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

Müller, J.M.

Chapter 3 – Strangers, burghers, patriots

Re-imagining Southern Netherlandish identity in the exile towns

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

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

[214] Schilling, *Niederländische Exulanten*, pp. 164-166.

seventeenth-century pamphlets and popular print but also in modern historiography.[215] However, on the basis of a close reading of these sources, I want to argue that pointing to migrants as the main agents behind social unrest was mainly a rhetorical figure that could be deployed in particular instances and sometimes even by individuals who were migrants themselves rather than an expression of a deep and permanent gap between natives and aliens.

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

> That in regard to their culture, the Northern Netherlanders had always been inferior to Brabant and Flanders, which overshadowed all other parts of the Netherlands before 1572, had left its traces in the minds of the Hollanders, who had to look up to the rich South for a long time without being able to bring a substantial change to this situation.[216]

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

---

[215] Asaert, *1585. De val van Antwerpen*, pp. 280ff.; Briels, *De Zuidnederlandse immigratie. 1572-1620*, pp. 65f.

[216] J. Briels, *De Zuidnederlandse immigratie in Amsterdam en Haarlem omstreeks 1572-1630. Met een keuze van archivalische gegevens*, Utrecht 1976, pp. 39f.: 'Dat de Noord-Nederlanders in cultureel opzicht altijd de mindere waren geweest van Brabant en Vlaanderen, die vóór 1572 alle overige delen van Nederland in betekenis verre overschaduwden, had niet nagelaten zijn sporen in de Hollandse geesten achter te laten, die al lang hadden moeten kijken naar het rijke zuiden zonder voorlopig bij machte te zijn in de situatie substantieel verandering te brengen.' See also: J. *Briels*, 'Brabantse *blaaskaak* en Hollandse botmuil. Cultuurontwikkelingen in Holland in het begin van de Gouden Eeuw', in: *De zeventiende eeuw* 1/1 (1985), pp. 12-36.

radical Calvinist Flemings and Brabanders, on the one side, and native Hollanders with only lukewarm sympathies for Reformed confessionalism, on the other, did not so much reflect socio-historical circumstances but were part of often inconsistent discourses on what constituted Netherlandish identity and what could be used as arguments in political and religious debates.[217] Collective memories played an essential role in these arguments, and the history of the early phase of the Dutch Revolt as well as the migration of Protestants from Flanders and Brabant were iconic episodes that were often recalled in the discussion of the present state of politics and religion. However, during conflicts in which an aggressive anti-immigrant rhetoric was employed, the lines between migrants and locals were often blurred so that identifying radical Calvinism with 'foreigners' often proved useful to Remonstrants or Mennonites, who could be migrants from Flanders themselves, in bolstering their arguments against their adversaries. In reaction to such claims and identifications memories of flight and persecution were, however, also used to incorporate migrant history and identity into the memory canons of the host societies of the migrants. As we will see later in this chapter, memories of the early Dutch Revolt could also serve to strengthen the ties between migrants and locals. As many migrant authors suggested, the past united rather than separated newcomers and natives, and the deliberate choice to settle down in a new town and their gratitude for the hospitality of locals made the migrants into self-proclaimed loyal citizens.

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

Even if the exclusion of migrants from social life and public offices in the Dutch Republic is sometimes exaggerated in modern scholarly literature, in the period between 1587 and 1618 Flemings and Brabanders certainly had difficulties if they wanted to participate in local politics. Formally, their host towns had legal grounds to exclude them from offices and sometimes even from full citizenship. The reasons for these restrictions were older than the Dutch Revolt and the mass migration it brought about. All polities and regions in the Netherlands had traditionally

[217] The distinction between two fundamentally different types of religiosity that divided Southern and Northern Netherlandish Protestants is for great parts due to the influence of the seminal work of H.A. Enno van Gelder. (H.A. Enno van Gelder, *Revolutionnaire reformatie. De vestiging van de Gereformeerde Kerk in de Nederlandse gewesten, gedurende de eerste jaren van de opstand tegen Filips II, 1575-1585*, Amsterdam 1943.)

cultivated a strong provincial outlook with historical roots that dated back to the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century resistance against the increasing centralization of the Low Countries under the Burgund and Habsburg authorities. While the Grand Privilege of 1477 had already excluded foreigners from political offices in the various provinces, in many cases Flemings and Brabanders were still able to enter the Court of Holland, especially in the early sixteenth century when the Grand Privilege was no longer binding.[218] Until the 1540s, there were no formal grounds on which to exclude persons from other provinces from provincial politics, but in the mid-sixteenth century the situation changed and provincial governments sought to introduce measures against the appointment of foreigners. Ironically, this practice did not have its origins in the North but in the South. In 1545 the central government appointed Antwerp merchant Jacob Grammary as revenue officer in Holland and at the same issued a privilege for the States of Brabant that allowed them to exclude 'strangers' from public offices.[219] The States of Holland tried immediately to also receive a similar privilege, which was denied. However, less than ten years later a new request from Holland was granted, and Holland was now also allowed to exclude Brabanders while natives of Flanders and Mechelen could still be appointed.[220]

In daily practice, this right to exclude foreigners was not applied as strictly as would legally have been possible. Especially in the early phase of the Dutch Revolt, between the 1560s and the mid-1580s, political participation of newcomers was not uncommon and surprisingly many Southerners were elected to the rebel city councils and magistracies of Holland and Zeeland. In the magistrates of Vlissingen and Middelburg and in the provincial government of Zeeland Flemings and Brabanders were quite well represented. Johan Nicolai, former burgomaster of Brussels, was appointed as secretary of the States of Zeeland and was even recommended as having 'fled hither because of his great piety'.[221] But also in

[218] Serge te Brake, *Met macht en rekenschap. De ambtenaren bij het Hof van Holland en de Haagse Rekenkamer in de Habsburgse Tijd*, Hilversum 2007, p. 128.
[219] Joop Koopmans, 'Vreemdelingen in Hollandse dienst 1545-1588. Opmerkingen bij het werk van Briels' in: A.H. Huussen, W.E. Krul en E.Ch.L. van der Vliet (eds), *Vreemdelingen. Ongewenst en bemind*, Groningen 1991, p. 38.
[220] Jan den Tex, *Oldenbarnevelt*, Haarlem 1960-1972 (5 vols), vol. 1, p. 20.
[221] See e.g. Briels, *De Zuid-Nederlandse immigratie*, p. 79.

Holland towns Southerners were able to enter the magistracies until the late 1580s.[222]

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

---

[222] For a list of Southern migrants in the magistrates of Holland and Zeeland as well as in the States General, see: J.A. Grothe, 'Brieven van Gerard Prouninck', in: *Kronyk van het Historisch Genootschap, gevestigd te Utrecht* 3e serie, dl. 1 (1855), pp. 235-236 and Koopmans, 'Vreemdelingen in Hollandse dienst', pp. 41-43.

[223] See: F.G. Oosterhoff, *Leicester and the Netherlands, 1586-1587*, Utrecht 1988, p. 118; Benjamin J. Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines. Confession and Community in Utrecht 1578-1620*, Oxford 1995, p. 175.

[224] Willem Nijenhuis, *Adrianus Saravia (ca. 1532-1613)*, Leiden 1980, p. 102.

among the town magistrates who supported Dudley were many that did not contain any newcomers. Among the strongholds of Leicester were not only all the towns in Friesland with the exception of Franeker but also all the Holland towns north of Amsterdam and Haarlem: Alkmaar, Hoorn and Enkhuizen as well the various smaller municipalities.[225] None of these places had seen any substantial influx of Southern refugees.

The iconic image of the Leicester troubles as a clash between natives and strangers should therefore in first instance be regarded as a discursive product of the conflict itself. Anti-Calvinists denounced their enemies as 'foreigners' and fashioned themselves as natives adhering to their local traditions and liberties. That phenomenon was already noted by Pieter de la Court, who in 1659, more than seventy years after the events, wrote that the involvement of 'a few' Flemings had given the local Libertine regents the opportunity to depict the entire conflict as a rebellion of foreigners and to exclude them from political power. Fortunately, this exclusion was due only to the 'arbitrary' reasoning of elite members and did not become a formalized prescription in the long run so that De la Court still harbored hopes of a political career for himself.[226] Even if the participation of Southerners in Holland and Utrecht politics declined for a longer period, De la Court was right. While a number of Southerners managed to keep their offices even after the Leicester period, such as the Brabander Nicasius de Sille who remained pensionary of Amsterdam until his death in 1601, it became easier for them to enter politics after the Twelve Years' Truce.[227] In 1606 Brabander Jan Jansz. Teyts was elected to the magistrate of Haarlem, and after the triumph of the Counter-Remonstrant party in 1618 others followed.[228] While the exclusion of foreigners was structural only during the period between the Leicester coup and end of the Twelve Years' Truce, the image of rebellious Flemings and Brabanders remained a part of collective memory and could be brought up again when it seemed appropriate.

---

[225] Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, pp. 228, 229.
[226] Pieter de la Court, *Het welvaren van Leiden. Handschrift uit het jaar 1659* (ed. F. Driessen), The Hague 1911, p. 6.
[227] For De Sille (or Van der Sille), see: Willem Frijhoff, Maarten Prak e.a. *Geschiedenis van Amsterdam*, vol. 2, Amsterdam 2004, p. 284; Grothe, 'Brieven van Gerard Prouninck', p. 236.
[228] Van Deursen, *Bavianen en slijkgeuzen*, p. 315.

Leiden and Haarlem as exile towns

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

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

[229] Ibid., p. 314.
[230] See for an overview: G. van der Ree-Scholtens, *Deugd boven geweld. Een geschiedenis van Haarlem, 1245-1995*, Hilversum 1995.
[231] Briels, *Zuidnederlanders in de Republiek*, p. 19.
[232] Ibid.

republics conquered by Parma's armies in the early and mid-1580's. Others had not directly fled to Haarlem but first settled in England or the German Empire and later moved to North Holland, such as large groups of textile workers from Goch. Particularly in the first decades after their arrival, the refugees formed a close and clearly recognizable group, living in their own 'Flemish Quarter' with their own bakers, shopkeepers and midwives.[233] They founded their own Flemish chamber of rhetoric, and, those who were not Dutch-speaking Calvinists, established their own Mennonite, Lutheran and Walloon Reformed churches, the latter in close alliance with the Dutch Reformed congregation.

Even though Leiden became the most important textile town in the Dutch Republic, its situation after the Habsburg campaigns into Holland differed in many aspects from that of Haarlem. While Haarlem was severely damaged in the siege, Leiden, which was besieged a year later, emerged triumphantly, an event that led to a vivid culture of civic commemoration that would prevail for centuries.[234] Despite Leiden's victory, the city also lost a substantial part of its population, and both towns had to be repopulated and rebuilt. The possibilities of recruiting Flemish textile workers were soon discovered, and from the late 1570s onwards the Leiden magistrate made contracts with exiles from Colchester who were allowed to settle in Leiden.[235] In 1591, the town authorities created a new settlement for newcomers working in the textile industry in Maredorp, a town quarter north of the Rhine River, which would become a typical Flemish neighborhood. Even though the percentage of Flemings and Brabanders seems to have been lower than in Haarlem, Leiden's spectacular population growth between the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century was also due to the numerous Southern migrants.[236] As in Haarlem, the refugees established their own institutions, including a social welfare system and a chamber of rhetoric, which was originally set up for Flemings but also had Brabant

[233] Spaans, *Haarlem na de reformatie*, p. 19.
[234] Judith Pollmann, *Herdenken, herinneren, vergeten. Het beleg en ontzet van Leiden in de Gouden Eeuw* (3 oktoberlezing 2008), Leiden 2008; Johan Koppenol, *Het Leids ontzet. 3 oktober 1574 door de ogen van tijdgenoten* (Amsterdam 2002).
[235] Johan Koopenol, *Leids heelal. Het Loterijspel (1596) van Jan van Hout*, Hilversum 1998, p. 29; Dirk Jaap Noordam, 'Demografische ontwikkelingen', in: Simon Groenveld (ed.), *Leiden. De geschiedenis van een Hollandse stad 2 1574-1795*, Leiden 2003, pp. 42-53; Dirk Jaap Noordam, *Geringde buffels en heren van stand: het patriciaat van Leiden, 1574-1700*, Hilversum 1994, p. 9.
[236] Noordam, 'Demografische ontwikkelingen'; Dirk Jaap Noordam, 'Leiden als ideale stad', in: Juliette Roding, Agnes Sneller and Boukje Thijs (eds), *Beelden van Leiden: zelfbeeld en representatie van een Hollandse stad in de vroegmoderne tijd*, Hilversum 2006, pp. 15-35.

members and even had a Brabander, the aforementioned Jacob Duym, as chairman. In the Dutch Reformed Church as well as in the various minority churches, Southerners were well represented and able to exercise influence.

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

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

[237] Van Deursen, *Bavianen en slijkgeuzen*, p. 90; Duke, 'The Ambivalent Face of Dutch Calvinism', pp. 291ff.
[238] Noord-Hollands Archief, Stadsarchief Haarlem. Raad inv.nr. 462 (1611-1635). I am grateful to Marianne Eekhout for this reference.
[239] See e.g.: Van Deursen, *Bavianen en slijkgeuzen*, pp. 252, 267.

until stadholder Maurice of Nassau chose the side of the Counter-Remonstrants in 1618. In August of this year, Oldenbarnevelt was arrested and in 1619 tried for high treason, while many city councils were purged of Remonstrant sympathizers. Years before the intervention of the stadholder libertines, Remonstrants and Mennonites had already labeled Haarlem's and Leiden's orthodox Calvinists as 'Flemish' radicals who wished to turn their towns into a 'new Geneva' where dissenting beliefs would not be tolerated. These accusations were spread in pamphlets, songs and other media that often referred to the past of the migrants and stimulated the recollection of memories of the early period of the Dutch Revolt, which would play an important role in the conflict as we will see below.

Haarlem and the memory of the London martyrs

In 1618, the Reformed Church in Haarlem found itself in trouble. The escalating tensions between Remonstrants and Calvinists had left deep splits in its congregational life: a majority of the church members had publicly manifested their dissent with the libertine elements in church and magistrate, and some parents even refused to let their children be baptized in services led by Remonstrant or even moderate Calvinist ministers.[240] Polemical pamphlets on both sides had provoked a nasty conflict that led to the banishment of five people from the city by the magistrate.[241] However, intra-confessional disputes among the Reformed were not the only cause of unease. Adherents of other denominations also took a hand in the confessional polemics. The descendants of two Flemish Mennonite artisans executed in London forty-three years earlier accused the Calvinists of sharing responsibility for the death of their ancestors.[242] When the London Mennonites were examined by Bishop Grindal in 1575, several members of the local Dutch Reformed Church had acted as translators and had also tried to convert the 'heretics' to the 'true Christian Religion'.[243] Fearing unrest among the religious exiles in the city, the magistrate had

[240] Noord-Hollands Archief, Acta van de kerkeraad van de Hervormde Kerk te Haarlem, January 7, 1618.
[241] Spaans, *Haarlem na de reformatie*, p. 220.
[242] Symeon Ruytinck, *Gheschiedenissen ende Handelingen, die voornemelick aengaen de Nederduytsche natie ende gemeynten, wonende in Engelant ende int bysonder tot Londen*, ed. J.J. van Toorenbergen, III, dl. I, Utrecht 1873, p. 314.
[243] Hans de Ries and Jacques Outerman, *Historie der waarachtighe getuygen Jesu Christi. Die de evangelische waerheyt in veelderley tormenten betuycht ende met haer bloet bevesticht hebben sint het jaer 1524 tot desen tyt toe*, Hoorn 1617, p. 706.

forced all exiles to sign a declaration that affirmed the authority of the bishop of London to punish heretics.[244] In the eyes of many, and not only Mennonites, signing the declaration proved the complicity of the Calvinists in the executions.

The memory of the London martyrs would remain a contentious issue between Mennonites and Calvinists both in England and on the continent for decades to come. A few months after the execution members of the Dutch Reformed congregation in London were confronted with accusations of being 'inquisitors and persecutors'. Two years later the Reformed Stranger Church in Frankenthal near Heidelberg reported similar experiences with local Anabaptists.[245] In 1576, the issue even led to a split within the Antwerp Church 'under the cross'. In particular among the stricter members of the congregation many were upset by the rumors from England, and a number of them converted to the Mennonites because they believed that Mennonites lived a much godlier life than the Calvinists whose consistory was full of 'drunkards and adulterers'.[246] Two young members of the Reformed consistory, Elder Hans de Ries and Deacon Albrecht Verspeck, who propagated a church discipline that was much stricter than that practiced in any Calvinist Church, became followers of Menno and eventually notable leaders of the Waterlander Mennonite communities in the Northern Netherlands. De Ries, who advocated severe penalties, such as public repentance and collective shunning, even when dealing with issues traditionally treated as *adiaphora*, played a decisive role in the commemoration of the London martyrs. When in 1589 Rotterdam Calvinist elder Pieter de Bisschop suggested that the London Mennonites had been executed because of their rebellious attitude and for insulting Queen Elizabeth, de Ries published a rebuttal in which he tried to defend the honor of his coreligionists: referring to the canonical *non poena sed causa*-doctrine, he argued that his London brothers were true martyrs - they had not been killed for lèse-majesté and insurgence but for the sake of faith.[247]

---

[244] Ibid., p. 707.
[245] Alastair Duke, 'Martyrs with a Difference: Dutch Anabaptist Victims of Elizabethan Persecution', in: Alastair Duke, *Dissident Identities in the Early Modern Low Countries*, Farnham 2009, p. 212.
[246] Guido Marnef, 'De gereformeerde wortels van twee Waterlandse leiders. Hans de Ries en Albrecht Verspeck', in: *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen* 21 (1995), p. 18.
[247] Hans de Ries, '"Verthoon van verschejden onwaerheden." Ingeleid en voor uitgave gereedgemaakt door Piet Visser', in: *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen* 11(1985), p. 160.

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

Remembering Flemish radicalism

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

[248] Hans de Ries and Jacques Outerman, *Historie der martelaren, ofte waerachtighe getuygen Iesu Christi die d' Evangelische waerheyt in veelderley tormenten betuygt ende met haer bloet bevesticht hebben sint het jaer 1524 tot desen tyt toe*, Haarlem 1615. The Hoorn martyrology from 1617 (*Historie Der Warachtighe getuygen Jesu Christi*, Hoorn 1617) is actually another edition of de Ries and Outerman's work. The book was not uncontroversial in Mennonite circles since the various cases were harmonized in accordance with the theology of the Waterlanders. The doctrine of incarnation as proclaimed in the martyrs' quotes in the Haarlem martyrology became a particularly contentious issue between Waterlander and Flemish Mennonites. See: Gregory, *Salvation at stake*, pp. 241f.
[249] J.H. Hessels, *Ecclesiae Londino-Batavum archivum*, Cambridge 1887-97, II, pp. 530, 536, 552f., 554f.
[250] De Ries and Outerman, *Historie der martelaren, ofte Waerachtighe getuygen Iesu Christi*, pt. 3, pp. 28ff.

forty years, they tried to overrule the natives and impose their own rules on their fellowmen.[251] In the days of persecution they had been welcomed to Holland as poor refugees, but now they acted as persecutors themselves. The central arguments of De Brauwer's pamphlet refer to memories from the South and the first period of migration to Haarlem. The true nature of the Calvinists had already been visible back in Flanders: wherever they had become powerful, they tried to 'kindle the fire of Geneva' and sought to persecute and expel those they called heretics. If the Calvinists were to seize power in Holland, they would act 'as they had done in Ypres'.[252] Apparently the mere reference to that city said enough – further explanations of what actually happened under Calvinist rule in that city in the 1580s are absent from De Brauwer's text. The collective memory of the Haarlem exile community was vivid enough to make clear that he referred to the expulsion of Mennonites and Catholics from Ypres during the siege by the Habsburg armies. The events in the Flemish Calvinist republics of the 1580s were notorious, and the former inhabitants of these cities frequently found themselves under attack in Haarlem. The magistrates of the Southern rebel towns, especially of Ghent, had come into conflict with William of Orange in the late 1570s because of their strict religious policies and were accused of hindering the Revolt against the Habsburgs with their radicalism.[253] In 1587, exiles from Ghent were insulted as 'noose-bearers, image-breakers, chalice-thieves and traitors to their fatherland'.[254] The insulting nickname 'noose-bearers' (*stropdragers*) was an old designation for citizens of Ghent since after a revolt in 1540 Charles V had deprived the town of all its privileges, and the city's magistrates were forced to repent with a noose around their necks. In 1597, the insults were repeated, and Ghent refugees in Haarlem were again confronted with accusations of Calvinist radicalism and rioting.[255] References to the Calvinist Republics that had existed between 1578 and 1585 in Ghent, Antwerp and

[251] Marijn de Brauwer, *t' Werck van M. de Brouwer, ghenaemt eenvuldighe waerschouwinghe aen de gevluchte vreemdelinghen , haer radende hunne magistraten (die haer ontfanghen ende beschermt hebben) te gehoorzamen, ende de wel-daden te gedincken die sy deur haer genoten hebben*., Haarlem 1618, fol. A1r.
[252] Ibid., fol. A2r.
[253] Swart, *Willem van Oranje en de Nederlandse Opstand*, pp. 152-155.
[254] Spaans, *Haarlem na de reformatie*, p. 110.
[255] Ibid., p. 112.

Mechelen were widely recognized – their memory belonged to the common knowledge in the cities of the North.

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

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

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

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

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

[256] *Het loon van den Brouwer, voor zijn werck t' onrecht ghenaemt, Eenvuldighe waerschouwinge, aen de ghevluchte vreemdelingen*, Haarlem(?) 1618, fol. 8: 'Hy (De Brauwer) seydt voorts dat tot Iperen yet gheschiedt te zijn, doch verhaeldt niet wat, oock niet wanneer , ofte aen wie, 't welck hy oock de ghevluchte vreemdelinghen te laste leyt, doch tis beter te ghelooven, indien daer yet gheschiedt is, dat d'Overheyt van Yperen daer aen schuldich is, ende niet de ghevluchte vreemdelinghen.'
[257] Ibid.: 'Maer u Munstersche sulccx toonden, als den verwoede, want die van hoere Sect niet was 'tsy quaet of goede jaechdemen ter Stadt uyt.'

townspeople were also confronted with thousands of refugees from the surrounding rural areas where continuous warfare had created a state of virtual anarchy.[258] To control immigration under these severe conditions, the magistrate had ordered that all refugee families without provisions for at least three months had to leave Ypres. Those who resisted would violently 'be led out of the town and treated as rebels'.[259] During the siege the measures became more and more draconian, and when winter drew near, great numbers of people, most of them Catholics, were sent away. In December 1583 Ypres citizen Augustijn van Hernighem noticed that again many strangers were to be expelled – even though 'their crying and weeping was so pitiful', they were forced to depart. On Christmas Eve a large convoy of people left for Bruges.[260]

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

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

[258] Briels, *Zuidnederlanders in de Republiek*, p. 35.
[259] F. van de Putte (ed.), *Nederlandsche Historie door Augustijn van Hermelghem* 1, Gent 1864, p. 89. I am aware of the many shortcomings of this edition, but was not able to consult the original manuscript. For a brief discussion of Van de Putte's edition, see: Pollmann, *Catholic Identity*, p. 204.
[260] Ibid., pp. 272, 275.

should keep watch and be ready
to withstand the enemy bravely.
But those who refused to do so
were forced to leave the town,
Which was a just measure for the sake of its defense
and which warns and exhorts us today,
when we plainly write this down.
Your wealth incites you and thus you become reckless'.[261]

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

Rich or poor immigrants?

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

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

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

[262] De Brauwer, *Eenvuldighe waerschouwinghe aen de gevluchte vreemdelinghen*, fol. A1r. De Brauwer's motto 'Wat stercke benen zijn't, die weelde connen draghen' was later also used in the painting *Allegory of Wealth* by Brabant refugee Adriaen van de Venne (Laurens J. Bol, *Adriaen Pietersz. van de Venne. Painter and Draughtsman*, Doornspijk 1989, p. 95).

situation in Haarlem 'thirty-eight years ago' when the great numbers of refugees from the South had arrived:

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

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

[263] Ibid.: 'Ghy vreemde nacy, van Vlamingen en Brabanders
Die nu by de Hollanders, maken een quaet gerucht,
Hoe blyde waert gy doen, gy vont sulcke voorstanders
Als gy verschrict verbaest, voor die moorders en branders
Beroyt, berooft, en naeckt, zijt uyt u Lant ghevlucht
In den hollantschen Thuyn, aldaer ghy sonder ducht
Langhe tijdt hebt gewoont, sonder eenich bezwaren:
Die goede Magistraet, ghy wel bedancken meucht,
Ghy sijt by haer gedult, wel achtendertich Jaren:
Ghy hebt met vry gemoedt, by een mogen vergaren,
In Kercken, en in Huys, sonder eenich aenstoot.
En doen ghy hier eerst quaemt, dit mot ick noch verclaren
Miserabel ghesteldt, vondt ghy troost inden noot:
Ghy sijt hier op gevoed, als 't Kint in's Moeders schoot:
Over de Magistraet, hebt ghy geen kaus om klagen,
Dit wert meer uyt hoochmoet, dan door armoede groot
Wat stercke beenen zijn't, die weelde connen draghen.'

welfare networks. These were dominated by Mennonites, among whom were numerous rich merchants willing to support their Southern compatriots regardless of their confession. The Reformed must have been embarrassed by the fact that their coreligionists were dependent on the charity of those whom they regarded as heretical sectarians.[264] This situation that had lasted until 1594 lived on in the common image of the Southern Calvinists – in the pamphlets from the troubles of 1618 they were always referred to as descendants of paupers and riffraff.[265]

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

> But now that you become wealthy,
> you display much hate and envy,
> You scandalize and scold and blame your own people
> with outrage and brutality […].[267]

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

---

[264] Spaans, *Haarlem na de reformatie*, p. 174.
[265] See also: *Copye van den lasterlijcken brief van Verlaen : in den Haerlemschen Harminiaen ghementioneert, met korte Annotatien gheillustreert: ghelijck mede van den Brieff aen de H. Burghemeesteren, van den selfden ter selfder tijdt gheschreven, tot blijck der waerheyt ghepubliceert*, Haarlem 1618; Gerard Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie, en andre kerkelyke geschiedenissen, in en ontrent de Nederlanden*, Rotterdam 1704, vol. 4, 639.
[266] *Het loon van den Brouwer*, fol. 4.
[267] Ibid., fol. 3: 'Maer nu ghy weeldich wort, toont ghy veel haet en nyt,
Ghy lastert, schelt, blameert, schand'lijck met violency,
U eyghen volck […].'

corrupted hearts of men.[268] The equation of the Calvinists with the underclass of the Southern newcomers was perceived as a severe attack. In a society in which poverty was associated with susceptibility to radical ideas the Reformed could not ignore such claims. The evidence that there had also been rich Calvinists and poor Anabaptists among the first exiles was considered important, and the Reformed pamphleteers did their best to refute the accusations of the Mennonites by turning them around.

Memory as 'a salutary warning'

One of the political victims of the 1618 coup that led to the purge of the Haarlem magistrate was council member and former burgomaster Gerrit van der Laen.[269] Although a member of the Reformed congregation, van der Laen had always sided with the 'libertine' faction in church and magistrate and had later gained notoriety as a defender of the Remonstrant cause. In 1618 anonymous Counter-Remonstrant authors published a letter that Van der Laen had written in 1615 to Amsterdam minister Hendrik Gesteranus in which he had complained about the influence of Counter-Remonstrant Southerners who 'agitated against the States and tried to create a Flemish state of affairs'.[270] In the same year two Haarlem citizens, Abraham de Block and Elias Christiaensen, were banished from the city for spreading vicious rumors about Van der Laen. The burgomaster, they reported, had been seen in the vicinity of the 'Red House', a local brothel, accompanied by two prostitutes. His sexual misbehavior, anonymous pamphleteers concluded, was the direct outcome of his 'libertine' religious views and had left him with various venereal diseases.[271] Van der Laen's position became more and more insecure – in Haarlem he was mocked as 'droncken Claesjen', an allusion to the former bishop of Haarlem, Nicolaas de Castro, who had been referred to with the same nickname. To suggest secret Catholic sympathies his enemies called Van der Laen 'bishop of Haarlem' and 'Don Gerrit' after Don Juan of Austria.[272] In 1618, his opponents felt safe enough to publish a number of pamphlets against him. In the most notable one, *Den*

[268] *Vrevghden-ghesanck over de schoone veranderinghen in't vrye Nederlandt*, fol. B2r.
[269] *Publicatie der stadt Haerlem. Afghelesen den xxv. Octobris anno 1618*, Haarlem 1618, fol. 2r.
[270] *Copye van den lasterlijcken brief van Verlaen*, p. 8.
[271] Gabrielle Dorren, *Eenheid en verscheidenheid. De burgers van Haarlem in de Gouden Eeuw*, Amsterdam 2001, p. 188.
[272] *Copye van den lasterlijcken brief van Verlaen*, pp. 5, 9.

Haerlemschen Harminiaen ('The Haarlem Arminian') the 1615 banishments were presented as the work of 'the Spanish tyranny under a new name, threatening to take over the land and letting the tyrannical spirit triumph'.[273]

In a notorious letter from 1615 that was discovered by his enemies Van der Laen had accused the Southerners of trying to overrule the natives and reestablish 'what they had tried to bring about in the days of the Earl of Leicester'.[274] If they were not stopped, they would repeat what they had done in Flanders, Brabant and Wallonia. The Southern Calvinists could be resisted only if the Hollanders awoke from their amnesia and remembered the past:

> These people want our memory concerning these things [the radicalism of the Southern Calvinists] to be like the memory of flies, who have escaped the knife five or six times, only to sit down again and be cut in pieces. No, these things will eternally remain in the memory of the Hollanders and they serve the magistrate as a salutary warning, because it is their duty to keep special watch over the religion and the welfare of the country […].[275]

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

> I also think that the memory of the Hispaniolized league shall remain forever in the memory of the Hollanders, and that they do not let themselves be fooled again under the pretext of reforming the true religion and the need to maintain the government's authority, as unfortunately has happened now. [276]

---

[273] *Den Haerlemschen Harminiaen. Dat is: Verhael van de vreetheyt der Heeren van Haerlem*, Haarlem 1618.

[274] *Copye van den lasterlijcken brief van Verlaen*, 7. For the role of southern Calvinists during the stay of Leicester in the Netherlands, see: F. G. Oosterhoff, *Leicester and the Netherlands, 1586-1587*, Utrecht 1988.

[275] *Copye van den lasterlijcken brief van Verlaen*, p.12: Dese luyden menen, dat men op dese saecke behoort te hebben de memorie van vlieghen, die vijf of ses malen achter malkanderen, den slagh van't mes ontgaen sijnde, terstont ter selfder plaetse wederkeren om aen stucken gheslaghen te worden. Neen het dient den Hollanders ter eeuwigher memorie, tot een heylsame waerschouwinghe van de Magistraet, dat hen lieden insonderheyt toekomt te waken voor de Religie ende de welstant vant Lant […].

[276] Ibid.: 'Ick meen oock dat by den Hollanders in eeuwigher memorie sal blijven de ghedachtenis van de ghehispanioliseerde Liga, ende datse haer andermael met den deck-mantel van de ware Religie beter te Reformeren, ende d'authoriteyt van d'Overheyt te maintineren also niet en sullen laeten verblijden, als nu leyder gheschiet is.'

The 'Hispaniolized league' of the Remonstrants is tagged here with attributes recognizable in collective memory: what the Arminians do is nothing but the renewal of the 'Spaensch placcaet' ('Spanish proclamation'), and their tyranny is worse than the rule of Don Juan of Austria in the Netherlands and of John of Leyden in Munster.[277] Fortunately, the anonymous author remarks, these historical examples have not been forgotten by the Hollanders so they can easily recognize and counter the threat of the 'new tyranny'.

Modern authors on the migration of Southerners to Haarlem have uttered their astonishment about Van der Laen's writings against the town's exile community.[278] Despite his agitation against the strangers his daughter Beatrix married the wealthy Antwerp merchant Isaac Massa in 1622, and Van der Laen seems to have been on good terms with son-in-law. Massa was not only an immigrant but also a Calvinist and thereby belonged exactly to the faction of his father-in-law's enemies. Even more surprising is the fact that Van der Laen himself had family bonds in the Southern Netherlands that dated back to the late Middle Ages.[279] Apparently the North Holland branch of the family had always remained in contact with their Southern relatives, and as a youth Gerrit van der Laen had studied in Louvain. This case illustrates once more that the stereotypical image of Flemish religious zealots altercating with native xenophobic Hollanders has its origin in contemporary polemics rather than in reality.

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

[277] Ibid., pp. 6, 27.
[278] See for example: Pieter Biesboer, 'De Vlaamse immigranten in Haarlem 1578 in Haarlem en hun nakomelingen', in: Pieter Biesboer, Gerrit Kolthof et. al., *Vlamingen in Haarlem*, Haarlem 1996, p. 41.
[279] M. Thierry de Bye Dóllemann and O. Schutte, 'Het Haarlemse geslacht Van der Laen', in: *De Nederlandsche Leeuw* 86 (1969), p. 326.

other Reformed principalities'. The authorities had to appoint 'trustees, superintendents or bishops, committed to the magistrate by oath'. These overseers should control the ministers whose only task was to study the scriptures and preach the Gospel – their interference in political issues had to be prevented.[280] In his long-lasting conflict with the Reformed consistory, the former Haarlem burgomaster had always maintained the position that as a public officer he had to commit himself to the public religion. In Haarlem this turned out to be the Reformed faith, but 'if the Augsburg Confession had been public and authorized, he would have converted' since he was an admirer of Melanchthon.[281] For him, he said, the only authority in religion was Scripture itself, and he had become Reformed only when Delft Minister Arnoldus Cornelisz. had convinced him that adherents of the Reformed Religion held no authority higher than the Bible.[282]

In fact, Van der Laen's position has to be situated in a conflict that can be traced back to the 'wonder year' in Antwerp that was long to be remembered in the Republic. During his studies in Louvain in the late 1560s Van der Laen had become a Protestant but was more drawn towards Lutheranism and became involved in the conflict between Calvinists and adherents of the Augsburg Confession, which arose in Antwerp in 1567.[283] Confronted with religious suppression, the two groups had disagreed on how to respond. The Lutherans refused to participate in any resistance or rebellion and were blamed by the Reformed for being unwilling to defend the common 'Christian freedom'.[284] The phraseology of the Antwerp Lutherans, accusing their fellow Protestants of rioting and unruliness, clearly resembles Van der Laen's letters from 1615: 'vous, Calvinistes, vous auctorises icy par force et violence, et nous y sommes avec le consentiment du magistrat'.[285] For Van der Laen obedience to the magistrate was, besides moral conduct, the only check to be observed in the appointment of ministers: the main problem with Calvinist ministers

[280] Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie*, vol. 4, p. 639.
[281] Noord-Hollands Archief, Acta van de kerkeraad van de Hervormde Kerk te Haarlem, December 20, 1622.
[282] Spaans, *Haarlem na de reformatie*, p. 193.
[283] M. Thierry de Bye Dóllemann and O. Schutte, *Het Haarlemse geslacht Van der Laen*, in: *De Nederlandsche Leeuw* 86 (1969), 326; Spaans, *Haarlem na de reformatie*, p. 193.
[284] J. W. Pont, *Geschiedenis van het Lutheranisme in de Nederlanden tot 1618*, Haarlem 1911, p. 89.
[285] Guido Marnef, *Antwerpen in de tijd van de Reformatie. Ondergronds protestantisme in een handelsmetropool 1550-1577*, Antwerpen 1996, p. 143.

was 'that they descend from the dregs and the scum of the unhewn and rude people who nourish a natural hatred against the magistrate'.[286]

The dispute between Lutherans and Calvinists in Antwerp festered on in the Republic for a long time. When the Northern cities were confronted with the immigration of Lutheran fugitives from Antwerp in 1585, Amsterdam Reformed minister Petrus Plancius accused them of sympathy with Catholicism and recalled the events of the wonder year in the Scheldt city. As late as 1602 and 1604, Lutherans in Amsterdam and Rotterdam were again reminded of the Antwerp dispute and denounced as traitors who had collaborated with the Catholics in persecuting the Reformed.[287] The quarrel around the Antwerp events of 1566 even spread across the borders of the Republic: when the States-General sent a letter to Philipp Nicolai, Lutheran minister in Hamburg, with an appeal for more tolerance towards the Calvinists in the Hanseatic City, the wonder year was once again a disputed matter. Not the Lutherans, Nicolai replied, but the Calvinists were to blame for the hardships in Antwerp: with their rebellious attitude and adamant intolerance they resembled more an Islamic sect than a Christian Church and thereby provoked persecution.[288] Van der Laen's resentment was thus not exceptional – the Antwerp past lived on and, according to J.W. Pont, was a main factor of the irreconcilability between the two confessions in the Republic: Lutherans were regarded as 'strangers in the State, as those, who let down (the Reformed) in the struggle for religious freedom'.[289] The ever-increasing tendency of the Calvinists to identify the Revolt with their own confessional cause aimed at the exclusion of other confessional parties who were identified as consisting of 'strangers'. In their eyes Netherlandishness was not so much determined by birth as by religion and loyalty to the Revolt. This new semantics could be turned around by referring to the Calvinist party as 'the strangers' since their majority did indeed consist of Southern exiles. The same strategy could be applied by the various religious minorities in the Northern cities: the agitation against 'strangers' and 'outlanders' does not reflect a general tendency of xenophobia - many of the authors were Southerners themselves

[286] '[G]esproten uitet schuim ende gespuis van't gemeene obesnoeit ende onwetent volk, die van naturen alle overheit haten.'(Dorren, *Eenheid en verscheidenheid*, p. 136.)
[287] Pont, *Geschiedenis van het Lutheranisme*, p. 89; C.Ch.G. Visser, *De Lutheranen in Nederland. Tussen katholicisme en calvinisme. 1566 tot heden*, Dieren 1983, p. 44.
[288] Ibid., p. 45.
[289] Pont, *Geschiedenis van het Lutheranisme*, p. 89.

- but a reestablishment of the traditional semantics of 'natives' and 'strangers'. Thereby memories of the Calvinist past in the South as well as the first phase of immigration to the Republic were important. They warned of Calvinist intolerance and radicalism and put the newcomers in their place: the refugees inhabited the country thanks only to the goodwill and the charity of the natives. As strangers they had to show their gratitude and stop interfering in political issues.

The case of Van der Laen was no exception. Not only sympathizers of Lutheranism but also moderate Reformed regents who sympathized with Erastian ideas employed an explicit anti-immigrant rhetoric while at the same time having Flemish and Brabant migrants among their personal friends and contacts. Amsterdam burgomaster Cornelis Pietersz. Hooft, for example, father to the famous poet Pieter Cornelisz. Hooft, is often cited as a typical example of a Holland regent with an explicit anti-immigrant stance.[290] However, Hooft was on friendly terms with Southern migrants and was even praised for his personal engagement in the admittance and accommodation of refugees in Holland. Joost van den Vondel, who was born of exiled Southern Netherlandish parents in Cologne, dedicated his play 'Hierusalem verwoest' to him and explicitly praised him as a generous host of Southern exiles:

> The most dignified fruit of this [Hooft's] work is that many thousands of exiled people were friendly nourished and accommodated in the bosom and the territory of the Serene Lords, the States. Resting under their protecting shadows, [the exiles] did no longer have to fear the rage of the Spanish Alecto, who arose from the limbo of hell and, having shaken her snake-wig thrice, kindled the fire with her torch in the faggots and the firewood of the stakes to which many pious Christians were attached, who sung for Jesus Christ in the midst of the flames and offered their body and soul as an odor, sweet and pleasant to God.[291]

[290] Briels, *Zuidnederlanders in de Republiek*, pp. 269ff.; Asaert, *1585. De val van Antwerpen*, pp. 260f.
[291] Joost van den Vondel, *De werken van Vondel*, (ed. J.F.M. Sterck, H.W.E. Moller e.a.) Amsterdam 1929, vol.1. (1605-1620), p. 91: 'De weerdighste vrucht van deze arbeyd is dat vele duyzend verjaeghde menschen in den schoot en het gebied der doorluchtige Heeren Staten gastvry zyn geherberght en lieflijck gekoestert, en die in veylige schaduwe gezeten niet meer hoeven te vreezen de grimmigheyd van die uyt het voorborgh der Hellen opgedonderde Spaensche Alecto, die drymael haer geslangde perruyck geschud hebbende, met haer fackel het vuyr stack inde mutsaerden en rijsbossen die de palen en staecken bekleeden waeraen dagelijcx vele vrome Christenen wierden vastgemaeckt, die midden inde vlammen Jesus Christus lof toezingende, hem lijf en ziele opofferden tot eenen zoeten en Godbehaegelijcken reuck.'

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

Managing counter-memory

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

[292] Ibid., vol. 2 (1620-1627), p. 760.
[293] C.P. Hooft, *Memoriën en adviezen* (ed. H.A. Enno van Gelder), Utrecht 1871 – 1925, vol 1, p. 131.
[294] *Ecclesiae Londino-Batavum archivum*, II, pp. 552f.
[295] Ibid., II, p 557.
[296] Ruytinck, *Gheschiedenissen ende Handelingen*, pp. 108ff.

defend the reputation of the Reformed Church, which explicitly did not define itself in local and congregational terms but as the universal and united *corpus Christi,* the Mennonites' memories had to be countered. The London congregation was prepared to respond to all accusations with an elaborate program of memory management. When the descendants of the London martyrs caused unease in Haarlem, the London Reformed congregation only had to send to Haarlem another copy of the 1581 letter to Van den Corput and the declaration of the converts.[297]

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

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

[297] Ibid., pp. 314ff.
[298] Duke, *Martyrs with a Difference*, p. 214.

outside their own congregation.[299] Since the first days of their existence the Dutch Reformed Church had shaped its self-image by referring to its position as the persecuted and afflicted flock. Its identity as the 'true Church', recognizable by suffering and being persecuted, was deeply internalized by its members as well as by its institutional organization. Printed sermons like *Het cleyn mostert-zaet*, originally preached by Ysbrand Balck in 1567 and 1585 in Antwerp when the Protestants were expelled from the city, served as a model of identification for the Calvinists.[300] Having been planted like a minuscule mustard-seed in a situation of hardship and suffering, their endurance would eventually be rewarded by becoming a majestic plant. Obviously the self-image of the Reformed as the true, persecuted Christians was threatened when they were accused of being persecutors themselves. Their opponents understood very well that the Calvinists could not deal with these accusations. In a similar case, the classis of Edam decided in 1608 not to take any steps against Mennonites slanderers since these measures would only give their opponents more reasons for backbiting. The Reformed ministers had already been called 'inquisitors,' and the classis did not want to make things worse.[301]

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

---

[299] This was clearly not the case when church members attacked and criticized the congregation. People like van der Laen were repeatedly called to account for their role in the conflict after the quarrels had ended (See for example: Acta van de kerkeraad van de Hervormde Kerk te Haarlem, October 2, 1619; December 20, 1622.).

[300] Ysbrand Balck, *Het cleyn mostert-zaet, dat is, de laetste predicatie a. 1567. den 9 Aprilis, ende wederom, die naest-laetste predicatie den 18. Aug. a. 1585. binnen Antwerpen, wten 4. cap. des Euan. Marci ver. 30.31.32*., Amsterdam 1590. See also: Frank van der Pol, *Mosterdzaad in ballingschap. Over christelijke identiteit en geloofsrepressie in de Nederlanden*, Kampen 2007, pp. 112ff.

[301] Van Deursen, *Bavianen en slijkgeuzen*, p. 146.

> At this point I must not remain silent and I cannot conceal that among the people who suffered under the Spanish and Papist persecution, there were some, who have suffered and even died for the Anabaptist faith. However, I do not want to mention their names, for if they were unknown until now, the members of their sect could use my work to fill their 'victim-books' and to praise and glorify their so-called 'martyrs'. But to God only the cause and not the punishment makes the true martyr, and those who die for heretical opinions, are miserable twice. [302]

Ampzing is aware that any information he gives could be used to remind the Mennonites of their own past and provide them with a further account about their own heroes as had been the case with the Reformed sources in the Haarlem martyrology. On the other hand, Ampzing's opponents during the struggle between Calvinists and Remonstrants are mentioned with great diligence. Burgomaster Gerrit van der Laen, who helped to defend Haarlem during the siege as a young man, is mentioned only euphemistically and sometimes even obliquely as 'the son of Klaes Verlaen'.[303] Ampzing barely mentions him, only noting that he fled from a strategic place that he and his company had to defend while those who stayed and fought against the besiegers perished.[304] The past had to remain under control since everything could be used in ways other than those originally intended by the author who delivered the historical account. In their efforts to keep control of collective memory the Reformed developed the most elaborate and deliberate strategies. Although counter-voices could not always be silenced – in their position as the public church, they were able to shape a coherent idea of the past that could successfully be defended against critics and dissidents.

Disseminating inclusive exile identities

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

[302] Samuel Ampzing, *Beschryvinge ende lof der stad Haerlem in Holland*, Haarlem 1628, p. 452: 'Ik en kan hier evenwel niet verswijgen, nochte verbergen, dat onder dese luyden, die de Spaensche ende Roomsche vervolgingen uytgestaen hebben, enige ook geweest sijn die om de Wederdoperije geleden hebben, ja den dood gestorven sijn: howel ik die willens op dien naem niet en hebbe willen melden, nochte uytdrucken, of ze hun veel-licht onbekend mogten wesen, opdat die van hunne Secte met mijnen arbeyd hun vermeynd Offer-boeck niet en stofferen, ende hunne martelaers door mij niet en komen te roemen, ende te verheffen: also de sake alleen, ende niet de straffe geenszins, den Martelaer voor Gode maeckt, ende die voor Gods-lasterlijcke opinien ende ketterijen sterven, maer veelmeer dobbel-ellendig te achten sijn.'
[303] Ibid., p. 242.
[304] Ibid., p. 328.

did not emerge outside and separate from confessional circles but was shaped rather in a non-confessional pattern. Most notably, those exiles who belonged to non-public but tolerated confessional groups began to shape their own identity in a way that did not accentuate any specific confession.[305] This pattern of identification emerged in particular among the groups of Mennonite linen weavers and yarn bleachers from West Flanders who had fled to Haarlem.

The numerous sources addressing the past in West Flanders and the flight to Haarlem of the Mennonite linen workers suggest that a living memory culture persisted until the first half of the seventeenth century. As late as 1646 yarn bleacher Pieter van Hulle was able to give a vivid account of the flight of his ancestors in 1578. Apparently the knowledge of the circumstances in Flanders was passed down to succeeding generations in such detail that Van Hulle could not only provide an account of the past in the South but also give the names (even nicknames) and birth places of no fewer than forty bleachers who had left the region around Menen with their wives and children. In Haarlem, which 'by God's grace and the wise government' had become 'one of the most powerful cities in Holland', they were 'welcomed in a friendly manner and treated like indigenous citizens'.[306]

The anonymous preface of the *Schilderboek* by the famous painter and author Karel van Mander from Meulebeke in Flanders who had migrated to Haarlem offers a similar account.[307] The anonymous author presents Van Mander's life including a great number of intimate details about the youth and early travels of the artist. Apparently, the memory of the Flemish past was preserved in stories and amusing anecdotes in the circles of Van Mander's family and friends. Long passages of the text depict the innocent tomfooleries of the young painter: Karel, who is smarter and wittier than his contemporaries, likes to play all kinds of tricks on them.

---

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

[306] S. C. Regtdoorzee Greup-Roldanus, 'Pieter van Hulle (1585-1656). Schrijver van het "Memoriael van de overkomste der Vlaemingen hier binnen Haerlem"', in: *Nederlandsche Historiebladen* 1938, p. 482.

[307] Karel van Mander, *Het schilderboek. Het leven van de doorluchtige Nederlandse en Hoogduitse schilders*, Amsterdam 1995, pp. 25ff. On this biographical account, see: Henk Duits, *'Het leven van Karel van Mander. Kunstenaarsleven of schrijversbiografie?', in: De zeventiende eeuw 9 (1993), pp. 113-130.*

On an extremely cold day he talks one of his father's servants into licking an iron water pump. The servant, as expected, remains stuck on the cold pump and can free himself only at the cost of a piece of his tongue skin. Altogether, the artist's youth in Flanders is presented in the form of a rural idyll and told as a sequence of comical and picaresque anecdotes. Suddenly the mood darkens and the idyllic countryside of West Flanders turns into a battle zone when marauding Walloon malcontents pillage the area around Kortrijk, plunder the houses and molest women and young girls. Van Mander's family is harassed and robbed, and they have to leave Meulebeke: 'Since then the whole landscape has turned into a scene of ruin and destruction'. After having fled to Bruges, they decide to settle in 'the old and famous town of Haarlem'.[308]

A similar narrative of the same events can be found in the songbook *Haerlem Soetendal* ('Haarlem, sweet valley') probably written in 1614. The events are told in almost the same pattern: the inhabitants of the beautiful town of Kortrijk are joyously celebrating the feast of Corpus Christi when suddenly the Walloon malcontents invade the town, molesting and killing the unfortunate citizens.[309] Although Van Hulle, Van Mander and the author of *Haerlem Soetendal*, a rhetorician operating under the pen name *Botten Bloeyen hooghe* ('Dog roses in bloom') were all Mennonites, none of the texts mention any religious issues. The events in Flanders are presented as a human catastrophe, not as the suffering of the elect few, persevering through hardship. Behind the narrative of these authors lies a new idea of what it means to be a Haarlemmer: They do not belong to the city by descent, nor are they predestined to inherit the land by belonging to the 'true Religion'. Their bond with Haarlem is one of choice and commitment: they were welcomed as refugees like 'children into their mother's bosom' and helped to make the town flourish after the siege. [310] As Pieter van Hulle made clear, the contribution of the Southerners to the economic success of the town was immense, and the new technologies brought by the refugees made it 'famous in the whole world, so that all foreign merchants are eager to buy Haarlem products.'[311]

---

[308] Van Mander, *Het schilderboek* , pp. 36, 39.
[309] *Liedekens ende Refereynen, ghemaeckt by Haerlem Soetendal, van zijn Avonturen ofte wedervarentheyt, sint zijn vertreck uyt Haerlem, in 't Jaer ons Heeren 1599*, Haarlem 16XX, fol. D3r.
[310] *Der Wit-Angieren Eeren-Krans, gesproten uyt de Vlaemsche Natie*, Haarlem 1630, *Voorrede*, fol. 2r.
[311] *Memoriael van de overkomste der Vlaemingen*, p. 483.

Poet and painter Van Mander, the most prolific cultural role model of Haarlem's Flemish community, employed a remarkable strategy to disseminate the new identity of the 'Haarlemmers by choice'. Around 1600 he composed two anthems on his new home town. In one of the songs, he clearly referred to a fifteenth-century song by Dirc Mathijszen, also a 'New Haarlemmer', born in South Holland or Flanders. Like Van Mander, Mathijszen emphasizes his love for Haarlem, which he finds more beautiful and pleasant than all other cities he has ever visited.[312] Van Mander rewrites Mathijszen's song and thereby tries to point to a tradition, in which Haarlem local identity is defined not by birth but by commitment to the new home:

> I have travelled, wandered, sailed,
> In my young years, in many directions,
> in countries and empires with beautiful towns,
> of which I will not mention all the names,
> for the sake of time –
> But I did not find a town so pleasant and fairly situated
> as Haarlem in Holland.
> It might be that this fondness lies in my nature,
> since affection can also cause a lack of judgment. [313]

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

> In the years of my youth
> I have travelled and sailed many miles.
> From here to there,
> From East to West and South to North:
> That's how I know a lot of towns,
> but I never came to one, in which I found more joy
> (as many will know)
> than Haarlem in Holland. [314]

---

[312] J.D. Rutgers van der Loeff, *Drie lofdichten op Haarlem. Het middelnederlandsch gedicht van Jan Mathijszen en Karel van Mander's twee beelden van Haarlem*, Haarlem 1911, p. 13.

[313] Ibid., p. 19: 'Ick hebbe gereijst, geloopen, gevaren,
Mijn jonge jaren, meest alder wegen
In landen in rijcken, daer schoon steden waren,
Die ick haer namen hier te verklaren,
Om tijt te sparen, late verswegen –
Maer soo lustighen stadt, noch soo wel gelegen
En vant ick als Haerlem in Hollant fijn,
Of natuere en drijft mijn sinnelijck genegen:
Want door affectie kan wel onverstant sijn.'

[314] Ibid., p. 13: 'Ic heb in minen jonghen jaren

Throughout the song, and often literally, Van Mander follows his late-medieval predecessor in praising the beautiful and fertile farmlands and fishing grounds around his new home town. He once more repeats the commonplace of 'mother' Haarlem, 'who sweetly welcomes the stranger like her own child in her bosom'.[315] His literary construction of a Haarlem identity, based not on birth but on choice, implies the existence of a long tradition, in which the poet inscribes himself.

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

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

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

[315] Ibid., p. 28.

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

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

[316] Govert van der Eembd, *Haerlemse Belegeringhs Treur-blyeynde-spel*, Haarlem 1619, fol. 2rf:
'Uyt Zuyden komt een volck, hoewel vreemt van tael,
En na-ghebuyrt met den krom-tongh-uyt-heemsen Wael,
Nochtans, uyt hatingh tot Gods af-ghestelde Santen,
Begheeren sy by u haer woon-plaets vast te planten.
s'Daeghs meer dan honderd komt; bewoont u huys en Hoff,
De vryheyd des gheloofs lijd al tot Godes loff,
De Wijd-beruchte Wael, den Vlamingh en Brabander
Ter Poorten indringt, ja met troppen d'een na d'ander.
Ghelijck de gaeuwe Bye, uyt woon-plaets gantsch verjaeght
Niet rust voor hy en heb een plaets die hem behaeght
Dat's daer elck vry en vranck onschreinnigh voor hun lijv
Sijn handel uyterlijck mach openbaerlijck drijven:
De welck'hy hebbende ghevonden draeght de maer
Aen d'and're doolende en uytghedreven Schaer;
Die dan met een ghedruys ter poorten heen in-dringhen,
En op 's poorts dorpel flucks tot loff huns huys-waerds singhen
Soo gaet het met dit volck; noch zijnde voor de Poort,
Een Lied tot lof des Lands van Beloften wierd ghehoort.'
[317] Ibid., *Voorrede*, fol. *3v.

Gable stone on the Beestenmarkt in Leiden (early seventeenth century): 'In't lant van beloften. In de nieuwe stad' (In the Promised Land. In the new town'). The relief refers to the biblical story of the twelve spies who bring giant grapes from Canaan to convince the Israelites to invade the country (Numbers 13: 1-14).

Inscribing migrant memories into the local memory canon

The migrant authors who were active in the Flemish and Brabantine chambers of rhetoric disseminated new civic identities that inscribed the past of the exiles into the historical narrative of their host societies. While the chambers were explicitly identified as Southern institutions, they also fashioned pronounced civic identities and acted as representatives of their respective home towns at literary festivities in other cities.[318] As immigrant institutions they had only individuals with a migrant background as their members but had contacts with native rhetorician societies and organized festivities and took part in competitions together with the other Holland chambers.

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

[318] See e.g.: Mieke B. Smits-Veldt, 'Het Brabantse gezicht van de Amsterdamse rederijkerskamer "Het Wit
Lavendel"', in: *De zeventiende eeuw* 8 (1992), pp. 160-166; J. Briels, 'Reyn Genuecht. Zuidnederlandse kamers van Rhetorica in Noordnederland 1585-1630', in: *Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis bijzonderlijk van het oud hertogdom Brabant* 57 (1974), pp. 3-89; Johannes Müller, 'Orthodoxie jenseits der Konfessionen? Die Diskussion religiöser Streitfragen in niederländischen Rhetorikergesellschaften im frühen 17. Jahrhundert', in: Andreas Pietsch and Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger, *Konfessionelle Ambiguität – Uneindeutigkeit und Verstellung als religiöse Praxis in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte), Gütersloh 2013, p. 275.

towns.[319] In particular, the annual commemorations of the Leiden siege that ended with a triumphant victory over the Habsburg troops became occasions to inscribe migrant identity into local memories and identities. For these commemoration festivities the Leiden Flemish chamber annually contributed poems and songs about Leiden's relief. As already mentioned, Jacob Duym had included his play on Leiden in his collection of plays about the Dutch Revolt and reserved a crucial role for the Flemish refugees who appeared in it. Like Duym, Amsterdam rhetorician Jan Sieuwertsz. Kolm, born to Southern refugee parents, included memories of flight and persecution in his historical play about the Revolt in the Northern Provinces. In his *Nederlants treurspel* (1616) he proclaimed that all Netherlanders - Southern refugees as well as local Hollanders - shared a common past.[320]

In his play about the siege of Leiden Jacob van Zevecote expressed the gratitude of the refugees to their new home towns, to which they felt strong commitment and loyalty.[321] Nostalgia for Flanders is combined with praise of Holland, which now became the true home of the refugees. Abraham de Koning of the Brabant rhetorician chamber of Amsterdam employed the same motif. After recalling the traumatic events many migrants had experienced he depicts their miserable state after arrival in the Holland safe havens. Only through the intervention of the Amsterdam magistrates had they been able to survive and build a future. One of the exiled characters from the Flemish town of Belle in De Koning's play *'Tspel van Sinne* ('Allegoric morality play') laments his fate and at the same time praises Amsterdam as follows:

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

[319] On the memory culture of the Dutch Revolt in Haarlem and other towns in the Netherlands, see the forthcoming dissertation of Marianne Eekhout. See also: Marianne Eekhout, 'De kogel in de kerk. Herinneringen aan het beleg van Haarlem, 1573-1630', in: *Holland. Historisch Tijdschrift* 43/2 (2011), pp. 108-119.
[320] Jan Sieuwertsz. Kolm, N*ederlants treur-spel. Inhoudende den oorspronck der Nederlandsche beroerten, 'tscheyden der ed'len, 'tsterven der graven van Egmont, Hoorn, ende der Batenborgers*, Amsterdam, 1616.
[321] Van Zevecote, 'Belech van Leyden', p. 233.

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

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

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

---

[322] Abraham de Koning, *'Tspel van Sinne vertoont op de Tweede Lotery van d'Arme Oude Mannen ende Vrouwen Gast-Huys*, Amsterdam 1616, fol. B2r.-v:

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

[323] De la Court, *Het Welvaren Van Leiden*.

town in which everyone who asked for it was granted citizenship. According to the treatise, it was the migration from Flanders that made Leiden the city it had become. Before the arrival of the Southerners the town did not have its big canals and occupied only a small spot that was now the city centre.[324] Since the Middle Ages as Flemish migrants settled in Leiden the city benefited from their arrival. In De la Court's historical account Leiden's wealth was dependent on the economic freedom it offered outsiders who brought capital and expertise into the town. The town's history is presented in a narrative that relies on the opposition between conservative native regents who try to uphold a system of nepotism and the real economic agents who fought for economic liberty and against traditional monopolies and guild-restrictions. In the conclusion of his argument De la Court sums up: 'Therefore the fact remains that Leiden has never prospered without liberty, and that even in peace time it declined through restrictions[…]'.[325]

De la Court's history of Leiden's success is in fact a history of migration. Countering the argument that the local guilds had always been the motor of the local economy, De la Court offered an alternative explanation of the town's welfare. From the medieval immigration of Flemings to Holland to the exodus during the Dutch Revolt and the influx of refugees from war-torn Germany after 1618 and from France, Brabant and Flanders in the 1630s, Leiden owed its economic success to strangers who were excluded from the local guilds.[326] In order to strengthen its own position the town should diminish the influence of these organizations and liberalize the trade and production of its local merchandise. Strangers and new citizens should also be granted the same rights and privileges as the natives and old, established families.[327]

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

[324] Ibid., p. 1. See also: Jan Orlers, *Beschrijvinge der stadt Leyden*, Leiden 1641, p. 43.
[325] De la Court, *Het Welvaren Van Leiden*, p. 10: 'Het is oversulcks ende blyft waargtig dat Leyden nooit is toegenomen dan in Vryheid, ende dat hetzelven door dwand ook afgenomen is in volle Vreede […]'.
[326] Ibid., p. 9.
[327] Arthur Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism in the Dutch Golden Age. The Political Thought of Johan and Pieter de la Court*, Leiden 2011, p. 159.

enough to oppose local and provincial interests in favor of the Union, De la Court belonged to the anti-Orange States faction. By the middle of the seventeenth century the situation had changed. The opposition between local regents and newcomers who sought influence was no longer automatically correlated to the struggle between provincial politicians of the local regent class with often Remonstrant or Libertine sympathies and centralist Orangists with a preference for Calvinism. De la Court combined aspects of both camps: he fought against the privileges of local families and organizations but at the same was a fierce critic of the House of Orange and of strict Calvinism.[328]

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

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

[328] See e.g.: Pieter de la Court, 'Voor-reden' to Viglius van Aytta, 'Grondig berigt van 't Nederlands oproer zo onder de hertogin van Parma, als den hertog van Alba. Beschreven in 't Françoys', in: Pieter de la Court (ed.), *Historie der gravelike regering in Holland*, Amsterdam(?)1662, p. 209.

[329] 'Het is nochtans waaragtig, dat eenige Vlamingen in den jaare 1587 seer onvoorsigtlik met den Grave van Leycester aanspannende om de regeering te hervormen, occasie hebben gegeven tot een scheuring, die niet ligt staat geheeld te sullen werden in voorspoedige tyden, ende soo lange als deeser stede diensten meer voor, als nadeels geven: Want hetselven de Regeerders een genoegsaam pretext heeft gestekt, om de voordeelen van de Regeeringe dependerende, aan weynige nakomelingen der oude Borgers vast te maken. Maar vermits die seclusie is reëlik, daadelik, arbitrair, ende niet door kragt van eenige secludeende Wet; soo is deselven in alle manieren drageliker ende min aanstootelik.' (De la Court, *Het Welvaren Van Leiden*, p. 6.)

In this narrative, the Flemings were not the agents behind the Leicester Coup but had only been imprudent ('onvoorsigtlik') and only a few of them ('eenige Vlamingen') had been involved at all. While the involvement with Leicester had been a difficult episode in the collective memory of many migrants, De la Court gives it another meaning and function. The message of this narrative does not concern the dangers of Flemish radicalism but serves to warn about local nepotism that used the involvement of some misguided migrants as a pretext to exclude the strangers from public offices. However, the rift between strangers and locals is at the same time rhetorically closed: Since there exists no formal law that excluded Flemings and the exclusion was the work of only a few influential local families and not based on an officially sanctioned act, Leiden is excused of anti-migrant sentiments. In De la Court's account the opposition between Holland natives and Flemish newcomers is exposed as an outdated ideological construction – in reality, Flemings had played only a minor role in the Leicester Coup, and the families who had exploited the image of the rebellious Flemings to exclude strangers had also been few. Strangers and newcomers as well as locals belonged to the city and its history. The real antagonism in Leiden's society is not between migrants and non-migrants but between a small corrupt elite and the rest of the population.

This inclusion of Southern migrants into new constructions of civic identity was accompanied by new ways of thinking about citizenship and belonging to the local community. It is therefore not surprising that the first theoretical and political treatises that reflected on citizenship in the towns of the Dutch Republic were written by Flemish migrants. The first one, *Het burgherlick leven* ('Civic life') written in 1590 by Simon Stevin, a first-generation migrant from Bruges, tried to define and describe citizens or burgers, including the behavior expected of them and the duties they owed to their hometowns.[330] Instead of grounding citizenship in local civic lineages Stevin defines it in terms of 'deliberate participation in civic life'.[331] True *burghers* are not those descended from local citizens but those who commit themselves to their hometowns and show their loyalty towards the local community.

[330] Simon Stevin, *Het burgherlick leven* (eds. Annie Romein-Verschoor en G.S. Overdiep), Amsterdam 1939. See on this work: Catherine Secretan, 'Simon Stevin's Vita politica. Het Burgherlick leven (1590). A practical guide for civic life in the Netherlands at the end of the sixteenth century', in: *De Zeventiende Eeuw* 28 (2012) 1, pp. 2-20.
[331] Ibid., p. 20.

To Stevin citizenship is a matter of free choice: when he discusses the relationship between city magistrates and inhabitants, he calls the latter those who 'who have chosen this place' as their home.[332] This view is characteristic for Stevin's outlook as a migrant who could not legitimize his position in the new society by referring to his lineage.

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

Fragmentary discourses

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

[332] Stevin, *Het burgherlick leven*, p. 27.
[333] Pieter de la Court, cited after: Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism in the Dutch Golden Age*, p. 159.
[334] Ibid., p. 160.

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

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

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

[335] Gisbert Voetius, *Den Ver-resenen Barnevelt, betabbert met alle sijne Politycke Maximen*, Zierikzee 1663, fol. B3.
[336] Ibid.

national memory canons. Having fled for their faith and having chosen the Northern towns as a new homestead to which they were willing to commit themselves as loyal citizens made the migrants part of the local communities.