Contents

Preface

Wow! After five years of studying this is the end. I will certainly not mention any adjectives like *finally* or *at last*, nor will I state that I enjoyed every minute of it. For the greater part, these past years have been great and it is weird to know that I will no longer attend classes after the summer.

This thesis roughly represents my entire master. The Reformation was the main subject in many of my classes and it was therefore nothing but logical that this period formed the basis of my final research. Besides the fact that I learned much about the history of tolerance and the implementation of it by early modern European societies, I learned that history does and will not ever bore me. I sincerely hope that this was not the last study I did on a historical topic.

Without the help of my supervisor Jo Spaans, I would not have been able to write this thesis and I would like to thank her for her time and efforts to get the job done. Also, I would like to thank my second supervisor Maarten Prak for his help, especially with the comparative side of the work. Besides this more 'intellectual' help, I thank my parents for always listening to me and giving advice at times when I need it. Their constant support and help with everything is of indescribable value to me. For this I also want to thank my dear friends, especially Lara, with whom I spend these past years laughing, crying, talking, drinking wine and oh, of course, studying. Last, but not least, I want to thank my fantastic boyfriend Tom for his help with the analysis and for every spelling check he has done for me these five years. There was not a better shoulder to cry on when things got to me and no greater enthusiast when I did well. For that, I am forever grateful.

Introduction

The sixteenth century meant an enormous turn in the religious world. Christianity would never be the same after Luther and later Calvin shared their thoughts with the people of Europe. Evidently, the leaders of the Roman Catholic Church and the devout rulers did not let the religious newcomers define their confessional beliefs as wrong and untrue, but after some time it became clear that the Protestant faith was there to stay. Luther and Calvin gained followers all over Europe and created new religions which became almost as important as the Catholic faith.

The Reformation, as the period is called, tore apart western society 'by deep disagreements about how human beings should exercise the power of God in the world, arguments even about was it was to be human.'[1] Attempts to bring the religious world together again were certainly made. In 1541 the Imperial diet of Regensburg was opened with many representatives of the Catholic Church and members of the Protestant side. Here, cardinal Contarini of Italy said to Martin Bucer, a prominent Protestant: 'How great will be the fruit of unity, and how profound the gratitude of all mankind,' to which Bucer replied: 'Both sides have failed. Some of us have overemphasized unimportant points, and others have not adequately reformed obvious abuses. With God's will we shall ultimately find the truth.'[2] However, regardless of these encouraging words, the conflict proved to be insolvable in the end. Every faith thought of itself as the true religion with the answers to the question of how the power of God should be exercised. However, to what extent could those faiths allow the other, new religions to think the same? In other words, to what extent did followers of one religion tolerate dissenters?

Scholars since the fifteenth century have thought about and discussed tolerance, which has resulted in many different perceptions. It began with world travels, which led to the conquering of distant lands and the demanding of the natives to replace their beliefs, ideas and practices with those of the foreign power. The treatment of the native people did not sit well with some scholars who argued for a more tolerant approach.[3] With the Reformation a new debate started about the idea of tolerance. The humanists of the Renaissance had already stated that the search for the common truth 'could only be arrived at by charity and peace, for the composing of differences was a prerequisite of agreement.'[4] The leading humanist of the time, Erasmus, went even further by saying that fewer rules would eventually lead to less conflict; people should be free to fill in the blanks for

---

[1] Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Reformation: Europe's house divided, 1490-1700* (London: Penguin Books, 2004) xxi.
[2] Ibidem, 230.
[3] Jonathan Dewald, *Europe 1450 to 1789: encyclopedia of the early modern world* 6(New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2004) 52.
[4] Henry Kamen, *The rise of toleration* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1967) 24.

themselves.[5] Other scholars, like the political philosopher Bodin, argued that differences were unchangeable and that they should be accepted, because no one could do anything about it anyway.[6]

During the seventeenth century more scholars became in favor of toleration. Philosopher Thomas Hobbes argued that as long the social order was stable and there were no political struggles, authorities should not stand in the way of the freedom of people to choose whatever belief most appealed to them. The Dutch philosopher Spinoza agreed, and further stated that the authorities could not control the beliefs of citizens, so they should not interfere with their choice.[7] The scholars of the Enlightenment were even more positive about toleration. British philosopher John Locke argued in his *Epistola de Tolerantia* that the state should not concern itself with religion, only with social order and individual rights. For this reason, it had to allow its citizens the freedom of conscience, meaning that one could choose his own beliefs.[8]

These scholars all seemed fairly in favor of an attitude of tolerance. However, we have to keep in mind that these were opinions about freedom of conscience. This is not the same as freedom of religion by which one can actually practice his faith.[9] All the above were more advocating the belief that faith could not be forced; one had to devote himself willingly. According to Luther, people had to be free to live by the gospel. Forcing them was not the way, although unrestricted freedom was not his intention either, because 'no one can be free from obligations of truth.'[10]

Besides the thoughts of prominent thinkers, there were those of the rulers of European states. They experienced great conflicts when thinking about this issue. The ultimate want for a unified state, but which consisted of divided subjects was one. Unity and order were a must for a strong state. Of this, religion formed a symbol. [11] Moreover, societies lived by religious symbols and feasts[12] and with religious changes meaning social changes. This system in society was not dismissed easily.[13] Another conflict was the responsibility a ruler had towards God and the people to remain

---

[5] Kamen, *The rise of*, 27.

[6] Dewald, *Europe 1450 to 1789* 6, 53.

[7] Kamen, *The rise of*, 24.

[8] Ibidem.

[9] M. de Smit a.o., *Koenen woordenboek, N/N Nederlands* (Utrecht & Antwerp: Koenen Woordenboeken, 1999) 393.

[10] Kamen, *The rise of*, 30.

[11] Benjamin Kaplan, *Divided by faith: religious conflict and the practice of toleration in early modern Europe* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007) 102.

[12] Ibidem, 64.

[13] Heinz Schilling, 'Confessional Europe', in: *Handbook of European history 1400-1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation* 2, Thomas A. Brady, Heiko A. Oberman & James D. Tracy ed. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995) 642.

loyal to the true faith.[14] Some rulers were very strong in their opinions about the new religions that settled themselves in European societies during the Reformation. King Francis I of France was quite ruthless when it came to other faiths: '…if one of the arms of my body was infected with this corruption [rd. heresy], I would cut it off, and if my children were tainted with it, I would myself offer them in sacrifice.'[15] Other monarchs, like Sigismund II of Poland-Lithuania, were more reserved and let their states be a safe haven for dissenters who had fled their homes in fear of religious prosecutions.[16]

Present day scholars see a shift towards an extended practice of tolerance in the seventeenth century. According to historian Benjamin Kaplan, the wars, and especially the Thirty Years War in the first half of the seventeenth century, made people think of tolerance in a more positive manner.[17] Also the Enlightenment made tolerance more attractive, although this was not because of the general belief that reason conquered faith, but because of secularization.[18] Historians Mullett and Kamen argue that politics were also of great significance when it came to the emergence of tolerance. Kamen states that democracy could account for more toleration, but also economic reasons could make tolerance a more attractive policy.[19] Mullett sees a more favorable climate for toleration at the beginning of the sixteenth century. According to him scholars did more research among religious minorities, the amount of opponents of the Inquisition grew and furthermore, the popularity of the Dominicans, a traditional Catholic monastic order, declined among the people.[20]

Setting beside all these theories, what did actually happen in Europe concerning the practice of tolerance. Did such an attitude occur at all? And if so, where in society was it noticeable and who determined to what extent it was granted? These issues will be examined here and will eventually lead to an answer of the main question: What were the causes that made toleration of the religious minority by the dominant religious group possible in Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth century?

To answer this, I will use a method called Comparative Historical Analysis. In a following paragraph this method will be explained. For now it is enough to know that it allows for general assumptions to be made about the occurrence or non-occurrence of a practice of tolerance by

---

[14] Brad S. Gregory, *Salvation at stake. Christian martyrdom in early modern Europe* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1999) 79.

[15] Kaplan, *Divided by faith,* 1.

[16] Janusz Tazbir, *A state without stakes. Polish religious toleration in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1973) 13.

[17] Kaplan, *Divided by faith ,* 336.

[18] Ibidem, 343.

[19] Kamen, *The rise of*, 153.

[20] Michael Mullett, *Radical religious movements in early modern Europe* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1980) 75.

comparing several European cities on several themes wherein toleration could be demonstrated. The results will then be explained by different power blocks that were visible in towns. Further clarification of the choices and method in this thesis follows.

Defining the subject

It is difficult to give a definition for the term tolerance, however it is crucial when you want to determine if the idea was present in European cities in early modern times. It is not a problem of a lack of definitions or words that one can associate with the term. It is more a problem of time, space and personal attachment. What we now think of the term and how we define it, is not by any means the same as people of the sixteenth century did. Moreover, personal surroundings and the society in which a person lives highly influences one's feelings about tolerance. These external factors also differ greatly from those in the early modern period. Does this mean that one definition cannot be given for the term? Probably, but that is not the goal here. It is actually quite nice that there is not an absolute definition, because this will allow me to reconsider my own at the end of this thesis. This may show that the outcomes of my research could be different when considering other criteria for the term.

Before we can evaluate the results in the end, we have to give a starting definition. Most of the scholars who have written about religious tolerance have done so. According to Benjamin Kaplan 'to tolerate something', until the Enlightenment, meant ' to grudgingly concede its existence.**'**[21] This is no way near the general definition that one would give now, but we have to keep in mind that religion was the society and the society consisted of the faithful who saw it as a social order held together by shared beliefs. Another definition is given by historian Diarmaid MacCulloch, who also stresses the grudging concession of one group, but adds that toleration always came from 'one body from a position of strength.'[22] The encyclopedia *Europe 1450 to 1789* agrees with the statement that toleration was only provided by the dominant group, but states that there had to be a certain readiness to grant it: 'Toleration (…) denotes the readiness of an individual or community to permit the presence and/or expression of ideas, beliefs and practices differing from what is accepted by that individual or by the dominant part of the community.' Furthermore, it states that approval of other ideas was not required, that differences had to be respected and that the term was by definition antithetical to persecution or repression.[23] This definition gives the impression of a more positive

---

[21] Benjamin Kaplan, '"Dutch" religious tolerance: celebration and revision', in: *Calvinism and religious toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, R. Po-Chia Hsia & H.F.K. van Nierop ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) 25.

[22] MacCulloch, *Reformation*, 543.

[23] Dewald, *Europe 1450 to 1789* 6, 51.

attitude towards tolerance, especially when we compare it to the definition historian Keith Luria gives, namely that 'to "tolerate" another religion meant to endure its existence only because elimination was not possible.'[24] Historian Janusz Tazbir also gives a reason why tolerance was sometimes established in a community, namely that it would help to keep public policy stable.[25]

These historians have tried to keep their definitions of tolerance as close to the thoughts and circumstances of people of the sixteenth century, instead of letting their twentieth century perceptions of the term influence their description. This is of great importance, because those perceptions differ substantially. Nowadays, religious tolerance is generally considered as freedom of religion, meaning the right to practice any faith in public or private. However, this was certainly not the case in the sixteenth and seventeenth century when religion and society could not be seen as separate spheres. Freedom of religion would mean that a person could choose from all known religions without separating themselves from the community. This was impossible in a society where people lived by certain religious ideas and believed that other ideas than their own would provoke Divine wrath and disturb the peace and social order.

Looking at the given definitions, it appears that an unwilling attitude and a dominant group are important in a definition of tolerance. So with that in mind, this thesis will hold the following as its directory: Tolerance is the, in great degree unwilling acceptance of a religion other than the one of the established community. The people allow the ideas of the other religion and while approval is not required, religious dissenters can exercise their faith without being assaulted or persecuted. This definition will be part of the analysis of this thesis that will eventually present itself in a Boolean Table, which will be explained in a following paragraph.

Cases and criteria

This thesis examines the emergence of religious tolerance in European towns. The reason for the choice of towns is that such a research permits a smaller scale examination and therefore a more profound study. Moreover, the discussion of towns can show great differences, even though some belonged to the same state. Evidently several towns had to be picked to form the case study. For the greater part, they were chosen randomly. However, there were some criteria that had to be met. First and foremost, religious pluralism had to be present with an obvious division between minority and majority. It did not matter if Protestants or Catholics made up this minority, because here the practice of tolerance is important, not the religious group who granted it. However, these are the only two religious groups which are discussed here. Other minority groups like the Jews or Muslims

---

[24] Keith P. Luria, *Sacred boudaries. Religious coexistence and conflict in early-modern France* (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2005) 8.

[25] Tazbir, *A state without stakes,* 22.

are not included, because the framework for this thesis is the period of the Reformation and the religions that proceeded from it. Including other faiths would lead us to exceed this limit.

Second, there could not be a frequent change in religious conviction in the town. This could happen when a monarchy was led by a string of kings of different religious convictions in a short period of time. Because of this, the English towns were excluded. In England, kings and queens of different faiths succeeded each other quite rapidly, thereby turning the minority group into the majority group on several occasions. This makes a comparison very difficult, because each period could be seen as a different case. Although England was very extreme in its changes of religious beliefs, it is important to keep in mind that these were times subject to severe changes. Therefore, most cases show signs of religious instability at some point. Here, the most stable religious structures, visible for the greatest part of the two examined centuries are discussed.

Last, but not least, there had to be a significant amount of data available for a case. Without the right information nothing can be said about a town and that makes it a poor case for such an comparison.

Eventually, the sample was made up by a diverse group of towns, which all met the requirements. For France, the south-western town of Layrac, Châlons in the North, Paris, and the western region Poitou were selected. The north-eastern city of Gdansk in Poland-Lithuania and Hamburg, in the North of the Holy Roman Empire were chosen for Central-Europe. Furthermore, Strasbourg, an imperial city first situated within the borders of the Holy Roman Empire, but after the Peace of Westphalia within those of France, was picked. Last, four towns of the Dutch Republic were chosen. Two in the southern part, namely Maastricht and Antwerp, in the south-west Bergen op Zoom, and finally Utrecht, which was situated in the centre of the state.

Besides selecting various cases, several features of those towns had to be picked, which could demonstrate a practice of tolerance. To establish if tolerance was indeed present, each is given a criterion for tolerance. The first theme of part one is *laws*. This will be the easiest to consider, because politics are much better recorded than other parts of society. Here the criterion will be that a town had to implement the national laws. The fact that there were national rules to initiate toleration or intolerance does not mean that the communities lived up to them.

The second is *mixed marriages*. The fact that a society allowed two people from different faiths to marry each other could be a sign of tolerance. Unfortunately, there are few numbers concerning these intermarriages, so to be sure that their occurrence was quite normal and not an exception on the rule, the criterion for mixed marriages is set not by introducing a certain limit, but by looking at the way people responded to and thought about such alliances. For example, did the town have rules on how to raise the children under such circumstances? If this was the case, it is probable that mixed marriages were not that exceptional.

Thirdly, *guilds* are addressed. In the sixteenth century guilds were still the most important employers of laborers. The question here is, if followers of the minority group were welcome in the guilds, or workplaces, of the dominant group. Because numbers are very limited, a minimum percentage cannot be given here. So the notion of it in the literature will have to suffice.

Last will be the theme of *sacred spaces*. Before the Reformation, Europe knew only one Church. But in the sixteenth century, the Protestant Church made its appearance which was of some consequence for the Catholic communities. Sometimes a Protestant place of worship would be established next to a Catholic building, but in some cases the community refused to let this happen. When a Protestant church building was allowed to establish itself in a Catholic society, or the other way around, this could mean that some tolerance was granted. So the criterion here is that the dominant religion in a community had to give the minority group a house of prayer, so that the followers could practice their faith as a community. The focus lies on 'give', because, as we will see, the minority group often did have a place of worship, but it was not always actively granted by the majority.

In part two, explanations for the practice of tolerance to occur in a town or not are discussed. These are chosen on the basis of visible power blocks in early modern societies, namely rulers of the state, the local authorities and the ruled, or community. The Church leaders are, for most part, left out because directly they had little influence on the towns. Besides these groups, pragmatic explanations are considered. Although all power blocks could use these explanations, here it was not so much that rulers or the community truly wanted tolerance. They were more or less forced by the situations in the town. The four groups serve as a cover for several causes for the practice of tolerance, as will be discussed in part two. Listing all these separate causes would leave us with an enormous and chaotic table at the end. Moreover, these causes are to specific for some cases and therefore not common enough for this research to be used separately.

Method of research

Historical research has usually been qualitative in nature. Historians go through endless piles of books and studies to find clues, supporting theories and contrasting views concerning their work . In the end this literature study provides them with the evidence they need to strengthen their formulated thesis or to acknowledge its incorrectness. Here, this type of research will not be ignored, nor applied solely; it will be part of an exceeding method that was originally used in the social sciences, namely Comparative historical analysis.

Combining qualitative and quantitative research, Comparative historical analysis is defined 'by a concern with causal analysis, an emphasis on processes over time, and the use of systematic

and contextualized comparison.'[26] Especially the causation part is a delicate matter for historians. Historical events have always been regarded as unique. Trying to expose similar causes for separate phenomena is not something that has been accepted by many historians yet. Moreover, Comparative historical analysis claims to be able to derive lessons from the past by 'viewing cases and processes at a less abstract level.'[27] Also, this is an idea that has been a taboo in the historical world for a very long time.

To reach conclusions that lead us to common causes of, on the surface similar, events, a set of cases for the comparison is needed. These cases need to have some common grounds that make them usable in a particular research. For this, a period of time can be set or a particular nation or continent can be chosen, depending on the subject or, otherwise said, the outcome of the research. Next, some variables need to be established on which the analysis can take place. These can come from examining the cases and noticing specific or more common features that played a role in their occurrence. This can be considered as the qualitative part of the research, wherein the cases are examined separately to learn more about their specific characteristics.

With this, the basis is set for the analytical part. The method used here is the one offered by Charles Ragin in his work *The comparative method. Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies*. Ragin, an American sociologist, makes use of a case-oriented approach to identify causes, through a systematic investigation of several cases of the same historical phenomenon. For this, he uses a Boolean analysis. Here, the input of the social sciences is clearly visible, because of the appliance of numbers for the outcome and different variables: a *1* is given for presence and a *0* for absence. By making a Boolean Table, the cases, variables and outcomes, with the last two being classified as present or absent, are put together. This makes it clear to see which variables or causes are indeed of importance to the outcome. Furthermore, it is often useful to make a Truth Table, which presents all the possible combinations of variables. It allows us to see whether certain combinations are absent in the set of cases. If there are combinations missing, it might mean that further research is necessary to give an ultimate conclusion.

The goal of this Boolean algebra is 'identifying patterns of multiple conjunctural causation.'[28] This can be achieved by several terms that can clarify the causal relationships. For example, necessary and sufficient causes can be become visible when minimalizing the sum-of-products, the combination of variables of one case, extracted from the Boolean table. Necessary means that a

---

[26] James Mahoney & Dietrich Rueschemeyer, 'Comparative historical analysis. Achievements and agendas', in: *Comparative historical analysis in social sciences*, James Mahoney & Dietrich Rueschemeyer ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003) 6.

[27] Ibidem, 9.

[28] Charles C. Ragin, *The comparative method. Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies* (Berkely & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987) 101.

cause must be present for a certain outcome to occur and sufficient means that a cause by itself can produce a certain outcome.[29]

In this thesis, two Boolean tables will be made wherein not only the causes will be presented, but also the variables that determine if the outcome was present in the cases. So the first table will provide numbers that indicate whether the themes show tolerance by the formulated criteria. The outcome here is T (Tolerance) and will be or present (1) or absent (0). The variables will also be numbered. The second table will show the causes that were or were not involved in the practice of tolerance in a case. The outcome T has already been identified by the first table and forms the link between the two. Now the causes are numbered by 1 or 0 and a pattern may or may not become visible.

In the end it might not be possible to determine which were necessary and/or sufficient for tolerance to emerge in an European city in the period of the Reformation. However, the Boolean table will help to order the findings in a constructive way, therefore making it easier to make some conclusive remarks about the causes of the practice of tolerance.

---

[29] Ragin, *The comparative method*, 99.

Part one: Themes of toleration

The Reformation shook the European societies to their cores. With the establishment of new faiths, people had to deal with issues they had never encountered before. The main conflict consisted of religious differences concerning teachings, symbols and beliefs. At stake was the unity of the states, which was of great importance for their stability and strength. The confessional divisions the Reformation had introduced, led to divisions in society; within the state itself, the towns and within the social bonds between people. To preserve unity in the state, national governments had to act upon the disintegration. For some this meant harsh action against religious dissenters, but in other cases, a policy of tolerance towards those with other religious convictions was applied. Here, four aspects of society will be discussed wherein the latter can be found. The focus here will not be on the *why* of certain features, but on the *what*. The first will be tackled in part two, where the causes of toleration will be analyzed.

Chapter one: Laws concerning religion

The Reformation had disastrous consequences for French society. The ancient Catholic community had to watch and see a large Calvinist community emerge. That these Huguenots, as they were called, were problematic, was demonstrated in the many religious outbreaks of violence France endured during the sixteenth century, the bloodiest being the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacre of 1572, when thousands of Huguenots lost their lives. French Catholics in general did not want the Huguenots to live alongside them. However, the national government initiated several laws which provided the dissenters with some rights, because she tried hard to establish peace in the state. The most important of these laws was the Edict of Nantes, established by Henry IV in 1598 after decades of intermittent warfare. This law allowed the Protestants 'to live and dwell in all the cities and places of [the] kingdom….without being required after, vexed, molested, or compelled to do anything in religion, contrary to their conscience.' This did not mean that they could practice their religion everywhere. This was only allowed in indicated towns where they had exercised their faith before.[30]

In the region of Poitou, the royal commissioners had little problems carrying out such laws, because the people were tired of the unrest and wars that had ravaged France through much of the sixteenth century. They wanted peace and social stability even if that meant giving the non-Catholics some space.[31] The fact that the monarchy had a powerful hold over the region became clear when the king ordered several declarations in the 1660s which restricted the freedom of Huguenots by

---

[30] Luria, *Sacred boundaries*, 5.

[31] Ibidem, 17.

prohibiting intermarriages and punishing insincere conversion severely.[32] These laws were accepted by the people of Poitou, although many probably were used to the Huguenots living in their society.

In Châlons the royal decrees were mostly ignored. Catholics there were not completely tolerant towards the dissenters and discrimination was the order of the day, but this was mainly because of royal pressure. Many times the intolerant attitude was confined to Protestants from elsewhere and not to Protestant members of the indigenous community.[33] When in 1585 the Treaty of Nemours was established between Catherine de Medici and the Catholic Duke of Guise, which banned Huguenots from France altogether, the people of Châlons were outraged. They resented the leadership of De Guise and did not want their fellow burghers to be outlawed. Eventually, De Guise was murdered three years later, which brought Châlons back under royal rule.

Paris is an example of a completely different attitude against Protestants. National edicts were initiated to create a stable situation between Catholics and Protestants. Paris, however, was against the tolerant attitude of the monarchy and kept fighting the laws of tolerance until it had its way. In 1562 the Edict of Tolerance, which provided the Protestants with limited freedom, was not applied in the city. The single religion of the city was again the Catholic one.[34] For the town of Layrac, there is little information on the enforcement of national laws in favor of or against Huguenots. However, the other themes will show that it was fairly tolerant concerning its Huguenot citizens and that they participated in society as a whole. Although this does not mean that the laws of the monarchy were not implemented, it is highly doubtful that they were strictly enforced.

Due to the war with Spain, the Dutch Republic turned against its Catholic citizens. In 1579, when the Union of Utrecht was founded, freedom of conscience was given to every religion. Also, no one could be persecuted on religious grounds. However, Catholics were forbidden to actually practice their faith.[35] Moreover, in 1581, discrimination went even further when a new law excluded them from full citizens' rights.[36]

In general, there is no evidence that these laws were not complied with in Dutch towns. For Bergen op Zoom, specific information lacks, but De Mooij does state that Catholics were seen as full

---

[32] Luria, *Sacred boundaries*, 185-6.

[33] Mark Konnert, *Local politics in the French wars of religion. The towns of Champagne, the Duc of Guise and the Catholic League, 1560-95* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2006) 87.

[34] Barbara B. Diefendorf, *Beneath the cross. Catholics and Huguenots in sixteenth-century Paris* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991) 63.

[35] H. van Nierop, 'Sewing the bailiff in a blanket: Catholics and the law in Holland', in: *Calvinism and religious toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, R. Po-Chia Hsia & H.F.K. van Nierop ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) 105.

[36] Joke Spaans, 'Religious policies in the seventeenth-century Dutch Republic', in: *Calvinism and religious toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, R. Po-Chia Hsia & H.F.K. van Nierop ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) 78.

members of society,[37] something that was officially prohibited. The law against the practicing of the Catholic faith, however, seems to have been enforced. In Utrecht, as in Bergen op Zoom, the national decrees were implemented in general; public practicing of the Catholic faith was not allowed. Nevertheless, there were rules the Utrecht society did not follow as strictly. By law, Catholic priests were prohibited to lead or participate in a procession. In Utrecht, however, this happened regularly, and not even in secret. In the seventeenth century, Catholic worship took place more openly, without causing much trouble for the participants or the leading priests; only five of the latter were prosecuted in the period 1580 to 1618.[38]

The Catholic towns of the Southern Netherlands were less strict in enforcing the policy of the Spanish monarchy against Protestants. In Antwerp, Charles V, wanted every immigrant to present a certificate of loyalty and inquisitors were to be send to the town. The Magistrate of Antwerp opposed these rules, because they were considered a real threat to society. The bill was not published in its original state, which led Charles V to revise his decree.[39]

In Maastricht, the situation was slightly more difficult. Until 1632, Catholicism was the official religion of the town, which was ruled by the prince-bishop of Liège and the Duke of Brabant. After a year of victory for the Calvinists in 1566-67, the town implemented serious measures to make sure that the Catholic faith would once again gain the upper hand. Among those was the ordering of an 'Inqueste' to locate non-Catholics.[40] After the capitulation of 1632, the Duke was replaced by the States-General of the Seven United Provinces and Calvinism and Catholicism were given equal rights. The situation before the capitulation did not change much. There were more Calvinists, but they still formed the minority. And although the States-General was on their side, the Catholics remained in possession of church buildings and economic revenues, which gave them the unofficial upper hand.[41] According to Ubachs, most laws of equality were lived up to by the authorities and the people. However, the following chapters will show that equality was not always achieved. Nevertheless, there are no examples of violent outbreaks or severe resistance to the rules.

Poland-Lithuania was a very tolerant state, especially in the sixteenth century for the Protestants, but also for Catholics in times of Protestant rule in the early seventeenth century. In

---

[37] Charles de Mooij, *Geloof kan Bergen verzetten. Reformatie en katholieke herleving te Bergen op Zoom, 1577-1795* (Hilversum: Verloren, 1998) 308.

[38] Benjamin Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines. Confession and community in Utrecht, 1578-1620* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995) 274-6.

[39] Guido Marnef, *Antwerpen in de tijd van de reformatie. Ondergronds Protestantisme in een handelsmetropool, 1550-1577* (Amsterdam: J.M. Meulenhoff bv., 1996) 119. The translation of 'certificate of loyalty' is 'certificaat van rechtgelovigheid'.

[40] P.J. Ubachs, *Twee heren, twee confessies. De verhouding van staat en kerk te Maastricht, 1632-1673* (Nederlandse Organisatie voor Zuiver Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek: Assen, 1975) 57.

[41] Ibidem, 161.

1573 the Confederation of Warsaw was established, which strengthened the already existing practice of religious tolerance.[42] In 1611, the then Catholic minority received the right to practice its faith and to enter leading positions.[43] Again, specific information about the towns, especially in Gdansk, lacks. However, there is no reason to doubt that the town followed the orders of the monarchy.

In Central-Europe, a conflict between theory and practice was visible. Catholics made up the religious minority in the Holy Roman Empire. They were granted 'exercitum religionis privatum' after the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. This meant that they were allowed to practice their religion in the chapels without any bells or spires.[44] However, in Hamburg the Lutheran clergy insisted on a more limited form of freedom because the Catholic Church did not have any rights before 1624. The Peace of Westphalia indicated this year as the 'normative year'. The situation before that year was held as a condition for the granting of religious freedom after 1648. Holding on to this condition, the clergy claimed nothing more than 'devotio domestica', that is only practicing faith in the private sphere, for the Catholic minority. [45]

Strasbourg accepted the laws of the Peace of Westphalia, which among other things strengthened the rule of 'cuius regios, eius religio'.[46] This gave the ruler of the region the right to choose the religious conviction. The town of Strasbourg remained an imperial city after the region of Alsace became property of the French king in 1648. It insisted on a tolerant policy for the Protestant minority.[47] This in contrast to some decades before, when the policy was much less favorable for the Catholic community. Catholics were banned from all official positions, prohibited to practice their faith in public and not allowed to marry within the town.[48]

Some towns did not agree with the harsh treatment of the religious minority by royal decree and they protected their citizens. However, most towns had no choice but to enforce the laws of the monarchy. Only Paris could reverse the laws the king had established. The other towns could only oppose such laws in loosely implementing them.

---

[42] Tazbir, *A state without stakes*, 91-2.

[43] Ibidem, 114.

[44] Joachim Whaley, *Religious toleration and social change in Hamburg, 1529-1819* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985) 5.

[45] Ibidem, 35.

[46] Franklin L. Ford, *Strasbourg in transition*, *1648-1789* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1958) 103.

[47] Ibidem.

[48] Ibidem, 18.

Chapter two: Mixed marriages

There were no royal decrees against mixed marriages anywhere in the discussed states until the late seventeenth century, when Louis XIV ordered that the phenomenon was to be banned.[49] But, although the monarchy did not legally act upon their occurrence, this did not mean that people were fine with Protestants marrying Catholics and that there were no laws at all; quite the opposite. Clergymen were virtually everywhere revolted by intermarriage. This negative feeling was mainly fostered by the fear that the church would lose followers if they married into the rival religion. The churches tried to oppose these marriages. Indeed in some cases with church ordinances, which were equal to royal orders and could, in theory, not be disregarded. However, in most towns mixed marriages occurred regardlessly.

One can ask if the marriage could still be considered as mixed after the conversion of a spouse. Indeed the adjective mixed could then be eliminated. However, it is quite impossible to know whether the converted spouse was really converted or just by word. Therefore, marriages between people of two faiths will be held as a point of measurement here, whether conversion occurred or not.

In Poitou, it was legal for a Catholic to marry a Protestant if he or she was baptized and if this baptism was approved by the Church.[50] Furthermore, figures show that there were many conversions which makes their occurrence even more likely.[51] Moreover, Catholic bishops tried to insist on the baptism of children of mixed marriage in all of France.[52] This was officially ordered in 1663, when king Louis XIV ordered that children from mixed marriages should be raised as Catholics.[53] This type of jurisdiction, which was of force in all of France, shows that authorities were forced to think about the consequences of mixed marriages, which makes them even more likely to have occurred in the region.

Hanlon gives a set of numbers concerning mixed marriages in Layrac. Table 1 shows that the number of such marriages was at its highest at 90 in the period 1598-1620 and at its lowest at 21 in the period 1681-1700.[54] When taking the estimated population of Layrac, which according to Hanlon

---

[49] H.F.W.D. Fischer, 'De gemengde huwelijken tussen katholieken en Protestanten in de Nederlanden van de XVIe tot de XVIIIe eeuw', in: *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis* 31 (1963) 465.

[50] Luria, *Sacred boundaries*, 151.

[51] Ibidem, 157. Luria gives some numbers for several towns in the region. In Melle, 106 people converted in the 1660's to Calvinism. It is not certain how many of them did this for the sake of marriage, but in this period there were at least 25 intermarriages. At least a third of the weddings which occurred in the town of Loudun between 1598 and 1601 was between an Huguenot and a converted Catholic.

[52] Ibidem, 181.

[53] Ibidem, 187.

[54] Gregory Hanlon, *Confession and community in seventeenth-century France. Catholic and Protestant coexistence in Aquitaine* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993) 107.

was around 3200 in the seventeenth century,[55] it seems that mixed marriages formed a moderate part of society. Calculations show that probably eleven percent of all marriages were between people of different faiths.[56] Because of the lack in numbers for other cases, a comparison is not possible. However the percentage makes intermarriage in Châlons seem indeed of a common nature. Hanlon does not provide information about the raising of children of mixed couples specific for Layrac. However, the law of 1663, which stated that all children from intermarriages should be raised as Catholics, applied to all of France.

Table 1. Mixed marriages in Layrac[57]

	C	A	Total
1598–1620			
Catholic women and Protestant men	55	2	57
Protestant women and Catholic men	32	1	33
1621–1650			
Catholic women and Protestant men	33	0	33
Protestant women and Catholic men	52	1	53
1651–1680			
Catholic women and Protestant men	29	1	30
Protestant women and Catholic men	43	9	52
1681–1700			
Catholic women and Protestant men	10	1	11
Protestant women and Catholic men	9	1	10

C: Reasonably certain   A: Ambiguous

For Paris and Châlons there is little information about the phenomenon of mixed marriage. In Châlons it is likely that they took place, based on the findings on the other themes in which the town was fairly tolerant of the minority religion. The focus of the town was more on the citizens than on the differences in faith. Therefore it could be that the people of Châlons cared more for marrying within the community of the town than within the community of the faith. Paris, on the other hand, held on to its Catholic character and was very hostile towards the Huguenot minority. Diefendorf describes how the Parisians wanted to strengthen their Catholic community by marrying within that

---

[55] Hanlon, *Confession and community*, 34.

[56] A calculation in regards to the percentage of intermarriages in Layrac can be made on the basis of the data Hanlon gives concerning the number of inhabitants and that of mixed marriages in the period 1598-1620. Ninety marriages consisting of two people makes for 180 people in total. Of the 3200 inhabitants, half can be counted for as children, which leaves an amount of 1600 people who were able to get married. 180/1600 times 100 is over 11 percent.

[57] Hanlon, *Confession and community*, 107.

community.[58] Although, this does not prove that mixed marriages did not occur at all, it does show that the people of Paris wanted a stronghold against the established religious minority, which makes the regular occurrence of such bonds very unlikely.

Fischer has examined the marriages between people of different faiths in the Low Countries on the whole and presents a distinction between North and South. He states that although the authorities did not legally prohibit mixed marriages in the southern regions, they did successfully lobby against them.[59] However, in the North, mixed marriages were much more common. Many times, deals were made between the spouses with regards to the religion their children would be raised in.[60]

Accordingly, Pollmann states that the figures of intermarriages in Utrecht were quite high.[61] This could be because Catholics could, from 1654 onwards, only become citizens of the town if they were born in the province of Utrecht or if they married into citizenship. This meant that they had to marry a citizen and because there were few Catholic citizens, it is likely they married Protestants to achieve this.[62] Also Ubachs shows that Maastricht fitted the picture painted by Fischer. Catholics and Protestants did live together in all parts of society, including marriage, although these were highly advised against by the Calvinist Church. Evidently, the *kerkraadsacta* showed few such marriages.[63] Furthermore, there is no information about legal agreements concerning mixed marriages or the religion of the children.

De Mooij, however, provides a different story for Bergen op Zoom. Here, it is likely that mixed marriages took place regularly. This is made clear by figures concerning the religious conviction of the brides and grooms. According to De Mooij, the number of Catholic brides increased and so did the number of reformed grooms. In contrast, the number of Catholic grooms decreased and so did that of reformed brides.[64] Furthermore, it was common that deals about the upbringing of children were made during the engagement,[65] and although there was no jurisdiction about this issue, it was often the case that the sons were raised in the religion of the father and daughters in

---

[58] Diefendorf, *Beneath the cross*, 127-30.

[59] Fischer, 'De gemengde huwelijken', 467.

[60] Ibidem, 466.

[61] Judith Pollmann, 'The bond of Christian piety: the individual practice of tolerance and intolerance in the Dutch Republic', in: *Calvinism and religious toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, R. Po-Chia Hsia & H.F.K. van Nierop ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) 56.

[62] Maarten Prak, 'The politics of intolerance: citizenship and religion in the Dutch Republic (seventeenth to eighteenth centuries), in: *Calvinism and religious toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, R. Po-Chia Hsia & H.F.K. van Nierop ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) 162.

[63] Ubachs, *Twee heren*, 393. The translation of 'kerkraadsacta' is literally 'charters of the church council'.

[64] De Mooij, *Geloof kan Bergen verzetten*, 139.

[65] Ibidem, 581.

that of the mother.[66] In general, it seems that confessional differences between family members in Dutch towns were quite common and easily maintained. According to an English traveler it was 'very ordinary to find the man of the house of one opinion, his wife of another, his children of a third and his servant of one different from them all; and yet they live[d] without the least jangling of dissension.'[67]

Unfortunately, there is little quantitative evidence for mixed marriages in Gdansk. However, mixed marriages in Poland did occur. In the fifteenth century there were already laws against marriages that involved people of the orthodox and Jewish faith,[68] but there were no laws against marrying someone of the Protestant religion. However, the authorities were very much opposed to mixed marriages. If the marriage was discovered the Catholic party was severely punished. Nevertheless, they were contracted by Polish bishops.

Hamburg was the only town where Catholic priests were in favor of mixed marriages. Here, instead of being afraid to lose Catholics to the Lutheran faith, they saw these marriages as a opportunity to strengthen their own community.[69] Mixed marriages provided, on the other hand, an opportunity for non-Lutherans to become citizens of Hamburg. These encouragements could have made intermarriages part of the Hamburg society, although actual numbers are not available. In the case of Strasbourg there is also a lack in data, but Luria does mention a law concerning the religion of children of mixed marriages. This stated that the children were to be raised in the religion of the father.[70] The fact that there was an actual law concerning this, shows that marriages between people of different faiths indeed occurred.

Because of the lack in data concerning mixed marriages in the cases, it is more about the rules a town had concerning intermarriage itself or its consequences for the upbringing of children. If such rules were to be found in a town, it is likely that intermarriage was not uncommon; evidently, people were at one point forced to think about these alliances. However, without the exact figures certainty cannot be given.

Chapter three: Guilds

Guilds dominated European working life from the Middle Ages onwards. These corporate organizations of workers were not only of importance to the economy of a town, but also for society as a whole. The higher goal was to secure communal peace and maintain social order. For the

---

[66] De Mooij, *Geloof kan Bergen verzetten*, 138.

[67] Pollmann, 'The bond of', 56.

[68] Tazbir, *A state without stakes*, 127.

[69] Whaley, *Religious toleration*, 47.

[70] Luria, *Sacred boundaries*, 182.

member himself the guild meant increase in status. It placed him in 'the finely graded hierarchy that structured Old Regime society.' Moreover, the access of workers into the organization was strictly controlled, so becoming a member was not something that was taken lightly. [71] Because of their significant role, guilds too provide a theme of toleration. They could apply a policy of tolerance for the sake of the town's social order. However, they were in a position where they could also show that religious dissenters had no business in the community.

In France, there was a fair amount of resistance to the Protestants on a national level. The monarchy tried to oppose the religious minority as much as possible, among other things by prohibiting it to join the guilds. Although there was no official law to enforce this, Protestants were hindered in their participation more and more.[72] Nonetheless, the cases show that Protestants were not completely precluded as guild members. Moreover, in the case of Layrac, the local authorities were eager to have Huguenots in the town councils. Here, they preferred the two faiths to collaborate, because this would keep the social order intact.[73] Furthermore, according to Hanlon 'there appears to be no trade, of the twenty-odd practiced in Layrac, in which all members belonged to a single confessional group.'[74] Luria makes the same point for Poitou. According to him, Protestants could be found in all social groups in society. They were also represented in many different professions, such as merchants and craft masters.[75] Furthermore, Luria states that from the 1630s onwards, Huguenots were increasingly excluded from the guilds,[76] which means that prior to these years they were indeed included as members.

In Paris, the situation was slightly different. Just like their views on marriage and law, the Parisians felt that the two confessional groups should always maintain their distance in the labor force. However, there were merchants belonging to the Protestant community who traded with Catholic merchants. Furthermore, the Protestant community was too small in Paris to support itself financially, so it had to get involved in the businesses of the Catholics. Although this does not necessarily mean that Protestants were allowed in the guilds, it does show that Protestants and Catholics worked together, even though both parties were against co-existence. Unfortunately, there is no specific information on Châlons, but in the other fields the co-existence of the two groups was quite common. Therefore, it would be unlikely to assume that they would not have had this peaceful arrangement in the guilds.

---

[71] Jonathan Dewald, *Europe 1450 to 1789: encyclopedia of the early modern world* 3 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2004), 99.

[72] Luria, *Sacred boundaries*, xxx.

[73] Hanlon, *Confession and community*, 43.

[74] Ibidem, 98.

[75] Luria, *Sacred boundaries*, 14.

[76] Ibidem, xxx.

In the Dutch Republic, the situation is more or less the same. Po-Chia Hsia states that Catholics could not join the guilds in the Republic.[77] Accordingly, Maarten Prak mentions the fact that to join the guilds, one had to be a citizen of the town.[78] However, after 1581 it was not possible for Catholic newcomers to obtain full citizens' rights by law. This would then mean that only Catholics who already lived in the Republic before 1581 could be members of the guilds. Despite this limitation, scholars, in general, argue that Protestants and Catholics worked together in the guilds, without this causing any trouble. This is also visible in the different towns. According to De Mooij, the guild system in Bergen op Zoom was not as closed off as in other towns, therefore guilds could not prevent Catholics from joining them.[79] So, even though, the main guilds were dissolved in the late sixteenth century because of the masters being Catholic, a new guild of shooters was founded with a Catholic as its leader.[80] Kaplan shows the same situation for Utrecht.[81]

Also in Antwerp religious minorities were free to enter the guilds. However, the authorities did not want a majority of those guild members to be Protestant, so the number of Catholic members had to be at least equal at every moment.[82] According to Marinus, almost fifty percent of all Protestants in Antwerp practiced a craft in the seventeenth century.[83] Although this does not mean that they were part of a guild, it is likely that a part of those Protestants were indeed guild members. The table beneath shows the participation of Calvinists in the different professions.

Table 2. Professional structure of prosecuted Calvinists in Antwerp, 1550-1566[84]

	aantal personen	%	% in 1584-1585
ambachtelijke beroepen	33	48,5	47,8
kunstnijverheid	11	16,1	4,6
intellectuele beroepen	3	4,4	3,0
handel en transport	15	22,0	38,6
overheid en administratie	1	1,4	3,1
kerkelijke ambten	5	7,3	0,3
totaal	68		

---

[77] Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia, 'Introduction', in: *Calvinism and religious toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, R. Po-Chia Hsia & H.F.K. van Nierop ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 6.

[78] Prak, 'The politics', 161.

[79] De Mooij, *Geloof kan Bergen verzetten*, 639.

[80] Ibidem, 229-33. The translation of 'main guilds' is 'hoofdgilden' and that of 'shooters guild' is 'schuttersgilde' or here 'kolveniersgilde'.

[81] Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, 277.

[82] Marie Juliette Marinus, *De contrareformatie te Antwerpen (1585-1676): kerkelijk leven in een grootstad* (Brussel: Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, 1995) 43

[83] Ibidem, 237.

[84] Marnef, *Antwerpen in de tijd*, 107.

Again this does not mean that the Calvinists were part of the guilds of these professions. Also, these numbers represent only the prosecuted Calvinists in this period. However, the percentages show a fair participation of Calvinists in the separate sectors.

The situation was different in Maastricht. Although, here, Protestants were also allowed to join guilds due to the theoretical equality, the Catholics were not keen on this. Ubachs states that there were only twelve to fourteen Protestants in the guild of weavers in 1661.[85] The authorities seem to have preferred mixed guilds, because they insisted on two guild masters to keep the number of Protestant members at a reasonable level. However, Protestants were still hindered to join the corporations frequently.[86]

In Poland, the type of town determined whether the religious minority, that is the Catholics, were allowed to join the guilds. In Gdansk the Catholics in general were not.[87] The king had granted the town certain rights and freedoms in the *privilegia casimiriana* in the fifteenth century, so it could decide for itself whether the minority was welcome in the guilds. If a town was controlled by the monarchy itself, religious minorities were permitted to enter the guilds.[88] In the seventeenth century, Catholics again became the dominant force in the cities and this time the Protestants were hindered, mostly by the clergy, to become members of the guilds.[89]

The Holy Roman Empire contained many trade towns, including Hamburg. According to Whaley there is little evidence that people there were reluctant about the participation of Catholics in their guilds.[90] Moreover, being a trade town, Hamburg saw the economic advantages of attracting minority groups.[91] This could mean that these minorities had little trouble entering the guilds, because it was this system Hamburg relied on for its trade.

Just like Hamburg, Strasbourg was a genuine trade town and relied on its guilds for economic prosperity. The citizens were divided among the guilds. Catholics did not belong to that group.[92] Some of them were given the status non-citizen, which meant that they enjoyed some protection, but nothing more. Most Catholics did not even gain this title, so that would mean that Catholics were not welcome in the guilds. However, according to Chrisman, the number of guild members seemed to be quite stable mid-sixteenth century. The same goes for the population.[93] On the other hand, the

---

[85] Ubachs, *Twee heren*, 414.

[86] Ibidem, 415.

[87] Tazbir, *A state without stakes*, 113.

[88] Ibidem, 107.

[89] Ibidem, 193-4.

[90] Whaley, *Religious toleration*, 69.

[91] Ibidem, 206.

[92] Ford, *Strasbourg in transition*, 18.

[93] Miriam Usher Chrisman, *Strasbourg and the reform. A study in the process of change* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1967) 288.

main religion switched from being Catholic to Protestant. So logically, this would mean that some guild members had to be Catholic.

In most towns the two faiths could work alongside each other. There are some cases where the minority was actively banned from the guilds, but in others the economical advantages were more important than religious differences. The work place seemed to be a part of daily life wherein confessional opponents co-existed quite peacefully.

Chapter four: Sacred spaces

During the period of the Reformation and thereafter, many Catholics had to fear for the existence of their church buildings. In some towns, the Protestant faith took over and established buildings were given a new religion to accommodate. In other towns sacred spaces remained in the hands of the leading religion, but they had to be shared with the minority faith. A third option was that the established place of worship did not change at all. In these cases the dissenters had to find other ways to practice their faith. They usually found a solution to this problem, regardless of the wishes of the town.

As the other themes would suggest, towns in France also differed greatly in the use of places of worship by the Protestant minority. For Layrac, there is no specific information. In contrast, Luria gives some figures for the region of Poitou. Here, the Protestants could use Catholic chapels on estates of wealthy Protestant men. At the end of the sixteenth century, Poitou counted thirty-nine church buildings and fifty-three other places of worship for Protestant usage for 80.000-100.000 Huguenot inhabitants.[94] This is a significant number, especially in comparison to the numbers in Châlons and Paris.

In these two towns the number of Protestant houses of prayer was close to none, but the minority group did have the opportunity to come together and practice its faith. The Huguenots in Châlons were bounded by the law, that stated that only one Huguenot church building was allowed in the 'bailliage', a specific area of jurisdiction for the king's representatives. However, they could appoint a pastor and come together in service.[95] In Paris, it seems that there was one Calvinist place of worship, which also had some ministers as its supervisors.[96] This may mean that it was set up quite professionally. However, the Parisian Huguenots still feared the violence Catholic people inflicted on them, so they often met outside the city walls or in private houses.[97] Moreover, in 1598 the Edict of

---

[94] Luria, *Sacred boundaries*, 12-3.

[95] Konnert, *Local politics*, 101.

[96] Diefendorf, *Beneath the cross*, 125.

[97] Ibidem, 123-4.

Nantes prohibited public worship by Huguenots in Paris and its 'suburbs'; only private worship was allowed.[98]

In 1581 the States-General of the Dutch Republic stated that the Catholic church was banned as national church, and appointed the Calvinist Church as the legally recognized state church.[99] The Catholic people were forbidden to practice their religion in public and were banned to secrecy. In the seventeenth century the Catholics founded the Holland Mission, which was a semi-secret society of priests who traveled from town to town where they settled for a while to help the Catholic community. Usually, the authorities tolerated their presence, often because the Catholics paid the local authority so that they could proceed at Mass.[100] Furthermore, there were numerous secret houses of prayer, known as *schuilkerken*,[101] which presented themselves as private houses on the outside, but were small church buildings on the inside. Just like the Holland Mission, these *schuilkerken* were known to the Protestant people, but here too a policy of tolerance was maintained.

In every Dutch town these 'secret' gatherings occurred, but in some towns the minority did not have to be so secretive. In Utrecht, the Calvinists were given the Jacobskerk and the Minderbroederskerk in 1579, for the free exercise of their religion. They had already shared the first with the Catholics in 1578, before they became the only owners.[102] Before this time they had to travel to nearby villages to attend services. After 1570, they continued to gather in private houses and, more openly, in large farms.[103] Also, in Maastricht, the minority did not have to hide its practice of worship. When the Calvinist Church became the official Church in the town in 1632, the Catholic Church was not forbidden to exist. On the contrary, it could keep all of its possessions and its freedom and had to give only two sacred places to the Calvinists. Moreover, these were only the smaller chapels Sint-Jacob and Sint-Hilarius and not two of the four main church buildings.[104] This also shows the difficult position of the Calvinists, although their Church was the official one. The

---

[98] Luria, S*acred boundaries*, 5.

[99] Perez Zagorin, *How the idea of religious toleration came to the West* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2003) 150.

[100] Christine Kooi, 'Paying off the sheriff: strategies of Catholic toleration in Golden Age Holland', in: *Calvinism and religious toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, R. Po-Chia Hsia & H.F.K. van Nierop ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) 90-2.

[101] Anton van de Sande, 'Roomse buitenbeentjes in een protestantse natie? Toelantie en antipapisme in Nederland in de zeventiende, achttiende en negentiende eeuw', in; *Een schijn van verdraagzaamheid. Afwijking en tolerantie in Nederland van de zestiende eeuw tot heden*, Marijke Gijswijt-Hofstra ed. (Hilversum: Verloren, 1989) 95. The translation of 'schuilkerk' is 'hidden church building'.

[102] Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, 262-3.

[103] Ibidem, 25.

[104] Ubachs, *Twee heren*, 160-1.

States-General tried to restrain some of the freedoms of the Catholics, but was bounded by the dual form of government which protected Catholic processions on shared property.[105]

In contrast to Utrecht and Maastricht, the dissenters in Antwerp and Bergen op Zoom endured much harder treatment. Catholics in Bergen op Zoom had to travel to nearby villages to practice their faith. The Catholic buildings were given other purposes after the law of 1581 and the town did its best to erase the Catholic community from society.[106] Afterwards, even the sacred spaces in the surrounding villages were closed.[107] And although *schuilkerken* were established within the city walls in the course of the seventeenth century, the Catholic community had to continue its secret gatherings for a long time. The same happened to the Calvinists in Antwerp after their year of ruling in 1566, when they enjoyed the right to practice their faith within city walls.[108] Unfortunately, this period of freedom lasted only one year and in April of 1567 the last Calvinist service was held.[109] The Calvinists were forced to go back into hiding and their Church, from then on, only existed underground.[110]

In Central Europe, the situation for the minority groups was not very different from their fellow believers in the West. There were periods when some freedom of worship was granted, only to minimize this freedom some time later. In Gdansk, the Protestant community received a few church buildings and sometimes Catholic buildings were shared.[111] However, in the seventeenth century many of them were again taken back by the Catholics.[112]

In Hamburg, there were rules in regard to the extent of freedom a religious group could enjoy. Calvinists and Catholics obtained the least of those types after 1648, namely 'devotio domestica'.[113] Apparently the Lutherans of Hamburg were not so willing to give minorities much room to exercise their faith. However, a decree, ordered by the emperor himself, allowed Catholics to practice their faith in a few chapels in the town. One of those chapels was the residence chapel.[114] The Lutherans did their best to try to prohibit the Catholics from practicing their faith and multiple attempts were made to shut down the chapels. Also in Strasbourg, the chapels were places of Catholic worship. The Protestant authorities approved their use for Catholic Mass.[115] When the

---

[105] Ubachs, *Twee heren*, 389.

[106] De Mooij, *Geloof kan Bergen verzetten*, 181.

[107] Ibidem, 309.

[108] Marnef, *Antwerpen in de tijd*, 128.

[109] Ibidem, 146.

[110] Ibidem, 183.

[111] Tazbir, *A state without stakes*, 81.

[112] Ibidem, 170.

[113] Whaley, *Religious toleration*, 35.

[114] Ibidem, 50.

[115] Chrisman, *Strasbourg and*, 239.

French obtained the region of Alsace after the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, the Catholic community was given one house of prayer. However, this was, in contrast to the situation in Maastricht, not just some small chapel, but the cathedral or Church of Notre Dame.[116] By the end of the seventeenth century the Catholics obtained some more sacred places within their own parishes.[117]

It seems that the practicing of faith was something that was difficult for authorities to control. When not given a sacred space of their own, the minority group would gather in private houses or travel to the nearest town or village where it could join services or attend Mass. There are no examples of outbreaks of violence when groups of dissenters went into these houses or left the towns, although sometimes the fear of such violence was present. In many towns where minorities were not granted their own church building, a policy of tolerance was followed. This could mean the sharing of a place of worship or the condoning of 'secret' private houses or *schuilkerken*.

So, again, as can be seen in the other themes of this part, there is a fine line between theory and practice in which every town followed its own feeling about their religious situation. Often, national laws issued the protection of the unity of the state, but most towns sought a different unity of their own. Therefore, in practice, these rules were not always strictly followed. Many towns felt obliged to protect their members, even if they were followers of the minority faith. Others needed the whole population for their economic well being and cared less about religious convictions. People did what they thought was needed to strengthen those bonds and, moreover, their towns. In general, social bonds were stable and much more important than religious differences. This suggests that there were two kinds of unity: one wherein everyone is identical in terms of religion and one wherein everyone can practice their own faith in more or less their own way.

---

[116] Ford, *Strasbourg in transition*, 103-4.
[117] Ibidem, 106.

Part two: Causes of toleration

In the first part, the focus was on several aspects of society which could indicate where and how practice of tolerance was present or not. It was more about the *what* than the *why*. In this section, the latter will be examined. Three main conditions for toleration of religious minorities by the majority group will be distinguished, namely the action taken by rulers, on a national as well as on a local level, the agency of the community, and lastly some pragmatic causes. Which reasons were there for a more tolerant attitude towards religious dissenters? Or were there more reasons for a state and/or society to implement a policy of intolerance? Again, the conflict between creating a unified state and divisions among the people due to the Reformation is of issue, but there is also a conflict between ecclesiastical and pragmatic thinking. The *why* of toleration was certainly not the same for all involved.

Chapter five: The rulers

After the Reformation, the religion of the state became more of a choice, which was never the case before. How the monarch or central government acted on this choice was of great importance, because it could either cause rest or unrest among the population.[118] Religion was a matter of tradition and traditionally Europe was attached to Roman Christianity. This was a long relationship from which the leaders of the different states could not and did not want to remove themselves. Rulers had the obligation to maintain the true religion, not only to God, but also to their subjects. Moreover, being a part of the Corpus Christi, their decisions could summon the love or wrath of God.[119] Therefore, the belief the Roman Church was the true religion up until the Reformation was not easy to dismiss.

Another important reason why rulers were more drawn to a policy of intolerance, was the interwoven relationship between religion and politics. Religious enemies would become political enemies and vice versa.[120] This was a serious factor to consider when thinking about tolerating religious dissenters, not just on an international, but also on a national scale. Unity was a goal for all rulers, because this presumably made the governing of the state easier. Religion was a symbol for a unified state; a factor that made subjects loyal and the authority of the ruler stronger.[121] At a time

---

[118] Luria, *Sacred boundaries*, 3.

[119] Kaplan, *Divided by faith*, 100.

[120] Ibidem, 102.

[121] Ibidem.

when the traditional Church and the Old Empire slowly disintegrated, rulers sought some security and order and this could be found in a united state.[122]

Something, however, changed as time passed. Reason became a factor in the decisions of the monarchs, in which they were influenced by modern thinkers who pleaded for the idea of tolerance.[123] Moreover, according to MacCulloch, rulers became more or less ashamed of persecuting because of religion.[124] Reasons in favor of toleration were considered more frequently. The expansion of power was one of them. When it became clear that the Christian religion was split for once and for all, rulers and societies made concessions and put up with religious dissenters, although of course still not supportive of the ideologies.[125] According to historian Heinz Schilling, tolerance could only really be implemented when a state could reject the idea that 'religion is the bond of society'[126] and therefore it had to be strong enough to rule without help from the Church or religion. In this period, this was not the case. However, Schilling also states that the different factions and nobles often broke the bonds of religion and 'retained their ties across confessional lines.'[127] These local authorities sometimes found that letting go of some of the old faith's cults and institutions could help them preserve the order and control in the town more effectively.[128]

So slowly but surely, an environment for more tolerance emerged in the European states. Kings, but also the elite in the towns, like dukes and landlords and the local governments themselves, became aware that society was changing and that the instability this brought along was not beneficial to the state. The ultimate goal for the rulers was therefore to create a more stable society, which could be enforced by either trying to restore religious unity or by accepting diversity. However, it could not be predicted which of the two would work best.

In general, laws issued by the monarchy were implemented by the town authorities. According to Luria, royal officials supervised the region and made sure that the rules were followed.[129] However, in some situations, political factions did not agree with the new rules and were not keen to participate in the plans of the royal government, because they did not think these plans

---

[122] Thomas A. Brady, Heiko A. Oberman & James D. Tracy, 'Introduction: the unsettling settlements', in: *Handbook of European history 1400-1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation* 2, ed. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995) xxi.

[123] Kaplan, *Divided by faith*, 7.

[124] MacCulloch, *Reformation*, 678.

[125] Ibidem, 677.

[126] Schilling,'Confessional Europe', 667-8.

[127] Ibidem, 668-9.

[128] Steven Rowan, 'Urban communities: The rulers and the ruled', in: *Handbook of European history 1400-1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation* 1, Thomas A. Brady, Heiko A. Oberman & James D. Tracy ed. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994) 221.

[129] Luria, *Sacred boundaries,* 2.

would benefit the town or its community. Here, a difference is made between their measures and those of the monarchy, indeed because the followed policies were not always the same.

In the Netherlands, a common enemy was the reason for a more tolerant policy. Here people wanted independence. William of Orange, who shared this wish, knew that he needed a great amount of support to overcome the Spanish monarch. He needed uniformity in a land with many different faiths. The answer was a powerful policy of tolerance with which he tried to unite all Dutch citizens against the enemy.[130] Eventually, the Spaniards were overcome and the Dutch became greatly intolerant to the Catholics in the state. Without a common enemy, the focus on confessional difference again got the upper hand.

In France and Poland, politics was the main reason for more tolerance. According to Kamen, the balance among the Polish nobility and the insolvable conflict between the political and dynastic factions in France caused the great edicts of tolerance, namely the Warsaw Confederation and the Edict of Nantes.[131] The attitude of the Holy Roman emperor in Hamburg shows an even greater political dimension, next to the fact that he himself was a Catholic. In the 1670s he established a firm patronage over the Catholic community because of his conflict with France, whose influence he wanted to reduce. He also wanted to increase his own power in the important northern-frontier post that was the city.[132]

Thirty years before the Edict of Nantes, a decree was ordered in France, which stated that Protestants were allowed to practice their faith under strict limitations as a temporary measure until a permanent solution to the religious problems was found.[133] In Paris, people were outraged by this policy and did everything they could to undo it. The following chapter will elaborate more on the situation in the capital. However, the example of Paris shows that the monarchy did try to insert its power and policy in the city, even if the people did not approve of it.

The towns in the Dutch Republic all seemed fairly in consent with the laws issued by the States-General. Here, the authorities ordered a national law against tolerance. After the war with Spain, the Dutch Calvinists did everything they could to prevent Catholics to participate in the new, Calvinist society. In 1581, a general law was issued stating that the Reformed Church was from then on considered as the national Church and that Catholics were prohibited from practicing their religion in the Dutch Republic.[134] Furthermore, Catholics could not obtain full Dutch citizens' rights

---

[130] Samme Zijlstra, '"Tgeloove is vrij". De tolerantiediscussie in de Noordelijke Nederlanden tussen 1520 en 1795', in: *Een schijn van verdraagzaamheid. Afwijking en tolerantie in Nederland van de zestiende eeuw tot heden*, Marijke Gijswijt-Hofstra ed. (Hilversum: Verloren, 1989) 50.

[131] Kamen, *The rise of toleration*, 145.

[132] Whaley, *Religious toleration*, 53.

[133] Diefendorf, *Beneath the cross*, 62.

[134] Zagorin, *How the idea,* 150.

and their organization as a religious community was strongly obstructed.[135] However, contrasting laws, for example the guaranteed freedom of conscience which was ordered in the Union of Utrecht in 1579 and stated that 'nobody shall be persecuted or examined for religious reasons,'[136] were also ordained in the whole state and implemented by the towns. This meant that due to these contrasting laws space for a local policy agenda was created.

In the towns, magistrates and city councils could also make decisions that supported tolerance to some extent. For all authorities, power was the keyword and this want for power, but also for peace and social stability, could lead local governments to a more tolerant policy. In Antwerp, even though the States-General held on to a firm anti-Catholic attitude, the Magistrate had more interest in extending some amount of tolerance in the town, because it wanted to limit the massive exodus the town experienced after 1585.[137] In France, a new faction, called the *politiques,* gained power in the sixteenth century. The members considered it to be more important to be a good citizen of France than to be a true follower of any religion. This view promoted citizenship and tolerance among all Frenchmen.[138] In Strasbourg, the *Rat,* an office consisting mainly of burghers, also favored this idea.[139] Moreover, Strasbourg followed a tolerant policy, mainly because the Magistrate wanted to increase its own power.[140] The toleration of religious dissenters was thereby important, because 'no new group emerged to grasp authority.'[141] This tolerant attitude is made clear by the request the town made to Louis XIV:

> *'His Majesty will leave the free exercise of religion as it has been since the year 1624 up to the present, with all the churches and schools, and will permit no one to make demands on them or on ecclesiastical properties…. But will guarantee them in perpetuity to the city and its habitants.'[142]*

The king answered as follows:

> *'Granted, as regards ecclesiastical properties, in accordance with the Treaty of Munster, except for the body of the Church of Notre Dame, otherwise called the cathedral, which will be returned to the Catholics. His*

---

[135] Spaans, 'Religious policies', 78.

[136] Po-Chia Hsia, 'Introduction', 2.

[137] Marinus, *De contrareformatie*, 52.

[138] Kamen, *The rise of*, 139.

[139] Chrisman, *Strasbourg and*, 241.

[140] Ibidem, 297.

[141] Ibidem, 296.

[142] Ford, *Strasbourg in transition*, 103. The year 1624 represents the 'normative year'. See note 35.

Majesty being pleased, however, to permit [the Lutherans] to make use of the bells of said church for all purposes for which they have been employed heretofore, except for ringing their prayers.[143]

That the towns could express their wants to the monarch and were in some cases indeed heard by him is shown by the response the authorities in Strasbourg received from king, although here it is important to realize that Strasbourg remained an imperial city even after the rest of the Alsace region was obtained by the French after the Peace of Westphalia, so the French king did not have the authority here as he had in the rest of his kingdom. However, the fact that Louis XIV insisted on the Notre Dame to be returned to Catholic possession strongly confirms the notion that symbols of the old religion, like the cathedral, were of great importance. It also suggests that while the French king granted Protestants some properties to practice their faith, he firmly held on to the notion that the Roman Church was the most important Church and that there should be no doubt about its supremacy.

The factions could also stimulate tolerance by providing a system of patronage for dissenters. In Hamburg, it was the emperor who established this for the Catholic community, but in France and Poland it was the nobility that looked after the religious minority. In Châlons, this system proved to be very advantageous for the minority, because it felt more secure to show itself among the Catholic citizens if it enjoyed some protection from the political factions.[144] Also in Poland, the nobles stood up for the Protestant minority. They were against the privileged position of the clergy who possessed many estates and was immune to lay courts and taxation. Protestantism was opposed to clericalism and therefore attracted many nobles.[145] And although the monarch had much power in the policy concerning tolerance, he could only do so much with a strong political faction, protecting part of the people.[146] For the factions, the advantages were sometimes very attractive. A good working and strong system of patronage could provide one with a great amount of power and with that he could force the town in certain directions.[147] For the religious minority it was also a positive thing to have men of power on its side. Both parties used the other to get what they wanted, respectively power, and protection and toleration.

In some cases the local authorities did not comply with the orders from above. The reasons for this could range from economic to the protection of citizens, whichever benefitted their own

---

[143] Ford, *Strasbourg in transition*, 104.

[144] Konnert, *Local politics*, 77.

[145] Winfried Eberhard, 'Reformation and counterreformation in East Central Europe', in: *Handbook of European history 1400-1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation* 2, Thomas A. Brady, Heiko A. Oberman & James D. Tracy ed. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995) 573.

[146] Tazbir, *A state without stakes*, 193.

[147] Ibidem, 4.

power the most. This meant that in many cases the authorities tried to protect their religious minorities in one way or the other. In Châlons, the laws issued against the Huguenots were only partially implemented.[148] In Layrac, Protestants were welcomed and moreover deeply valued in the town council; when both religions represented the town, unity and control were considered easier to maintain.[149] In Antwerp and Bergen op Zoom, the Magistrate did their best to protect the minorities. Although this was not always easy, because other organizations tried to oppose this protective attitude. This was the case in the latter, where the city council thwarted these attempts.[150]

Moreover, in Antwerp, the royal decree of Charles V in 1550 concerning the prosecution of heretics, in which he commanded the presentation of a certificate of loyalty by everyone living or entering the town, was eventually adjusted because the Magistrate did not approve of the original regulation.[151] According to Marinus, the Magistrate in Antwerp saw no danger in its religious minority; its size was too small to have or gain any significant power.[152] This may be the reason for the local authority to implement a more tolerant policy, or better said not oppose the practice of it. Antwerp shows that in conflict, demands could not only be made top down, but also from the bottom up.

Chapter six: The community

Besides the rulers, there was another group that presented itself as a stakeholder in the quest for tolerance, or intolerance for that matter: the community. This was formed by the inhabitants of a town, burghers and non-citizens, including religious minorities. This part of society had its own reasons for implementing the practice of tolerance or intolerance and here too, a conflict could arise between these and the orders from above. If a conflict emerged, it was because the community did not accept the royal decree. In the sixteenth and seventeenth century, a king was called legitimate because he was chosen by the 'Grace of God'[153] and the choice of God could not be opposed. However, if a monarch did not rule as he should by God's law, his subjects could disobey his orders. This is exactly what happened in some cases.

In accordance to the ultimate goal of the state, the community also had the maintaining of peace and uniformity as its prominent objective. To achieve this, a policy of intolerance was not the ordinary course. However, neither was the practice of tolerance; both were seen as abnormal.[154]

---

[148] Konnert, *Local politics*, 87.

[149] Hanlon, *Confession and community,* 43.

[150] De Mooij, *Geloof kan Bergen verzetten*, 305.

[151] Marnef, *Antwerpen in de tijd*, 119.

[152] Marinus, *De contrareformatie*, 244.

[153] Schilling, 'Confessional Europe', 656.

[154] Kaplan, *Divided by faith*, 9.

Nonetheless, order was wanted and according to historian Zagorin, some thought that this wish for order should stand above Church ordinances.[155] It is hard to imagine that people of early modern towns were in favor of this idea. As already pointed out in the previous chapter, religion was the society and society was part of the Corpus Christi.[156] People lived by symbols and feasts of religion and because of this strongly interwoven relationship between faith and society, people were not willing to alter either.

The community had old values which combined social and religious matters. Due to this it was probably more afraid of dissenters than hateful towards them; they could endanger the uniformity, based on those values, the community had known for a very long time. Moreover, the idea of individualism had not found its way into society yet, so the communal thought was that if one believer did something wrong, it would ultimately affect the whole community.[157] This thought was also visible in the way people thought about dissenters: it would hurt them personally if their neighbor had a different religious conviction.[158]

Nonetheless, also in the community the practice of tolerance became more visible as time passed. Although people were not keen on followers of other faiths, they might accept them as long as they kept their religious convictions to themselves. Here, an important feature of communal life becomes clear, namely that dissenters were allowed to practice a different faith, but only if they kept this outside the city walls. This would not jeopardize the community as a whole.[159] Evidently, the division between private and public had to be honored.[160] According to MacCulloch, belonging to a community was of great value precisely because the emergence of different confessions made belonging much more important.[161] Brady agrees and states that when the period of confessionalization was fading and the time of individualism had begun in the mid-seventeenth century, the communal feelings of people became less important, which may have increased the practice of tolerance.[162]

Next to being a community of religion, the people were bound by other factors, like the guilds and communal law, that already existed before the Reformation. Social bonds had emerged

---

[155] Perez Zagorin, *Ways of lying. Dissimulation, persecution, and conformity in early modern Europe* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1990) 80.

[156] Berndt Hamm, 'The urban Reformation in the Holy Roman Empire', in: *Handbook of European history 1400-1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation* 2, Thomas A. Brady, Heiko A. Oberman & James D. Tracy ed. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995) 194-5.

[157] MacCulloch, *Reformation*, 598.

[158] Kaplan, *Divided by faith*, 70.

[159] Ibidem, 167.

[160] Ibidem, 195.

[161] MacCulloch, *Reformation,* 338.

[162] Schilling, 'Confessional Europe', 668-9.

long before, which is exactly the issue here. The religious changes did not present the town with new people, only with new religious convictions. So towns had to deal with dissenters who had always been members of their community. This membership brought along many aspects, of which the social standards and values were of great importance. In general, all citizens shared these social values, regardless of whether they held the Catholic or Protestant faith. But did these values exceed the confessional differences? According to Luria, they did.[163] The feeling of being part of a community rather than part of a Church could cause the people to ignore of even resist laws the monarchy proclaimed against or in favor of the members of the religious minority.

This was the case in Châlons. Here, a Catholic duke, of the De Guise lineage, took charge of the town after Henry IV, who was initially a Protestant, became the new king.[164] However, his negative ideas about Huguenots did not sit well with the inhabitants. Not because the Catholic community was so fond of the Huguenots, but because they were indeed very protective of their citizens. So the people of Châlons chose the social community over the religious one. Furthermore, freedom and autonomy were of great value to the inhabitants. When De Guise tried to dismiss this freedom and push his own ideas through, the town revolted.[165] De Guise was murdered and Châlons gave its loyalty to the monarchy.[166]

The situation was similar in Utrecht. Social bonds and values brought the community together, even though religious differences sometimes tore it apart.[167] Here, a division between the private and public spheres contributed to the more or less peaceful co-existence.[168] This common feature of Dutch societies seemed to be effective enough to keep the population from large outbreaks of violence or other expressions of conflict. However, there were no rules on the exact division line that prevented the conflicts from happening; to what extent the religious minorities could practice their faith remained a difficult question to answer.

The above are examples of tolerance, but in Paris dissenters were very much hated and everything but tolerated. Parisian history was that of a strict Catholic society and according to its inhabitants, Catholicism was also its future. However, after the Reformation, some Parisian Catholics converted to Protestantism and became the thorn in the flesh of the town. Moreover, several royal decrees were declared in favor of the Huguenots, among them the Edict of Toleration which allowed the Huguenots to practice their religion in a limited way. The Parisians were outraged by this new policy and did their best to oppose it. According to them, the only way society could maintain its

---

[163] Luria, *Sacred boundaries*, xvi-i.

[164] Konnert, *Local politics*, 161-4.

[165] Ibidem, 189.

[166] Ibidem, 104.

[167] Kaplan, *Calvinists and libertines*, 278.

[168] Ibidem, 295.

civilization was for heresy to be eliminated.[169] Therefore, it is apparent that the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacre of 1572 originated in the capital.

The never ending opposition from Paris against the laws of religious tolerance was unfortunate for the national government. Paris was an important city, especially for the financing of wars and other policies.[170] Although the monarchy regularly tried to establish peace and order by prohibiting the Catholic priests to arouse the crowds during services, it did not help much against the feelings of hatred.[171] Eventually, the monarchy cracked. The unrest and violence against the Huguenots persisted whilst the loyalty to the crown shrunk to a minimum. In April of 1562, due to the pressure of many outbreaks of violence, Henry III invalidated the Edict of Tolerance in the city. All other religions besides Catholicism were banned,[172] which made it almost impossible for the Huguenots to continue to live in the French capital. Moreover, the local Calvinist community ceased to exist after the horrors of 1572,[173] all because of the pressure applied by the Parisian people.

The case of Paris is a striking one. The fact that the Parisians were in a position in which they could force the king to revoke a national law is quite remarkable, although this was for a large part because of their importance to the state's financial security. Moreover, their case is special because they did not feel any compassion for the Huguenot community, which contained many people who had been members of the town community for many years. The cases of Châlons and Utrecht make clear that this could make tolerance much more acceptable among people. An explanation for the attitude of the Parisian people might be that Paris was considered as the symbol for Catholicism, not only by the inhabitants but also by the French king. In keeping Paris a Catholic stronghold, he would always show his religious conviction to the world. But if this was the case, why was Paris ordered to implement the laws in favor of tolerance in the first place?

Evidently, the community had a voice in the matter of tolerance, but how did the subjects make up their minds about whether or not to allow dissenters to live peacefully in a town? Already the social ties versus confessional differences have been discussed, which remains the biggest component in the question for tolerance, but there is something else that has to be considered. It seems that the ruled, in most cases, did not care as much about the differences in religious conviction as the authorities did. Pragmatic considerations were of more importance, while the rulers were much more involved in juridical matters. It was difficult to determine where the line for tolerance had to be drawn. Could dissenters have one place of worship or two? And were they

---

[169] Diefendorf, *Beneath the cross*, 178.

[170] Ibidem, 179.

[171] Ibidem, 58.

[172] Ibidem, 63.

[173] Ibidem, 136.

allowed to come together in groups of ten, twenty or fifty people? These were questions that had to be raised at some point, but not by the inhabitants of the towns themselves. Although religion was visible in every part of their lives, on a daily basis they dealt with issues like labor, economic well-being and security. That these were factors that also determined whether tolerance was to be practiced in a town, chapter seven will show.

Chapter seven: Pragmatic explanations

Rulers were often bound by ecclesiastical traditions their monarchies had honored for centuries. The practice of tolerance was therefore hard to implement, although this did not always stop them from establishing some form of peaceful co-existence among their subjects. For the community, the focus was not on these religious laws. The business of daily life was far more important. Therefore, instead of showing social values and what the consequences were for the community when tolerance was granted, as the previous chapter did, the situation in which a town found itself and the practical decisions it made concerning tolerance are of issue here.

It is not to say that religion came in second place, on the contrary. Traditions, rituals and symbols made up a huge part of communal life and the issue of religious pluralism after the Reformation was certainly felt and acted on by the townspeople. However, according to MacCulloch, continuity was very much present as a factor that dominated the sixteenth and seventeenth century. The daily life of the common man remained in many aspects the same instead of experiencing radical change. There was a sense of separation from the ecclesiastical conflicts in the religious world. The community did not have nor wanted a part in the battles for religious truth; it was up to God and king to sort out the religious problems, whilst they would sort out the issues of their daily lives. This meant that if tolerance was to be granted, it had to be because it was either beneficial or indeed not harmful to the day to day business of the people granting this tolerance.

Nevertheless, also rulers had more riding on their well-being. Already the conflict with politics has come to light and Brady underlines this by stating that in the seventeenth century great wars were the reason for the deconfessionalization.[174] Especially the Thirty Years War, in which almost all of Europe participated, became more a war of politics than of religion in which states of the same religious conviction fought each other violently. Here, politics were being separated from religion, in contrast to what it had up until then been, namely interwoven.

Back in the community, the daily business of labor, economic well-being and security were the basic issues. For the people themselves but also for the community as a whole. Trade was for many towns the way to economic survival and it was therefore of great value that businesses were

---

[174] Schilling, 'Confessional Europe', 670.

thriving. A policy of tolerance could help keep commerce at a high level or even increase it. Evidently, the more laborers a town accommodated, the higher the overall production of goods was and the more products could be sold.

This pragmatic solution seems fairly logical, however not every town welcomed new laborers or citizens of other faiths. Why were there in some towns rules on membership of dissenters in the guilds? The answer could be related to feelings of unity the people of one community felt. This bond among the inhabitants was already formed before the religious world was turned upside down by the Reformation and it was this bond that had to be protected. By letting too many dissenters into the community, uniformity would be endangered. Moreover, controlling a town became more difficult once there were new inhabitants who had different religious convictions and other social values and rules than the community. Another reason for the sometimes reserved attitude of local authorities was that their town was in essence still a Catholic or Protestant society, wherein the dissenters formed only a minority. They could and would not give them total freedom in religious and social sense, because this would not leave them the upper hand, which they needed to control the whole community.

Nonetheless, many towns saw the economic advantages of a policy of tolerance and granted religious minority groups more rights to allow them into the working life.[175] In Maastricht, the authorities from Liège were more tolerant towards Protestants for the sake of the town its trading position and industry.[176] Also in Antwerp, the Magistrate executed a more tolerant policy towards Protestants, because it would benefit the town more than if they were hindered in their participation in the community.[177] According to the Magistrate, but also the central government, Antwerp, as the large trades town that it was, could not afford 'religious zealotry of strict persecution.'[178]

Next to economic reasons, an adaptive attitude of the minority could enhance the practice of tolerance. This could be out of fear but also because the dissenters wanted to blend in and live in peace within the community.[179] Luria applies this argument to Poitou and also Ubachs states that the Protestant minority in Maastricht did partially adapt to the Catholic majority in the city. The Calvinists participated in Catholic festivities and enrolled in Catholic schools.[180] Although this argument can only be applied to two cases, it must be considered as a valid point. Chapter six already discussed the argument that people were fine with the situation of religious pluralism if the dissenters honored a separation between the public and private sphere. In most towns dissenters

---

[175] Spaans, 'Religious policies', 78.

[176] Ubachs, *Twee heren*, 118-9.

[177] Marnef, *Antwerpen in de tijd*, 119.

[178] Marinus, *De contrareformatie*, 243.

[179] Luria, *Sacred boundaries*, 2.

[180] Ubachs, *Twee heren*, 417.

came together in secret, not openly provoking the other members of society. Of course, this was not ideal for them, but in general they confined themselves to the limits that they were given. So, in a way they adapted to the situation wherein they were the smaller, to be tolerated group, living among the group that could grant that tolerance.

The want to avoid unrest and violence was not something only the minority longed for. In many towns the inhabitants had more than enough of the troubles and conflicts the changes in religious life had brought them. In France, this was the case especially after the devastating Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacre, which was only one of the many outbreaks of violence the state had to endure in the sixteenth century. The Religious Wars, as they are now called, caused many deaths among the French people, but also tore apart society as a whole. Luria makes a special notice of this in Poitou, where people were tired of the religious conflicts and wanted peace.[181] In Poland, the example of France was a warning to the state government. Nobody wanted it to come that far and even when king Henry III of France was offered the crown, he had to promise to grant Protestants the same amount of tolerance they had enjoyed the years before.[182] Even though tolerance was far from customary, it was slowly implemented, because it would hopefully restore some of the peace and quiet the people longed for.[183]

Lastly, there was a cause for tolerance that was seen only in Poland. Here, tolerance came somewhat more naturally. Of course, also in Poland kings thought differently about the extent to which they should grant rights to dissenters. Moreover, in the beginning of the seventeenth century the policy of tolerance became more and more limited, among other things because support for the Reformation decreased gradually.[184] However, in the sixteenth century, the state was seen as a safe haven for all religious dissenters who were persecuted in their own states.[185] The reason for this, according to Tazbir, was the fact that Poland had always lived under multiple faiths. In the eleventh century, the state was split between the territories of the Churches of Rome and Byzantium.[186] From then onwards, Poland had to deal with more than one faith. Moreover, there was no official doctrine of the Church and there were no ethnical or class divisions between Protestants and Catholics.[187] In contrast to the other European states, Poland did not have a long history with the Roman Church, not exclusively anyway. This made it easier to accept other religions and even to support the Protestants to a great extent.

---

[181] Luria, *Sacred boundaries*, 11.

[182] MacCulloch, *Reformation*, 340-4.

[183] Zagorin, *How the idea*, 146.

[184] Tazbir, *A state without stakes*, 163.

[185] Ibidem, 13.

[186] Ibidem, 31.

[187] Ibidem, 34.

Economic interests were important when granting religious minorities some extent of tolerance in the European towns. But also unity and the prevention of violence outbreaks made people to allow dissenters a bit more freedom. Furthermore, it is clear that on a lower level in society, tolerance was probably more easy to implement because of the pragmatic issues that came first, instead of the ecclesiastical problems the rulers and Churches had to deal with.

Conclusion

The practice of religious tolerance was something that most people in the sixteenth century had not thought about. Why should they have done so? Christianity was build upon one faith. However, during the Reformation, the religious world found itself divided between the old religion and a new one, Protestantism. States and communities were torn apart by this split and were forced to deal with people who suddenly held other religious convictions. Monarchs found themselves between multiple ways by which they could hold on to the wanted unity in their state. They could impose harsh measures on dissenters to try to eliminate them or they could try to accept different faiths in their state. The problem was that they did not know which of these measures would help to preserve unity and order. Among the subjects, in the communities, conflict occurred also. Here, shared social values versus different religious beliefs was the core of the problem.

This thesis has studied the practice of tolerance in several European towns. The main question was: What were the causes that made toleration of the religious minority by the dominant religious group possible in Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth century? The first question that was necessary to answer this was that of the presence or absence of toleration in the cases. The answer was provided by two separate ways. One was the definition given at the beginning of this thesis, namely that tolerance was:

The in great degree unwilling acceptance of a religion other than the one of the community. The people of that community allow the ideas of the other religion and while approval is not required, religious dissenters can exercise their faith without being assaulted or persecuted.

Furthermore, themes or aspects of society decided whether a practice of tolerance was present or absent in the cases. These were laws, mixed marriages, guilds and sacred spaces. Using a definition and themes as measures for tolerance made the outcome stronger and more stable.

In some cases there were more national rules than in others. However, the town community, including the local authorities could, to a certain extent, decide whether it would fully implement these laws. The clergy was in almost every state firmly against intermarriage, however, the various cases have shown that these occurred on a regular basis regardless of the opposition. The same goes for sacred spaces. Although the religious minority was not always granted a building for services or Mass, it was in some cases allowed to come together in other ways. In theory this was a secret, but in practice most people knew about and condoned it. The guilds were the only aspect of a town that were not ruled by the monarch. They had their own rules, but did have relations with the town councils. There are no cases that explicitly show a non-access policy for religious dissenters. This could be because of the small role religion played in the realm of work.

In part two the focus shifted to the explanations of the practice of tolerance in the towns. What were the forces behind such an attitude if there indeed was one? Here rulers, local town authorities, the community and pragmatic explanations were the leading causes. For rulers and local authorities, the focus was on a variety of issues very much interrelated with religion. Politics, society itself and unity among the subjects were all issues rulers had to consider when thinking about tolerance. Stability served a monarch's power best, but was that reached by allowing dissenters into the state? Moreover, the traditional, ecclesiastical laws were not easy to dismiss and had to be handled with care when letting other faiths into a society.

The communities were much more pragmatic in their thinking. They dealt with the daily business of life, without dwelling too much on religious differences. So if dissenters could help trade to grow by working and living in a town, their convictions did not matter that much. Furthermore, the social bonds created on the basis of shared values seemed to matter more than religious convictions. Nonetheless, religion played a big role in the lives of people and conflicts could occur when dissenters openly showed their beliefs.

In the end, all theories concerning tolerance were set aside. No one knew what would preserve or regain unity and stability in a state or in a community. This meant that in practice, people, rulers as well as the ruled, dealt with confessional differences along the way. Moreover, two kinds of unity were wanted, namely on a national and on a local scale. The first was based on politics and on religion itself, because rulers were heavily involved in the battles for religious truth. So unity based on religion was of importance for them. However, the community was much more focused on social bonds and communal values. Evidently, unity between the people based on a social level seemed to be accepted in most communities. Both groups tried hard to achieve this unity, but, as the cases have showed, this was not always easy.

Boolean tables

The results from the literary study are presented in the Boolean tables below. These want to examine a) if the practice of tolerance was indeed present in a town and b) what the causes were for the occurrence of the outcome *T* (tolerance). In the first table the four themes are displayed. The criteria given to them, by which a 1 for presence and a 0 for absence are determined, are listed beneath the table.

Four question marks are visible in the first table. These were put in simply because of the lack in information on Layrac and Châlons on these themes. However, the outcome could still be determined, partially by the numbers given for the other themes and partially by the overall information that was available on the towns, which leaned more towards a policy of tolerance than

to a policy of discrimination against religious dissenters. With that in mind, the outcome (T) was indeed present or semi-present.

Besides question marks, the table also contains many half points (*0.5*). These were not given out of doubt, but because the cases indeed presented a mixture of the criteria. In Paris, the Calvinists were granted a place of worship, but due to the persistent violence against them they had to hold their services outside the city walls most of the time. Evidently, one cannot speak of tolerance here, although the criterion for *1* was met. The same goes for Maastricht in regards to the participation in guilds. Religious dissenters were allowed to join the guilds on the principle of equality. However, the authorities did everything they could to prevent them from doing so. Therefore, a *1* could again not be given with full conviction.

In the second table, the four main causes are listed. They represent all the reasons given per group in part two of the thesis. The outcome (T) is taken from the first table and ordered from zero to one. The criteria for the causes are more straightforward than those for the previous table. This is simply because the question is much easier: Did the group made an effort to implement tolerance or barely or not at all?

Boolean table to determine if tolerance was absent or present in a town.

Cities/Themes	Laws	Mixed marriages	Guilds	Sacred spaces	Outcome *(Tolerance)*
Paris	0	0	0.5	0	0
Poitou (region)	1	1	1	1	1
Layrac	?	1	1	?	1
Chalons	1	?	?	0.5	0.5
Strasbourg	0	1	1	1	1
Utrecht	1	1	1	1	1
Maastricht	0.5	0	0.5	1	0.5
Bergen op Zoom	0.5	1	1	0	1
Antwerpen	0.5	0	1	0	0.5
Gdansk	1	0	1	1	1
Hamburg	0.5	1	1	0.5	1

Laws:
1= To support tolerance. (or in favor of the minority)
0= To support intolerance. (or in favor of the majority)

Mixed marriages:
1= When there were rules on how to deal with these marriages, for example dealing with the children and/or when there are significant numbers that show the common occurrence of intermarriages.
0= When there were no rules about the consequences of mixed marriages, which would tell us that they did not happen regularly and/or when there are significant numbers that only show an irregular occurrence of intermarriages.

Guilds:
1= If the minority group could still be member of the guilds.
0= If the minority group could no longer participate in the guilds.

Sacred spaces:
1= When there were one or more church buildings granted to the minority by the majority group.
0= When there were no church buildings granted to the minority by the majority group.

T is coded 1 when tolerance was present according to the definition given in the introduction or to a large extent of this in combination with the results of the four themes and 0 when this tolerance was absent according to that same definition in combination with the results of the four themes.

Boolean table to determine the cause(s) for tolerance in a town.

Cities/Causes	The monarchy or central government (M)	The elite or local governement (L)	The community (C)	Pragmatic explanations (P)	Outcome (Tolerance) (T)
Paris	1	0	0	0	0
Châlons	1	1	1	0	0.5
Maastricht	0	1	0	1	0.5
Antwerpen	0	1	0	1	0.5
Bergen op Zoom	0	1	1	0	1
Hamburg	1	1	0	1	1
Gdansk	1	1	0	1	1
Poitou	1	1	1	1	1
Layrac	1	1	0	0	1
Strasbourg	1	1	0	0	1
Utrecht	0	0	1	0	1

A cause was coded 1 if this group made an effort to implement tolerance and 0 if this group barely made an effort to implement tolerance or not at all.

Analysis

Before we look at the most important of the two tables, the first deserves some attention. The conflicts that tolerance brought along were of returning importance throughout this thesis. Tradition, the interwoven relationship between religion and society and political issues all influenced the question about tolerance. The first table shows that in practice, towns were somewhat unstable in their attitude towards granting tolerance to the religious minority. All cases have ones, zeroes and sometimes half points in their rows. Their policies evidently were a mix between tolerance and intolerance. Why tolerance was granted in one theme and not in the other is another question and cannot be given here. What can be observed is that Paris and Utrecht are extreme cases, because the first shows more or less zeroes and the latter four times a 1. Remarkably, these towns are special in the second table as well.

The second table is not that interesting when looking at the separate columns. In the first, the numbers given to the cases can easily be explained by the fact that laws were determined by national governments and expected to be implemented in every town they were issued in. In the second column a distinction is made between the wishes of the monarchy and that of the local authorities in the towns. Evidently, the latter were more willing to grant some extent of tolerance to the dissenters. Furthermore, the cases of Paris and Utrecht make clear that this local feeling about tolerance is not determined by the state in which the town resided. Column three and four show no real connection to the geographic position of the town.

If we look at the rows we can say more about the specific cases. Paris is special, because she is the only town where hardly any practice of tolerance was visible. Even though the monarchy tried to implement several laws in favor of the Huguenots, the town authorities and citizens rejected them and established a strong, Catholic city without room for other faiths. Poitou is another special case. Here all groups that could cause the practice of tolerance to be part of a town supported such a policy. The last remarkable case is that of Utrecht. Here the outcome is positive and the only group that caused this was the community. This may mean that the consent of the community for a tolerant attitude was sufficient for tolerance to occur. Utrecht is the only case which has only one cause supporting tolerance when the outcome is indeed 1.

Just by looking at the table we can see that none of the causes are necessary for the outcome to be positive. By applying Boolean algebra, this is visible in a more structured way. Furthermore, it shows us which causes were important when it comes to the practice of tolerance in the sixteenth and seventeenth century.

T is 1 when:

T= MLcP+MLcP+MLCP+MLcp+MLcp+mlCp+mLCp

T=MLcP+MLCP+MLcp+mlCp+mLCp

T=MLP+MLcp+mCp

Every new line is a minimalization of the former and although this does not give us any significance evidence about necessary or sufficient causes it does show something interesting. In the first two sum-of-products, there is a combination of M and L, so the monarchy and the local authorities. In the last sum-of-product, we find an absence of those two, but the presence of C, the community. These two power blocks seem to be the main causes of the practice of tolerance. When the outcome is positive, M and L are present, in the cases of Hamburg, Gdansk, Layrac and Strasbourg, or C is present, in the cases of Bergen op Zoom and Utrecht. The latter is most remarkable, because the community is the only cause present. Moreover, in every case with cause C present, tolerance is indeed practiced. Châlons is the only exception to this, but, as the next concept will show, the town could be considered as one with a positive outcome. Poitou is the only case where all causes are visible. All this means that if the community is absent, a powerful combination of the monarchy and the local authorities is needed to produce a positive outcome.

 This conception is not fully supported by the algebra applied above. Here P, the pragmatic explanations, also play a part and the present causes are still in combination with the absent ones. However, the case of Châlons might steer us in the direction of the newly raised hypothesis, namely *T=ML + C*. Châlons is a somewhat special case. Specific information on the town was lacking, but the themes *laws* and *sacred spaces* were rated positive and semi-positive. Considering that Châlons was a town that thought highly of her community and inhabitants and was more focused on social bonds than on religious ones, she could be listed as a case with a positive outcome, so *T*=1, instead of a case with a semi-positive one. Taking her into account, the equation becomes the following:

T=1 when:

T= MLcP+MLcP+MLCP+MLcp+MLcp+mlCp+mLCp+ MLCp

T=MLcP+MLC+MLcp+mlCp+mLCp

T=MLc+MLC+mCp

T=ML+mCp

Here, the case of Châlons has eliminated the presence of P, which leaves the presence of M and L and of C in combination with the absence of M and P. This matches the hypothesis to a great extent. Moreover, the table proves that the monarchy and the local authorities together create a power

block. A truth table gives sixteen possible combinations. Four of them begin with 1-1-x-x and are present in this caseload. With the outcome of those four being positive, it is proven that together the causes M and L give a positive *T*. This is strengthened by the fact that according to the table, it is impossible to have only M or L giving a positive outcome. We see cause L without cause M in the cases of Maastricht and Antwerp, but here the outcome is 0.5. We also see cause M without cause L in one case, namely Paris, but here *T* is negative. So, a combination of the two is necessary for the outcome to be 1.

Having said all this, it is important to remember that this table does not show all the possible combinations of variables. As mentioned at the beginning of this thesis, a truth table can be made. Here, this would exists of sixteen combinations, namely 2^4, because there are four variables. The cases in this thesis show eight different ones and three of them are seen twice. Evidently, the problem of limited diversity is present here. The hypothesis of *T=ML+C* is strongly supported by these cases. However to be absolutely sure, the excluded cases with combinations *mLcp* and *MlcP* are important to take into account. Also the absent combination with cause C present is interesting, namely mlCP. Including these combinations in the Boolean algebra could strengthen the hypothesis even more.

After this analysis, a conclusion can be reached stating that the power blocks of the monarchy and the local authorities and that of the community played a important role in the establishment of a practice of tolerance. However, during this research it became clear that the first definition of tolerance could be slightly altered. According to the literature, prosecutions due to religious conviction were no longer of common nature in this period, especially in the seventeenth century. So letting go of the last two words, the definition becomes somewhat more strict, because discrimination and assaults against the religious dissenters was still daily business. This would maybe give different outcomes, with the danger being that in every case the outcome becomes negative, leaving us with the conclusion that the practice of tolerance was not present in any town in Europe in the sixteenth century.

To test if our results would change, the first given definition could be changed. For example, tolerance is

the in great degree **willing** *acceptance of a religion other than the one of the community. The people of that community allow the ideas of the other religion and while approval is not required, religious dissenters can exercise their faith without* **being assaulted**.

Although this is an option, it is not a very good survey of the situation in the period of the Reformation. People were just not willing to accept any other religion than their own and assaults

towards dissenters happened frequently, if not daily in some cases. Looking at the outcomes in the first table, it is remarkable to see the amount of cases where tolerance was indeed granted. Moreover, only one out of eleven towns did not practice tolerance and that is Paris, a traditional, Catholic stronghold. Even by holding on to a realistic definition in combination with realistic criteria for the themes, some extent of tolerance was visible in sixteenth and seventeenth century Europe. It seems that scholars who stated that tolerance was more and more acceptable and granted by the monarchies are indeed right. These results do add the community to these theories as a leading group in the quest for tolerance. Co-existing with the religious minority seemed acceptable as long as the beliefs of the dissenters did not interfere with its daily business of life.

Bibliography

Brady, Thomas Allen, Heiko A. Oberman and James D. Tracy, 'Introduction: the unsettling settlements', in: *Handbook of European history, 1400-1600: late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation* 2, Thomas Allen Brady, jr., Heiko A. Oberman and James D. Tracy ed., Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.

Chrisman, Miriam Usher, *Strasbourg and the reform. A study in the process of change*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1967.

Dewald, Jonathan, *Europe 1450-1789: encyclopedia of the early modern world* 3, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2004.

Dewald, Jonathan, *Europe 1450-1789: encyclopedia of the early modern world* 6, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2004.

Diefendorf, Barbara B., *Beneath the cross. Catholics and Huguenots in sixteenth- century Paris*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Eberhard, Winfried, 'Reformation and counterreformation in East Central Europe', in: *Handbook of European history, 1400-1600: late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation* 2, Thomas Allen Brady, jr., Heiko A. Oberman and James D. Tracy ed., Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.

Fischer, H.F.W.D., 'De gemengde huwelijken tussen katholieken en Protestanten in de Nederlanden van de XVIe tot de XVIIIe eeuw', in: *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis* 31, 1963.

Ford, Franklin L., *Strasbourg in transition, 1648-1789*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1958.

Gregory, Brad S., *Salvation at stake. Christian martyrdom in early modern Europe*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Hamm, Berndt, 'The urban Reformation in the Holy Roman Empire', in: *Handbook of European history, 1400-1600: late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation* 2, Thomas Allen Brady, jr., Heiko A. Oberman and James D. Tracy ed., Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.

Hanlon, Gregory, *Confession and community in seventeenth-century France. Catholic and Protestant coexistence in Aquitaine*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993.

Kamen, Henry, *The rise of toleration*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967.

Kaplan, Benjamin J., *Calvinists and libertines. Confession and community in Utrecht, 1578-1620*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

Kaplan, Benjamin J., *Divided by faith: religious conflict and the practice of toleration in early modern Europe*, Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007.

Kaplan, Benjamin J., '"Dutch" religious tolerance: celebration and revision', in: *Calvinism and religious toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, R. Po-Chia Hsia & H.F.K. van Nierop ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Konnert, Mark W., *Local politics in the French Wars of religion. The towns of Champagne, the Duc of Guise and the Catholic League, 1560-95*, Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2006.

Kooi, Christine, 'Paying off the sheriff: strategies of Catholic toleration in Golden Age Holland', in: *Calvinism and religious toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, R. Po-Chia Hsia & H.F.K. van Nierop ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Luria, Keith P., *Sacred boundaries. Religious coexistence and conflict in early-modern France*, Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2005.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *Reformation. Europe's house divided, 1490-1700*, London: Penguin Books, 2004.

Mahoney, James & Dietrich Rueschemeyer, 'Comparative historical analysis. Achievements and agendas', in: *Comparative historical analysis in social sciences*, James Mahoney & Dietrich Rueschemeyer ed., New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Marinus, Marie Juliette, *De contrareformatie te Antwerpen (1585-1676): kerkelijk leven in een grootstad*, Brussel: Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, 1995.

Marnef, Guido, *Antwerpen in de tijd van de Reformatie. Ondergronds Protestantisme in een handelsmetropool, 1550-1577*, Amsterdam: J.M. Meulenhoff bv., 1996.

Mooij, Charles de, *Geloof kan Bergen verzetten. Reformatie en katholieke herleving te Bergen op Zoom, 1577-1795*, Hilversum: Verloren, 1998.

Mullett, Michael A., *Radical religious movements in early modern Europe*, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1980.

Nierop, Henk van, 'Sewing the Bailiff in a blanket: Catholics and the law in Holland', in: *Calvinism and religious toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, R. Po-Chia Hsia & H.F.K. van Nierop ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Po-Chia Hsia R., 'Introduction', in: *Calvinism and religious toleration in the Dutch golden age*, R. Po-Chia Hsia & H.F.K. van Nierop ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Pollmann, Judith, 'The bond of Christian piety: the individual practice of tolerance and intolerance in the Dutch Republic', in: *Calvinism and religious toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, R. Po-Chia Hsia & H.F.K. van Nierop ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Prak, Maarten, 'The politics of intolerance: citizenship and religion in the Dutch Republic (seventeenth to eighteenth centuries)', in: *Calvinism and religious toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, R. Po-Chia Hsia & H.F.K. van Nierop ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Ragin, Charles C., *The comparative method. Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies* Berkely & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987.

Rowan, Steven 'Urban communities: the rulers and the ruled', in: *Handbook of European history, 1400-1600: late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation* 1, Thomas Allen Brady, jr., Heiko A. Oberman and James D. Tracy ed., Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994-95.

Sande, Anton van de, 'Roomse buitenbeentje in een protestantse natie? Tolerantie en antipapisme in Nederland in de zeventiende, achttiende en negentiende eeuw', in: *Een schijn van verdraagzaamheid. Afwijking en tolerantie in Nederland van de zestiende eeuw tot heden*, Marijke Gijswijt-Hofstra ed., Hilversum: Verloren, 1989.

Schilling, Heinz, 'Confessional Europe', in: *Handbook of European history, 1400-1600: late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation*, vol.2, Thomas Allen Brady, jr., Heiko A. Oberman and James D. Tracy ed., Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.

Smit, M. de, *Koenen woordenboek, N/N Nederlands*, Utrecht & Antwerp: Koenen Woordenboeken, 1999.

Spaans, Joke, 'Religious policies in the seventeenth-century Dutch Republic', in: *Calvinism and religious toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, R. Po-Chia Hsia & H.F.K. van Nierop ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Tazbir, Janusz, *A state without stakes. Polish religious toleration in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*, New York: Twayne Publishers, 1973.

Ubachs, P.J.H., *Twee heren, twee confessies. De verhouding van staat en kerk te Maastricht, 1632-1673*, Nederlandse Organisatie voor Zuiver Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek: Assen, 1975.

Whaley, Joachim, *Religious toleration and social change in Hamburg, 1529-1819*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Zagorin, Perez, *How the idea of religious toleration came to the West*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton U.P., 2003.

Zagorin, Perez, *Ways of lying: dissimulation, persecution and conformity in early modern Europe*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Zijlstra, Samme, '"Tgeloove is vrij". De tolerantiediscussie in de Noordelijke Nederlanden tussen 1520 en 1795', in: *Een schijn van verdraagzaamheid. Afwijking en tolerantie in Nederland van de zestiende eeuw tot heden*, Marijke Gijswijt-Hofstra ed., Hilversum: Verloren, 1989.