estimations, many migrants were probably counted twice or even thrice because they did not simply move from one place to another but often re-emigrated again and again. In the face of the complex historical developments and political alternations the migration of individuals and families was seldom a one-directional process in which one left his hometown and settled down permanently elsewhere but more likely a long route of re- and transmigration during which individuals and families repeatedly relocated again and again, sometimes for decades. Even those migrants who settled down permanently in one place typically remained connected to other migrant towns through family members and friends.

Such phenomena have only recently received attention from students of migration. As scholars in the field of modern transnational studies have noted, migration has often been studied as 'a unilinear, stage-like process of incorporation or assimilation' while individual practices of migrants and their various allegiances to diverse social and cultural entities were overlooked.[53] Furthermore, the notion of

[50] Briels, *Zuid-Nederlanders in de Republiek*, p. 80; Woltjer, 'Zuid-Nederlanders in de Republiek'.
[51] Judith Pollmann, *Catholic Identity and the Revolt in the Netherlands*, Oxford 2011, pp. 133f.
[52] Asaert, *1585.De val van Antwerpen*, p. 46.
[53] Robert C. Smith, 'Transnational Localities. Community, Technology and the Politics of Membership within the Context of Mexico and U.S. Migration', in: Luis Elgardo Guarnizo, Michael Peter Smith, *Transnationalism from Below*, New Brunswick, NJ 1998, p. 197. See also: Michael Peter Smith, *Transnational Urbanism. Localizing Globalization*, Malden/MA 2001, pp. 3ff.

migration as a one-directional movement with clearly defined points of departure and arrival is contradicted by the findings of modern migration studies. Instead of moving from one nation-state to another and leaving all their ties behind migrants often stay engaged in processes that bridge and transcend the boundaries between the various stations of their travel. Scholars such as Nina Glick Schiller and others have therefore argued that contemporary migrants should be characterized not as 'uprooted' but rather as 'becoming firmly rooted in their new country, but maintaining multiple linkages to their homeland.'[54]

To avoid the misconception that the migration of groups and individuals brings an end to the ties with the former homeland or to earlier stations of their migration to which they have said goodbye for good the term 'transmigrant' was introduced. Not only in many present-day migration movements but also in the networks of the early modern Netherlandish diaspora one-directional migration was not the norm. Not only merchants but also people of other professions continued to migrate between the various exile towns in the North Sea region, the Rhine region and the Dutch Republic.[55] Even among the numerous textile workers who left Flanders in the late sixteenth century such transmigration movements were not uncommon, and many weavers and bleachers moved via Western German territories or the English coast to the Dutch Republic.[56] These migration routes did leave their traces, and many migrants built networks on which they and their descendants could rely later. As chapter 5 of this study shows, many families continued to travel and migrate along the same routes as their forefathers until the late seventeenth century.

The continuous transmigration of many early modern migrants from the Low Countries shaped the narratives and memories that were preserved and handed down to future generations. While many accounts of the refugees' past employed a

---

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

[55] Oscar Gelderblom, *Zuidnederlandse kooplieden en de opkomst van de Amsterdamse stapelmarkt (1578-1630)*, Hilversum 2000, pp. 74-76; Grell, 'The Creation of a Transnational, Calvinist network', pp. 630ff.

[56] See e.g.: N.W. Posthumus, *De geschiedenis van de Leidsche lakenindustrie*, vol 2, The Hague 1939, pp. 12-14.

narrative mode that suggested a linear departure from the lost to the new 'home' and served as tales of origin, the sources also reveal a sense of belonging to a travelling diaspora that was not located in a fixed territory but spread among Germany, the Dutch Republic and England. Studies on modern transmigrant networks show that diasporas create links and bonds in their various host societies but at the same time cultivate the idea of an imaginary homeland that serves as a binding factor. As Michael Peter Smith has put it, the experience of migration often produces a 'multiple emplacement or situatedness both *here* and *there*'.[57] The diaspora's 'cultural bifocality' also invokes the notion of a homeland or a 'there' of the sort which 'Benedict Anderson would call an "imagined community", invented by deterritorialized people to make present felt absences in their lives'.[58] While the notion of a common origin structured the narratives through which individuals identified themselves with the wider Netherlandish refugee diaspora, it was, however, not always clear what the common homeland actually was. The exile experience historically coincided with the emergence of a supra-regional patriotic discourse that united the various provinces in the Low Countries, and the absent homeland was often created only retrospectively. It is therefore not surprising that refugees played an important role in the production of what Simon Schama has called 'patriotic scripture' and engaged in discourses that would contribute to a 'proto-national' consciousness in the Dutch Republic.[59]

Diasporic imagination and patriotic discourse

Research on modern transnational networks has shown that transmigrant communities often harbor a strong ambiguity regarding the memories of the lost homeland.[60] As Lousia Schein has demonstrated in the case of Chinese and Laotian refugees looking for marriage partners in their countries of origin, the imagined homeland served as a nostalgic projection while 'dreamlike memories' of a home

[57] Michael Peter Smith, 'Translocality. A Critical Reflection', in: Katherine Brickell, Ayona Datta, *Translocal Geographies: Spaces, Places, Connections*, Burlington 2011, p.181.
[58] Michael Peter Smith, 'Can you Imagine? Transnational Migration and the Globalization of Grassroots Politics', in: *Social Text* 39 (Summer 1994), pp. 17, 18.
[59] Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches. An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age*, New York 1988, 51ff.
[60] Glick Schiller, Basch and Szanton Blanc, 'From Immigrant to Transmigrant', p. 51. Louisa Schein, 'Forged Transnationality and Oppositional Cosmopolitanism', in: Elgardo Guarnizo, Smith, *Transnationalism from Below*, pp. 291ff.

that 'housed the most archaic pockets of their tradition left on earth' went together with a deep abhorrence of the political reality of the present. The complex discourses about the lost homeland of early modern Netherlandish refugees are deeply marked by such ambiguities. While, for example, many Southern exiles in the Dutch Republic insisted on the unity of all provinces of the Low Countries and claimed that Holland was also their home, at the same time they referred to themselves as strangers. The cities of Brabant and Flanders remained their imagined homeland even when it had become clear that a return would not be possible in the foreseeable future. The situation of exiles outside the Netherlands was even more ambiguous: while most of them had fled from the Southern Netherlands, the Dutch Republic increasingly became the cultural and geographical center of the transnational diaspora although memories of the lost South were still preserved.

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

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

[61] Alastair Duke, 'Patriotism and Liberty in the Low Countries, 1555-1576', in: Judith Pollmann, Robert Stein, *Networks, Regions and Nations. Shaping Identities in the Low Countries, 1300-1650*, Leiden 2010, p. 221; Grell, 'The Creation of a Transnational, Calvinist Network', p. 620.
[62] See e.g.: Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, pp. 129ff.

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

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

[63] Judith Pollman, 'No Man's Land. Reinventing Netherlandish Identities, 1585-1621', in: Pollmann, Stein, *Networks, Regions and Nations*, pp. 241-263.
[64] Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Special Sorrows. The Diasporic Imagination of Irish, Polish and Jewish Immigrants to the United States*, Berkeley/Los Angeles 2002, p. 241.

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

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

Exile memories and their changing meanings

[65] Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, pp. 51ff.
[66] C. Huisman, *Neerlands Israël. Het natiebesef der traditioneel-gereformeerden in de achttiende eeuw*, Dordrecht 1983.

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

While not only Southern Netherlandish Protestants and Mennonites from various confessions and sub-confessions but also Catholics suffered exile during the Dutch Revolt, this latter group did not produce a long-term diaspora that persisted for generations, and therefore Catholics are included only in the first two chapters and used to illustrate that religious cultures of exile were not a uniquely Protestant phenomenon. While most of the Northern Catholics were clerics who did not hand down their experiences to (legitimate) progeny, the notion of a wandering diaspora often died with them and was not continued by non-migrant coreligionists. Another

group that is dramatically under-represented are women. While students of memory have often identified early modern women as important agents in the oral tradition of family memories, the only documents in the studied family archives written by women were succinct data on births, deaths and marriages.[67] Only in the context of the Pietist and orthodox-Reformed cultures in chapters 4 and 6 do women such as Anna Maria van Schurman, Jacoba Lampsins or Elisabeth Bartels-Schütz play a more important role. While most women in the Netherlandish diaspora, especially in the rich merchant circles, were more literate than the average European woman of the time, few women seem to have taken it upon themselves to write about distant genealogical issues. Future research on the transmission of early modern diasporic memories should also take into consideration nonliterary social practices which allow for a better grasp of wider populations who participated in translocal cultures of exile and homelessness.

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

[67] For example the booklet with family records of Magdalena Thijs (UB Leiden, Arch. Thys. inv. nr. 148). See on the role of women in early modern memory transmission: Katharine Hodgkin, 'Women, memory and family history in seventeenth-century England', in: Kuijpers, Pollmann e.a. (eds), *Memory before Modernity*, pp. 297-313.

general and the differences and similarities between modern and early modern ways of remembering. As a whole, the research project offers a more complete view of how memories of the Dutch Revolt shaped new social identities and affected the lives of individuals and groups in the Low Countries, and this study also serves as a contribution to this largely unexplored topic.