



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Refugee Politics in Early Modern Europe

de Boer, D.; Janssen, G.H.

DOI

[10.5040/9781350307711](https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350307711)

Publication date

2024

Document Version

Final published version

License

CC BY-NC-ND

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

de Boer, D., & Janssen, G. H. (Eds.) (2024). *Refugee Politics in Early Modern Europe*. Bloomsbury Academic. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350307711>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.



Edited by
David de Boer
& Geert H. Janssen

REFUGEE POLITICS
IN EARLY MODERN
EUROPE

Refugee Politics in Early Modern Europe

Refugee Politics in Early Modern Europe

Edited by David de Boer and Geert H. Janssen

BLOOMSBURY ACADEMIC
LONDON • NEW YORK • OXFORD • NEW DELHI • SYDNEY

BLOOMSBURY ACADEMIC
Bloomsbury Publishing Plc
50 Bedford Square, London, WC1B 3DP, UK
1385 Broadway, New York, NY 10018, USA
29 Earlsfort Terrace, Dublin 2, Ireland

BLOOMSBURY, BLOOMSBURY ACADEMIC and the Diana logo are trademarks of
Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published in Great Britain 2025

Copyright © David de Boer, Geert H. Janssen and contributors, 2025

David de Boer and Geert H. Janssen have asserted their right under the Copyright,
Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as Editors of this work.

Cover image: Maerten de Vos, *Moses Showing the Tablets of the Law to the Israelites, with
Portraits of Members of the Panhuys Family, their Relatives and Friends.*

© Archivart / Alamy Stock Photo

This work is published open access subject to a Creative Commons Attribution-
NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International licence (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0, [https://
creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)). You may re-use, distribute, and
reproduce this work in any medium for non-commercial purposes, provided you
give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher and provide a link to the
Creative Commons licence.

This open access publication was funded by the Dutch Research Council (NWO):
016.Vici.185.020

Bloomsbury Publishing Plc does not have any control over, or responsibility for, any
third-party websites referred to or in this book. All internet addresses given in this
book were correct at the time of going to press. The author and publisher regret
any inconvenience caused if addresses have changed or sites have ceased to exist,
but can accept no responsibility for any such changes.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN: HB: 978-1-3503-0768-1
ePDF: 978-1-3503-0769-8
eBook: 978-1-3503-0770-4

Typeset by Deanta Global Publishing Services, Chennai, India

To find out more about our authors and books visit www.bloomsbury.com and sign up
for our newsletters.

Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| List of contributors | vi |
| Introduction: Refugee politics in early modern Europe <i>David de Boer and Geert H. Janssen</i> | 1 |
| Part I Refugees and belonging | |
| 1 Arguing about refugeedom: Religious mobility in Jacobean London and Counter-Reformation Rome <i>Diego Pirillo</i> | 15 |
| 2 Transnational refugee networks and the politics of the early Dutch Republic, 1568–90 <i>Jesse Spohnholz</i> | 33 |
| 3 Inventing Irish identity in exile <i>Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin</i> | 50 |
| 4 The refugee discourse of the Moriscos: Petitioning and diplomacy after the expulsion decree of 1609 <i>Gerard Wiegers</i> | 66 |
| 5 Outsiders within: Internally displaced persons in Sweden, 1700–1721 <i>Sari Nauman</i> | 85 |
| Part II Humanitarianism | |
| 6 Refugees, poor relief and the birth of philanthropy in Protestant Europe <i>Alexander Schunka</i> | 105 |
| 7 In face of xenophobia: Polish-Lithuanian Jewish refugees and their survival strategies in the 1650s <i>Adam Teller</i> | 117 |
| 8 The newspapers of Holland make a great noise: Newspapers and humanitarian culture in Britain and Europe, 1715–45 <i>Catherine Arnold</i> | 132 |
| Part III Migration management and imperialism | |
| 9 Plague, war and the politics of refuge in early modern Prussia <i>Kat Hill</i> | 153 |
| 10 Engineering the Refuge: Switzerland, England and the Huguenots, 1685–1700 <i>Owen Stanwood</i> | 170 |
| 11 Exile between revolution and counter-revolution, c. 1800 <i>Jan C. Jansen</i> | 189 |
| Afterword: Refugee politics in longue-durée perspectives <i>Fabian Klose</i> | 206 |
| Index | 217 |

Contributors

Catherine Arnold received her PhD from Yale University and is currently a trainee barrister at Matrix Chambers.

David de Boer is Assistant Professor of Political History at Radboud University Nijmegen.

Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin is Professor of History at University College Dublin.

Kat Hill is Senior Lecturer in Early Modern History at Birkbeck, University of London.

Jan C. Jansen is Professor of Modern History at the University of Tübingen.

Geert Janssen is Professor of Early Modern History at the University of Amsterdam.

Fabian Klose is Professor of International History at the University of Cologne.

Sari Nauman is Associate Professor of History at the University of Gothenburg and the Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study.

Diego Pirillo is Associate Professor of Italian Studies at the University of California, Berkeley.

Alexander Schunka is University Professor of Early Modern History at Freie Universität Berlin.

Jesse Spohnholz is Professor of History at Washington State University.

Owen Stanwood is Associate Professor of History at Boston College.

Adam Teller is Professor of Judaic Studies and History at Brown University.

Gerard Wiegers is Professor of Comparative Religious Studies and History at the University of Amsterdam.

Introduction

Refugee politics in early modern Europe

David de Boer and Geert H. Janssen

The term *refugee* made its entry into European dictionaries long after the refugee had come into being as a phenomenon. Denis Diderot's concise 1765 description in the *Encyclopédie*, for one, defined the figure as a Protestant who had been forced to leave France after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685).¹ This exclusionary characterization, however, was not universally accepted. Two hundred years earlier, in the correspondence of Cardinal Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle (1517–1586), the term *refugee* had made its first known appearance, singling out not beleaguered Protestants but repressed Catholics who had fled the Calvinist Netherlands.² A flexible neologism, *refugee* thus emerged as an ambiguous and politicized tool in early modern Europe. Its use was typically conditioned by rhetorical purpose and confessional preference. The refugee's complex conceptual history is at the heart of the current volume, which seeks to map and explain how the emergence of refugee categories shaped European politics, informed migration management and affected humanitarian sensibilities in early modern societies.

Historians have generally explained the discursive invention of the refugee as the outcome of growing religious conflicts in Europe and the security concerns of its modernizing states, which generated a dramatic rise in displaced persons between 1450 and 1750. Some have seen the expulsion of Jewish minorities from the Iberian peninsula in 1492 as a watershed moment in this regard; others have cast the Reformation as Europe's first refugee crisis. The protection of refugees likewise depended on the utilitarian motives of rival confessional regimes, who began to welcome displaced coreligionists as victims of repression deserving of solidarity.³ Thus, the notion of refugee was strictly bounded by confessional discourse. Only in the eighteenth century did the Enlightenment further a new emotional culture that fuelled a more inclusive sense of empathy and advocated for universal human rights. The thinking of humanitarianism and international law pertaining to refugees would eventually emerge and develop out of this broadening of sentiments.⁴

Refugee Politics in Early Modern Europe aims to challenge the narrative of this state-centred perspective. We propose that the refugee's emergence was largely shaped by the activism of displaced people seeking religious freedom, international solidarity and legal protections abroad.⁵ Religious dissenters of the Reformation era appear to be the first to have exploited this rhetorical strategy, thus transforming unprivileged migrants

from social outcasts into victims of repression deserving of special status in civilized societies. Media spin and a common 'brand name' proved key to these campaigns. Such exercises in refugee identity formation also informed lobby campaigns for charity, privileges and diplomatic intervention, and paved the way for a broader human rights' thinking on which Enlightenment philosophes would build. Shifting the focus of attention to such strategies and campaigns allows us to approach forced migrants as historical actors, whose ambitions, plans and decisions made a profound impact on early modern societies.⁶

By tracing the origins of the concept of refugee and its political utilization, *Refugee Politics in Early Modern Europe* engages with three ongoing debates in historical scholarship. First, the authors in this volume address the shifting language of migration to explain the semantic development of refugee categories. The early modern period generated various forced migrations, whose causes ranged from religious persecution and warfare to economic deprivation and climate change. Yet not all afflicted groups – which is to say, only certain *specific* groups – framed their position in terms of refuge, asylum, diaspora or exile. Building on a set of selected case studies, this volume will elucidate when, where and why migrants and host societies considered such terminology useful, on what religious and classical models they were based, and how legal concepts of refugees followed from this.

Second, the volume seeks to identify the role of displaced minorities in forging humanitarian networks. The forced migration movements of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries coincided with the rise of support and pressure groups that advocated for refugee protection and that also organized charity efforts, framed media coverage and lobbied for diplomatic interventions.⁷ By studying how diasporic communities organized themselves as political actors, the authors of this volume uncover the significance of displaced persons in initiating transnational charity networks, promoting an international culture of empathy and influencing domestic and foreign policies. To allow a comparative analysis, they will chart this process across different religions (Christian, Jewish, Muslim), geographies (from the Baltic to the Maghreb) and periods (from the sixteenth to the early nineteenth century).

Third, *Refugee Politics in Early Modern Europe* examines the impact of refugees on European state formation and imperialism. Early modern states were largely responsible for the rise of forced migrations, but displaced migrants also helped forge these modernizing states. Persecuted outcasts in their lands of origin, refugees not infrequently committed themselves to serve rival states, shaping their policies and religious cultures. By addressing the dialectical relationship between governments and displaced communities, the volume will assess the interaction of the accommodation and legal protection afforded to refugees and the ambitions of state authorities to expand their territories and forge confessional regimes.

Refugee politics

Our very title prompts the question: What do we mean by 'refugee politics'? The term, though lacking clear conceptualization, regularly pops up in academic texts

and in the news media, usually denoting government policies vis-à-vis refugees on the local, national or international level. According to the political scientist Cheryl Benard, refugee politics can refer to a variety of practices. It can pertain to 'national and international decision-making process concerning the admission, treatment, and administration of the refugees'. It can encompass the policies of organizations which operate in the interests of refugees, or allude to the idea of refugees 'as a kind of polity, having its own kind of political process'.⁸ Adopting a broad, historical perspective, this book uses 'refugee politics' as an umbrella term pertaining to all forms of political behaviour aimed at influencing or changing the position of displaced people, whether carried out by refugees themselves, representatives of (potential) host societies, persecuting authorities or (humanitarian) interest and lobbying groups. This holistic approach allows us to draw a fuller picture of the many decision-making processes that determined the lives of displaced people and their environments.

Use of the term 'refugee politics' allows us to shift the focus of attention to a myriad of political actors; examining their attempts to exert pressure as well to negotiate and to compromise; and explaining when, where and why such efforts succeeded or failed. In so doing, *Refugee Politics in Early Modern Europe* aims to fill a gap in our knowledge about the origins of refugee discourses, the development of humanitarian sensibilities and the emergence of transnational refugee management. Its cross-confessional and transnational approach will also enable readers to identify similarities and differences across time and space.

Part I: Refugees and belonging

Studies of Reformation Europe have long recognized the experience of displacement as a crucial component to the development of new confessional identities in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Unprecedentedly centralized state persecutions in various parts of Europe created Calvinist diasporas in safe havens such as London, Emden and Geneva, well-connected cities that heavily influenced other parts of the Protestant world.⁹ Catholic refugees, less numerous overall, also laid the foundations of a militant confessional worldview in exile.¹⁰ The progeny of (former) exiles bore the memory of persecution as a badge of honour and maintained these networks, which distinguished them as especially godly members of the community.¹¹ Some scholars have seen exile experiences as the cradle of Reformed Protestantism or have demonstrated how diaspora fostered a (re)Judaization among dispersed Iberian communities.¹²

Exiles also played a formative part in shaping a religious culture in which the memory of persecution became key to all believers. For most adherents of the emerging confessions, the theological hairsplitting that had dominated the early decades of the Reformation went only so far in defining their religious consciousness. Building on the theological common ground that cast God's true Church as a persecuted Church, all emerging confessional groups soon began to cultivate a shared memory of religious violence. From the middle of the sixteenth century onwards, commemorations of the violent deaths and displacement of steadfast true believers from different parts

in Europe became an integral part of religious life. As Andrew Pettegree has argued, the immensely popular martyr books and songs authored by Lutherans, Calvinists, Catholics and Mennonites formed 'a critical step in building a sense of a church that extends to all of common faith in different European nations'.¹³

The religious conflicts that plagued Christendom between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries thus not only created new enemies but also forged new long-distance solidarities among people who recognized in each other fellow believers in a dark world of heresy. As various parts of Europe lapsed into religious warfare in the 1560s and 1570s, identification and commiseration with persecuted coreligionists intensified. Historians may have only recently begun to rewrite their accounts of the sixteenth-century wars of religion as transnational conflicts, but many contemporaries readily regarded these conflicts as interconnected struggles.¹⁴ News of local persecutions reverberated throughout Europe, suggesting that what had happened was every reader's concern.¹⁵ Pamphlets connected the dots, spreading the idea that instances of religious violence were not isolated events but local skirmishes in a universal struggle between the forces of good and evil. Benjamin Kaplan reminds us that even at the height of the wars of religion, day-to-day conviviality between religious groups outweighed – by far – acts of interconfessional violence.¹⁶ Yet among most confessional groups, the transnational memory of displacement evolved into a cornerstone of a shared religious identity.

Migrants could sometimes use the widespread celebration of exile to their advantage. Although the construction of the refugee as a social category and legal identity has not been the subject of systematic scrutiny, scattered evidence suggests that refugee identity formation included the development of a more varied vocabulary of migration, a language that provided displaced men and women with tools to reinvent themselves as semi-martyrs of the faith. The emerging refugee idiom was typically shaped by biblical or classical frames of reference, giving rise to scripted exile narratives.¹⁷ Of course, the use or eschewal of these semantic categories and tropes was influenced by time and space: for migrants who aimed for social assimilation or economic integration into host communities, the vocabulary of exile was not always useful or appropriate. Yet in early modern Europe, being considered a refugee or exile by a host society often provided substantial benefits compared with migrants who failed to communicate a history of displacement.

For all its admirable qualities, Reformation scholarship has tended to study religious migrations in isolation, resulting in claims about, for instance, 'typically Calvinist' or 'uniquely Sephardic' responses to exile. While differences among Europe's displaced religious communities are undeniable, comparative analysis can only increase our understanding of the underlying mechanisms that shaped these groups, including expelled Muslims ('Moriscos'), who have mostly been left out of traditional Reformation histories. Against the backdrop of this rich yet compartmentalized tradition of scholarship, the time is right for a volume that tests the merits of a more comprehensive and comparative history of the coping strategies and language used by refugees.

The authors of this volume take the discursive strategies of religious minorities themselves as a point of departure: for example, which arguments, rhetorical models

and vocabulary did they use to articulate their 'refugeedom'? Which audiences (fellow refugees, secular authorities, posterity) did they seek to address in this way, and for what purposes? This approach is also pertinent for the analysis of emerging legal categories. Susanne Lachenicht has recently suggested that opposing groups of refugees copied each other's rhetorical strategies, for example by using the Edict of Potsdam (that offered particular privileges to Huguenots in Brandenburg after 1685) as a legal frame of reference.¹⁸ Transnational competition among different refugee communities and rivalling regimes thus appears to have stimulated the creation of common refugee categories and a gradual standardization of refugee protection laws. As a result, by 1800 the refugee had firmly established itself as a known type among European governments and as a term in various dictionaries.

Part II: Humanitarianism

In today's world, refugee relief is typically recognized as a form of humanitarianism. Few historians, however, regard the treatment of refugees in the age of Reformations as humanitarian. The dominant narrative goes that only in the second half of the eighteenth century did philosophers such as Smith, Hume and Rousseau herald a 'humanitarian revolution', as they replaced the thoroughly negative Hobbesian view of humankind that had defined Europe's age of persecution with a more positive view of humans as naturally sociable and benevolent.¹⁹ The ability of pre-Enlightenment Europeans to sympathize with people across social boundaries, so it is implied, had been far less developed. A narrative first established by late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century philosophers remains widely endorsed among historians today;²⁰ in the words of Juan Pablo Domínguez, 'the Enlightenment, as a whole, was an effort to overcome the divisions created by the Wars of Religion.'²¹ The (often no so) implicit assumption is that the emergence of a humanitarian culture went hand in hand with a cooling of religious tensions.²² In recent years, however, new studies on early modern refugees prompt us to question some of the assumptions about the genealogy of long-distance compassion and humanitarianism. Any discussion about the origins of an ideology or practice begins, of course, with establishing a working definition. We should therefore first ask the obvious question: What is humanitarianism?

While the historiographical debate is somewhat diffuse and definitions often remain implicit, three crucial characteristics almost invariably emerge in the conceptual approaches and definitions applied to humanitarianism. First, as Michael Barnett summarizes, humanitarianism is a practice oriented towards 'life-saving relief in response to mass suffering'.²³ Humanitarianism thus pertains to 'emergencies that threaten mass suffering and death'.²⁴ As such, it is centred not around a notion of global progress, as in human rights, but around a sense of 'precariousness', the constant fear of 'instability, mass violence, dispossession, and injustice'.²⁵ Second, humanitarian practices are typically transnational or trans-regional. They are meant to relieve the suffering of distant strangers living in a different polity. Partly, this orientation can

be explained because discourse on humanitarianism often focuses on humanitarian *intervention*, which implies cross-border political action. More importantly, it is meant to describe a practice in which aid crosses social and political boundaries, thereby differentiating it from local charity and disaster relief.²⁶

This brings us to the final characteristic, one that singles out the *human* in humanitarian – and explains why its origins are usually traced to the late eighteenth century. Most scholars state or imply that a relief practice should be called humanitarian only if it is motivated by, or at least justified with recourse to, a universalizing discourse of humanity – that is, suffering foreigners deserve support simply because they are human.²⁷ In this light Didier Fassin provides an apt definition of ‘humanitarian’ as ‘connoting [. . .] on the one hand the generality of human beings who share a similar condition (mankind), and on the other an affective movement drawing humans toward their fellows (humaneness).’²⁸

In important respects, early modern refugee engagement failed to meet this last condition. Notable exceptions aside, most relief efforts appear to have remained bounded by confession until the mid-eighteenth century. However, public evaluations of the treatment of minorities as either humane or inhumane have a deeper history. Inclusive expressions of compassion already developed into an important polemical tool during at least the seventeenth century, paving the way for the cautious (and incomplete) breakdown of confessional boundaries separating relief efforts in the eighteenth century.

Take, for example, the publicity campaign orchestrated by the Reformed Waldensians in Piedmont after suffering a massacre at the hands of their sovereign, the Duke of Savoy, in 1655. While taking refuge in France, the Waldensians drew up several pamphlets describing what had befallen them, in what turned out to be a successful attempt to garner international support. Because they hoped to convince as wide and international audience as possible that they deserved aid, these pamphlets were surprisingly low on confessional rhetoric. Instead, the refugees focused on the illegal and inhumane nature of the violence to maximize their gains. Internationally, governments could support the refugees without drawing accusations of engaging in confessional politics. By evading confessional rhetoric, even Catholic Monarchs might lend their support: the Waldensians received diplomatic and financial assistance not only from the Dutch Republic and the Commonwealth of England but also from Louis XIV, who offered them shelter and intervened with the Court of Savoy on their behalf. Throughout the seventeenth century, one recurrently sees refugees, persecuted minorities and their advocates adopting this sort of deconfessionalized language to attract international support across confessional boundaries.²⁹

The current volume builds on this growing body of scholarship on early humanitarianism by demonstrating how refugees themselves acted to shape a new type of transnational solidarity in Europe; it delves into when, where and how these charitable networks lost their confessional connotations. This is not to suggest that ‘modern’ secular narratives gradually replaced more traditional confessional ones over the course of the early modern period, as some scholars in the past assumed. As we will see, these two rhetorical models seem rather to have existed side by side, and their use depended on audience and purpose.

Part III: Migration management and imperialism

The formation of European states has been a classic, much debated topic in historical scholarship. Tying in with Charles Tilly's seminal thesis that 'war made the state, and the state made war', refugees have typically been portrayed as marginalized victims of emerging modern states.³⁰ In a similar fashion, confessionalization, with regard to Europe's religious minorities, has been seen as a negative, repressive force. The rise of religiously cohesive and effective bureaucracies was predicated on curbing and expelling dissenters. Nonetheless, this dominant narrative fails to acknowledge that refugees could also benefit from, and even actively shape, the same modernizing or confessionalizing polities. As this volume will show, states made refugees, but refugees also made states.

Some examples of this dialectic phenomenon are, in fact, wellknown. Scholars have long been aware that Prussian accommodation of Huguenot refugees in the 1680s served as an instrument of the Brandenburg authorities to populate parts of their territory, reinvigorate its local industries and reinforce Protestant authority.³¹ Numerous early modern armies, including those of Philip II of Spain and William III of England, likewise benefitted from the integration of Catholic or Protestant refugees into their regiments.³² Displacement could also be an opportunity for expelled minorities to assert claims to political or religious recognition. In the sixteenth-century Low Countries certain refugees capitalized on sympathetic attitudes towards their victimhood, seizing key positions in the emerging Dutch Republic and Habsburg Netherlands. In the Ottoman Empire, too, displaced Iberian Moriscos made their mark as dedicated brokers within the sultanate's diplomatic networks.³³ In these contexts, refugees became shapers of policy.

The protection and recruitment of refugees also served to expand the interests of states globally. Religious migrations have only recently been studied more systematically as a part of empire-building and geopolitical concerns. Here Jonathan Israel has paved the way by demonstrating how Sephardic Jews were at once agents and victims of empire.³⁴ Expelled from Habsburg Spain, they became brokers of global maritime networks and European colonization plans. Owen Stanwood has recently highlighted a similar role played by Huguenot diasporas in the overseas expansion plans of France's rivals.³⁵ Labour historians, for their part, have observed that maritime states like Britain and the Dutch Republic heavily relied on the influx of migrants to fulfil their expansionist ambitions in Asia, Africa and the Americas.³⁶ Displaced Protestants from the German Palatinate, Waldensian refugees from Piedmont and escaping Huguenots from France were, for instance, routinely employed by the Dutch East and West India Companies. Refugee crises elsewhere in Europe thus facilitated British and Dutch global expansion.

Several authors in this volume address the dialectical relationship between emerging states and displaced communities. They examine how the relocation and protection of refugee communities by confessional regimes should be seen as part of their ambition to expand their territories and to strengthen state power. They also confirm the importance of comparative analysis to avoid the pitfalls of exceptionalism and

isolationism that have long coloured our understanding of religious migrants and their fate. By positioning itself at the intersection of social, religious and political history, *Refugee Politics in Early Modern Europe* seeks to rewrite refugees into mainstream European historiography. It rethinks common images of refugees as marginalized, anonymous victims of conflict and presents coerced human displacement as a driving force behind the evolution of certain social categorizations and humanitarian sensibilities, as well as the development of European states.

Outline

The eleven chapters of this volume follow from these three major themes. Part I, *Refugees and belonging*, engages with questions about refugee discourse, identity formation and ‘refugeedom’ by studying these processes among different national and religious groups: Protestant exiles in England (Pirillo) and the Low Countries (Spohnholz), Irish Catholics in exile (Ó hAnnracháin) and English Catholics in Rome (Pirillo), Iberian Moriscos in the Ottoman Empire (Wiegers) and Swedish refugees in the Great Northern War (Nauman). Part II, *Humanitarianism*, examines and compares forms of charity, long-distance solidarity and support networks among Protestant minorities in Central Europe (Schunka), Jewish communities from Poland-Lithuania (Teller) and media reports as a humanitarian tool in eighteenth-century newspapers (Arnold). Part III, *Migration Management and Imperialism*, addresses the politics of refuge, asylum and empire-building among Mennonites in Prussia (Hill), Huguenots in Switzerland, Britain and its colonies (Stanwood), and the counter-revolutionaries in the Atlantic orbit around 1800 (Jansen). The Afterword (Klose) establishes the similarities and differences between these different groups, regions and periods, and identifies the underlying factors that guided these. In this way, it also provides some helpful tools for re-assessing nineteenth- and twentieth-century approaches to refugee politics in an increasingly globalized world.

Notes

- 1 ‘Réfugiés: C’est ainsi que l’on nomme les Protestans françois que la révocation de l’édit de Nantes a forcés de sortir de France, & de chercher un asyle dans les pays étrangers, afin de se soustraire aux persécutions qu’un zele aveugle & inconsidéré leur faisoit éprouver dans leur patrie.’ *Encyclopédie, ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers*, ed. Denis Diderot and Jean le Rond d’Alembert (Paris, 1751–1772), Vol. 13 (1765), 907 (article assumed to be written by Denis Diderot himself). Compare Peter Burke, *Exiles and Expatriates in the History of Knowledge, 1500–2000* (Brandeis: Brandeis University Press, 2017), 2–4; Max Scholz, ‘The Expanding Definition of Refugee in Early Modern Hesse-Kassel and Württemberg,’ *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 112, no. 11 (2021): 296–307.
- 2 Geert H. Janssen, ‘The Legacy of Exile and the Rise of Humanitarianism,’ in *Remembering the Reformation*, ed. Brian Cummings et al. (London: Routledge, 2020), 229–30.

- 3 Philipp Ther, *The Outsiders. Refugees in Europe since 1492* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019); Nicholas Terpstra, *Religious Refugees in the Early Modern World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
- 4 Michael Barnett, *Empire of Humanity. A History of Humanitarianism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011); Lynn Hunt, *Inventing Human Rights. A History* (New York: Norton, 2007); Fabian Klose, ed., *The Emergence of Humanitarian Intervention. Ideas and Practice from the Nineteenth Century to the Present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
- 5 Peter Gatrell, *The Making of the Modern Refugee* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
- 6 This is the working hypothesis of the project ‘The Invention of the Refugee in Early Modern Europe’, based at the University of Amsterdam and funded through a NWO-Vici grant.
- 7 Ole P. Grell, *Brethren in Christ. A Calvinist Network in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); David van der Linden, *Experiencing Exile. Huguenot Refugees in the Dutch Republic, 1680–1700* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015); Adam Teller, *Rescue the Surviving Souls. The Great Jewish Refugee Crisis of the Seventeenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020); David de Boer, *The Early Modern Dutch Press in an Age of Religious Persecution. The Making of Humanitarianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2023).
- 8 Cheryl Benard, ‘Politics and the Refugee Experience’, *Political Science Quarterly* 101, no. 4 (1986): 624.
- 9 Heiko Oberman calls the Calvinist Reformation a ‘Reformation of Refugees’; H. Oberman, ‘Europa Afflicta. The Reformation of the Refugees’, *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 83 (1992): 91–111; for exile identities see Johannes Müller, *Exile Memories and the Dutch Revolt. The Narrated Diaspora, 1550–1750* (Leiden: Brill, 2016).
- 10 Katy Gibbons, *English Catholic Exiles in Late Sixteenth-Century Paris* (London: Boydell, 2011); Judith Pollmann, *Catholic Identity and the Revolt of the Netherlands* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Geert H. Janssen, *The Dutch Revolt and Catholic Exile in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014); Liesbeth Corens, *Confessional Mobility and English Catholics in Counter-Reformation Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).
- 11 Müller, *Exile Memories*; Van der Linden, *Experiencing Exile*; Judith Pollmann, ‘Met grootvaders bloed bezegeld. Over religie en herinneringscultuur in de zeventiende-eeuwse Nederlanden’, *De Zeventiende Eeuw* 29, no. 2 (2013): 154–75.
- 12 Heiko A. Oberman, *John Calvin and the Reformation of the Refugees* (Geneva: Droz, 2009); Andrew Pettegree, *Emden and the Dutch Revolt. Exile and the Development of Reformed Protestantism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992); Menna Prestwich, ed., *International Calvinism, 1541-1715* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985); Miriam Bodian, *Hebrews of the Portuguese Nation. Conversos and Community in Early Modern Amsterdam* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997); David Graizbord, *Souls in Dispute. Converso Identities in Iberia and the Jewish Diaspora, 1580-1700* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003); Jonathan I. Israel, *Diasporas Within a Diaspora. Jews, Crypto-Jews and the World of Maritime Empires (1540–1740)* (Leiden: Brill, 2002); David B. Ruderman, *Early Modern Jewry. A New Cultural History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 23–40; Mercedes García-Arenal and Gerard Wiegers, eds, *The Expulsion of the Moriscos from Spain. A Mediterranean Diaspora* (Leiden: Brill, 2014).

- 13 Andrew Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 206–7.
- 14 Rosanne Baars, *Rumours of Revolt. Civil War and the Emergence of a Transnational News Culture in France and the Netherlands, 1561–1598* (Leiden: Brill, 2021).
- 15 Jonas van Tol, *Germany and the French Wars of Religion* (Leiden: Brill, 2018); Andrew Pettegree, *The Invention of News. How the World Came to Know About Itself* (London: Yale University Press, 2014), 145–51.
- 16 Benjamin J. Kaplan, *Divided by Faith. Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007).
- 17 Burke, *Exiles*, 2–4, 39–81; Corens, *Confessional Mobility*; Müller, *Exile Memories*, 203–5; Max Scholz, *Strange Brethren. Refugees, Religious Bonds, and Reformation in Frankfurt, 1554–1608* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2022).
- 18 Susanne Lachenicht, ‘Refugees and Refugee Protection in the Early Modern Period’, *Journal of Refugee Studies* 30, no. 2 (2017): 261–81; Benjamin Kaplan, ‘The Legal Rights of Religious Refugees in the “Refugee-Cities” of Early Modern Germany’, *Journal of Refugee Studies* 32 (2019): 86–105.
- 19 Barnett, *Empire of Humanity*; Thomas L. Haskell, ‘Capitalism and the Origins of Humanitarian Sensibility, Part 1’, *American Historical Review* 90, no. 2 (1985): 339–61; Norman S. Fiering, ‘Irresistible Compassion. An Aspect of Eighteenth-Century Sympathy and Humanitarianism’, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 37, no. 2 (1976): 195–218; Patricia Margaret Warthon, ‘The Humanitarian Movement in European History’, *Il Politico* 43, no. 4 (1983): 693–726.
- 20 But see the discussion of seventeenth-century theories of compassion in Fiering, ‘Irresistible Compassion’.
- 21 Juan Pablo Domínguez, ‘Introduction. Religious toleration in the age of Enlightenment’, *History of European Ideas* 43, no. 4 (2017): 273–87.
- 22 See for instance Warthon, ‘The Humanitarian Movement’, 695.
- 23 Michael Barnett, ‘Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and the Practices of Humanity’, *International Theory*, 315, 326; compare with David J. B. Trim and Brendan Simms, ‘Towards a History of Humanitarian Intervention’, in *Humanitarian Intervention. A History*, ed. Brendan Simms and David J. B. Trim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 4; compare with Fiering, ‘Irresistible Compassion’, 195.
- 24 Barnett, ‘Human Rights’, 326.
- 25 *Ibid.*, 336.
- 26 Responses to disasters within a state are, instead, typically covered by disaster studies. See, for instance, Hanneke van Asperen and Lotte Jensen, eds, *Dealing with Disasters from Early Modern to Modern Times. Cultural Responses to Catastrophes* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2023).
- 27 Abigail Green, ‘Humanitarianism in Nineteenth-Century Context. Religious, Gendered, National’, *The Historical Journal* 57, no. 4 (2014): 1159.
- 28 Didier Fassin, *Humanitarian Reason. A Moral History of the Present* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), 2.
- 29 De Boer, *The Early Modern Dutch Press*, 22–53. Compare David J. B. Trim, ‘If a Prince use Tyrannie towards his People. Interventions on behalf of Foreign Populations in Early Modern Europe’, in *Humanitarian Intervention. A History*, ed. Simms and Trim, 29–66; Jeremy Fradkin, ‘Christian Hospitality and the Case for Religious Refuge in Interregnum England’, *Past and Present* 254, no. 1 (2022): 51–85; Erica Boersma, ‘Supporting the Waldensians. The Politics of Transnational Aid in the Dutch Republic’, *Early Modern Low Countries* 6, no. 2 (2022): 201–32.

- 30 Charles Tilly, *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990–1990* (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1990).
- 31 Justus Nipperdey, 'Die Hugenottenaufnahme als Katalysator der Idee des Populationismus', *Francia* 40 (2013): 113–38; Ulrich Niggemann, "'Peuplierung" als merkantilistisches Instrument. Privilegierung von Einwanderern und staatlich gelenkte Ansiedlungen', in *Handbuch Staat und Migration in Deutschland seit dem 17. Jahrhundert*, ed. Jochen Oltmer (Berlin: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2015), 171–218.
- 32 Ciaran O'Scea, *Surviving Kinsale. Irish Emigration and Identity Formation in Early Modern Spain, 1601-1640* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015); Matthew Glozier, *The Huguenot Soldiers of William of Orange and the Glorious Revolution of 1688. The Lions of Judah* (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2012); Karin Schüller, *Die Beziehungen zwischen Spanien und Irland im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert. Diplomatie, Handel und die soziale Integration katholischer Exulanten* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1999).
- 33 Tijana Krstić, 'The Elusive Intermediaries. Moriscos in Ottoman and Western European Diplomatic Sources from Constantinople, 1560s-1630s', *Journal of Early Modern History* 19, nos. 2/3 (2015): 129–51.
- 34 Jonathan I. Israel, *European Jewry in the Age of Mercantilism, 1550–1750* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985); Dagmar Freist and Susanne Lachenicht, eds, *Connecting Worlds and People. Early Modern Diasporas* (London: Routledge, 2016).
- 35 Owen Stanwood, *The Global Refuge. Huguenots in an Age of Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020).
- 36 William O' Reilly, 'Working for the Crown. German Migrants and Britain's Commercial Success in the Early Eighteenth-Century American Colonies', *Journal of Modern European History* 15, no. 1 (2017): 130–56; Alison Games, *The Web of Empire. English Cosmopolitans in an Age of Expansion, 1560-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); Jelle van Lottum, *Across the North Sea. The Impact of the Dutch Republic on International Labour Migration, c. 1550-1850* (Amsterdam: Aksant, 2007); Jan Lucassen, 'Labour and Early Modern Economic Development', in *A Miracle Mirrored. The Dutch Republic in European Perspective*, ed. Karel Davids and Jan Lucassen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 367–409.

Part I

Refugees and belonging

Arguing about refugeedom

Religious mobility in Jacobean London and Counter-Reformation Rome

Diego Pirillo

On 22 August 1542 Bernardino Ochino, vicar general of the Capuchins and one of the most popular preachers of sixteenth-century Italy, wrote a long letter to his patron Vittoria Colonna, the most prominent woman writer of the time, to justify his decision to leave Italy for Northern Europe. Ochino had decided to flee in the previous weeks, after Paul III had created the congregation of the Holy Office, also known as the Roman Inquisition, to fight the spread of Protestant heresy in the Italian peninsula:

On several occasions Christ taught me to flee, as he taught in Egypt and to the Samaritans, and even Paul told me that one should move to another city when one is not welcomed where one resides. Moreover, what would I do in Italy? Preach, arousing suspicions, and preach Christ masked in jargon?¹

In defending his choice to run away from the Inquisition, Ochino was condemning Nicodemism, the widespread practice of religious simulation, which suggested avoiding persecution by conforming exteriorly to the local orthodoxy.² Ochino had practised Nicodemism for years, preaching heretical doctrines obliquely and indirectly to small and highly selective circles. Reforming the church from within, abstaining from theological controversies and preserving the unity of Christendom, were the central beliefs of the Italian spirituali, the group of reformers influenced by Juan de Valdés and Reginald Pole, which included Ochino and Colonna among its members.³

To be sure, Ochino's letter to Colonna is only the most famous record of the sixteenth-century Italian controversy over the legitimacy of flight from persecution. The refugee experience was discussed in dozens of texts, from letters to conversion narratives and theological commentaries in both Latin and the vernacular. In Geneva, Basel and London, Italian reformers such as Pietro Martire Vermigli and Niccolò Balbani invited their fellow philo-Protestants in Italy to flee, condemning the Nicodemites and reminding their readers that the only choice was between martyrdom and exile. 'Dissimulations and fakery – as Vermigli argued – must be left to the hypocrites and

actors [. . .] No one can serve him [God] and mammon at the same time nor obey two masters ordering opposite things.⁴ Many of these texts had a significant afterlife and continued to shape the identity of refugee groups throughout the early modern period, not only in Europe, but in the larger Atlantic world. While the ideas of Vermigli and Balbani were appropriated by prominent New England Puritans such as Thomas Shepard and Cotton Mather, Ochino gained new fame among ‘the eighteenth-century Commonwealthmen,’ who – as Caroline Robbins has shown – played a decisive role in ‘the ideological origins of the American Revolution’ through their belief in natural rights, limited government, republicanism, the rule of law, religious toleration and individual liberty.⁵ Indeed, in October 1763 the radical English whig Thomas Hollis, editor of Locke’s *Letter concerning Toleration*, donated Ochino’s works to Harvard, in an effort to create a ‘library of liberty,’ through which he intended to support the American colonies by promoting religious toleration and political liberalism.⁶

In the past few decades scholars have worked extensively on the religious crisis of sixteenth-century Italy, recovering in detail its geography and chronology.⁷ When Ochino left, in 1542, the most dynamic phase of the Italian Reformation was just about to start. In the 1540s and 1550s theological debates moved from elite circles to the public arena, to streets and squares, reaching merchants and artisans well beyond the aristocracy and the cultural elite. Only after the end of the Council of Trent, with the strengthening of the Roman Inquisition and the Index of Prohibited books throughout the 1570s and 1580s, did Rome bring the history of the Italian Reformation to an end. Substantial attention has been given to the lives and ideas of Italian religious refugees, who sometimes integrated into the new Protestant orthodoxies, and sometimes quarrelled harshly with them. Along with contributing to the early modern theories of religious toleration, Italian religious refugees played a major role as cultural intermediaries, disseminating the language and culture of Renaissance Italy in Europe.⁸ Moreover, while moving across religious borders, they also participated in the creation of early modern diplomacy, acting as intermediaries and facilitating cross-confessional exchanges between Protestant and Catholic states, even when formal diplomatic contacts were suspended.⁹

To be sure, Counter-Reformation Italy was not just a place of departure for religious dissidents, it was also a place of refuge for many displaced communities, who relocated or simply passed through the Italian peninsula during the early modern period. On the one hand, the absence of a unifying monarchy made it harder to enact mass expulsions as in Spain or France. On the other hand, the Papacy took an active role in managing refugee flows coming not only from Protestant lands, such as the English Catholics, but also from Catholic countries, as was the case of Sephardic Jews and Spanish Moriscos, whose presence in Italy has only recently been recovered.¹⁰ As the second part of this chapter argues, a crucial turning point in the history of Catholic policies towards refugees was the papacy of Gregory XIII (1572–1585), who sought to transform Papal Rome into a sanctuary city and a *communis patria* for its many foreign communities.¹¹ To this end Gregory XIII created a series of seminaries for Catholic refugees, such as the English College discussed below, that were intended not only to train missionaries and promote the re-Catholicization of Protestant Europe, but also to turn early modern Catholicism into a world religion.¹² The new emphasis on Roman

cosmopolitanism and on the Papacy's role in the protection of refugees was also an answer to similar claims made by secular states, from England to Venice and the Dutch Republic, that in the same period developed asylum policies and fashioned themselves as safe havens for displaced communities.¹³

In recent years scholars such as Eric Dursteler, Geert Janssen, Bruno Pomara Saverino, Vincenzo Lavenia, Liesbeth Corens and Owen Stanwood have raised new questions on the history of displaced communities and have shown how early modern Europe, once seen as a stable and cohesive society, was in fact a highly mobile world, marked by the movement of religious refugees, merchants, labour migrants, slaves, renegades, itinerant scholars and grand tourists.¹⁴ Considering the Reformation the first period in European and possibly global history in which the religious refugee became a mass phenomenon, Nicholas Terpstra has brought to light the spiritual beliefs that shaped the history of mass expulsions in Europe, where Christian societies purged their political bodies by removing or confining the religious Other.¹⁵ Yet the focus of Terpstra's authoritative study is constituted more by the ideas and the instruments of expulsion rather than by the reactions or thoughts of those who were expelled. This chapter instead recovers the agency of religious refugees and shows that they were not simply the victims of the early modern persecuting society, but that they contributed to the creation of supranational networks and diasporic identities, shaping the emergence of International Calvinism and Catholicism, or participating in the cosmopolitan world of the Republic of Letters. Focusing on 'religious mobility' rather than on 'religious exile', I challenge the victim-centred approach that has dominated research on early modern refugees and emphasize the active role played by displaced communities, tracing the ways in which they interacted with, and resisted, institutional actors.¹⁶ Despite the institutions' attempt to homogenize and enclose them, I underline the refugees' 'polyphony' and internal divisions, even on the very meaning of refugeedom, imagined now as a permanent state, now as a temporary condition, that would ultimately be overcome either by peaceful or military means.¹⁷ In so doing, I bring to light the multiplicity of refugee voices and study the various channels of communication they employed to spread their ideas and intervene in the post-Reformation public sphere.¹⁸

Italian Protestant refugees in Jacobean London

On 24 July 1550 Edward VI created the Italian Protestant church of London, granting the refugees the use of the church of Austin Friars, a former Augustinian convent situated between Broad Street and the north wall of the city, 'to practice, enjoy, use and exercise their own rites and ceremonies, and their own ecclesiastical discipline, notwithstanding that they do not conform with the rites and ceremonies used in our Kingdom, without impeachment, disturbance or vexation.'¹⁹ Although it has attracted less attention than its Dutch and French counterparts, the early history of the Italian Protestant church of London is known through the sixteenth-century minutes that cover the period between 1570 and 1591.²⁰ Its seventeenth-century history, however, is still largely unexplored, due to the shortage and fragmentary

nature of the sources.²¹ And yet, the movement of refugees between Italy and England did not end with the Tudors. On the contrary, during the controversy with Rome, caused by the Gunpowder Plot and the oath of allegiance, James I offered protection to several anti-Roman Italian writers, including Paolo Sarpi, 'the great unmasker of the Trentine Council', who, however, declined the English king's invitation and never left Venice. In this section I focus on one episode from the 1610s and 1620s whose main protagonists were Marco Antonio de Dominis, the Archbishop of Split who fled to London and joined the Church of England before converting back to Catholicism a few years later, and Cesar Calandrini, the minister of the Italian Protestant church, whose family had migrated from Lucca in Tuscany to Northern Europe thus creating a vast Calvinist network. The case is especially interesting as the dispute between De Dominis and Caladrini was not confined to the small Italian Protestant community in London but attained a wide international echo and coincided with the rupture between Arminians and Gomarists at the Synod of Dort in 1618–19.

In 1616 the royal printer John Bill published a manifesto in London, in both Latin and English, in which De Dominis, who had just arrived in England in December of that year, explained the reasons that had convinced him to leave his 'owne Country, and passe into another.'²² To justify his conversion, De Dominis traced his intellectual and spiritual autobiography, from his youth, when he studied at the Jesuit college in Padua, to his appointment as Archbishop of Split, a Venetian colony in the Adriatic since the fifteenth century. As he pointed out, leaving Venice and the Roman Church was not a sudden decision but was in fact the result of 'ten yeeres deliberation at the least.'²³ The turning point was constituted by the Venetian Interdict of 1606/07, when Pope Paul V excommunicated the doge and the Senate and prohibited Catholic services in Venetian territory. On that occasion, De Dominis explained, his eyes were opened, and he saw 'the infamous corruptions of the Court of Rome, wholly degenerated into a temporall Monarchie.'²⁴ Together with Sarpi, the theological adviser of the Republic, De Dominis took an active role in the war of words that erupted between Venice and Rome and wrote several pamphlets denouncing the temporal power of the church and confronting the ideas of cardinals Bellarmine and Baronius directly.²⁵

The fame De Dominis gained in this period as an anti-Roman polemicist drew him close to the English embassy in Venice, which had protected religious dissidents throughout the Interdict and beyond, often facilitating their flight from Italy. In 1614 De Dominis corresponded with the English ambassador Dudley Carleton, expressing his desire to find 'refuge in a safe house' under King James.²⁶ In September 1616, having been offered a generous pension by the English king and the Archbishop of Canterbury George Abbot, De Dominis finally left for England, where he arrived after three months of travel through Switzerland, the Rhineland and the Netherlands.²⁷ That November the Inquisition in Venice opened a procedure against him and searched the books he had left behind, finding among many other texts also James I's *Apology for the Oath of Allegiance*.²⁸ The fact that a Catholic archbishop had abandoned his post to become the client of a Protestant king caused a stir throughout Europe and in 1617 the English Jesuits John Floyd and John Sweet published rejoinders accusing De Dominis of seeking nothing but material gains.²⁹

Shortly after his arrival in England, his patrons appointed De Dominis dean of the Chapel Royal at Windsor and master of the Savoy, the hospital with chapel attached, in London. James had decided to recruit the Italian archbishop and to use him to bring forward his plan to reform Christianity.³⁰ He intended on the one hand to rebut Papal Rome and on the other hand to promote a reconciliation among the various churches. Initially, De Dominis did not disappoint the English king and repaid his favour working intensively on several projects. He edited Sarpi's *Historia del concilio tridentino*, translated Francis Bacon's *Essays* into Italian, and dedicated to James the *De republica ecclesiastica*, a massive treaty in folio, in which he challenged the theories of papal power by Bellarmine, Baronius and Suarez while developing his own ecumenical ideas on how to reunite Christianity.³¹ The *De republica ecclesiastica* was well received by James and circulated widely throughout the Republic of Letters, reaching readers such as Grotius, Hobbes and Leibniz, among others.

The arrival in England of an illustrious refugee such as De Dominis also gave a new impulse to the reconstruction of the Italian Protestant community in London. Having been closed in 1598 because of its declining membership, the Italian church was reopened by James in 1609.³² Preaching there on 30 November 1617, the first Sunday in Advent, De Dominis insisted on the same points he had discussed in the *De republica ecclesiastica*. He blamed the Papacy for having disregarded the Scriptures and the first four general councils, but at the same time argued that in quarrelling with each other Catholics and Protestants had forgotten the common religious ground that united them. Focusing on the *fundamentalia fidei* rather than on controversial doctrines that were not essential for salvation would enable them to reconcile their differences and to reunite the church: 'I would faine set you right my Auditors, in a great, and very common mistake, if so bee that yee thinke the Reformed Religion to bee another Religion wholly differing from the Romane. The Religion of both is in the main essentials and fundamentals the very same.'³³ In the following pages De Dominis employed the image of the church as *navicula Petri* to outline his ecumenical plan, explaining how a religious unification among the confessions could be reached by reforming and limiting the unrestrained authority of the papacy.³⁴

In the following years De Dominis delivered other sermons at the Italian Protestant church. Indeed, as he had argued in his manifesto, he regarded preaching as especially important in the relationship between the pastor and his community, viewing it as 'an inseparable part of the duty of the bishop'.³⁵ As has been noted, the sermon was the main vehicle for spreading religious dissent in sixteenth-century Italy, and between the 1540s and 1560s it succeeded in creating dozens of conventicles in the main urban centres throughout central and northern Italy.³⁶ Sermons played a crucial role also during the Interdict, and were employed by both sides in the confrontations between Venice and Rome, including De Dominis and other theologians close to Sarpi's party, who used them to attack the Papacy.³⁷

In 1617 De Dominis's sermons began to appear in print in London in editions published by the royal printer John Bill in both Italian and English translation.³⁸ Between 1618 and 1619 other translations in Latin, German and French appeared on the Continent. The sensation De Dominis's sermons caused in England and Europe is confirmed by the echo they had in contemporary diplomatic correspondence. While

in the Dutch Republic Carleton received news of the Italian archbishop's preaching skills, and in June 1618 the papal nunzio in Paris Guido Bentivoglio warned Cardinal Scipione Borghese that De Dominis's Italian sermons circulated in France.³⁹ Venice continued to keep a close eye on the former Archbishop of Split. Shortly after De Dominis had delivered his sermons, the Venetian ambassador in England, Pietro Contarini informed his government about the large audience that had listened to De Dominis's sermon against the Roman church.⁴⁰ In 1621, the chaplain of the Venetian embassy in London, Alessandro Gatti, denounced De Dominis to the Venetian Inquisition, saying that he had preached against Purgatory and the primacy of Peter.⁴¹

Despite the great interest De Dominis's sermons aroused, not everyone at the Italian Protestant church was ready to embrace his ecumenical plans regarding the reunification of Christianity. Indeed, the Italian archbishop quickly came into conflict with Cesar Calandrini, the young Calvinist minister of the church. Calandrini belonged to an influential merchant family from Lucca, a city which in the early 1540s under the leadership of Pietro Martire Vermigli had hosted 'the first and last Protestant theological college' of early modern Italy, at the convent of San Frediano.⁴² Having embraced the Reformation, the Calandrini soon decided that migration was the only way they had to preserve their faith. As Ole Peter Grell has shown, they relocated to Northern Europe together with several other prominent families from Lucca, such as the Diodati, Balbani, Burlamacchi and Turretini, creating a vast Calvinist network that spanned throughout England, France, Switzerland and the Netherlands.⁴³ The majority of the Lucchese refugees continued to be active in trade, but several of them made a career in the Calvinist church, such as Niccolò Balbani, minister of the Italian Protestant church in Geneva, or Giovanni Diodati, professor of theology in Geneva and famous for his translation of the Bible.

Born in Stade in 1595, Calandrini was the first of his family to be chosen for an ecclesiastical and scholarly career. As a student he moved between several different institutions, including Geneva, Oxford, Saumur, as well as the university of Leiden, where he matriculated in theology in November 1616. The following year Calandrini became a trainee minister in the French church in London and in March 1618 he was ordained by the coetus, the joint body of ministers from the Dutch and French churches. Initially he was on good terms with De Dominis, which facilitated his appointment as minister of the Italian Protestant church. However, their relationship soon deteriorated and brought to light the hard divisions among the Italian refugees. While the Italian church in London always struggled to reconcile the Calvinist majority with the radical wing, now the tensions were exacerbated by the Synod of Dort. Although he did not attend the Synod, De Dominis had an intense correspondence with Hugo Grotius, one of the leaders of the Arminian party, and sent copies of the *De republica ecclesiastica* to Carleton, Maurice of Orange and the States General in August 1617, inviting them to peacefully resolve the religious divisions among the Protestant factions.⁴⁴ Calandrini, on the contrary, was present at Dort and sided with the Gomarists, speaking very violently against the Arminians. In 1619, informing his friend Constantine Huygens about the Synod, Calandrini argued that the Arminians 'seem to have appropriated all the tricks of the Jesuits, especially Episcopius', concluding that there was no other option but to 'cast [them] out'.⁴⁵

Once on good terms, De Dominis and Calandrini now found themselves on opposite sides and entered into a bitter dispute. De Dominis even tried to revoke Calandrini's ordination by the Strangers' church, but in the end his efforts came to nothing. He complained to James I and accused Calandrini of being a dangerous Puritan ('totus Genevensis'), an opinion later confirmed also by Anthony Wood, who referred to Calandrini as a 'puritanical theologian'. These attacks did not hinder the career of Calandrini, who became rector of Stapleford Abbots in Essex and later minister to the Dutch church in London. While Calandrini rose in the ranks of International Calvinism, De Dominis's stay in England soon came to an end. Disappointed by his patrons, many of whom – such as Carleton and Abbot – sided with the Gomarists at Dort, the Italian archbishop left England in spring 1622, with the help of the Spanish ambassador, and reconciled himself with the Catholic Church. His good relationship with pope Gregory XV convinced him to move back to Rome. Having arrived there in November 1622 to publicly abjure the works he had written against the Papacy, De Dominis was however arrested by the Inquisition. He died in prison in Castel Sant'Angelo the following year. His death did not stop the inquisitorial trial, which continued until December 1624, decreeing that De Dominis had died as a relapsed heretic. As a result, his body and his books were burned at Campo dei Fiori. In the same years De Dominis was also the victim of harsh recriminations by his former English patrons and his story was used to voice anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish sentiments. Thomas Middleton's play of 1624 *A Game of Chess* represented De Dominis as a fat bishop, worldly, proud and gullible, who fell victim to the machinations of the black knight (the Spanish ambassador Gondomar) to return him to the kingdom of darkness.⁴⁶

The dispute between De Dominis and Calandrini sheds light on the 'polyphony' that characterized refugee communities during the early modern period. While the Strangers' church in London was created by the English monarchy to govern the refugee flows coming from Catholic Europe, granting them independence from the Church of England while also imposing on them a common discipline, the Italian Protestant church turned out to be a site of tension rather than harmony. Throughout its history, the Calvinist ministers of the church struggled to contain the radical wing of the Italian philo-Protestants who saw the Reformation in a very different light. On the one hand, there were figures like Calandrini, who, despite his Italian origin, had fewer and fewer exchanges with Italy and was more at ease with the circles of international Calvinism. His position at Dort against the Arminians suggests that in the early modern period the drive to purge and purify the *Corpus Christianum* was adopted not only by states and churches, as Nicholas Terpstra has shown, but by refugees as well, in an attempt to set clear boundaries for their diasporic communities.⁴⁷ On the other hand, there were radical and utopian reformers, such as De Dominis, who believed that a reconciliation among the Christian churches was still within reach and who did not hesitate to return to Italy to persuade the Papacy to pursue his ecumenical plans. To be sure, despite his failure, De Dominis was not an isolated visionary. He belonged to an old prophetic tradition that envisioned the reunification of Christianity and that continued to flourish in the age of the Republic of Letters. During the early modern period similar tensions also shook other refugee communities, such as the English Catholics in Rome.

English Catholic refugees in Counter-Reformation Rome

Visiting Rome in 1580, a place that he considered the ‘most cosmopolitan city of the world [. . .] where strangeness and differences of nationality are considered least’, Michel de Montaigne noted that pope Gregory XIII had transformed the city into a sanctuary site for Catholic refugees, building colleges for all ‘the children of those nations, corrupted by evil opinions against the Church’, where ‘the boys are lodged, fed, dressed, instructed, and provided with everything, without one *quattrino* of their own.’⁴⁸ While the age of the Grand Tour would turn Papal Rome into a place of conversion for non-Catholic visitors, the missionary impulse of the Counter-Reformation created a new network of seminaries that trained Catholic priests and promoted the re-Catholicization of Protestant Europe.⁴⁹ Among them the English College, which opened in 1576 and was licensed by Gregory XIII’s bull on 1 May 1579 so that ‘the young men who had fled hither from that wretched Kingdom, and have been led by the Holy Spirit to abandon their country, their families and their possessions’ could be ‘instructed in the Catholic religion in which they were born’ not only for their own salvation but also ‘to return to England to enlighten others who had fallen away from the way of truth.’⁵⁰

Situated in Via di Monserrato next to Piazza Farnese, the English College replaced the ancient English Hospice that had housed merchants, artisans, sailors, clergymen and pilgrims since the years of the Western Schism.⁵¹ It joined the other English colleges that were created during the 1560s and 1570s in the Spanish Low Countries and in France under the guidance of William Allen, the leader of English Catholicism during the Elizabethan period. At the end of the sixteenth century other colleges appeared in Valladolid and Seville.⁵² As has been noted, English Colleges fostered among English Catholics a diasporic and cosmopolitan identity and ‘occupied a unique position as extranational institutions attempting to intervene in English political life and the public sphere.’⁵³ They offered seminarists a course of study based on the latest trends of Catholic humanism and required students to master theology and philosophy, as well as Latin, Greek and Hebrew.⁵⁴ Looking closely at the curriculum taught in Jesuit colleges, Allen introduced among the students and teachers Ignatius of Loyola’s *Spiritual Exercises* ‘in order to the perfect examination of our consciences’ and to ‘choose a holier state of life.’⁵⁵ In addition, he promoted the use of Catholic vernacular bibles to rebut Protestant opponents. To this end, Allen supported the work of Gregory Martin, who while in Rome as chaplain of the English College, completed his famous English translation of the New Testament, which appeared in Rheims in 1582.⁵⁶

In the early 1580s, the international controversy caused by the English mission led by the Jesuits Robert Persons and Edmund Campion – the latter executed for treason in December 1581 – forced Allen to intervene in order to defend the English College network from the suspicions of the Elizabethan government, that regarded them as sites of seditious political activity. According to the papal nunzio in Paris Giovanni Battista Castelli, Elizabeth feared the English College in Rheims more than France or Spain.⁵⁷ Indeed, between 1580 and 1582, the English government issued a series of royal proclamations, intending to regulate the status of English Catholics abroad. While taking a hard line against those ‘rebels and traitors’ who ‘live in foreign parts’

only to conspire against the monarchy, the English government offered a chance of reconciliation to everyone else, recalling home those who were not politically active and who had left simply for religious reasons, who 'refusing to live here in their natural country. . . have wandered from place to place, and from one prince's court to another.'⁵⁸ The same position was restated in 1583 by Sir William Cecil, Elizabeth's secretary of state, in *The Execution of Justice in England for the maintenance of publique and Christian peace*, a text immediately translated into Dutch, French, Italian and Spanish as part of a concerted plan of propaganda intended to reach both the English and the Continental audience.⁵⁹ As is well known, Cecil argued that the Elizabethan government did not persecute Catholic subjects for their religious beliefs but only responded to direct political threats. In this way *The Execution of Justice* extended an olive branch to Catholic loyalists, offering them the possibility to coexist with the Protestant state once they had rejected the English Jesuits' seditious plans.

Allen's response did not take long to appear and in the early 1580s he published several works to rebut Cecil. He understood clearly that with those measures – repressing political dissent while offering toleration to all Catholic subjects who would return home and remain loyal to the Queen – the English government was trying to dismantle the English College network he had created. In the *Apologie and true declaration of the institution and endeavours of the two English colleges, the one in Rome the other now resident in Rhemes*, published in Reims in 1581, he defended the English seminaries from the accusation of fostering political radicalism, arguing that Catholics abroad were not 'fugitives', and had not fled 'for any crime or disloyalties done against the Prince or Commonwealth', but exclusively for 'matters incident to Religion' and because the rigorous education they sought was available neither at Oxford nor at Cambridge.⁶⁰ Yet, delineating a clear distinction between religion and politics – as Allen did in the *Apologie* – was highly problematic in post-Reformation England, when the contours between ecclesiastical and secular powers were constantly being redesigned, especially after Pius V had excommunicated Elizabeth in February 1570.⁶¹ Moreover, in stating that Catholic refugees had no political agenda but left only for religious reasons, Allen was not saying the whole truth. As his correspondence reveals, during the 1570s and 1580s he passionately campaigned for a pan-European 'holy crusade' against Protestantism, mobilizing a vast Catholic diplomatic network that spanned throughout Papal Rome, Spain and the Guise in France.⁶² Indeed, Allen's appointment as cardinal of England in 1587 was universally understood as the sign of the imminence of the Spanish Armada.⁶³

Along with defending the English seminarists from the accusation of conspiring against their sovereign, Allen also reaffirmed that leaving one's country for religious reasons was a legitimate choice. While the Elizabethan government was inviting the English Catholics on the Continent to return home, he reminded them that when facing an intolerant regime there was no other option but 'to seeke for succour at such Prelates and Princes hands', explaining that 'the curtesie and custom of al Kings and nations' inclined 'them to the favour, helpe and protection of strangers and desolate persons'.⁶⁴ And where should English Catholics go – Allen asked his readers – if not to Rome, that since antiquity had been a place of refuge for persecuted Christians? Drawing on Jerome's Letters, Allen presented the eternal city as 'the most secure port

of our Catholick Communion [. . .] the rocke of refuge' in the stormy waters of post-Reformation Europe.⁶⁵ In this respect, the foundation of the English College in Rome was presented by Allen only as the most recent chapter in the long history of Catholic cosmopolitanism and papal hospitality towards strangers. By reviving this tradition and by establishing seminaries for foreigners, Gregory XIII had turned Rome into a sanctuary city, where, according to Allen, English Catholicism could survive despite the persecutions it suffered from the Elizabethan regime. The power to grant asylum to refugees was thus another sign of the superiority of papal authority over that of secular rulers, a principle that Allen invoked repeatedly in the *Apologie*, in an effort to defend the English College network in response to his Protestant opponents.

Although Allen made great efforts to unify the various components of English Catholicism, he could not prevent the emergence of harsh controversies, that shook the English College in Rome from its foundation and inflamed the tensions between regular and secular clergy. More precisely, tensions came to a head between the Jesuits, who took control of the College in 1579, and the less studied anti-Jesuit faction that emerged in response during the same years. That the relations between the Jesuits and the English Catholic clergy had not always been smooth was already clear during the Catholic restoration under Mary Tudor. Having been contacted in January 1555 by Ignatius of Loyola, who suggested creating Jesuit colleges in England, Cardinal Reginald Pole, papal legate in charge of the restoration, politely declined the offer. Many factors came into play. Pole feared the Jesuits' connections with Spain and distrusted their independence from the hierarchy that he intended to reinstate. As has been suggested, while in England Pole 'sought to re-establish the former grandeur of Catholicism' and did not see any place for 'new religious orders which were not part of the religious tradition that had been disrupted by Henry VIII and were now so conscientiously being re-established by his daughter'.⁶⁶ In the 1580s, in the wake of the dispute caused by Persons' and Campion's English mission, the conflict exploded anew, as the rise of the Jesuits challenged the model of the Marian church, opening a dispute on the very identity of English Catholicism, more and more divided not only between recusancy and conformity, but also between different ideas of church reform.

The English College in Rome was rife with tensions from its very foundation. Indeed, early in 1579 a harsh confrontation erupted between the English students and the Welsh leaders of the college, the rector Morys Clynog and his associate Owen Lewis, the future bishop of Cassano, who had both played a crucial role in the recent transformation of the English Hospice into a seminary. Both educated at Oxford, Clynog and Lewis had distinguished careers before moving to Rome. Clynog lectured civil law in various colleges before becoming secretary of Cardinal Pole, while Lewis taught canon law at Douai.⁶⁷ After moving to Rome they soon became prominent figures in the English community. Thanks to their scholarly merits and to their capacity to navigate the papal curia, they won the favour of the Cardinal Protector of England, Giovanni Morone, who appointed them to the head of the English College. However, the position they secured did not last for long and in January 1579 their leadership was openly challenged by the English students. In a memorial sent to Morone, the students lamented that while they had come to Rome to be trained and sent back to England to fight heresy, Clynog and Lewis intended, in fact, simply to enjoy the comfort of

seminary life in Italy.⁶⁸ They also noted that the tension between the English and the Welsh faction could be regulated only by appointing an independent mediator.⁶⁹ This marked the beginning of a war of words between the two parties that culminated in the English students' rebellion against their Welsh superiors during Lent of that year. While Morone tried to defend his Welsh protégés, in the end he could not help them. By the end of the year the Jesuits had taken control of the English College, while Clynogg had been stripped of his rectorship and Lewis had moved to Milan to work with Cardinal Carlo Borromeo.⁷⁰

The controversy is well known not only through the many memorials written by the two factions but also by the reports by Protestant observers, such as Anthony Munday's *The English Romayne Lyfe*, published in London in 1582.⁷¹ According to Munday, who visited the English College in Rome in 1579 presumably as a spy of the Elizabethan government, the main reason of the conflict was the fact that Clynogg and Lewis favoured the Welsh over the English students. Surely the uneasy relationship between the Welsh and the English contributed to raise tensions. When the papal secretary Cardinal Como minimized the incident arguing that it was nothing more than a dispute 'betwixt two divers provinces of *Tuscany* and *Romagna*', Sir Richard Shelley, prior of the hospital of St. John of Jerusalem in England, answered that 'the difference was rather as betwene the Moores and the Castilians, applying the Moore to the Welchmen'.⁷²

And yet, along with the cultural antagonism between English and Welsh, the episode brings to light the divisions that existed within the Catholic refugee community in Rome. While the English students embraced the missionary spirit of the Counter-Reformation and regarded the College as a place to train priests for the English mission, Clynogg and Lewis believed that their role was to prepare men to occupy benefices on the continent while waiting for the return of England to Catholicism.⁷³ Moreover, the fact that right after the incident Owen Lewis moved to Milan to become the vicar general of Cardinal Borromeo – whom several other English anti-Jesuits claimed to take as their mentor – confirms that the clash between English and Welsh was grounded in two opposite views of early modern Catholicism. As John Bossy argued, 'the Borromeian tradition stood for the inviolability of established hierarchies, the supremacy of bishops and the rights of the secular priesthood; while prepared to use the Jesuits in their place, it was extremely hostile to institutional and other experiences associated with them, and determined to resist the extension of their influence in the Church as a whole'.⁷⁴ Indeed, Borromeo's strained relations with the Jesuits reached their height in 1579, when he removed them from the seminaries in Milan. This precedent was cited twenty years later by John Mush, one of the leaders of the student revolt at the English College in Rome, who was appointed deacon of chapel at the college in 1581 and was then sent to England on the mission. Siding with the anti-Jesuit faction and defending the secular clergy, Mush suggested limiting the influence of the Jesuits as Borromeo had done in Milan, showing that 'yt was more necessarie for Godes Church to have learned pastoures then learned religiouse men'.⁷⁵

Although the Society of Jesus took control of the English College, its influence did not go unchallenged and, even after the removal of Clynogg and Lewis, the Jesuits had to face the opposition of many former students. As Alexandra Walsham has shown, at

the end of the sixteenth century the Jesuits' uncompromising recusancy found one of its fiercest critics in Thomas Bell, who entered the English College in Rome in 1579, before being sent to England on the mission in 1582, where he worked intensely for years until he recanted in 1593, becoming an anti-Catholic polemicist.⁷⁶ During the 1580s and early 1590s, Bell's influential defence of occasional conformity alarmed his fellow missionaries to the point that in December 1592 Allen denounced his teachings in a letter to English Catholics.⁷⁷ In sum, the turbulent foundation of the English College in Rome can be regarded as a microcosm of broader tensions that run through early modern Catholicism, such as the dispute over recusancy and conformity, or the controversy between the secular clergy, that saw the revival of episcopacy as the key to Catholic renewal, and the members of religious orders like the Jesuits, whose activities cut across parochial boundaries and diocesan structures.⁷⁸

Conclusion

The disputes that erupted at the Italian Protestant church in London and at the English College in Rome during the late sixteenth and the early seventeenth centuries bring to light the intense polyphony that marked displaced communities in the early modern period. Scholars have studied the divisions and internal competition among modern refugee groups, suggesting avoiding the search for unity, and to acknowledge instead the clashes, created by power and gender relations as well as by cultural and social hierarchies, that fractured refugees.⁷⁹ The same was true in post-Reformation Europe, despite the fact that confessional churches made every effort to impose unity and conformity. Both Catholic and Protestant refugees strongly disagreed on many decisive issues. They debated how to organize and coordinate themselves abroad, whether it was preferable to flee or rather to occasionally conform, whether to mark a clear demarcation between confessions or rather to facilitate their reunion, ultimately disagreeing on the very meaning of refugeedom, considered by some a permanent move and by others just a temporary state, that would eventually be overcome by the settling of religious disputes. Places of refuge were the forums for such debates, where different views were imagined and considered and where different factions competed for leadership. Given the fluid and loose structure of displaced communities, the balance of power among refugee groups was often unstable and precarious. Although the Italian Protestant church in London followed the Calvinist discipline and had close ties with Geneva, the anti-Calvinist and Arminian faction repeatedly challenged the orthodoxy and, in some instances, as the case of De Dominis suggests, even emerged as the leading voice, gaining the support of secular and religious authorities. Similarly, even though the Society of Jesus quickly took control of the English College in Rome, the anti-Jesuit faction was never silenced and continued to contest hard-line recusancy, arguing in favour of conformity while also defending the secular clergy and the role of the episcopate as an instrument of church reform.

Analyzing the debates that divided displaced communities from within also allows for the tracing of the different channels of communication that refugees employed to voice and circulate their ideas. De Dominis's communicative strategies during his years

in London are a case in point. On the one hand, by publishing his *De republica ecclesiastica* and editing Sarpi's *Historia del concilio tridentino*, he engaged with the learned audience of the Republic of Letters, that included not only Grotius and Bellarmine but also his patron James I. Scholarly and diplomatic channels often overlapped and in circulating his works De Dominis carefully cultivated his relationship with European diplomatic networks in an effort to influence contemporary events, such as the Synod of Dort. On the other hand, De Dominis never confined himself exclusively to the intellectual and political elite but, through his sermons and Italian publications, he made efforts to also reach a vernacular audience in London and on the Continent. Preaching at the Italian Protestant church in London he reduced his thought to the essence, making his ideas on the reunion of Christendom available to a larger audience that was not familiar with Latin theological treatises. This confirms the importance of orality and preaching in post-Reformation Europe that recent scholarship has emphasized.⁸⁰ Moreover, the publication and circulation of the sermons suggests that they were directed also to an Italian audience on the Continent. Indeed, anonymous vernacular publications, such as De Dominis's *Scogli del christiano naufragio* which appeared in London in 1618 with no mention of the author or place of publication, had long been employed by Italian philo-Protestants to circumvent censorship and to reach readers in Italy.

In addition, while an old historiographical tradition has downplayed the history of the Catholic book, identifying print with Protestantism, the many editorial activities of English Catholic refugees suggest otherwise.⁸¹ Allen's leading role within English Catholicism was exercised first and foremost through his pen and publications, directed not only against Protestant opponents, such as John Jewel and William Cecil, but also at fellow English Catholics, in order to guide and bring them into line. Moreover, Allen's support of the Douay-Rheims Bible confirms his appreciation of both the vernacular and the printed book as tools to foster and unify the English Catholic community. On the other hand, the divisions within the English College in Rome produced a war of words that continued for years. Bell's use of scribal culture to defend occasional conformity and the Jesuits' responses against him, often published at clandestine presses, further bring to light the different modes of communication that English Catholic refugees employed while arguing among themselves and contributing to the rise of the post-Reformation 'public sphere'.

Finally, considering the polyphony within early modern displaced communities, both Catholic and Protestant, and the different media through which they circulated their ideas, has the potential to offer historical insight into the contemporary debate on refugee law. As legal scholars have pointed out, the increasing securitization of asylum policies risks stripping away rights from refugees, reducing them to mere recipients of aid from states, to be confined to camps and detention centres.⁸² Against policymakers' lack of interest in the migrations of the past, refugee scholars have emphasized how it is in fact essential to clarify 'how today's movements are related to those of the past: how institutional actors responded to people displaced in earlier migration crises, how discourses of the refugee have emerged and how they have shaped policies for refugees and asylum.'⁸³ Indeed, tracing the long history of religious migrations shows how in the early modern period, when expulsions became a mass phenomenon in the wake of the Reformation, refugees were able to resist, and interact with, institutional actors,

reclaiming their role as ‘political subjects’ and thus shaping the international debate on the very meaning of refugeedom.

Notes

- 1 Bernardino Ochino to Vittoria Colonna (22 August 1542), in Bernardino Ochino, *I ‘dialogi’ sette e altri scritti del tempo della fuga*, ed. Ugo Rozzo (Turin: Claudiana, 1985), 123–4.
- 2 See, also for further bibliography, M. Anne Overell, *Nicodemites: Faith and Concealment Between Italy and Tudor England* (Leiden: Brill, 2018).
- 3 Massimo Firpo, *Juan de Valdés and the Italian Reformation* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015).
- 4 Pietro Martire Vermigli, *Loci communes* (London: Thomas Vautrollier, 1583), 1084–5, English translation by John Patrick Donnelly in Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Life, Letters, and Sermons*, vol. 5 (Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies, 1999), 95.
- 5 Caroline Robbins, *The Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthman. Studies in the Transmission, Development and Circumstance of English Liberal Thought from the Restoration of Charles II until the War with the Thirteen Colonies* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959).
- 6 Harvard University Archives, III, 50.27.61, box 1, folder 1.
- 7 See Silvana Seidel Menchi, ‘Italy’, in *The Reformation in National Context*, ed. Robert Scribner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 181–201, and more recently Firpo, *Juan de Valdés and the Italian Reformation*.
- 8 John Tedeschi, *The Italian Reformation of the Sixteenth Century and the Diffusion of Renaissance Culture: A Bibliography of the Secondary Literature (Ca. 1750-1997)*, (Ferrara: Panini, 2000).
- 9 Diego Pirillo, *The Refugee-Diplomat. Venice, England and the Reformation* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2018).
- 10 See Vincenzo Lavenia, ‘Rifugiati’, in *Storia mondiale dell’Italia*, ed. Andrea Giardina (Rome-Bari: Laterza, 2017), 390–4, Giovanna Fiume and Stefania Pastore, eds, ‘Diaspora morisca’, special issue of *Quaderni storici* 48, no. 144 (2013).
- 11 Susanne Kubersky Piredda, ed., ‘*Roma communis patria. Comunità straniere nella Roma di Gregorio XIII*’, *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana* 42 (2018): 383–481. See, more broadly, Irene Fosi, *Convertire lo straniero. Forestieri e inquisizione a Roma in età moderna* (Rome: Viella, 2011).
- 12 Simon Ditchfield, ‘The “Making” of Roman Catholicism as a “World Religion”’, in *Multiple Modernities? Confessional Cultures and the Many Legacies of the Reformation Age*, ed. J. Stievermann and R. Zachman (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck GmbH Company KG, 2018), 189–203.
- 13 Geert H. Janssen, ‘The Republic of the Refugees: Early Modern Migrations and the Dutch Experience’, *The Historical Journal* 60, no. 1 (2017): 233–52.
- 14 Eric Dursteler, *Renegade Women: Gender, Identity, and Boundaries in the Early Modern Mediterranean* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011), Geert H. Janssen, *The Dutch Revolt and Catholic Exile in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), Bruno Pomara Saverino, *Rifugiati. I moriscos e l’Italia* (Florence: Florence University Press 2017), Cornel Zwierlein and Vincenzo Lavenia, eds, *Fruits of Migration: Heterodox Italian Migrants and Central European Culture 1550–1620* (Leiden: Brill, 2018), Liesbeth Corens, *Confessional Mobility and*

- English Catholics in Counter-Reformation Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), Owen Stanwood, *The Global Refuge. Huguenots in an Age of Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020).
- 15 Nicholas Terpstra, *Religious Refugees in the Early Modern World: An Alternative History of the Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
 - 16 For a similar point see Corens, *Confessional Mobility*.
 - 17 See Peter Gatrell, Anindita Ghoshal, Katarzyna Nowak and Alex Dowdall, 'Reckoning with Refugeedom: Refugee Voices in Modern History', *Social History* 46 (2021): 70–95. See also Stéphane Dufoix, *Politiques d'exil. Hongrois, Polonais et Tchécoslovaques en France après 1945* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2002).
 - 18 Peter Lake and Steven Pincus, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England', *Journal of British Studies* 2 (2006): 270–92.
 - 19 Johannes Lindeboom, *Austin Friars: History of the Dutch Reformed Church in London 1550–1950* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1950), 198–203. See also Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), and Silke Muylaert, *Shaping the Stranger Churches: Migrants in England and the Troubles in the Netherlands, 1547–1585* (Leiden: Brill, 2020).
 - 20 O. Boersma and A. J. Jelsma, eds, *Unity in Multiformity. The Minutes of the Coetus of London, 1575 and the Consistory Minutes of the Italian Church of London, 1570–1591* (London: Publications of the Huguenot Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 1997).
 - 21 See Stefano Villani, 'The Italian Protestant Church of London in the Seventeenth Century', in *Exiles, Emigrés and Intermediaries Anglo-Italian Cultural Transactions*, ed. Barbara Schaff (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2010), 217–36, and 'La chiesa protestante italiana di Londra nel Seicento', in *Tramiti. Figure della mediazione culturale nella prima età moderna*, ed. Maria Antonietta Visceglia, Elena Valeri and Paola Volpini (Milan: Viella, 2015), 263–85.
 - 22 Marco Antonio De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives, Whereupon the most Reverend Father, Marcus Antonius De Dominis, Archbishop of Spalato (in the Territorie of Venice) Undertook His Departure Thence* (London: John Bill, 1616), 3. On De Dominis see Noel Malcolm, *De Dominis (1560-1624): Venetian, Anglican, Ecumenist and Relapsed Heretic* (London: Strickland and Scott, 1984), Silvano Cavazza, 'De Dominis, Marcantonio', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 33 (1987): 642–50, W. B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 220–59, Eleonora Belligni, *Auctoritas e potestas. Marcantonio De Dominis fra l'inquisizione e Giacomo I* (Milan: Franco Angeli, 2003).
 - 23 De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, 1.
 - 24 *Ibid.*, 19–20.
 - 25 On the Interdict see Filippo De Vivo, *Information and Communication in Venice: Rethinking Early Modern Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
 - 26 London, National Archives, SP 99/17, fol. 72. See Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*, 228–32.
 - 27 Cavazza, 'De Dominis, Marcantonio'.
 - 28 Archivio di Stato, Venezia, *Fondo Sant'Uffizio*, b. 71.
 - 29 John Floyd, *A Survey of the Apostasy of Marcus Antonius de Dominis, Sometime Archbishop of Spalato* (Saint-Omer: English College Press, 1617); John Sweet, *Monsignor Fate'Voi. Or: A Discovery of the Dalmatian Apostata, M Antonius de Dominis* (Saint-Omer: English College Press, 1617).
 - 30 Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*.

- 31 Marco Antonio De Dominis, *De republica ecclesiastica libri x* (London: John Bill, 1617).
- 32 Villani, 'The Italian Protestant Church of London in the Seventeenth Century.'
- 33 Marco Antonio De Dominis, *A Sermon Preached in Italian. . . in Mercers Chappel in London, to the Italians in that City* (London: John Bill, 1617), 30–1. The Italian text was printed in the same year: De Dominis, *Predica fatta da Monsr. Marc'Antonio De Dominis, Archiv'. di Spalato, la prima domenica dell'Auuento quest'Anno 1617. in Londra, nella Capella detta delli Merciarì (chè la chiesa degl'italiani) ad essa nazione italiana* (London: John Bill, 1617).
- 34 De Dominis, *A Sermon Preached in Italian*, 33–6. Cfr. *Predica fatta da Monsr. Marc'Antonio De Dominis*, 33–7.
- 35 De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, 15.
- 36 Seidel Menchi, 'Italy', and Giorgio Caravale, *Preaching and Inquisition in Renaissance Italy: Words on Trial* (Leiden: Brill, 2016).
- 37 De Vivo, *Information and Communication in Venice*, 187–9.
- 38 De Dominis, *Predica fatta da Monsr. Marc'Antonio De Dominis*; De Dominis, *A Sermon Preached in Italian*; the texts of other sermons appeared in print in *Scogli del christiano naufragio* (London: John Bill, 1618), translated into English: *The Rockes of Christian Shipwracke* (London: John Bill, 1618).
- 39 Patterson, *King James and I and the Reunion of Christendom*, 233; Luigi de Steffani, ed., *La nunziatura di Francia del cardinale Guido Bentivoglio: lettere a Scipione Borghese, cardinal nipote e segretario di Stato di Paolo V*, 4 vols (Firenze: Le Monnier, 1865), II, 454.
- 40 Belligni, *Auctoritas e potestas*, 190–1.
- 41 Archivio di Stato, Venice, *Fondo Sant'Uffizio*, 74, trial against Alessandro Gatti, mentioned by Villani, 'La chiesa protestante italiana di Londra nel Seicento', 266, footnote 6.
- 42 Ole Peter Grell, *Brethren in Christ: A Calvinist Network in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 27, citing Philip Mc Nair, *Peter Martyr in Italy. An Anatomy of Apostasy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), 221.
- 43 Grell, *Brethren in Christ*.
- 44 Harm-Jan van Dam, 'Italian Friends. Grotius, De Dominis, Sarpi and the Church', *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis / Dutch Review of Church History* 75 (1995): 198–215. Cfr. also Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*, 220–59.
- 45 Grell, in *Brethren in Christ*, 105.
- 46 Thomas Middleton, *A Game at Chess* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993).
- 47 Terpstra, *Religious Refugees in the Early Modern World*.
- 48 Michel de Montaigne, *Journal de voyage*, ed. François Rigolot (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1992).
- 49 Fosi, *Convertire lo straniero*.
- 50 Gregory XIII, *Quoniam Divinae Bonitati* (1579), English translation by Jerome Bertram in Michael E. Williams, *The Venerable English College Rome. A History* (Leominster: Gracewing, 1979), 272–80.
- 51 See *The Venerable Sexcentenary Issue*, Volume XXI, 1962, reprinted as *The English Hospice in Rome* (Leominster: Gracewing, 2005).
- 52 Michael Questier, 'Seminary Colleges, Converts and Religious Change in Post-Reformation England, 1568–1688', in *College Communities Abroad. Education,*

- Migration and Catholicism in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Liam Chambers and Thomas O'Connors (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), 142–71.
- 53 Mark Netzloff, 'The English Colleges and the English Nation. Allen, Persons, Verstegan, and Diasporic Nationalism', in *Catholic Culture in Early Modern England*, ed. Ronald Corthell, Frances E. Dolan, Christopher Highley and Arthur F. Marotti (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007), 236–60: 237. For the later period see Corens, *Confessional Mobility*.
- 54 Gregory XIII, *Quoniam Divinae Bonitati*.
- 55 Eamon Duffy, 'William, Cardinal Allen, 1532-1594', *Recusant History* 22 (1995): 265–90, citing Thomas Francis Knox, ed., *The First and Second Diaries of the English College, Douay* (London: David Nutt, 1878), xxxix.
- 56 Duffy, 'William, Cardinal Allen', 276.
- 57 Thomas Francis Knox, ed., *The Letters and Memorials of William Cardinal Allen (1532-1594)* (London: David Nutt, 1882), 409.
- 58 Netzloff, 'The English Colleges and the English Nation', 241.
- 59 John Bossy, *Under the Molehill. An Elizabethan Spy Story* (New Haven: Manchester University Press, 2001), 94–5.
- 60 William Allen, *Apologie and True Declaration of the Institution and Endeavours of the Two English Colleges, the One in Rome the Other Now Resident in Rhemes* (Mounts in Heinault [Rheims: Jean de Foigny?], 1581), 12.
- 61 Stefania Tutino, *Law and Conscience. Catholicism in Early Modern England, 1570-1625* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 19–21.
- 62 Knox, ed., *The Letters and Memorials of William Cardinal Allen*, 406–7. On Allen's contribution to the crusading projects against Protestantism and to 'International Catholicism' see Janssen, *The Dutch Revolt*, 115–16.
- 63 Duffy, 'William, Cardinal Allen', 266.
- 64 Allen, *Apologie and True Declaration*, 16.
- 65 *Ibid.*, 17.
- 66 Thomas M. McCoog, SJ, 'Ignatius Loyola and Reginald Pole A Reconsideration', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 47, no. 2 (1996): 270–1.
- 67 Anthony Kenny, 'From Hospice to College', *The English Hospice in Rome*, cit., 221 and 228.
- 68 *Publications of the Catholic Record Society*, vol. II (London: Privately Printed for the Society at the Arden Press, 1906), 103.
- 69 *Ibid.*
- 70 See Kenny, 'From Hospice to College', Jason A. Nice, 'Being "British" in Rome: The Welsh at the English College, 1578-1584', *The Catholic Historical Review* 92, no. 1 (2006): 1–24, and Brian C. Lockey, *Early Modern Catholics, Royalists and Cosmopolitans* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), 64–71.
- 71 Anthony Munday, *The English Roman Life*, ed. Philip James Ayres (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980). On Munday and Catholicism see Donna B. Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics, 1560-1633* (London: Routledge, 2005).
- 72 Robert Persons, SJ, *The Correspondence and Unpublished Papers*, ed. Victor Houlston, Ginevra Crosignani and Thomas M. McCoog, SJ (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies), 64, 70.
- 73 John Bossy, *The English Catholic Community, 1570–1850* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1975), 26. See also Nice, 'Being "British" in Rome', 9–10.
- 74 *Ibid.*, 27.
- 75 *Ibid.*, 28.

- 76 Alexandra Walsham, *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), 53–84.
- 77 Thomas M. McCoog, Ginevra Crosignani and Peter Holmes, eds, *Recusancy and Conformity in Early Modern England* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2010), 260–2.
- 78 Walsham, *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain*, 348–9.
- 79 Gatrell, Ghoshal, Nowak and Dowdall, 'Reckoning with Refugeedom', Dufoix, *Politiques d'exil*.
- 80 Caravale, *Preaching and Inquisition in Renaissance Italy*.
- 81 See in general Walsham, *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain*, 235–84.
- 82 Simon Behrman, 'Legal Subjectivity and the Refugee', *International Journal of Refugee Law* 26, no. 1 (2014): 1–21.
- 83 Philip Marfleet, 'Refugees and History: Why We Must Address the Past', *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 3 (2007): 136–48.

Transnational refugee networks and the politics of the early Dutch Republic, 1568–90

Jesse Spohnholz

The persecutions and wars of the Reformation era led to religious refugees – Christians, Jews and Muslims alike – becoming a mass phenomenon in European history.¹ Among sixteenth-century Christians, religious refugees included Catholics, Lutherans, Anabaptists and Reformed Protestants, the last being the subject of this chapter. Their flight often affected the politics of their places of origin as well as in their new homes. French Reformed Protestants fleeing to Geneva, for instance, profoundly transformed the city; they inspired xenophobia, to be sure, but in the longer term, they also helped push the city to adopt a more distinctly Calvinist politics.² They also helped transform the politics in France by training missionaries, printing illegal literature and even plotting the overthrow of the government.³ For the Netherlands, historians also have credited Reformed refugees with transforming politics at home and abroad. Facing the risk of arrest, dispossession or execution at the hands of officials of the Habsburg government in Brussels, tens of thousands of Reformed Protestants fled the Low Countries for England and the Holy Roman Empire. Once abroad, Reformed refugees organized church councils (called consistories) and congregations, sometimes with the blessing of local authorities, sometimes in secret, and sometimes in semi-clandestine compromise situations.

While some refugees remained unchurched or only loosely affiliated with the new diasporic ecclesiastical organizations, many thousands who joined these churches became active in organizing religious life, and affected politics both in their new homes and back in the Low Countries. In England, they inspired radical Puritan politics.⁴ Those who fled to cities in the Holy Roman Empire provoked constitutional crises about how to apply imperial law.⁵ For politics back home, historians have credited refugees with playing a critical role in the formation of a brand-new state in the rebel-held lands, which became the Dutch Republic. However, in this case, it's important to distinguish between two refugee movements. The first were Reformed refugees fleeing Habsburg victories in the southern Netherlands in the 1570s and 1580s to the rebel-held lands to the northeast. These migrants have been credited with bringing a doctrinaire Calvinism with them.⁶ That interpretation has been undercut by Willem Frijhoff and Johannes Müller, who point out that the intellectual profile of these

migrants was far more diverse than this picture suggests. In later decades, though, the stereotype of the radical exile was used by Calvinists' Remonstrant, Mennonite or Erastian opponents as a rhetorical device to cast Calvinist ideologues as a foreign threat.⁷

The other earlier group of Reformed refugees were those who fled the Netherlands for England and the Holy Roman Empire starting in the 1550s and 1560s. According to conventional historical accounts, they organized churches in exile that were independent of government authority and committed to Calvinist doctrine, which they introduced into their homelands as soon as rebel victories in 1572 allowed.⁸ Historians have referred to this group of refugees to explain why Reformed pastors proved so resistant to magisterial oversight in the early Dutch Republic; that is, they had formed independent from state oversight from their very start. Inspired by Frijhoff and Müller, this chapter offers an alternative reading of this second group. In order to do so, this chapter considers the activities of ministers, elders, and deacons of eleven Dutch-speaking Reformed migrant churches in the Holy Roman Empire, in three imperial cities (Cologne, Aachen and Frankfurt), seven territorial cities in the Duchy of Cleves (Wesel, Emmerich, Xanten, Kalkar, Goch, Rees and Gennepe) and one Dutch colony in the Electoral Palatinate (Frankenthal) from the late 1560s through the 1580s.⁹ This chapter considers consistory members' construction of new ecclesiastical institutions, their hiring of pastors, their charity efforts and their support for the revolt. It shows that these religious networks of Dutch Reformed migrants focused less on supporting the Dutch Reformed Church, the revolt or the politics of the Dutch Republic than previously understood. Rather than imagining these congregations primarily as foreign staging grounds to build up an imagined Dutch Reformed Church in their 'fatherland', their leaders focused more on sustaining multilingual, regional and trans-regional communities of support among the faithful within the Empire.

Ecclesiastical institutions

Before 1568, there was no unified ecclesiastical association among Dutch Reformed Protestants, but regional nodes of organization around Antwerp, London and Emden.¹⁰ The first effort to develop a unified church system, during William of Orange's 1568 military campaign against Habsburg rule in the Netherlands, quickly failed.¹¹ Soon after, discussions about the benefit of such an organization began among Reformed refugees living in the Palatinate and England.¹² A key promoter of this effort was Philip van Marnix, Lord of St. Aldegonde, a Reformed nobleman who participated in organizing against Habsburg rule in 1565–6.¹³ In spring 1569, Marnix helped to develop alliances between Elector Palatine Friedrich III, leading Netherlandish Reformed pastors and William of Orange.¹⁴ One necessary precondition for this was promoting greater coordination among the Netherlandish Reformed. By March 1570, Marnix and Gaspar van der Heyden, the pastor at Frankenthal, co-wrote an open letter to coreligionists across the diaspora recommending that they build institutions capable of tracking migrants between the disparate congregations and to organize some way

for raising money to support hiring pastors in underserved congregations.¹⁵ Neither of these initiatives ever got off the ground.

In the summer of 1571, Marnix also helped organize a meeting of Reformed Protestants in Bedburg, a sublordship of the Neuenahr noble family that operated as a Reformed enclave within the Duchy of Jülich.¹⁶ Marnix also used these meetings – which took place on 3 and/or 4 July – to promote greater coordination between congregations and to try to build alliances with German Lutherans and French Reformed.¹⁷ We don't have a complete list of attendees and, besides the surviving articles, we know little about what took place. Like the earlier efforts, the meeting largely came to nothing. It's also clear that the organizers did not see this as an exclusively 'Dutch' matter. Representatives of German congregations came from Aachen and Cologne, but also the villages in Meil and Laurensberg. Records, kept in both Dutch and German, distinguished between *Duytschlandt* and *Nederlandt*, but treated Reformed Protestants from both places as sharing a common cause. As we'll see, this vision of a multilingual alliance of Reformed living in multiple states endured among Netherlandish Reformed in the Empire.

Later that year, Marnix helped organize a larger and more successful synod, held in the East Friesian city of Emden, whose attendees met over ten days in October 1571 to write a provisional church order. Organizers invited representatives from congregations in the Netherlands and across the diaspora. Delegates came from nine congregations in Brabant, Flanders, Holland and West Friesland and seven congregations in the Empire, though the meeting was not comprehensive in scope. The churches in England and Emden declined the invitation, for fear of indicating to their local governments that they followed a foreign ecclesiastical authority.¹⁸ In many cases, delegates merely confirmed principles agreed to at synods held in Antwerp in the 1560s. Disagreements also emerged on key issues, including which doctrinal statements to adopt and how narrowly to draw the lines of acceptable belief.¹⁹ The most novel decision made at Emden was to recommend the creation of a transnational ecclesiastical structure with three tiers of assemblies for delegates to resolve thorny questions and discuss matters of common interest. Congregations would be divided into nine regional groupings called *classes* (singular, *classis*, a Latin word for 'group'): Palatine/Frankfurt, Jülich/Cologne/Aachen, the Duchy of Cleves, Emden, England, Brabant, Flanders, the Walloon provinces and Holland/West Friesland.²⁰ Less frequent meetings of delegates would meet at trans-regional 'provincial' synods (though they did not all correspond to a specific province or territory) and at comprehensive 'general' synods. While this organizational system drew on French Reformed precedents, coreligionists in France only included French-speaking congregations operating within the Kingdom of France.²¹ Netherlanders at Emden imagined a transnational, multilingual diasporic organization operating in the Netherlands, England and the Holy Roman Empire. As such, native Dutch, French and German speakers attended, and the records were written in Latin. The articles distinguished between the 'foreign' churches (congregations of Netherlanders living abroad) and 'Netherlandish' churches (located in the Low Countries), but the word used for their place of common origin – *Belgium* – referred to the multilingual lands of the Low Countries.

While in England and East Friesland, Dutch-speaking congregations remained unconnected from this new ecclesiastical system, the eleven congregations under examination here quickly joined new classes on the model proposed at Emden, centring around the Duchy of Cleves, the Duchy of Jülich and the Electoral Palatinate.²² Initially, all three classes maintained ties to the emerging Dutch ecclesiastical system, but none invested much attention either to providing support for the Dutch Reformed Church or seeking guidance from church leaders in the Netherlands. The heart of the classis of Cleves was Wesel's Dutch Reformed consistory.²³ Wesel's Walloon congregation also belonged, as did the mixed local-migrant congregations in Cleves (in Goch, Xanten, Gennep, Rees, Emmerich and Kleve) and German Reformed congregations elsewhere in Cleves (at Duisburg, Zevenaer and Orsoy), in small enclave lordships (Hörstgen and Alpen), and in neighbouring territories, including in Rheinberg (in the archbishopric of Cologne), Bocholt (in the prince-bishopric of Münsterland) and Hamm (in the county of Mark). Leadership for the classis whose geographical centre lay in Jülich – usually called the classis of Cologne – mostly came from the Dutch- and German-speaking congregations in Cologne and Aachen.²⁴ French-speaking congregations in those cities were also members. The majority of its congregations were not made up of Netherlanders, but Reformed Protestants from the Empire, including congregations in Jülich (including Sittard, Venrath, Düren, Susteren, Gladbach, Oberwinter, Warden and Heinsberg), the archbishopric of Cologne (Bonn and Neuss), noble enclaves (Bedburg and Bedburdyck) and in the city of Maastricht. Attendees seem to have spoken a mixture of German, Dutch and Latin at meetings.²⁵ Most businesses in both classes focused on making recommendations for best practices for managing within majority Catholic communities and limiting the influence of Catholics and Anabaptists on their congregations.²⁶

Leadership for the class is based in the Electoral Palatinate largely came from the Dutch settlement of Frankenthal.²⁷ The classis also included the Dutch-speaking congregation in Frankfurt. However, most of the churches represented in the body were French-speaking, including Walloon congregations in Otterberg, Frankenthal, Schönau, St. Lambert and Wetzlar.²⁸ Meetings focused on local matters, including solving conflicts between Dutch and French speakers.²⁹ Their records were kept in French, suggesting that deliberations were also in that language.³⁰ Thus, all three classes included underground, semi-clandestine and public congregations across a range of types of states. They all included German, Dutch and French speakers. None of them provided an especially robust support of Netherlandish Reformed churches before 1572, and none took their cues primarily from the Dutch Reformed Church after.

Quite quickly, we see the evidence of a tension developing between these multilingual regional institutions and the emerging Dutch Reformed Church. The first place we see it is in the uncertain authority of the articles adopted at Emden. Immediately after the synod, in November 1571, elders of the German-speaking Cologne congregation declined to sign its articles, even after repeated insistence from Cologne's Dutch pastor, Cornelis Walraven and others.³¹ In the face of this unwillingness, delegates at the classis meeting in March 1572 asked whether a pastor might explain their content.³² At the next classis, held 7 July 1572, Johannes Christianus began with a sermon that underlined the authority of the Emden synod, after which delegates ordered

members of Cologne's German-language consistory to sign the articles 'because they were recognized as right and Christian'.³³ Apparently resistance continued, because at the meeting that November (which Cologne's German-language congregation did not attend), Christianus was asked to write to Caspar Olivianus, theologian at the University of Heidelberg, and Gaspar van der Heiden, pastor at Frankenthal, for advice about that congregation's unwillingness to sign.³⁴ A year later, delegates admonished that congregation yet again about its refusal to sign the articles.³⁵ After that, the controversy was dropped. In the coming years, Cologne's German-language Reformed congregation participated collegially in classis business without any sign of lingering acrimony. But its leaders never approved the articles.³⁶ Three years later, some members of the Reformed church at Susteren similarly refused to approve the Emden articles. They did not bring the controversy to the Cologne classis, but to the Dutch elders in Wesel. Elders there recommended that Susteren's Reformed Protestants follow the example proposed at Emden, because it is 'good enough and has been signed by many wonderful congregations'.³⁷ We never get any explicit explanation about what concerned leaders of these congregations about the articles, though Germans were the only ones who expressed hesitancy. Regardless of motivation, the incident reveals a tension within classes in the Empire that were supposedly members of the ecclesiastical structure of the Dutch Reformed Church, but also multilingual, regional Reformed institutions serving the broader evangelical cause in their region.

A similar tension emerged in 1578, when church leaders in the rebel-held Netherlands organized a large-scale Reformed meeting, to be held in the summer in Dordrecht, which its organizers referred to as a 'national' synod. In a sixteenth-century context, the Dutch word *natie* referred to a group of people with a common heritage, but also had three more specific meanings. Many Netherlanders understood their 'nation' to be the *territory* that they came from, that is, Brabant, Flanders, Holland or otherwise.³⁸ Migrants moving to Wesel organized themselves into 'nations' in this way.³⁹ 'Nation' could also refer to members of a shared language group, as when Dutch speakers in Frankfurt distinguished 'their nation' from the Walloons.⁴⁰ Most inclusively, 'nation' could be used to refer to all people with origins in the Low Countries. In Hamburg, the 'Netherlandish nation' included Dutch and Walloon speakers who held specific legal and economic privileges.⁴¹ What did it mean when organizers in 1578 invited delegates to a 'national synod'? For sure, they welcomed delegates from congregations across the Low Countries – French- and Dutch-speaking alike – as well as those in England and the Empire. The official proceedings proclaim themselves to be the records of a 'National Synod of the Netherlandish Dutch and Walloon churches, both domestic and foreign'.⁴² Walloon delegates imagined the synod's decisions as applying to them when they translated them into French.⁴³ And yet, by 1578, there was also a growing sense that ecclesiastical organization would be divided by language, and that the public church of the Republic would be Dutch-speaking. In his invitation letter, Gaspar van der Heyden called the meeting a gathering of 'de Nederlandtsche duytsche kercke'.⁴⁴ The Walloons wrote that the synod was for 'Flemish churches', and only selected delegates who spoke 'the Flemish language'.⁴⁵ In their response, pastors in England also described the event as being for congregations of the 'Neder-duytschen sprake'.⁴⁶ At the event, the discussions were held in Dutch and records were written in Dutch.

But as the Dutch Reformed Church became ever more *Dutch* in its linguistic and political orientation, the classes of Cleves, Cologne and the Palatinate remained trilingual institutions that spanned multiple polities. A year before, the Dutch congregation at Frankfurt had submitted questions to a synod held in Dordrecht in 1577, without realizing that the meeting was only intended for Walloons; classis officials simply held onto the letter until it could be addressed by Dutch-speaking delegates at the next year's 'national' synod.⁴⁷ Members of the classis of Cologne, though, resented the Dutch-centred orientation of the 1578 meeting. As Cornelis Walraven explained in a sharply written letter, the 'so-called national synod' (*eens Synodi, ghenoeemt national*) was really just an 'extraordinary meeting' (*bysonder versamlung*), since it did not look like one of the three-tier hierarchy of synods – general, provincial, classical – envisioned at Emden.⁴⁸ Walraven also made clear that his classis also included French- and German-speaking congregations. 'We have not yet heard of anyone who has approved such extraordinary meetings' that would meet without representatives of the French- and German-speaking congregations, 'but now that we see that those of the Dutch [*Nederduytsche*] or Flemish language follow such an example, we can no longer stay silent about it'.⁴⁹ There were two more 'national' synods of the Dutch Reformed churches in the sixteenth century, one at Middelburg in 1581 and another in The Hague in 1586. At both, domestic concerns dominated while the foreign congregations played little role.⁵⁰ At Middelburg, the only delegate from a congregation in the Empire was Johannes Badius from Cologne. Wesel's French- and Dutch-speaking congregations explained that they would not be able to attend, but did ask for advice, which they requested be written in Dutch and French.⁵¹ But they did not necessarily follow the guidance they received. For instance, Wesel's elders asked whether it was permissible to appoint women as deaconesses.⁵² After they were instructed to stop the practice, they changed the title of these women to 'overseer' but soon reverted to appointing women deacons.⁵³ None of these eleven congregations even sent delegates to the synod in 1586 or wrote to it asking for advice. The three classes in the Empire continued operating as multilingual institutions across multiple polities into the seventeenth century, even as the Dutch Reformed Church increasingly became Dutch-speaking and defined by its (sometimes fraught) relationship with secular officials in the Dutch Republic.

The supply of pastors

Previous historians have stressed the role of refugee churches in staffing the newly opened Reformed congregations in the United Provinces. Certainly, Emden played a role in staffing underground congregations in the 1560s, and some thirty Dutch pastors moved from East Friesland to the rebel-held Netherlands from 1572.⁵⁴ However, while the other refugee congregations in the Empire played a small role in staffing those pulpits, the University of Heidelberg proved far more important. Wesel's Reformed community supplied only four pastors to Dutch churches.⁵⁵ Aachen's supplied two. Five former pastors in Cologne later worked in the Netherlands, though three of these had studied at Heidelberg, and one other was dismissed for bad

behaviour. Nine former pastors in Frankfurt later worked in the Republic, but eight of these had also studied at Heidelberg or preached elsewhere in the Palatinate. And some pastors who did move from refugee centres to take pastoral positions in the newly independent United Provinces were not advocates of Reformed orthodoxy, but heterodox thinkers who challenged Dutch church leaders.⁵⁶ Meanwhile from 1550 to 1600, some 529 Netherlanders studied at Heidelberg, many of whom later staffed Dutch pulpits, including Arent Cornelisz, Peter van Aelst, Thomas van Thielt, Jacob Barlaeus, Reginaldus Dondeclock, Henricus van der Corput, Heinrich Smetius, Hugo Donellus, Franciscus Gomarus and many more.⁵⁷ Fred van Lieburg identifies ninety-one German pastors also serving in Dutch parishes from 1572 to 1599, most of whom probably had studied at Heidelberg.⁵⁸ Most of these were never refugees, but participants in the *peregrinatio academica*.

At times, congregations within the diaspora even opposed efforts to recruit pastors for the United Provinces from their ranks. In 1574, when Dordrecht's consistory proposed hiring the Dutch schoolmaster in Wesel, Gerardus Larenius, Wesel's elders refused, explaining that their need outweighed those in Holland.⁵⁹ Soon after, Wesel's elders helped Larenius take a pastoral position in nearby Emmerich.⁶⁰ In October 1576, the Reformed congregation in Gorkum asked the Dutch congregation at Aachen to send their pastor, Johannes Huckelum, to help them build their congregation in the 'fatherland'.⁶¹ The consistory at Gorkum appealed to the Emden synod, which suggested that pastors who originate from the Netherlands (*Ministri Belgio oriundi*) who have taken positions abroad (*exteris*) should heed calls to serve in the Netherlands.⁶² In his letter refusing this request, Johannes Christianus argued that Aachen's larger Reformed community needed to maintain pastoral care for its members. The Electoral Palatinate was sending pastors to staff Dutch churches, Christianus admitted, but even the pious Elector Friedrich III does not abandon his own congregations to do so! He also argued that it was inaccurate to describe Huckelum as originating from the Netherlands, since he was born in the Duchy of Guelders *before* it became part of the Habsburg Netherlands in 1543.⁶³ In 1577, the church at Dordrecht hired Servatius Wijnants out from under the nose of the five congregations in Cleves he was serving.⁶⁴ Wesel's elders grew angry that they had not been consulted, as they wrote, 'not without great scandal and shame'.⁶⁵ That same year, the Reformed congregation at Brussels also asked the Dutch-speaking congregation at Frankfurt to send Werner Helmichius to 'help plant the Word of God among them'. Reformed elders in Frankfurt declined unless their coreligionists found a replacement and a means to pay the substitute's salary.⁶⁶ The following year, a replacement was found in Martinus Lydius, and Frankfurt's elders agreed to loan Helmichius. But Helmichius never returned. Within a year, Lydius took a post at Amsterdam, so Frankfurt's Dutch congregation was again in search of a pastor. In 1578, the new stadholder of Guelders, Count Johann of Nassau-Dillenburg, requested that Johannes Badius, pastor of Cologne's German-language Reformed congregation, become his court preacher.⁶⁷ However, Cologne's congregation declined to give up their pastor to the Nassau prince.⁶⁸

When it came to pastoral staffing, the Dutch Reformed congregations in the Empire clearly did not primarily envision themselves as refugee congregations seeking to build up Christ's true church in the 'fatherland'. Instead, they spent more of their attention

trying to staff their own congregations. Wesel's elders devoted considerable attention to helping congregations in Cleves secure pastoral care. After the small congregations sharing the pastor Nicolaus Pancratius fired him because his travelling was attracting unwanted attention in 1579, elders in Wesel tried to hire a German minister trained at Heidelberg, Erasmus Lauterbach.⁶⁹ In 1581, Wesel's elders successfully arranged for a new minister, Paschasius Auiensis, to serve the congregations in Goch, Gennep, Emmerich, Rees, Kalkar and Zevenaer.⁷⁰ More than once, Wesel's elders urged congregations in Cleves to put up with a disappointing pastor, in part because finding a replacement proved such a challenge.⁷¹ The German-speaking and Dutch-speaking Reformed congregations at Cologne often shared pastors, due to staffing shortages.⁷² The same was true between the French- and Dutch-speaking congregations at Frankfurt.⁷³ Aachen's Reformed congregation also loaned a pastor to coreligionists in Cologne in 1572.⁷⁴ Congregations did try to help spread the Gospel, but their priority was not necessarily the Low Countries. At the meeting of the Cologne Classis at Birkesdorf (in Jülich) in 1573, delegates sent the pastor Cornelis Walraven to help set up congregations in Düsseldorf and Essen 'where many good people are who do not want to find themselves in superstition'.⁷⁵

Charitable giving

With regard to charitable giving, these congregations primarily supported their own members as well as other diasporic congregations in the Empire, but maintained little relationship to the Netherlands. Cologne's Dutch-speaking congregation, which included many wealthy merchants, often took the lead in providing assistance to others in the diaspora. On 29 October 1571, pastors of Cologne's Dutch congregation urged church members to give generously (*liberalich*) to support poor coreligionists in Wesel.⁷⁶ While congregations proved unable to collect a substantial sum that year, the following year Cologne's congregation sent 25 daler.⁷⁷ In response to a January 1579 plea from Wesel, Cologne's Dutch congregation sent three Hungarian ducats, two Portuguese half real coins, two sovereign crowns, four royal daler and one imperial daler.⁷⁸ Peter Gorter estimates that Cologne's Dutch congregation spent two-thirds of its charity collections on other Netherlandish Reformed congregations in the diaspora.⁷⁹ The only time that Cologne's Dutch congregation sought financial support was in 1586, when it faced the twin crises of the Cologne War and floods of refugees fleeing Alexander Farnese's conquest of Antwerp. That March, the consistory wrote to Frankenthal for help 'during this sorrowful and dreadful time'.⁸⁰

In contrast, Wesel's Dutch-speaking Reformed community proved to be the largest charitable receiver among these eleven congregations. Wesel's consistory requested money, food, clothing and firewood from coreligionists in Cologne, Frankfurt, Frankenthal, Hamburg, London and Stade.⁸¹ Wesel's elders and deacons drew financial support for their needy from elsewhere as well, including twice from stranger churches in England.⁸² They often turned to sympathetic Reformed nobles in the region, especially the Neuenahr family.⁸³ The only charitable gift Wesel's consistory ever

recorded receiving from the Netherlands came not from a church, but from someone in Dordrecht (probably a former refugee) who left money for Wesel's poor in his will in 1574.⁸⁴ Members of Wesel's consistory also clearly understood that they were part of a community of giving and receiving. In March 1579, just as Wesel's elders were writing desperate letters asking for assistance for refugees streaming into the city, they sent 100 daler to Aachen's church to help refugees fleeing to that city.⁸⁵ During the gruesome Spanish siege of Wesel from 1586 to 1590, Wesel's elders wrote impassioned pleas for help to Dutch churches in Amsterdam, Dordrecht, Leiden, as well as in the diasporic congregations in Emden, Bremen, Cologne, Frankfurt and elsewhere.⁸⁶ While they did not receive responses from the Netherlands, gifts poured in from Dutch Reformed in the Empire.⁸⁷ As the elders in Cologne wrote:

Because we believe in a community of the Saints, who together are members of one body under one head, Jesus Christ, that calls to a common father in heaven, who are in one church, who are baptized with one baptism, who are governed with one spirit, like members of one body with one soul.⁸⁸

Hamburg's Dutch Reformed community also sent an impressive 300 daler in 1589.⁸⁹ Elders also sought assistance from wealthy individuals who had once lived in their community.⁹⁰ After the siege ended, elders wrote to the Dutch church of London for help dealing with hungry people and orphans.⁹¹ The purpose of examining such efforts here is not to romanticize mutual support or to assess whether such efforts were sufficient. Rather it is to note that these diasporic Dutch Protestants were more oriented to supporting one another than to either relying on or contributing to the public church of the Dutch Republic.

Dutch Reformed migrant congregations in the Empire also provided direct care for one another's orphans. In December 1571, the Dutch elder in Cologne, Gillis de Schepper, escorted recently orphaned children from his congregation to be cared for by Wesel's deacons.⁹² Two weeks later, that same consistory sent the children of Joris de Greve, a Flemish tapestry maker, to Frankenthal to be cared for by another tapestry maker there.⁹³ After Peter Eckberg died in the Spanish siege of Maastricht in 1579, his wife and children fled to Aachen. When his wife died the following year, Aachen's Reformed congregation sent the orphans to live with their grandmother in Wesel.⁹⁴ In February 1590, Wesel's elders asked the church in Frankenthal to care for two sixteen-year-old orphaned girls who survived the siege of Wesel.⁹⁵ The following year, Wesel's Dutch Reformed elders coordinated moving another orphan to Cologne. This time Cologne's Dutch-speaking elders reprimanded them, because the child seems to have been badly disabled, and thus care would make it harder for members of Cologne's clandestine congregation to hide from Catholic authorities. Cologne's elders urged that Wesel's elders not to take advantage of offers of mutual assistance, 'because it is not an appropriate custom (*oordentlick ghebruick*) that one church should send the burden of their poor to another, but that each [church] should take good care of their own poor.'⁹⁶ Despite this chastising tone, Cologne's Reformed sent orphans to Wesel and Frankenthal.⁹⁷ When, in March 1574, they sent the orphaned son of Peter de Zee to be cared for by the Dutch-speaking

congregation in Frankfurt, they explained that the boy misbehaved openly in the streets, which brought unwanted attention to their congregation. At Frankfurt, they reasoned, because the Reformed congregation was safer, guardians would be able to ‘punish such bad behavior with words and also with rods.’⁹⁸ The reluctance of Cologne’s Dutch-speaking elders to welcome the orphan from Wesel in 1591, then, should probably be understood as another effort to avoid unwanted attention, and not a categorical belief that congregations should be self-sufficient in caring for their needy.

Support for military operations

Dutch Reformed Protestants in the diaspora also provided little support for the military and political resistance led by William of Orange or his allies against Habsburg rule. This fact often disappointed Orange.⁹⁹ Orange’s agents, including Dietrich Sonoy, collected funds in Cleves to support the prince’s military campaign in the fall of 1568, though these efforts contributed little materially to the war efforts.¹⁰⁰ Otherwise, the Dutch Reformed migrants devoted little effort in support of the revolt. There was not even one prayer and fast day in support of Orangist armies listed in the surviving records of these eleven congregations. When elders at Wesel proposed a fast day in February 1575, it was not to pray for Orange’s victory, but for a peace treaty between him and the ‘court of Burgundy’.¹⁰¹ When Orange’s general, Philip of Hohenlohe-Neuenstein, wrote to Wesel’s Dutch consistory in November 1579 to collect funds to support ‘the general fatherland and the upbuilding of the church of God’, elders explained that they could not give. We have too many impoverished refugees from Guelders, Jülich and Limburg, they explained. Even if they had the resources to spare, they added, they would not send them, lest they anger Wesel’s magistrates.¹⁰² The long-time pastor in Frankenthal, Petrus Dathenus, even sought to reconcile with King Philip II in 1583 if he could just convince him to grant permission for Reformed Protestants to worship.¹⁰³ While orthodox Calvinists later closely identified with the Orangist cause, Reformed refugees in these networks provided little material support for the rebels or their new state.

Conclusion

Leaders of these eleven congregations understood themselves to be part of an international community of fellow believers from the Low Countries with bonds of mutual association and support. However, that did not mean that they primarily saw themselves tied to the Dutch Reformed Church, the Orangist cause or the new Dutch state. Indeed, of the 380 individuals I can identify moving from one of these refugee congregations to another home, 67 per cent moved to places elsewhere in the Empire. Only 29 per cent returned to the Low Countries, even after political and military conditions allowed it.¹⁰⁴ And while living abroad, for the most part, the refugees

continued to deal with their own local and regional affairs, and they turned to one another for help when they needed it.

So where did this narrative that refugees were so important to shaping the Dutch Reformed Church and the politics of the early Republic come from? Certainly, Emden played a role in sustaining the Reformed movement before 1572, though its influence quickly waned after. But for the rest of the refugee communities, maintaining this position about the significance of exile has required setting aside a lot of counterevidence. The story of exiles being the source of a steadfast commitment to a doctrinaire, voluntaristic church was the result of a slow merger of two (partially misleading) narratives. The first, that Dutch Reformed Protestants were fundamentally committed to a church unencumbered by political oversight, traces back to the 1570s. However, as Silke Muylaert has argued, the argumentation around this issue was rather muddled and inconsistent, and Reformed Protestants proved perfectly willing to embrace theocracy whenever they held the governmental advantage.¹⁰⁵ By the end of the sixteenth century, though, in the face of formidable political opposition to their agenda, many Dutch Reformed theologians were adopting a principled argument that the true church should remain free from governmental interference.¹⁰⁶ In short, they made a virtue out of necessity. As Johannes Müller had shown, the second narrative that refugees proved especially influential in shaping the Dutch Reformed Church emerged as a rhetorical device by the end of the sixteenth century as well, either to describe Calvinism as a dangerous and foreign imposition or to celebrate refugees in the past as suffering martyrs for a righteous cause.¹⁰⁷ After 1685, Huguenots fleeing to the Dutch Republic even leveraged such memories of the sixteenth-century refugees to find common cause with their hosts.¹⁰⁸ However, it was only in the nineteenth century that these two narratives fully merged into one: that sixteenth-century Reformed Protestants' commitment to independence from governmental authority originated in refugees' experiences abroad. Dutch Neo-Calvinists used this new narrative to bolster their own insistence on autonomy against what they saw as the tyranny of the liberal state and secularism.¹⁰⁹ Later, secular historians repeated this narrative to explain the conflicts between orthodox pastors and magistrates in the early Republic. However, instead of leveraging sixteenth-century refugees as a rhetorical device to explain the politics of the Dutch Republic, when we look at the situation from their own perspective, they appear less oriented towards the politics of the Netherlands than often portrayed. Instead, their activities crossed linguistic and political boundaries in the service of a faith unbounded by political affiliations.

Notes

- 1 Nicholas Terpstra, *Religious Refugees in the Early Modern World: An Alternative History of the Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
- 2 William G. Naphy, *Calvin and the Consolidation of the Genevan Reformation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994).
- 3 Robert Kingdon, *Geneva and the Coming of the Wars of Religion in France, 1555–1563* (Geneva: Droz, 1956); Philip Benedict, *Season of Conspiracy: Calvin, the French*

- Reformed Churches, and Protestant Potting in the Rign of Francis II (1559–60)* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society Press, 2020).
- 4 Patrick Collinson, 'The Elizabethan Puritans and the Foreign Reformed Churches in London', in his *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1983), 245–72.
 - 5 Achim Dünwald, *Konfessionsstreit und Verfassungskonflikt: Die Aufnahme der niederländischen Flüchtlinge im Herzogtum Kleve, 1566–1585* (Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte, 1998).
 - 6 Pieter Geyl, *The Revolt of the Netherlands (1555–1609)* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1958), 209; J. Briels, *Zuid-Nederlanders in de republiek, 1572–1630: Een demografische en cultuurhistorische studie* (Sint-Niklaas: Danthe, 1985), 228–96.
 - 7 Willem Frijhoff, 'Migrations religieuses dans les Provinces-Unies avant la second Refuge', *Revue du Nord* 80, no. 326–7 (1998): 573–98; Johannes Müller, *Exile Memories and the Dutch Revolt: The Narrated Diaspora, 1550–1750* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 84–123.
 - 8 E.g. Geyl, *Revolt of the Netherlands*, 110; Christine Kooi, *Liberty and Religion: Church and State in Leiden's Reformation, 1572–1620* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 8, 10, 39, 43.
 - 9 These results are part of a collaborative research project, 'Rhineland Refugees and the Religious Landscape of the Dutch Republic, 1550–1618,' led by me and Mirjam van Veen and funded by the Dutch Research Council. The argument presented here is my own, but draws on research also undertaken by Peter Gorter and Inge Schipper and has benefitted from the feedback of Van Veen and Silke Muylaert. In this essay, to avoid confusion, I use the English 'Cleves' when referring to the duchy and the German 'Kleve' to refer to the town.
 - 10 F. R. J. Knetsch, 'Ortsgemeinden und synoden in den frühen französischen und niederländischen reformierten kirchneordnungen um 1564', *Zwingliana* 19, no. 2 (1991–2): 173–81; Judith Becker, *Gemeindeordnung und Kirchengründung: Johannes a Lasco's Kirchenordnung für London (1555) und die reformierte Konfessionsbildung* (Leiden: Brill, 2007). See also Alastair Duke, 'Towards a Reformed Polity in Holland, 1572–78', in his *Reformation and Revolt in the Low Countries* (London: The Hambleton Press, 1990), 201–2.
 - 11 Jesse Spohnholz, *The Convent of Wesel: The Event that Never Was and the Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).
 - 12 Silke Muylaert, *Shaping the Stranger Churches: Migrants in England and the Troubles in the Netherlands, 1547–1585* (Leiden: Brill, 2021), 197; Auke Jelsma, *Frontiers of the Reformation: Dissidence and Orthodoxy in Sixteenth-Century Europe* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 113.
 - 13 Monique Weis, *Philipp de Marnix et le Saint Empire (1566–1578): Les connexions allemandes d'un porte-parole de la Révolte des Pays-Bas* (Brussels: Société royale d'histoire du protestantisme belge, 2004).
 - 14 Willem Frijhoff, 'Marnix over de opvoeding', in *Een Intellectuele Activist: Studies over Leven en Werk van Philips van Marnix van Sint Aldegonde*, ed. H. Duits and T. van Strein (Hilversum: Verloren, 2001), 59–76.
 - 15 Philip van Marnix and Gaspar van der Heyden, 'Rondgaande brief, namens de gemeenten te Heidelberg en Frankenthal, aan de verstrooide gemeente der vluchtelingen in Engeland en Duitschland', in *Philips van Marnix van St. Aldegonde: Godsdienstige en kerkelijke geschriften, aanhangsel*, ed. J. J. van Toorenenbergen (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1878), 3–38.

- 16 Herbert Frost, 'Ablauf und kirchrechtsgeschichtliche Bedeutung der Bedburger Synode vom 3. und 4. Juli 1571', in *400 Jahre Bedburger Synode: Eine Festschrift* (Niederaußen: Evangelische Kirchengemeinde Bedburg, 1971), 25–48.
- 17 J. H. Hessels, ed., *Epistulae et Tractatus cum Reformationis tum Ecclesiae Londino-Batavae Historiam illustrantes, 1544–1622*, vol. 2 (Cambridge: Ecclesiae Londino-Batavae, 1889), 378–87; H. Q. Janssen and J. J. van Toorenenbergen, eds, *Acten van classicale en synodale vergaderingen der verstrooide gemeente in het land van Cleef, Sticht van Keulen en Aken, 1571–1589* (Utrecht: Kemink & zoon, 1882), 3–7. The German-language records report that the meeting was 3 July. The Dutch-language records indicate that the meeting lasted two days. Some have speculated that the Dutch speakers may have held separate meetings on the second day, though there is no clear evidence for this. Frost, 'Ablauf', 30.
- 18 Charles Littleton, 'The Strangers, their Churches and the Continent: Continuing and Changing Connexions', in *Immigrants in Tudor and Early Stuart England*, ed. Nigel Goose and Lien Luu (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2005), 184; Timothy Fehler, 'The French Congregation's Struggle for Acceptance in Emden, Germany', in *Memory and Identity: The Huguenots, France, and the Atlantic Diaspora*, ed. Bertrand van Ruymbeke and Randy J. Sparks (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 79–80.
- 19 Willem Nijenhuis, ed., 'The Synod of Emden, 1571', in *Ecclesia Reformata: Studies in the Reformation* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 101–24. For the political implications of these debates, see J. J. Woltjer, 'De politieke betekenis van de Emdense synod', in *De synode van Emden, oktober 1571: Een bundel opstellen ter gelegenheid van de vierhonderdjarige herdenking*, ed. D. Nauta, J. P. van Dooren and Otto J. de Jong (Kampen: Kok, 1971), 22–49.
- 20 F. L. Rutgers, ed., *Acta van de Nederlandsche synoden der zestiende eeuw* (Dordrecht: J.P. van den Tol, 1980), 59–61.
- 21 Glenn S. Sunshine, *Reforming French Protestantism: The Development of Huguenot Ecclesiastical Institutions, 1557–1572* (Kirkville: Truman State University Press, 2003).
- 22 The English congregations formed organs they called the colloquy and coetus. Becker, *Gemeindeordnung und Kirchengründung*. Muylaert, *Shaping the Stranger Churches*, 63–6, 75–8, 82–5. East Friesland had already long had a body they called a coetus, which operated a bit differently than the coetus in England. Henning P. Jürgens, *Johannes a Lasco in Ostfriesland: Der Werdegang eines europäischen Reformators* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 304–11.
- 23 The classis was also called the classis of Wesel. On the role of this consistory in Wesel, Jesse Spohnholz, *The Tactics of Toleration: A Refugee Community in the Age of Religious Wars* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2011), 76–88.
- 24 The classis was also sometimes called the classis of Jülich.
- 25 Peter Gorter, *Gereformeerde migranten: De religieuze identiteit van Nederlandse gereformeerde migrantengemeenten in de rijkssteden Frankfurt am Main, Aken en Keulen (1555–1600)* (Hiversum: Verloren, 2021), 170.
- 26 For the classis of Cleves, Evangelisches Kirchenarchiv Wesel (hereafter EKAW) Gefach 12,5. For a modern printed edition, Eduard Simons, ed., *Synodalbuch: Die Akten der Synoden und Quartierkonsistorien in Jülich, Cleve und Berg, 1570–1610* (Neuwied: Louis Heuser, 1909). For classis of Cologne, Janssen and Toorenenbergen, *Acten van classicale en synodale vergaderingen*.
- 27 The classis was also sometimes called the Highland (*Oberland*) classis.

- 28 Friedrich Wilhelm Cuno, *Die pfälzischen reformirten Fremdegemeinden* (Westheim: Verlag des evangelischen Vereins für die Pfalz, 1886), 22–3.
- 29 Gorter, *Gereformeerde migranten*, 54, 169–70.
- 30 Institut für Stadtgeschichte (Frankfurt am Main), 1.12.21.2., Findbuch 653, 1.1.8.99, fols. 100–48.
- 31 H. Janssen, *Handelingen van den kerkeraad der Nederlandsche Gemeente te Keulen, 1571–1591* (Utrecht: Kemink & Zoon, 1881), 11, 19, 20–1. Eduard Simons, ed., *Kölnische Konsistorial-Beschlüsse: Presbyterial-Protokolle der heimliche Kölnische Gemeinde, 1572–1596* (Bonn: P. Hanstein's Verlag, 1905), 36.
- 32 Janssen and Toorenenbergen, *Acten van classicale en synodale vergaderingen*, 11–12; Janssen, *Handelingen*, 24–5.
- 33 Janssen and Toorenenbergen, *Acten van classicale en synodale vergaderingen*, 17.
- 34 *Ibid.*, 23.
- 35 *Ibid.*, 27.
- 36 In later years, elders discussed recommendations made at Emden, but they never treated them as binding. Simons, *Kölnische Konsistorial-Beschlüsse*, 124.
- 37 EKAW Gefach 72,2 fols. 45r–46r.
- 38 A. C. Duke, 'The Elusive Netherlands: The Question of National Identity in the Early Modern Low Countries on the Eve of the Revolt', *Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden* 119, no. 1 (2004): 10–38.
- 39 Spohnholz, *Tactics of Toleration*, 76–7.
- 40 Hermann Meinert, ed., *Das Protokollbuch der Niederländischen Reformierten Gemeinde zu Frankfurt am Main, 1570–1581* (Frankfurt am Main: Kramer, 1977), 140–1. This is also how the Dutch pastor in London, Simeon Ruytinck, meant the word 'nation' in the title of his 1618 book. Simeon Ruytinck, *Gheschiedenissen ende handelingen die voornemelick aengaen de Nederduytsche natie ende gemeynten: wonende in Engelant ende int bysonder tot Londen*, ed. J. J. van Toorenenbergen (Utrecht: Kemink en zoon, 1873).
- 41 Jerun Poettering, *Migrating Merchants: Trade, Nation, and Religion in Seventeenth-Century Hamburg and Portugal*, trans. Kenneth Kronenberg (Berlin: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2019), 53–4, 242–3.
- 42 Rutgers, *Acta*, 234.
- 43 *Livre synodal contenant les articules résolus dans les synodes des eglise Wallonnes des Pays-Bas*. vol. 1: 1563–1683 (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1896), 43–65.
- 44 Rutgers, *Acta*, 284.
- 45 See 'Advis du Synode sur les articules resolues à Emden pour estre communiqes à compaignie (assemblée des Eglise flamenge): Afin qu'il en soit arresté au Synode general', printed in Nicolaas Christiaan Kist, 'De Synoden der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerken onder het Kruis, gedurende de jaren 1563-1577, gehouden in Braband, Vlaanderen enz', *Nederlandsch archief voor kerkelijke geschiedenis* 9 (1849): 189; Rutgers, *Acta*, 303.
- 46 Rutgers, *Acta*, 304.
- 47 Meinert, *Das Protokollbuch*, 164. F. R. J. Knetsch, 'The National Synod of Dordrecht, 1578 and the Position of the Walloon Churches', *The Low Countries History Yearbook/Acta Historiae Neerlandicae* 13 (1980): 59–67.
- 48 Rutgers, *Acta*, 310–11; Gorter, *Gereformeerde migranten*, 172–3. See also Knetsch, 'National Synod of Dordrecht', 54–5. This objection was also raised in the fiercely particularistic city of Gouda. C. C. Hibben, *Gouda in Revolt: Particularism and Pacifism in the Revolt of the Netherlands 1572–1588* (Utrecht: HES, 1983), 105.

- 49 Rutgers, *Acta*, 311.
- 50 *Ibid.*, 339–643; J. P. van Dooren, ed., *De nationale synode te Middelburg in 1581: Calvinisme in opbouw in de Noordelijke en Zuidelijke Nederlanden* (Middelburg: Koninklijk Zeeuws Genootschap der Wetenschappen, 1981).
- 51 EKAW Gefach 72,2 fol. 229v–230r. Rutgers, *Acta*, 417, 427–30, 457–60.
- 52 EKAW Gefach 12,5 fol. 42r. Rutgers, *Acta*, 417, 437.
- 53 Jesse Spohnholz, ‘Olympias and Chrysostem: The Debate over Wesel’s Reformed Deaconesses, 1568–1609’, *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 98 (2007): 84–106.
- 54 Andrew Pettegree, *Emden and the Dutch Revolt: Exile and the Development of Reformed Protestantism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 73–4, 195–6.
- 55 Martinus Janssen (who became pastor in Delft), Lieven Massis (later pastor in Middelburg), Abraham Musenhole (who took a post in Breda), and Pierre Moreau (who served the Walloon congregation at Delft).
- 56 Mirjam G. K. van Veen and Jesse Spohnholz, ‘Calvinists vs. Libertines: A New Look at Religious Exile and the Origins of “Dutch” Tolerance’, in *Calvinism and the Making of the European Mind*, ed. Gijsbert van den Brink and Höpfl Harro M. (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 76–99.
- 57 J. de Wal, *Nederlanders, studenten te Heidelberg* (Leiden: Brill, 1886). On Heidelberg as an international centre of Reformed learning, see Christoph Strohm, ‘Die Universität Heidelberg als Zentrum der späten Reformation’, in *Kirche und Politik am Oberrhein im 16. Jahrhundert*, ed. Ulrich Wien and Volker Leppen (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 197–214.
- 58 Fred A. van Lieburg, *Profeten en hun vaderland: De geografische herkomst van de gereformeerde predikanten in Nederlamd van 1572 tot 1816* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1997), 198. See also Christiaan Ravensbergen, ‘Language Barrers to Confessional Migration: Reformed Ministers from the Palatinate in the East of the Netherlands (1578)’, in *Transregional Reformations: Crossing Borders in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Violet Soen et al. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019), 354–5.
- 59 EKAW Gefach 72,1 fol. 55r–v.
- 60 Ingeborg Schipper, ‘Across the Borders of Belief: Netherlandish Reformed Migrants and Confessional Boundaries in the Duchy of Cleves, c. 1550–1600’ (PhD diss., Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 2021), 129, 155.
- 61 Gorter, *Gereformeerde migranten*, 174–5.
- 62 Rutgers, *Acta*, 74.
- 63 Eduard Simons, ‘Ein rheinisches Synodalschreiben aus den Jahr 1576’, *Zeitschrift des Bergischen Geschichtsvereins* 36 (1903): 145–51.
- 64 Schipper, ‘Across the Borders of Belief’, 110, 111, 129. EKAW Gefach 72,2 48r. Simons, *Synodalbum*, 533; Th W. Jensma, *Uw Rijk kome: Acta van de Kerkeraad van de Nederduits Gereformeerde Gemeente te Dordrecht 1573–1579* (Dordrecht: J.P. van den Tol, 1981), 114.
- 65 EWKA Gefach 72,2 fols. 155v–156v.
- 66 Gorter, *Gereformeerde migranten*, 173–4.
- 67 Doede Nauta, ‘De Nationale Synode van Dordrecht’, in *De Nationale Synode van Dordrecht 1578: Gereformeerden uit de Noordelijke en Zuidelijke Nederlanden bijeen*, ed. Doede Nauta and J. P. Van Dooren (Amsterdam: Buijten & Schipperheijn, 1978), 47.
- 68 Rutgers, *Acta*, 332–3. Ravensbergen, ‘Language Barrers’, 341 n.32.
- 69 EKAW Gefach 72,2 fols. 222r–223v. Instead, Lauterbach took a post in Werth, in the prince-bishopric of Münster. David M. Luebke, *Hometown Religion: Regimes of*

- Coexistence in Early Modern Westphalia* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2016), 125.
- 70 EKAW Gefach 72,2 fols. 235r-v.
- 71 EKAW Gefach 72,2 fol. 217r, fol. 254r-v. Schipper, 'Across the Borders of Belief', 131-2.
- 72 Janssen, *Handelingen*, 13, 19, 25, 40; Janssen and Toorenenbergen, *Acten van classicale en synodale vergaderingen*, 30; Eduard Simons, *Niederrheinisches Synodal- und Gemeindeleben 'unter dem Kreuz'* (Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr, 1897), 56; Gorter, *Gereformeerde migranten*, 80, 165-6.
- 73 Gorter, *Gereformeerde migranten*, 167-8.
- 74 Janssen and Toorenenbergen, *Acten van classicale en synodale vergaderingen*, 14.
- 75 Johan van Toorenenbergen, ed., *Brieven uit onderscheidene kerkelijke archieven* (Utrecht: Kemink, 1882), 79; Janssen and Toorenenbergen, *Acten van classicale en synodale vergaderingen*, 30; Gorter, *Gereformeerde migranten*, 169-70.
- 76 Janssen, *Handelingen*, 10.
- 77 Toorenenbergen, *Brieven uit onderscheidene kerkelijke archieven*, 26, 55-7.
- 78 EKAW Gefach 72,2 fol. 124r-v. Toorenenbergen, *Brieven uit onderscheidene kerkelijke archieven*, 90.
- 79 Gorter, *Gereformeerde migranten*, 177.
- 80 Toorenenbergen, *Brieven uit onderscheidene kerkelijke archieven*, 95.
- 81 Spohnholz, *Tactics of Toleration*, 92; EKAW Gefach 72,2 fol. 27r; Gorter, *Gereformeerde migranten*, 177.
- 82 Andrew Spicer, *The French-speaking Reformed Community and their Church in Southampton, 1567-c.1620* (London: Huguenot Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 1997), 129; Muylaert, *Shaping the Stranger Churches*, 209.
- 83 EKAW Gefach 72,2 fols. 10r, 41r 47v, 48r-v, 65v-67v, 70r-71v, 93r, 163v, 165r-v.
- 84 EKAW Gefach 72,1 fol. 36v.
- 85 EKAW Gefach 72,2 fol. 157r. Jan G. J. van Booma, *Communio et mater fidelium: Acta des Konsistoriums der niederländischen reformierten Flüchtlingsgemeinde in Wesel, 1573-1582* (Cologne: Rheinland-Verlag, 1991), 80-1. For similar collections in England, see Spicer, *French-speaking Reformed Community*, 113.
- 86 EKAW Gefach 72,3 15-19, 20-1.
- 87 EKAW Gefach 72,3 57. Gorter, *Gereformeerde migranten*, 176-7. EKAW Gefach 72,3 131-2. Another gift arrived from some a source whose name is illegible. Gefach 72,3 135-6.
- 88 Toorenenbergen, *Brieven uit onderscheidene kerkelijke archieven*, 123; EKAW Gefach 72,3 57.
- 89 Spohnholz, *Tactics of Toleration*, 92; Frederick Norwood, *The Reformation Refugees as an Economic Force* (Chicago: American Society of Church History, 1942), 10.
- 90 EKAW Gefach 72,3 120-2.
- 91 EKAW Gefach 72,3 159-61.
- 92 Janssen, *Handelingen*, 17.
- 93 *Ibid.*, 17-18. The records do not indicate that Joris de Greve was deceased, but that seems likely.
- 94 After the grandmother died, Wesel's Reformed deacons found local caretakers for the children. Spohnholz, *Tactics of Toleration*, 93.
- 95 EKAW Gefach 72,3 133-4; Spohnholz, *Tactics of Toleration*, 93.
- 96 Toorenenbergen, *Brieven uit onderscheidene kerkelijke archieven*, 130-3.
- 97 Gorter, *Gereformeerde migranten*, 176.

- 98 Toorenenbergen, *Brieven uit onderscheidene kerkelijke archieven*, 81.
- 99 Muylaert, *Shaping the Stranger Churches*, 175–87. More support for Orange's cause came from wealthy English Protestants than Netherlanders in England. David Trim, 'Immigrants, the Indigenous Community, and International Calvinism', in *Immigrants in Tudor and Early Stuart England*, ed. Goose and Luu, 211–22.
- 100 An elder at Wesel later explained that they had loaned 100 dalerto Sonoy, 'not for the common good [*gemeynen nuts*], but for Sonoy's own personal use.' EKAW Gefach 72,2 fol. 108r.
- 101 EKAW Gefach 72,2 fol. 58r.
- 102 EKAW Gefach 72,2 fol. 159r. The surviving copy of this letter in Wesel is not complete, so it is not clear whether they sent the letter as written. However, the missive does provide an explanation of their attitude.
- 103 Alastair Duke, 'Calvinist Loyalism: Jean Haren, Chimay, and the Demise of the Calvinist Republic of Bruges', in *Dissident Identities in the Early Modern Low Countries*, ed. Judith Pollmann and Andrew Spicer (London: Routledge, 2009), 271.
- 104 These data come from a database, currently with 19,164 individuals who lived in these eleven cities (not all of whom were members of these congregations) that was compiled as part of the larger project mentioned in footnote 9.
- 105 Muylaert is currently completing a monograph on this topic, tentatively titled 'Arent Cornelisz, Mobility, and the Reformed Landscape of the Netherlands, 1570–1600.' In Calvinist-ruled Ghent, residents were required by law to belong to the Reformed Church. J. Decavele, *Het Eind van een rebelse droom: Opstellen over het Calvinistisch bewind te Gent (1577–1584) en de terugkeer van de stad onder de gehoorzaamheid van de koning van Spanje (17 september 1584)* (Ghent: Stadsbestuur, 1984).
- 106 Benjamin J. Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines: Confession and Community in Utrecht, 1578–1620* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 196–260.
- 107 Müller, *Exile Memories*.
- 108 *Bewegreden en propositie tot soulaas der arme Franse vluchtelingen van de Gereformeerde religie* (Amsterdam: n.p., 1688). My thanks to David de Boer for this reference. See also David van der Linden, *Experiencing Exile: Huguenot Refugees in the Dutch Republic* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), 177–223.
- 109 Jesse Spohnholz and Mirjam G. K. van Veen Veen, 'The Disputed Origins of Dutch Calvinism: Religious Refugees in the Historiography of the Dutch Reformation', *Church History* 86, no. 2 (2017): 398–426.

Inventing Irish identity in exile

Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin

The confessional configuration of early modern Ireland was crucially influenced by a whole series of transnational forces and developments that gave rise to a significant displacement of people, who found themselves forced to try to negotiate new positions for themselves in a series of different environments, not least through the development of narratives of meritorious victimhood that presented these exiles as refugees from their native land. While this chapter concentrates on Irish Catholicism, the evolution of the island in this period can only be understood when account is taken of the fact that it became home to two very different Protestant traditions, both of which were almost entirely the product of inward migration. By the end of the seventeenth century, perhaps only 10 per cent of the Irish population identified themselves as adherents of the official Church of Ireland, but members of this community dominated the political landscape of the kingdom, owned the bulk of its land and largely monopolized control of municipal administration and a great deal of its commercial activity. Their predominance reflected the most comprehensive example of the displacement of an existing elite by an immigrant grouping anywhere in Europe, with the possible exception of parts of the Balkan peninsula under Turkish rule.

A very vigorous strand of Protestant non-conformity also existed on the island, of which the dominant grouping was Presbyterianism centred in the northern province of Ulster, and largely deriving from a series of waves of Scottish immigration over the course of a century. Although vitally important figures such as Archbishop James Ussher, the outstanding Protestant intellectual of early modern Ireland, or James Butler, the Duke of Ormond, and the most influential political figure of the era, belonged to established pre-Elizabethan families, the correlation between Protestant identity and late Tudor/Stuart era British provenance was ubiquitous.¹

The majority Catholic population of the island, on the other hand, largely represented the descendants of families – whether Gaelic or Anglo-Norman – already rooted in the island prior to Elizabeth's accession in 1558. Nevertheless, Irish Catholicism too was deeply shaped by important transnational institutions and events. In the course of seventy years down to the death of Elizabeth I in 1603, the English state for the first time expanded its effective jurisdiction to encompass the entire island, in the process breaking the independent military power of a large number of previously autonomous lordships. The culmination of this process was the defeat of what became close to a

country-wide insurrection, the Nine Years' War, 1594–1603.² The driving motor of this series of sixteenth-century conflicts was not primarily religion – even if little native enthusiasm for the Reformation was visible in the island – rather they were sparked principally by the increasingly intrusive attempts of the state to tranquillize and subdue the island's lordships.³ Nevertheless, religion became foregrounded as a significant issue of tension for two major reasons.

First, the Protestant character of the English regimes of this period, leaving aside the reign of Mary 1553–8, more or less ensured that Gaelic and Gaelicized rebels against their authority would seek to gain continental assistance by playing the religious card. This became evident in the 1530s during the Kildare rebellion and the Geraldine league, when resentments of Henry VIII's government led to appeals for aid to fellow Catholics from the Emperor; in the 1570s and 1580s during the Desmond and Baltinglass rebellions, which framed resistance to Elizabeth as war in the interests of the Catholic religion; and during the Nine Years' War when Hugh O'Neill sought to transfer suzerainty of the kingdom from England to Spain and insisted that he remained in arms to vindicate the rights of the Catholic Church.⁴ The defeat of these various rebellions also resulted in the flight of defeated protagonists to the continent, where they naturally chose to emphasize the confessional motivations behind their failed insurrections: Gerald FitzGerald, eleventh earl of Kildare, found refuge with his kinsman Reginald Pole in Rome;⁵ James Eustace, third Viscount Baltinglass, became a pensioner of Philip II in Spain until his death in 1585; and most famously Hugh O'Neill, second earl of Tyrone, finished his days in Rome as the reluctant recipient of papal and Habsburg largesse.⁶

Second, religion emerged as an important site of cleavage between the older colonial community generally termed the 'Old English', which dated back to the original Norman conquest, and the growing Elizabethan administration and army. The last decades of Tudor rule in Ireland, morphing gradually into a war of conquest, proved ruinously expensive. This exasperated the queen, but drove her loyal Irish subjects to desperation, who found themselves expected to pay for a disproportionate part of the expenses of maintaining English forces. Their bitter complaints about mis-government in Ireland undermined the careers of a series of English governors during the 1560s, 1570s and 1580s.⁷ This atmosphere of financial constraint and bitter recrimination militated against the inculcation of an English-style reformation in colonial Ireland which, in turn, led to an escalating series of tensions between incoming English administrators, increasingly the product of a Protestant formation, and the religiously conservative Old English of Ireland. At an accelerating rate, the colonial community's resentment of governmental innovation translated into rejection of the new church establishment. This further deepened the rift between them and their government: English administrators could use the disobedient religious stance of the Old English as a weapon to undermine their criticisms of the government's actions, a stance which was both useful and consonant with the apocalyptic expectations which vigorous Protestantism and the threat of Spanish invasion created in the last decades of the reign. The watershed moment in this regard was the 1590s; under massive military pressure during the Nine Years' War the government lost all effective capacity to enforce religious

conformity, which facilitated a massive desertion of the Established church by the Old English and a definitive alignment of the community with Catholicism.⁸ Added to their lukewarm commitment to the military struggle with O'Neill, the officials and military commanders of the state found in this stance an essential confirmation of the doubtful loyalty of the older colonial community. Coming to dominate the Irish government in the wake of the rebellion, they strongly articulated a view that only English Protestants could be considered truly loyal and helped to preside over a 'Plantation' society which aimed to secure and tranquillize Ireland by the importation of strategic colonies of settlers.⁹

Religion thus became the vector through which the conflicts of sixteenth-century Ireland intersected with the Europe of the wars of religion. And contacts with the continent of Europe and expatriate communities resident there proved deeply influential in the development of Irish Catholicism throughout the seventeenth century. Critically important to this process was the mobilization of a refugee identity and vocabulary by different groups of Catholic exiles. Clearly motivated in large part by the desire to provoke sympathy and support from their continental coreligionists, the insistence on religious persecution ultimately became centrally important to Catholic Irish self-understanding. As a result, the influence of this refugee construction of Irish exile eventually extended far beyond the relatively small number of intellectuals who helped to construct the paradigm.

Secular Catholic exiles in Europe

Catholic Europe provided refuge, education, succour and employment to both secular and clerical Irish migrants. At the heart of the secular Irish community in exile were the defeated aristocrats and military leaders who had opposed Elizabeth. Two special nexuses developed in this regard; one in Spain and centred on La Coruña, and the other in the southern Netherlands. The La Coruña community in exile, which saw the arrival of up to 10,000 Irish in the decade following the defeat of the Spanish army of intervention at Kinsale in 1601, deployed a number of different strategies to excite Spanish favour. One approach was to insist on an identity of Spanish brotherhood. Tracing their origin to Spain through Milesian ancestry, the Gaelic Irish thus claimed kinship with the Iberian population and a natural claim on their assistance.¹⁰ But far more important was the significance of wartime service, both to Spain and to Catholicism. In 1596, the Irish confederates had turned down generous peace terms on the basis of assurances of support from Spain. From this point on, both sides considered themselves allies in a war with a heretical power. This resulted in the arrival of a Spanish expeditionary army at Kinsale, as well as a smaller series of supplies of money and munitions. In the aftermath of the war, the Irish in Habsburg dominions were thus at pains to present themselves not simply as cases of charity but as defeated allies to whom the Spanish had obligations. Encompassing and buttressing these factors was an insistence on the religious dimension of the struggle which had precipitated their flight from Ireland.

In 1605, for instance, Donal Cam O'Sullivan Beare, the single most important figure in this northern Spanish immigration, addressed a memorial to Philip III. In this document, he emphasized the richness and importance of the position which he had held in Ireland prior to the war and his good standing with the English government. Nevertheless, he had placed 'the service of God and of Your Majesty above his own personal interest' in providing the Spanish invasion of Ireland with much needed assistance. Following the defeat, he put himself at great personal risk to rescue endangered Spaniards and 'as one who wished to continue in the service of God and of Your Majesty' maintained the war in the south at great expense, until he was forced to take his forces to Ulster, performing notable actions against the common enemy and taking fearsome casualties. His prominent role ultimately meant that he was excluded from pardon and 'subjected to such persecution that he was in manifest danger of losing his life' so that he was moved to respond to the written invitation of the King of Spain to take refuge in Iberia,

for he was no longer able to maintain himself in that kingdom, nor could he benefit from the peace, from which he was excluded because he took such a leading part in the defence of the Catholic cause and in the service of Your Majesty.

In that context he appealed to the monarch to recompense him for the vast extent of his losses and the quality of his service by the provision of honourable pensions 'to himself, his wife and his household'.¹¹

O'Sullivan's claim to Spanish assistance can thus be seen to depend on several key factors: he was at pains to demonstrate the magnitude of his loss; the sheer extent of the fortune which had been placed at hazard for religion and for Spain. Substantial merit thus inhered in the way his personal interest had been set aside for a higher purpose. In a manner which was hardly likely to offend Spanish sensibilities, there was an essential assumption too that the service of religion and of the monarchy were inextricably linked. O'Sullivan also emphasized the quality of the services he had rendered: the dangers which the Spanish in Ireland would have undergone without his assistance, the size of the forces he had raised, the manner in which he was exceptional in maintaining the struggle and the damage which he had inflicted on the adversary. Finally, O'Sullivan insisted on the necessity which had brought him to Spain as a result of the genuine danger to life and the manner in which his wartime role had resulted in his exclusion from pardon.

It can be noted that this memorial was accompanied by a letter from the Count of Caracena, the governor of Galicia, which noted that 'It is true that he lost everything in defence of the Catholic cause and in the service of Your Majesty'.¹²

This explication of the religious and political merits of the Irish reached its apotheosis in the publication of *Historiae Catholicae Iberniae compendium*,¹³ by a close kinsman of Donal Cam, Philip O'Sullivan Beare, whose text situated the conflicts of sixteenth-century Ireland within an entirely confessional framework of a war between Catholics and heretics. This was a book aimed at stimulating continental sympathy and admiration as well as rescuing the memory of unconquerable martyrs

afflicted with giant sufferings [who] vigorously poured out their souls; our greatly pious confessors of faith who suffered in squalor, placed in foetid prisons left this

life to the splendour of a fiery palace; our most eloquent preachers who opposed the rage of hellish doctrine; our most strong and famous leaders and magnanimous soldiers who preferred to fall in battle, fiercely and bravely fighting than to submit to heretics, the worst type of men; our women who endowed with a manly spirit never succumbed to the terror of the heretics; our children and infants whose lives the swords of the heretics rarely spared.¹⁴

But sympathy was not merely to excite pity but part of a project to fire enthusiasm for Catholic intervention because an understanding of the venerability and merits of Irish Catholicism and its current degradation by the savage brutality of its heretical enemies would necessarily inspire the desire 'that aid should be given to that kingdom by which the Apostolic faith should be liberated into freedom from the servitude of the heretics and be restored to its prior state and splendor'.¹⁵

Inevitably, Irish Catholics in Spain during the first decades of the seventeenth century must have been aware of the contemporaneous debates concerning the Morisco population which ultimately resulted in the mass deportation of Spanish Muslims in 1609. Echoes of those debates presumably helped to ensure that even the 'gente inutil' (useless people) among the Irish exiles to Spain were not deported back to a heretical jurisdiction where their faith and souls might be threatened.¹⁶

At the core of the Irish community in the southern Netherlands were two key institutions: a dedicated Irish regiment, *el viejo tercio Irlandese* (the old Irish regiment), and the Irish Franciscan college of St. Anthony's at Louvain. The existence of the regiment both reflected the sense of obligation which the Habsburg dynasty felt towards Hugh O'Neill, whose sons in turn commanded the *tercio*, and the desire to make use of Irish manpower in the war against the Dutch. It can be noted, however, that especial care was taken to keep the regiment in being even after the 1609 truce, which again evidently reflected the claim on Spanish generosity which O'Neill's conduct during the Nine Years' War had created.¹⁷ On the other hand, much to O'Neill's frustration, he was offered no possibility of achieving what he really wished, namely a return to Ireland, either through a Spanish-brokered deal with James VI and I, or as the spearhead of a new insurrection and Spanish war with England.

In attempting to sway Habsburg sympathies, O'Neill and his ally Ruairi O'Donnell outspokenly insisted on the compelling religious importance of the Irish situation, insisting that if the king failed to respond he would 'be called to account for it before the Supreme Judge' before finishing their letter with the hope that the king be preserved 'for the good of the oppressed Catholics of all Christendom'.¹⁸ This was a motif which had been stressed by O'Neill's partisans during the Nine Years' War, most notably by Peter Lombard in Rome, who stressed how a victory for the Catholic party in Ireland could act as a springboard to much wider gains against Protestantism across Northern Europe by virtue of Ireland's geographical position, astride the trading routes to the Americas and within easy sailing distance of Britain and the great Catholic maritime powers, and as a result of its natural resources, and its warlike and fervent population.¹⁹ This theme of the island as a vital geopolitical base for European Catholicism 'from which any supplies could easily be transferred against all heretical regions of the North' continued to be emphasized down until the Peace of Westphalia and formed

the background to many of the Irish claims to succour and assistance.²⁰ In 1607, the fragile peace with England was too important for Spain to put it at risk for the sake of their Irish allies, but they did ensure that O'Neill was kept in frustrated comfort in a Roman palace until his death.

Irish clerical migrants on the continent

St. Anthony's was to prove one of the most important links in an extraordinary chain of Irish colleges which mushroomed into existence in Catholic Europe from the later years of the sixteenth century and which catered to a constant migratory flow of students and clergy which ultimately allowed for the consolidation of Catholicism as the majority religion in Ireland. Between 1578 and 1680, twenty-nine such institutions were founded. Seventeen of these catered the education of secular clergy, of which six were situated in Iberia and five in the Netherlands, together with five in France and one in Rome. Supplementing these were twelve regular colleges for various orders of friars, including a Franciscan college in Prague, the most eastern outpost of this phenomenon.²¹ The colleges represented an institutional response to a consistent pattern of Irish Catholics coming to continental Europe for education, rather than continuing to frequent the English universities of Oxford and Cambridge. This became visible initially during the reign of Edward VI, with two future Catholic archbishops in the island, Richard Creagh and Dermot O'Hurley, matriculating in Louvain in 1548 and 1549, respectively.²²

From the 1570s, there is a record of petitions of Irish in Salamanca, seeking financial assistance from the university to allow them to complete their studies. These invariably foregrounded the trope of religious persecution in Ireland. Oliver Eustace, for instance, recorded the 'injuries of the savage heretics' which prevented him from receiving support from Ireland. He also sourced a supporting testimonial from the papal nuncio who described him as 'exiled from his homeland because of the Catholic religion'.²³ John Philips noted the violent rushing into his homeland of the 'pestilential' heresy of the English.²⁴ He was an ordained priest, and although the university noted that they were already supporting an Irishman (Eustace), he had managed to attract the support of 'very distinguished people' at court and was thus given the first available chaplaincy as well as a stipend.²⁵ Similarly Thomas Prendergast, explicitly using the term 'refugiens', claimed that he was 'fleeing the viciousness and violence of the heretics' in coming to Spain.²⁶ The following year his stipend was renewed with the university, noting that he had 'come fleeing the Lutherans of England who molest his country'.²⁷ Like Eustace, Prendergast was supported by the papal nuncio in his application for relief. A similar pattern can be seen with regard to the Irish College in Lisbon during the 1590s, when the collector at the nunciature wrote on behalf of Irish students to Rome urging support for 'poor young Irish fled from that island of Ireland through heresy'.²⁸ Prendergast ultimately continued to receive support for four years.

The success of individual Irish petitions at Salamanca depended on the belief that they were victims of heresy and thus entitled to support in Catholic Spain. Testimonials from prestigious figures were important also in encouraging the university to extend

assistance, but renewal of aid for a further length of time was clearly contingent on convincing the authorities that they were indeed worthy recipients of this type of charity. But the development of a network of Irish colleges in Catholic Europe saw an important modulation in the perception of the nature of the charitable enterprise. Above all, the goal of the colleges was to form Irish priests to return to Ireland – a model of students as organizational migrants rather than refugees. The language of heretical oppression of the Irish certainly continued, but support for the colleges was an act of charity to the Irish people and to the church. In 1606, Philip III articulated this very clearly in a letter to Archduke Albert in Flanders, explaining his decision to fund a college in Louvain to the tune of 1,000 ducats annually because the Franciscan provincial of the Irish province, Flaithrí Ó Maolchonaire, had informed him:

that by cause of the persecution of the heretics this order has greatly diminished in that kingdom [. . .] and being prohibited studies there the old preachers they have there are deficient, supplicating me so that the Catholic religion should not entirely be brought to nothing but persist in vigor in that kingdom, assisted and sustained by learned persons of that order, to give them alms annually while the persecution lasts, so that in the university of Louvain a number of young religious from that country can maintain themselves and study and for the reasons mentioned and other just considerations of the service of God I have accorded them this favor and alms.²⁹

The primary purpose of the Irish colleges, therefore, was not to offer charity merely to individual Irish figures but rather to provide the clerical lifeblood to sustain Catholicism in Ireland itself. This was made explicitly clear, for instance, in the constitution of the secular college at Louvain. Students were required to bring letters of recommendation from the highest ecclesiastical authority in their native dioceses, together with a document outlining their previous education and vocation to religious life. Once admitted, as was standard in all the colleges, students had to swear an oath to enter the priesthood and go back to Ireland when deemed ready to do so.³⁰ Of course not all students returned to their native land. In September 1639, for instance, the archdeacon of Arras, Richard Pauli-Stravius, complained to Rome that many Irish who had received ordination to undertake missionary activity postponed ‘their return to their country on the pretext of studying, who continue like this for eight, ten, and twelve years, living on the offerings of their masses.’³¹ Nevertheless, very considerable numbers did make their way back. To take a single example, in 1652, the rector of St. Patrick’s at Salamanca claimed that over six decades the college had sent 389 priests to Ireland.³² Without such success, it is unlikely that wealthy continental patrons would have continued to fund the establishment and continuation of what became a plethora of Irish institutions.

Of critical importance to the success of the Irish colleges was the agency of Irish expatriates themselves. In contrast, for instance, with the rather desultory support of the papacy for Balkan Catholicism through the Loreto college, Irish institutions invariably developed from the networking and perseverance of Irish migrants. As noted by Philip III, Flaithrí Ó Maolchonaire was the critical lobbyist who ultimately

secured royal support for St. Anthony's. St. Isidore's in Rome owed everything to the relationship forged by Irish Franciscan, Luke Wadding, with the cardinal nephew, Ludovico Ludovisi. The Irish Jesuit, John Howling, successfully involved his wealthy colleague, Pedro Fonseca, to develop the college of Lisbon, whose board quickly developed into an *irmandade* (confraternity) drawn 'from the most considerable of the kingdom'.³³ Francis Nugent was integral to the establishment of Capuchin houses in Lille and in Charleville.³⁴

Central to these successes and many others was the manner in which such Irish advocates were able to convince enthusiastic continental Catholics of the 'so pious and so praiseworthy' nature of the endeavours.³⁵ In fact, the support of Irish Catholicism was so self-evidently worthy a cause, that it could offer a way out of difficult political circumstances. In 1645, Innocent X was able to begin his pontificate with a major cash donation to the Irish confederates rather than any other Catholic cause, which would have aroused hostility in the context of the Franco-Habsburg war. By trumpeting the Irish mission, he even managed to smuggle a nuncio into France to attempt to mend fences with Mazarin's regime.³⁶ Similarly, the Irish Capuchin foundation at Charleville proved convenient for the Walloon province of the order, since it allowed them to respond to the request of Charles de Gonzague, who did not want the Bourbon-linked French province in his lands, without themselves moving into French territory.³⁷

The reshaping of Irish identity

A particularly important cohort of Irish clerical figures stayed far longer than the three or four years needed to graduate, namely intellectually outstanding figures who were retained to progress to further study, and to teach and discharge other responsibilities. Some of these, such as Flaithrí Ó Maolchonaire and Aodh MacAingil, two of the most able theologians produced within the Gaelic tradition and the authors of seminal devotional texts in the Irish language, ended their lives on the continent, as did possibly the two most significant Old English clerical intellectuals, Peter Lombard and Luke Wadding. Another gargantuan figure, David Rothe, spent two decades on the continent before eventually returning to the island, to become vice-primate and then bishop of Ossory.

This expatriate clerical network proved the nerve centre of a multifaceted programme of literary, historical, devotional and hagiographical activity which had a truly revolutionary effect on Irish Catholicism. Elsewhere, I have suggested that these clerical exiles were animated by two chief preoccupations. First, they wished to bring Ireland to the attention of a wider European audience. This was a vital factor in their attempt to excite the generosity of their continental hosts for further support of the colleges and the communities in exile. But operating in tandem with this was an ardent streak of patriotism, which was desperate to establish Irishness as a meritorious identity in the contemporary European family of Catholic nations.³⁸ A certain parallel can perhaps be seen here with Jan Amos Comenius's desire to ensure that the suffering of Bohemian Protestants was included in the Protestant canon of suffering as a new

version of Foxe's *Acts* was being prepared.³⁹ Irish Franciscans in Louvain, for instance, noted:

the distressed state of our native country, which albeit in time past being rightly reputed and still named the Isle of Sainctes through the infinitt multitudes of her most holy men wherin she easily surpasseth ech other kindome, yet was not soe happie at that any hitherto should bring to light her manifould ancient ecclesiasticall monuments, to the no smale dishounour of the whole nation.⁴⁰

Second, they saw themselves as part of an enterprise of renewal of Irish Catholicism, by bringing it into conformity with contemporary European notions of morality, sanctity and devotion. Hagiography was itself a tool to sharpen devotion by bringing alive the memory of Irish saints, in the process restoring their honour, and to acknowledge and give thanks for their intercessory power. The Franciscans were inspired by

how all other Catholicke kingdoms earnestly endeavour to extend their name and fame to procure their felicity and final salvation, and to mantayne in vigour to the divine service and Catholicke faith by the devout worshipping of their proper Sainctes and holly patrones [. . .] what ingratitude it is not to acknowledge the innumerable benefits by their merits received whom even as our country had of old on earth those glorious instructors and doctors of the lawe of life and discipline, so them enjoyeth for intercessors in the celestiaall kindome to matayne constantly the faith and piety by them anciently thought.⁴¹

What became a profound reworking and rearticulation of Irish Catholic identity was largely mediated by this network of continental exiles, the vast bulk of whom were clerics. A particularly seminal figure was Peter Lombard, who combined a heavyweight career as theologian and author with a vitally important organizational role as the chief arbiter of promotion within the Irish church as archbishop of Armagh. Lombard seems to have left Ireland as a teenager in 1572 and ultimately never returned. He enjoyed a glittering career at the university of Louvain, first as a student and then as a professor. Dispatched to Rome on the business of his university at the end of the century, Lombard became a vital part of Hugh O'Neill's lobbying network, and it was largely due to his alliance with the earl that he was elevated to the primatial see of Armagh in 1600. It was during this period that he penned his influential treatise *De Regno Hiberniae Sanctorum Insula Commentarius* in 1600–1601.

Lombard's text foregrounded fidelity to Catholicism as the central characteristic of Irish identity. The Irish were so tenacious of Catholicism that they could never be either tricked or intimidated to abandon it.⁴² This organic connection between Catholicism and Irishness was grounded in a particular presentation of Irish history and topography. Lombard devoted a large part of his text to the national apostle, St. Patrick. In significant respects, his portrait emphasized tropes in Patrick which also distinguished Lombard and his own contemporaries. He stressed the eighteen years that the saint spent studying in continental Europe, his journeys to Rome and the support of his mission by the papacy, and the manner in which he was equipped with

vital liturgical and cultic objects such as vestments, chalices and books. His Patrick was an opponent of British heresy, most notably Pelagianism and Arianism.⁴³ Ireland's freedom from snakes was traditionally ascribed to the saint, but Lombard emphasized an allegorical reading of this episode. The scriptural representation of heresy through the figure of serpent allowed for an understanding that what Patrick had achieved was in fact the safeguarding of the Irish character against the ingress of heretical religion. Similarly, the purity of Irish waters carried the gifts of holy men, their health-promoting qualities had been 'imparted and obtained through the merits of the Saints of this region.'⁴⁴

Lombard also devoted an extensive section of his text to a refutation of Scottish claims to ancient Irish saints. The medieval custom of referring to the Irish as 'Scoti' had opened the way for figures such as George Thompson, who in 1594 published his Douai edition of *De Antiquitate Christianae Religionis apud Scotos*, to try to appropriate individuals described with this term for Scotland.⁴⁵ The zeal with which Lombard pursued this argument was fired by a number of considerations. The first was clearly the desire to vindicate national honour in a fashion similar to the Louvain Franciscans. But medieval Irish saints played a critical role in Lombard's identity-building for three additional reasons. First, their holiness exemplified the national character, a holiness which found its expression in fervent Catholicism. Second, a key element of the heroic success of medieval saints lay in their evangelization of Europe. For a Catholic exile such as Lombard, this was of central importance. For not only did it demonstrate the longstanding dialectic of Irish and continental contribution to the maintenance of Catholic belief, but it allowed for a transformed perspective on the relationship between contemporary European Catholicism and its persecuted Irish variant. Rather than mere charity – the transfer of resources and support from the metropolitan centre to the Irish – this could become a reciprocal arrangement in which both parties benefitted, with Christian charity being rewarded by both constancy and heroic endeavour. Hagiography also allowed for the elaboration of identity in an idiom of central importance to the post-Tridentine church, integrating Irish experience into a lineage of sanctity stretching back to the persecutions of the original Christian martyrs of antiquity. Third, this vertical chronological exposition of Irish identity had interesting implications for the complex ethnic composite of the contemporary Catholic community on the island. Lombard was himself of Old English stock, but he framed the medieval past in national rather than ethnic terms. This was of central importance because not only did it allow a figure like Lombard to claim the sanctity of the Irish medieval inheritance, but it also constructed the conflict in Ireland as between heresy and true religion, in which English rule became the chief reason for the regression of Ireland from its pristine state. He invoked his own English ancestors to disavow any anti-English bias, but he did not shy away from the implications of the Tudor Reformation. By virtue of the breach with Rome, English rule in Ireland had now become pernicious and inimical to the preservation of religion, as was clearly demonstrated by the manner in which first a boy and then a woman had become the supposed head of Christ's church.⁴⁶

The text, however, was not a manifesto of despair. Instead, Lombard highlighted how the Irish abroad formed part of a providential pattern which allowed for the

education of pastors who could not merely instruct the Irish but improve their morals by restoring the continence and austerity of the ancient habits of life.⁴⁷ A key element of this mode of religious restoration was the burgeoning network of Irish Colleges in Iberia and Flanders.⁴⁸ On the other hand, he also detected the hand of divine providence in the visible failure of heretical ministers and preachers to win the Irish people for the Protestant church.⁴⁹

Lombard's *Commentarius* was not published until 1632, but his position as chief ecclesiastical organizer of the Irish church ensured a wide currency for his ideas. The influential hagiographer Thomas Messingham clearly had had sight of the manuscript. It seems inevitable too that David Rothe, who acted as Lombard's secretary in Rome, was aware of Lombard's writings. Rothe represents an interesting counterpoint to Lombard in that his intellectual formation largely occurred on the continent, but he eventually returned to Ireland as vice-primate.⁵⁰ It was in the first years after his return that he produced one of his most significant writings, *Analecta Sacra Nova et Mira, de rebus Catholicorum in Hibernia*, which can be seen as part of the profound adjustment that a cultivated Catholic intelligence had to make to the entirely different circumstances of the clandestine Irish church.⁵¹ Both Lombard and O'Sullivan Beare wrote openly in favour of armed Catholic intervention in Ireland. Rothe could not afford such bluntness, but his work is fascinating for the manner in which he reshaped ideas put forward by Lombard for a less confrontational but still uncompromisingly Catholic version of the Irish past and identity.

Rothe's presentation of the Irish Catholic experience emphasized both its difference from and its similarity to the European version, in a fashion which helps explain how Irish exiles proved so adept at firing the enthusiasm and exploiting the charity of their continental hosts. When describing the difficult conditions in Ireland, he noted that Irish Catholics were identical in their beliefs and religion to their continental counterparts, but they differed profoundly in that the Irish were forced to suffer for their faith while European Catholics were rewarded and praised for the same acts.⁵²

Part of Rothe's audience was certainly intended to be cultivated continental Catholics and this presentation allowed them to empathize with their Irish coreligionists while enjoying a certain frisson of horror at their tribulations. Rothe also expanded at length on a theme adumbrated in Lombard, namely the almost ontological Catholicity of the Irish who were 'all naturally led as if by instinct and drawn by a good guardian spirit to believing this standard [Catholicism]'.⁵³ Even the tiny handful of Irish who were tempted to apostacy generally repented on their deathbeds. He noted smugly that the Protestant Lord Deputy of Ireland, Sir Arthur Chichester, had bitterly observed that 'he did not know where this tenacity of Roman religion should come from in the hearts of the Irish unless the very soil was infected or the air polluted'.⁵⁴

Even immigrants to the island were moulded by this national characteristic according to Rothe, claiming (with striking disregard for the fact of a growing immigrant Protestant community) that the very soil of the island seemed to germinate Catholics.⁵⁵ And Ireland's merits were even more strongly revealed by its difference to its neighbouring peoples, whose lapsing from Catholicism he saw as a surrender to the pleasures of vice.⁵⁶ Rothe's work probably was of particular utility to Old English

Catholics in allowing them to sustain a sense of wrongful religious persecution while avoiding direct confrontation with the state.

Conclusion

A sustainable case can be made that no major religious persecution occurred in Ireland prior to the Cromwellian conquest of 1649–53. From the middle years of Elizabeth's reign down to the Interregnum, for instance, the anti-Catholic statutes in England were far more severe than their Irish equivalents. Relatively small numbers of clergy were executed at intervals during this period, but the Protestant Bishop of Derry, John Bramhall, could note with some accuracy that for eight years during his ascendancy in the 1630s not a single Catholic had been executed or fined for recusancy, and that only a handful had suffered any imprisonment for religious purposes.⁵⁷ This is not to deny that the state waged exceptionally brutal wars in sixteenth-century Ireland which resulted in massive civilian casualties, but these can be viewed more in the light of colonial atrocity than contemporary religious war. Indeed, the significant immigration of English Catholics to Ireland during this period offers an indication of the relatively easier situation of the religion in the island than across the Irish sea.⁵⁸ Yet during the same timeframe, the notion of the Irish as a particularly devout people who continued to endure great persecution for their faith became widely accepted in continental Europe. During the 1640s, French diplomats were warned in their letters of instruction, for instance, that the Irish were very devout and ticklish about their religion. There is a note of shock in the final report of the papal nuncio to the island during that decade, GianBattista Rinuccini, that perhaps the Irish attachment to Catholicism was not so swerving and unbending as was generally believed.⁵⁹

The central actors in constructing this particular understanding of Irish history and the national character were the large body of migrants who found temporary or permanent refuge on the continent during this period. Their activities and writing had a transformational effect not merely on European perceptions of Ireland but on Irish self-understanding. The image they forged of an exceptionally persecuted and devout *gens catholica* proved highly attractive within the general Irish population, whether those of Gaelic Irish origin, who were content to reconfigure the savagery of English conquest as a war of religion, or the Old English whose alienation from their government seemed more meritorious when it was presented in terms of faith rather than tax. Geert Janssen's work has been invaluable in allowing an understanding of how the particular preoccupations of exiles became woven into the nascent Dutch Republic.⁶⁰ It seems clear that very similar forces were at work in terms of constructing a sense of Catholic identity in early modern Ireland, although in the Irish case many of the exiles never returned to Ireland and influenced the country through their role as teachers of clergy and writers.

To what extent, however, were Irish migrants and exiles religious refugees? In this regard, Liesbeth Corens's recent discussion of confessional mobility in the cognate case of early modern England is of particular importance with its insistence that distinctions between exile, visitation and pilgrimage are often artificial and that 'pure' motivation

in instances of movement are not merely difficult to establish but also constraining, since the identities of those engaged in such mobility were often fluid and ineluctably plural.⁶¹ Few if any of the Irish secular exiles could be considered to have fled abroad primarily for religious reasons. That is not to suggest that Catholicism did not figure at all as a factor in provoking their decisions to rebel, but they had many coreligionists who opted not to oppose the crown and who were able to continue to practice their faith. The clerics who sought third-level Catholic education on the continent were certainly attempting to source something which was denied to them in Ireland, but did this make them refugees? Most, after all, subsequently returned and operated successfully in the island. Not until the 1650s was there to be any comprehensive deportation of Catholic clergy from Ireland. To what extent then did they construct an image of themselves as refugees?

There is no doubt that the Irish abroad heavily emphasized religious persecution. In this regard, they probably benefitted from a continental lack of knowledge and a generalized assumption that the far more severe English statutes also applied in Ireland, and that all inhabitants of the Tudors and Stuart monarchies were subject to the same penalties which obtained in England. But, while emphasizing persecution, the Irish success in mobilizing continental support made use of many different strategies. Secular exiles put forward arguments of incurred obligation and geopolitical utility. Clergy abroad drew attention to the European debt to the medieval Irish evangelization of Europe and, above all, they appealed to the missionary enthusiasm of post-Tridentine Catholicism. By supporting Irish colleges, European princes and nobles could participate in the type of heroic and exotic endeavours which fired contemporary missionary activity, with the added sense that they were assisting in the salvation of a cognate people whose plight was explained to them by representatives of an obviously different but still recognizable culture. Ireland was both comfortingly familiar and just exotic enough to appeal to the imagination of the members of a confession which actually perpetrated far more persecution than it endured. The success of the Irish abroad as a lobby group, therefore, depended on a complex nexus of factors, of which the single most important was probably the ability of the Irish themselves to tap into various different European discourses and to shape them to their advantage. Recognizing the potential utility of religious solidarity in a continent of confessionalized identities, the Irish abroad constructed themselves as particular objects of Catholic sympathy. But while the image cultivated by the Irish can certainly be understood within the broad category of 'refugee', their preference was not for pure and unadulterated victimhood but rather a notion of meritorious suffering and the offer of material and spiritual benefits to those who offered assistance.

Notes

- 1 These developments are analyzed in detail in Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin, *Confessionalism and Mobility in Early Modern Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021).
- 2 James O'Neill, *The Nine Years War, 1593-1603: O'Neill, Mountjoy and the Military Revolution* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2017).

- 3 Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin, 'Guerre de religion ou guerre ethnique? les conflits religieux en Irlande 1500 1650', *Revue historique* 649 (2009): 65–97.
- 4 Ibid.
- 5 Judy Barry, 'FitzGerald, Gerald', in *Dictionary of Irish Biography*, ed. James Maguire (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), <https://www.dib.ie/index.php/biography/fitzgerald-gerald-a3150>.
- 6 Micheline Kerney Walsh, *An Exile of Ireland* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1996).
- 7 Ciaran Brady, *The Chief Governors* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- 8 See, for example, Sir Henry Wallops's criticism of the religious practices of Old English Ireland: 'Paper on the Causes of the Rebellion in Ireland', in *Calendar of the State Papers Relating to Ireland of the Reign of Elizabeth*, ed. Ernest George Atkinson, vol. 10 (London: Mackie and Co., 1905), 122.
- 9 John McCavitt, *Sir Arthur Chichester: Lord Deputy of Ireland 1605-16* (Belfast: The Institute of Irish Studies, 1998); Nicholas Canny, *Making Ireland British* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- 10 As noted by Wallop, for instance, in the paper referenced above: 'Paper on the Causes of the Rebellion in Ireland', 121.
- 11 Translated in Micheline Kerney Walsh, 'O Sullivan Beare in Spain: Some Unpublished Documents', *Archivium Hibernicum* 45 (1990): 49–51.
- 12 Ibid., 49.
- 13 Matthew Kelly, ed., *Historiae Catholicae Iberniae Compendium Domino Philippo Austriaco Hispanarum, Indiarum, Aliorum Regnorum Atque Multarum Ditionum Regi Catholico Monarchaeque Potentissimo Dicitum A D. Philippo O'Sullevano Bearro, Ibero* (Dublin: John O'Daly, 1850).
- 14 '[...]qui cruciatibus ingentibus affecti pro lege Christi Redemptoris animas strenue profuderunt; nostri maxime pii confessores, qui foetidorum carcerum situ, et squalore afflicti, ad Empyreae regiae splendorem demigrarunt; nostri eloquentissimi concionatores qui tartareorum dogmatum rabiei repugnarunt; nostri fortissimi et clarissimi duces militesque magnanimi, qui malerunt in acie cadere, acriter et animose praeliantes, quam hereticis, scelesto hominum generi obtemperare, nostrae faeminae quae virili animo praeditae nunquam haereticorum terrori succubuerunt; nostri pueri et infantes, quorum vitae haereticorum ferrum minime pepercit': *ibid.*, 3–4.
- 15 'ut ei regno feratur auxilium, quo fides Apostolica ab haereticorum servitute in libertatem vindicata, in pristinum status, nitoremque restauraretur': *ibid.*, 338.
- 16 Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin, 'Religious Refugees or Confessional Migrants? Perspectives from Early Modern Ireland', *Journal of Early Modern Christianity* 6, no. 1 (April 2019): 3–18.
- 17 Gráinne Henry, *The Irish Military Community in Spanish Flanders, 1586-1621* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1992), 64–5.
- 18 Kerney Walsh, *An Exile of Ireland*, 70.
- 19 Peter Lombard, *De regno Hiberniae Sanctorum Insula Commentarius Authore Illustris, ac Reverendiss. Domino D. Petro Lombardo Hiberno, Archiepiscopo Ardmachano, totius eiusdem Regni, Primate, olim in Alma Universitate Louvainensi S. Theol. Doctore, & quondam Praeposito Ecclesiae Cathedralis Cameracensis, &c.* (Louvain: Apud Viduam Steph. Martini, 1632), 90–102.
- 20 'sic ex ipsa facile possint transferri suppetiae quaevis in haereticas omnes Septemtrionis regions': *ibid.*, 498.
- 21 T. J. Walsh, *The Irish Continental College Movement* (Dublin and Cork: Golden Eagle Books, 1973), 36–87; Cathaldus Giblin, 'The Irish Colleges on the Continent', in *The*

- Irish-French Connection 1578-1978*, ed. Liam Swords (Paris: The Irish College, 1978), 9–20.
- 22 J. Nilis, 'Irish Students at Leuven University, 1548-1797', *Archivium Hibernicum* 60 (2006/2007): 1–304.
- 23 'nec quisquam ex patria idque acerba truculentorum hereticorum injuria recipere possit'; 'desterrado de su patria por causa de la religion catholica': quoted in Amalio Huarte, 'Petitions of Irish Students in the University of Salamanca, 1574-1591', *Archivium Hibernicum* 3 (1914): 96–7.
- 24 'in dies in patria mea Hibernia ingruente illa anglorum pestifera haeresae': *ibid.*, 99.
- 25 'personas muy principales': *ibid.*
- 26 'hereticorum prauitatem et violentiam refugiens': *ibid.*, 107.
- 27 'venido huyendo de los luteranos de Ynglaterra, que molestan su tierra': *ibid.*, 108.
- 28 'poveri giovani Irlandesi fuggiti da quella isola d'Irlanda per l'heresia': quoted in Patricia O'Connell, *The Irish College at Lisbon, 1590-1834* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2001), 27.
- 29 'por causa de la persecución de los hereges ha venido en gran diminución esta orden en aquel reyno . . . y estar prohibidos los estudios, se han acabado los predicadores viejos que avia, supplicándome que paraque de todo punto no se acaben, y floresca en aquel reyno la religión Catholica, ayudada de personas doctas de la dicha orden, les haga alguna limosna annual durante la persecución, para que en la universidad de Lobayna se puedan sustentar y estudiar un numero de frayles mozos de aquella nación, y por las causas referidas, y otras justas consideraciones del servicio de Dios, les he hecho merced y limosna.': Philip III to Archduke Albert, 21 September 1606 in *Louvain Papers, 1606-1827*, ed. Brendan Jennings (Dublin: Irish Manuscripts Commission, 1968), 1.
- 30 Constitution of the Secular College at Louvain, Archivio di Propaganda Fide (Rome), SRG 1, fos 141v-142r.
- 31 'vanno nondimeno procrastinando il loro ritorno alla patria sotto pretesto de studii, quali si continuano per otto, dieci, et dodeci anni, vivendo essi della limosne delle loro messe': Richard Pauli-Stravius to a (undecipherable) cardinal, 3 September 1639, 140, APE, SOCG 140, f. 324r.
- 32 Gary Mooney, 'The Irish Student Diaspora in the Sixteenth Century and the Early Years of the Irish College at Salamanca', *Recusant History* 14 (1977–8): 257.
- 33 'dos mas graves do Reino': quoted in O'Connell, *Irish College*, 22–6.
- 34 F. X. Martin, *Friar Nugent, 1569-1635* (Rome and London: Capuchin Historical Institute/Methuen, 1962), 163–88.
- 35 'si pieuse et si louable': the phrase is taken for the letter of Jean de Robles, governor of Lille, concerning the foundation of the college in the town, *ibid.*, 310.
- 36 Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin, 'Vatican Diplomacy and the Mission of Rinuccini to Ireland', *Archivium Hibernicum* 47 (1993): 78–88.
- 37 Martin, *Friar Nugent*, 177–80.
- 38 Ó hAnnracháin, *Confessionalism and Mobility*, chapter 8.
- 39 Johann Amos Comenius, *The History of the Bohemian persecution, from the beginning of their conversion to Christianity in the year 894. To the year 1633* (London: RA for John Walker, 1650).
- 40 Jennings, *Louvain Papers*, 143–4.
- 41 *Ibid.*
- 42 Lombard, *Commentarius*, 113.
- 43 *Ibid.*, 146–53.

- 44 'impertitam, atque impetratam per merita Sanctorum huius regionis': *ibid.*, 75.
- 45 This was first published in Rome in 1594.
- 46 *Ibid.*, 240–69.
- 47 *Ibid.*, 284.
- 48 *Ibid.*, 315–17.
- 49 *Ibid.*, 287.
- 50 Thomas O'Connor, 'Rothe, David', *DIB*.
- 51 David Rothe, *The Analecta of David Rothe, Bishop of Ossory*, ed. P. F. Moran (Dublin: Gill and Sons, 1884); all references to the text are taken from this version.
- 52 *Ibid.*, 3–4.
- 53 'omnes quippe suo quasi instinctu duci, & à bono genio trahi ad hanc solam credenda normam': *ibid.*, 26–7.
- 54 'se nescire unde ista proveniat Romanae religionis tenacitas in praecordiis Hibernorum, nisi vel gleba sit infecta, vel pollutes aër;': *ibid.*, 125.
- 55 *Ibid.*, 43.
- 56 *Ibid.*, 27–8.
- 57 John Vesey, *The Works of the Most reverend Father in God, John Bramhall D.D. Late lord Archbishop of Armagh, Primate and metropolitane of All Ireland* (Dublin: His Majesties Printing House, 1676), 188.
- 58 David Edwards, 'A Haven of Popery: English Catholic Migration to Ireland in the Age of Plantations', in *The Origins of Sectarianism in Early Modern Ireland*, ed. Alan Ford and John McCafferty (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 95–126.
- 59 Rinuccini's relation to the pope in *Nunziatura in Irlanda di Monsignor Gio. Baptista Rinuccini arcivescovo di Fermo negli anni 1645 à 1649*, ed. G. Aiazzi (Florence: Dalla Tipografia Piatti, 1844), 432.
- 60 Geert H. Janssen, 'The Republic of the Refugees: Early Modern Migrations and the Dutch Experience', *Historical Journal* 60 (2017): 233–52.
- 61 Liesbeth Corens, *Confessional Mobility & English Catholics in Counter-Reformation Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 2–4.

The refugee discourse of the Moriscos

Petitioning and diplomacy after the expulsion decree of 1609¹

Gerard Wieggers

Within the general theme of this volume on the emerging early modern refugee phenomenon in cross-cultural perspective, this chapter will deal with Morisco refugees expelled from Spain between 1609 and 1614.² Moriscos were Muslims in the Spanish kingdoms who, under various degrees of duress, were converted to Christianity between 1499 and 1526; the term also includes their descendants who continued to live in Spain until the expulsion of 1609–14 and, in small numbers, even after 1614, mostly as Christians but some, especially in Granada, as crypto-Muslims. While they lived in Spain the Moriscos were the subject of a long public debate (especially after the forced migration of the Granadan Moriscos to Castile in 1570). They numbered about 280,000 persons around 1609. Spanish authors at first referred to them as *nuevos convertidos de moros* (New Christians, or converts of Moorish origin), and it is not until the second half of the sixteenth century that the term ‘Morisco’ became current in the specific historical sense. ‘Morisco’ is also applied to refugees after their arrival in North Africa and other Islamic lands, where they almost always resumed Islamic life, and retained for a long time – in some areas in Tunis, Algeria and Morocco even until today – a distinct social and ethnic identity. In Arabic sources these people were described collectively as *Andalus* (*sic*), individuals often as Andalusian (*Andalusī*).³

In the history of the displacement of Muslims from Iberian soil as religious refugees we can distinguish several phases and conditions. The first phase was marked by Muslim refugees who fled their Muslim lands when these were conquered by the Christians. In that phase, refugees consisted of two categories. First of all, there are those who directly immigrated to Islamic lands when their territories were conquered by the Christians. This movement became manifest in the Iberian Peninsula in about the eleventh century with the fall of such cities as Toledo in 1085 CE. In the conceptual terminology of Islamic law and ethics, these fugitives performed the emigration (Ar. *hijra*) to the abode of Islam (Ar. *dār al-islām*), something which in Islamic law was qualified as religiously laudable behaviour, and which many religious scholars even

saw as a duty. This partly explains why many considered their migration to North Africa as a divine grace, a liberation and a return 'home' from exile.⁴

The performance of this duty was modelled indirectly on the prophet Muhammad's immigration to Medina (Ar. *hijra*) in the face of the mounting opposition of the Quraysh in Mecca, and on the model of those who would migrate to the Muslim community in Medina after the Prophet had migrated there. This phase continued up to the fall of Granada in 1492, when the last part of *dār al-islām* on Iberian soil ceased to exist, and ended with the conquest of Granada and the end of the last political Muslim stronghold. From that moment onwards, emigrants from Iberia were people who had lived as Muslims under Christian rule.

This second category of Muslim emigrants, that is, those who fled after having lived under Christian rule, had existed already before the conquest of Granada. These religious 'migrants' were in addition often called in Arabic sources written in Muslim-majority countries *mudajjanūn* (Mudejars, Sp. *mudéjares*), from the Arabic *al-dajn* (treatise), referring to the treatises that these groups had concluded with the Christian conquerors when their territories or cities had been conquered in exchange for privileges such as the freedom to practice their religion. The Arabic word has a pejorative connotation referring to the fact that these persons had willingly accepted non-Muslim authority and rule. We find Mudejars in many places in Aragon and Castile since the eleventh century as well.⁵

A next phase of migrations started when all Muslims who lived in Spain had been converted under duress and those who remained were crypto-Muslims, the aforesaid Moriscos. These forced conversions occurred between 1499 and 1526. Then, after the revolt of the Alpujarras, all Granadan Moriscos were exiled to Castile. This affected around about 84,000 persons. Crypto-Islam became a general concern of the Spanish authorities from that moment onwards.

The last phase, finally, started with the aforesaid expulsion of the Moriscos from Spain. In this last phase, from the announcement of the expulsion of the Moriscos in Valencia in 1609 to the end of the expulsion process in 1614, the Moriscos were expelled in stages. Some communities were directly transported via the Spanish ports in the south and ports in the Levante to North Africa; others crossed to the South of France, and went – sometimes via Italy (where some of them settled) – to the Ottoman Empire, Egypt, Algeria and especially Tunis. Many were deported directly to the Moroccan coast.

Rumours about the imminent expulsion led Moriscos in various parts of Spain to start migrating clandestinely even before 1609. Some Moriscos were able to evade expulsion (viz. those who succeeded in arguing that they had lived as Christians or had had special privileges), and a very small number of Moriscos secretly returned to the Peninsula.

Even though some attention has been devoted to the migration routes, settlement and integration of the Moriscos and their social, cultural and political life in North Africa and the Ottoman Empire, studies of how the refugees constructed their identities as religious refugees vis-à-vis the authorities in other countries, and their petitions to them hoping to be accepted and offering their willingness to be useful to them, are rare. In her valuable comparative study of refugee protection in Europe in the

early modern period, Susanne Lachenicht does not deal with Moriscos, even though she mentions them briefly.⁶ This is not to say that such efforts were non-existent or that studies devoted to them are absent. Several studies show that Mudejars and Moriscos approached authorities outside Spain in order to negotiate a future settlement. We are reasonably well informed about their migration routes. However, a study dedicated to their self-presentations and to the contents of the petitions they offered to those authorities whom they hoped to persuade to help or accept them as refugees does not yet exist.

In reviewing the extant evidence about such processes, we can say that there seem to be three types of negotiation processes. The first type is a negotiation of Iberian Muslims (Mudejars or Moriscos) to settle in Muslim territory. Famously, the Tunisian Dey, 'Uthmān, allowed the Moriscos to settle in Tunis after their expulsion in about 1610. However, processes of settlement were not always preceded by negotiations. The city of Cherchell in Morocco, for example, had been depopulated until it was populated and rebuilt by Granadans who had left their city in about 1492, and they apparently did not need any explicit permission to do so.⁷

The second type was that of negotiations with foreign rulers about military help to Muslims in Spain, suggesting that those rulers raid and invade Spanish territories, often arguing that they, the Moriscos, would assist them, often also offering the help of Iberian Muslims who had already settled in those territories. Such contacts occurred during the War of the Alpujarras (1568–71) but also during the reign of the Moroccan sultan Zaydān (1608–27), when contacts between the sultan and Moriscos led to alliances between him and Moriscos in his armies as well as Moriscos still in Spain.⁸ While these negotiations are reflected in archival documents, Morisco writings offer insight into these contacts as well. In addition, Moriscos petitioned European powers, either to help them revolt against the Spanish authorities (as we will see below) or to negotiate a settlement. According to Bruno Pomara, they were successful in their negotiations with several powers in Italy. After an initially favourable response, the French authorities did not allow them to settle as Muslim migrants, and only a few remained in France. Most Moriscos settled in Morocco, and especially in Tunis.⁹ Let us now turn to their extant petitions and examine which ones shed light on their identities as refugees, focusing in particular on one document as a case study that has not been examined in detail before.

Morisco petitioning

On 15 September 1612, almost three years after the first expulsion edict was made public, a Morisco whose identity remains unknown delivered a petition (Sp. *memorial*) in the presence of the vizir at the sultan's palace in Istanbul. In it he gave historical and political arguments for the accommodation of his people in the Ottoman Empire, in particular in the regency of Tunis.

He was not the first Morisco to have been in contact with the Ottomans. There had been contacts between Granada and the Ottomans from the Middle Ages onwards and Moriscos had settled in Istanbul during the second half of the sixteenth century,

especially after the repression of the revolt of the Alpujarras in about 1571.¹⁰ In Istanbul, Moriscos settled in Galata, the part of the city where Jews and Christians also lived, where they became a visible, influential and vocal minority, as appears from recent studies by Tijana Krstić.¹¹ The Moriscos in Galata were at times strongly anti-Catholic and anti-Jewish, as she shows.

The state of preservation of the source deserves a brief comment. The only version that has survived is found among the Castilian state documents in the Archive of Simancas. As the accompanying correspondence tells us, the Spanish succeeded in intercepting the Ottoman envoy, a *çavuş*, who was on his way to deliver documents to Moriscos in Tunis. The original document was brought to the knowledge of the Duke of Osuna, viceroy of Sicily and Naples in Palermo, who in turn brought a summary in Spanish to the attention of the State Council merely as evidence, he says in his accompanying note, of 'how right His Majesty [Philip III] had been to expel these people'.¹²

This *memorial*, which, as we have just seen, is only partially rendered in summary – the original, the author says, was much longer – provides an interesting case of a discourse by the emerging Diasporic Morisco community to the Ottoman sultan which presents a refugee vocabulary in a political, legal and religious argumentation. It has not yet been the subject of a separate study.¹³ Luis Bernabé Pons briefly refers to it at the end of an important article on the cohesion of the Diasporic Morisco communities but does not offer a detailed analysis.¹⁴ Tijana Krstić does not mention it in her studies on Moriscos in Istanbul.

As we will see, in addition to being a valuable source for a political refugee discourse in its own right (albeit not in its complete and original form), it is not an isolated text, since Moriscos are known to have offered memoranda and petitions to political authorities before, starting in the early sixteenth century.¹⁵ In 1567, famously, Francisco Núñez Muley, an elderly Granadan nobleman who in his youth had been a page in the household of Archbishop Hernando de Talavera, voiced the Morisco protest against a number of imminent measures against the Moriscos in the Kingdom of Granada.¹⁶ These measures were aimed at prohibiting the wearing of the *almalafa* by Morisco women, the use of baths and even the use of written and spoken Arabic. His protest was in vain. The Granadan Moriscos revolted, and a bloody and cruel civil war followed. Several years later, shortly before the expulsion, a Morisco from Segorbe, Hamete Musrif, presented a *memorial* to the French Protestant King Henry IV on behalf of the Moriscos of Valencia, to which I will return below.¹⁷

These *memoriales*, thus, were presented under different conditions, and their authors aimed for different goals. Francisco Núñez Muley, warning against the consequences of the assimilation measures, including the prohibition of Arabic, presented his people as loyal and faithful Arabic-speaking Christians. Musrif offered the Protestant French king his fellow Moriscos as allies in a military campaign against Spain. This proposed alliance was part of a larger diplomatic effort to attract attention to the Morisco cause among Christian and Muslim rulers. In 1612–13, for example, the Morisco Aḥmad Ibn Qāsim al-Ḥajarī travelled from Marrakesh to France in order to recover goods allegedly mstolen by French ships from Moriscos. From France he went on to the Netherlands. In both countries he discussed the vicissitudes of the Morisco refugees,

and in The Hague he also suggested a possible alliance between the Dutch Republic, the Ottomans, the Moroccans and the Moriscos with the aim of invading Spain. For all their differences, the Republic and the Moriscos were united in their war against Habsburg Spain. Al-Ḥajarī told the Dutch Stadholder and army leader Maurice of Nassau that he saw the permission of the Ottomans and Moroccans to the Moriscos as conditional to Maurice's possible involvement in such a military enterprise, and handed over a coded letter to him, apparently for those rulers.¹⁸ These meetings took place in 1612 as well. In an indirect way, the travelogue in which al-Ḥajarī discusses these matters sheds an interesting light on the ways in which the Moriscos defended their case. So far, no research has been done into the litigation in France. Al-Ḥajarī tells us in his travelogue that he was successful in retrieving money, but does not go into the details.¹⁹

The *memorial* addressed to the sultan reveals in more detail the agency of the Moriscos in forging a humanitarian network in the Diaspora. It also deals with the significance of these refugees in initiating charity networks, promoting an international culture of empathy and sympathy, and influencing domestic and foreign policy. The focus of this chapter is the Ottoman Empire, though I will also discuss European migration and diplomatic efforts in the Mediterranean area and analyse how the protection and accommodation of displaced minorities interacted with the ambitions of the Ottoman Empire to expand and solidify its territories, in Europe and beyond. In my analysis below, I will draw on recent studies to put this chapter into this context. I will first describe and analyse the structure of the discourse, then analyse its historical social and political background, and finally address its significance for the emerging Morisco refugee discourse.

Main characteristics of the 1612 *memorial*

The *memorial* is structured as follows: it begins with a detailed historical account, taking its readers back to the conquest of 'Spain' by focusing on the Muslim ruler it calls 'Miramolin Yaccob Almançor' and his conquests, 800 years before, which means in about 800 CE (we will see that the document is quite keen on mentioning crucial dates). I will return to this element later, but let me briefly add here that, as we will see further, this historical introduction is not unique, and I will give a tentative explanation for this below.

'Miramolin Yaccob Almançor' had been able very rapidly to conquer Spain, so that for the Christians only a small piece of territory remained. Then the *memorial* goes on to discuss the wars between 'Moors' (*moros*) and Christians (*christianos*) that took place in Spain for hundreds of years, until they ended with the rendition of the Alcázar of Granada (probably the Qasba of the Alhambra is meant – the name is strange, as if the author were not familiar with the local situation). That surrender could occur because of what is presented as 'treason.' Moreover, the Granadans had rendered the Qasba to the Castilian conquerors on the condition that the Muslims (*moros*) would be allowed to profess the faith of the Prophet. However, the Christians broke their word 'after two years' (i.e. in 1494) and later converted all Muslims in

Spain by force. The next phase is the repression and burning of those who continued to adhere to their religion internally; that had to happen by force, since Islam is the true religion.

This led to the revolt in the 'mountains', that is, the Alpujarras. Again, a precise year is mentioned, namely forty-three years earlier, and the rebels had raised a Muslim flag (*lebantaron bandera de moros*), implying that they had publicly returned to the status quo ante, that of an independent Muslim-majority political entity, calling on the Ottoman Sultan Selim for help. Selim, however, had been busy with other military campaigns, and was unable to help them. Indeed, no outside force had come to their aid, and they lost the war. The consequence, the author tells us, was that they were dispersed and exiled (Sp. *desterrar*) to other parts of Spain. This is a reference to the dispersal (*repartimiento*) of the Granadan Moriscos throughout Castile in 1571.

The repression continued until the moment that the Spanish authorities realized that the Muslims would never truly convert to Christianity and would always remain faithful in their hearts to the 'true religion'. It was then that, according to the author, the authorities had decided to expel them. This occurred in 1609, as the document mentions.

Indeed, as we have seen, the first edict (*bando*) of expulsion was made public in September 1609. The anonymous *memorial* spells out its conditions: the fact that very few belongings could be taken abroad, the dramatic circumstances under which the expelled were transported, killed and robbed on their way, and the robberies upon arrival, especially when they arrived in Barbary, i.e. the North African coasts, by Bedouins. These atrocities have continued, the author states, up to the day the memorandum was presented.

In contrast, the Dey and the Diwan in Tunis helped the migrants, who were mostly poor and needy. The Morisco intermediary asks the Ottoman sultan to continue that policy of offering Moriscos shelter and help in Tunis, if possible under even more favourable conditions, arguing that doing so will be not only morally good, but even advantageous for the sultan. Here the author mentions the military advantages of having such motivated people, bent on revenge, in the militias. The author reminds his audience again about the prophecies about the conquest of Europe.

Analysis of the refugee discourse in the *memorial*

The general historical argument presented here is that even though a war had been going on in Spain, it was the Muslim party that acted justly and kept its word, while the Christian Spaniards should not be believed and act treacherously and unjustly. It is also interesting to observe that the theatre is limited to Spain as a geographical entity/unity. No mention is made of conquest beyond the Iberian territories, for example, in the South of France. Religion plays a role in this discourse, but it is closely connected to a legal discourse and to the prophecies mentioned at the end (see below). The most important element in this argument is the conclusion of a treaty with the Granadan Muslims in 1492.

Indeed, that treaty officially guaranteed the freedom to practice Islam, including by those who had converted to Islam, the so-called *elches*. Several authors have pointed out that indeed, under the influence and by direct intervention of Cardinal Jiménez de Cisneros, the clause about respecting the freedom of those inhabitants who had converted to Islam in Islamic times was not respected, and violence was used against them to force them to reconvert to Christianity. This led to a revolt in 1501 in the Muslim quarter of Granada, the Albaicín, which spread to the Alpujarras and was put down by military force. Massive conversions followed, while more Muslims took the opportunity to immigrate to Islamic territories. In February 1502, the Mudejars of Castile (which included Granada) were offered the choice between conversion, immigration or death. In their international diplomatic efforts in Egypt and the Ottoman Empire to justify these events, the Catholic Monarchs had argued that the rebellion had nullified the capitulations and that the forced conversion was justified.²⁰

Interestingly, the historical source on which the author relies for his general picture is a pseudo-historical one, called the *Historia Verdadera del Rey don Rodrigo*, written by the Morisco translator and physician Miguel Luna and published in 1598, as has been observed by Luis Bernabé Pons. Luna presented his work as his own translation from an Arabic manuscript extant in King Philip's own library, that of El Escorial. This work, very soon suspected by contemporary Spanish authors to be a forgery, became quite popular in several editions and European translations.²¹ Miramolin (Commander of the Faithful) Yaccob Almançor, the conqueror mentioned above, cannot be the Almohad caliph Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb al-Manşūr (reigned 580–95/1184–99), for that caliph was victorious against the Castilians in the battle of Alarcos in 1195, so in fact much later, while Luna's hero lived, according to him, very early in Islamic history. This fits '800 years ago' (even though today we date the hijra earlier than here). The author of the *memorial* even quotes directly from the *Verdadera Historia*.²²

Is this use coincidental, and could the author also have used other historical sources? Perhaps this is the case, but is remarkable that Hamete Musrif in his memorial to Henry IV mentions data characteristic of the *Verdadera Historia* as well, and also does so in an introductory passage of the French published version.²³ We will return to this below. A second interesting element in the discourse of our Morisco is that the fall of Granada is presented as the result of 'treason', which makes it an interesting parallel with the treason story about Don Rodrigo in Luna's *Verdadera Historia*. In this telling it is not the superiority of the Christian armies, but internal strife, that leads to the downfall of Nasrid Granada and the loss of Al-Andalus.

The general line of argument of the discourse from that moment onwards is that the Spanish authorities have treated the Moriscos unjustly. This results in an image of the Moriscos as a persecuted group. This image serves the goal of arousing the sympathy of the Ottoman sultan. The killings and the cruel reception on the Moroccan coasts contrast with the welcoming attitude of the Deys of Tunis, whose regency formed part of the Ottoman empire. On the basis of this analysis, we may conclude that the perspective of this memorial is very likely that of the Granadan Moriscos, including those Granadans who had lived in their Diaspora in Castile. It also focuses attention on the help the Moriscos requested from Sultan Selim around the time of the revolt of the Alpujarras, studied recently by Tijana Krstić. Krstić has indeed shown that, around the

years of the civil war in the Alpujarras, a Granadan intermediary, Ibraim Granatino, visited Istanbul various times to promote the Morisco cause. However, the Ottomans had preferred to concentrate their military efforts on Cyprus and refrained from interfering in the revolt.²⁴ From this we may perhaps conclude that the Morisco author was well informed about the history of the Moriscos in Granada, possibly by other Moriscos who belonged to the same circles as he did. It is interesting to observe that the memorial used the concept of exile (*desterrar*) to frame the expulsion to Castile around 1571. So, the perspective here is that of a group of exiled Granadan Moriscos who, as part of a much larger group of Morisco refugees, saw themselves as having in the past always treated others justly, but were themselves faced with utter injustice and cruelty.

The author hopes to redress this injustice by a better integration into Tunisian society, but indirectly also by providing the Ottoman sultan with a new military force that may help him in the war against Spain. Here he points to the existence of prophecies about a future conquest of Europe (*las profecías y conquistas de Europa*) that might offer a supernatural confirmation that invasion might be a successful policy for the Ottoman sultan to follow. Indeed, we know that such prophecies existed, and as Cornell Fleischer has shown, they played an important role in the sultan's decisions. Fleischer shows how Ottoman eschatological prophecies (Ar. *jafr*, Sp. *jofor*) were influenced by works of mystic and esoteric learning ('Iettrism'), referring to such scholars as 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Biṣṭāmī. The Ottomans kept books of history and prophecy in the palace in the Privy Chamber.²⁵ Also historically relevant is the fact that the author points to the positive attitude of the Dey, whose name was 'Uthmān, and especially of the Sufi leader Abu 'l-Ghayth al-Qashshāsh, who offered the needy and poor Moriscos upon their arrival a stay and shelter in his lodge (*zāwiya*). 'Uthmān's successor Yūsuf Dey had later revoked some of these privileges, and our author seems to be trying to interfere in these Tunisian politics by appealing to the Ottoman sultan to solidify the favourable policies and even reinforce them.²⁶

Humanitarian diplomacy and diplomatic networks

The use of Luna's *Verdadera Historia* in both memorials might indicate that its wider argument was attractive to the Morisco refugees who wanted to present the Morisco minority as loyal and reliable subjects, apparently in spite of the fact that Luna's work at the time was already rumoured to be a forgery. It was also becoming very popular inside and outside Spain, and so it may have been well known, unlike other histories of Muslim Spain. We may perhaps speculate whether the need for a political legitimation of the interests of Moriscos to the world outside Spain may even have motivated Luna to write the *Verdadera Historia*. Further study of the wider dynamics of the diplomatic efforts of the Moriscos during and after the expulsion is needed.

The activities of these networks before and after the expulsion have been studied in the last few years by a number of scholars.²⁷ From these studies emerges a network of wealthy and influential Moriscos, some well-educated (a number of medical doctors and official Arabic translators) based in Granada and New Castile (where one of the Morisco intellectual centres, the town of Pastrana, is located). Official, licensed Arabic translators

and medical doctors such as Alonso del Castillo and his son; Miguel de Luna and his son Alonso de Luna, the translator and merchant; Lorenzo Hernández del Chapiz and his grandson; the medical doctor Muḥammad ibn Abī 'l-Āṣī; the royal secretary Diego Calvo Navarro (a.k.a. Yūsuf al-Qalbu),²⁸ and the aforesaid translator Diego Bejarano, a.k.a. Aḥmad Ibn Qāsim al-Ḥajarī, all seemed to belong to that circle. Al-Ḥajarī, who was born in Hornachos (Extremadura) in about 1570, became royal interpreter at the court of the Moroccan sultan Mawḷāy Zaydān, travelled to France in 1612 to recover goods stolen from Moriscos on board French ships by French sailors, and in about 1637 migrated to Testour and Tunis, by that time 'the best place for the Moriscos', as he writes in his account. All these persons belonging to the Granadan Diaspora elite were in contact with each other in the early seventeenth century in Spain and beyond, in various parts of the Mediterranean area, in Tunis, Morocco, Algiers, Istanbul and Cairo, forming what may be called a transnational, humanitarian-diplomatic network.

An important source for the study of these networks is a letter written by Aḥmad Ibn Qāsim al-Ḥajarī, which was later translated in Tunis into Spanish and circulated among them. During his aforesaid mission to France, al-Ḥajarī had written this letter on 12 May 1612 from Paris; he directed it to fellow Moriscos in Constantinople to inform them about his current situation. Let me note that this letter was written a few months before our anonymous Morisco presented his memorandum, namely on 15 September.²⁹ A number of elements in the letter are also found in the memorial: for example, it mentions the robberies of Moriscos on board French ships and also the Bedouins as a plague for Moriscos who arrived on Moroccan shores.³⁰ While much is still not yet clear about the network, we can say that Miguel Luna was active as a translator in Granada, and with Alonso del Castillo responsible for much translation work in the Sacromonte Lead Book affair and for spreading an Islamic polemical message among other Moriscos in the networks.³¹ After the expulsion, contacts continued between these Moriscos on the one hand and between them and several political authorities on the other, with promotion of the interests of the diasporic community as a principal object. The contacts with Ottomans in Istanbul and active diplomatic actions were the concern of the aforesaid Muḥammad ibn Abī 'l-Āṣī,³² who was also one of the addressees of Aḥmad Ibn Qāsim al-Ḥajarī's letter. Other addressees were: the Morisco sharīf, diplomat and author Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Raḥī,³³ a man who had gone to Constantinople and from there to Tunis, very likely taking al-Ḥajarī's letter with him, and Luis de Valdivia, who is also mentioned in other Morisco documents of this period which are preserved in the Archive of Simancas.³⁴ Another member of this network was very likely a man called Luis de Zapata, who became the shaikh of the Andalusians in Tunis.³⁵ The letter was later translated into Spanish in Tunis, probably by the author himself, on the initiative of and paid for by a rich Morisco from Aragon, Mohamed Rubio, at the request of older Moriscos who were unable to read Arabic.³⁶

Shifting perspectives

The comparison of the 1612 *memorial* with the (translated) *memorial* presented by Musrif in 1602 shows that the focus of the latter differed significantly. While the 1612

version aimed for social integration of Morisco communities, Musrif's bellicose text argued in favour of a joint invasion of Valencia-Spain by Moriscos and the armies of the Protestant Henry IV. The perspective was also broader and included all Moriscos in Spain, not just the Granadan community, as is the case in the *memorial* of 1612. In the 1602 text the common polemics between Protestants and Muslims against (Spanish) Roman Catholicism are played out. Hence, the offer is aimed at France's invading Spain and staying there, rather than leaving it, as its main perspective. Yet the discourse of the defence of Muslim ethics and politics and the unreliability of the Spanish authorities in dealing with the Mudejars and Moriscos is the same. What Musrif's memorial of 1602 and the memorial presented in September 1612 also have in common is their reference to prophecies and to Luna's *Historia*. These may point to communications between different Morisco groups about a common message to foreign rulers.

When we compare the two *memoriales* with the *memorial* presented by Don Francisco Núñez Muley in 1567, we can see that, while Núñez Muley presents the Granadan Moriscos as loyal Arabic Christians, the two later memorials present them in a dramatically different way. This is again an indication of religious diversity among Moriscos, which we know really existed – many were Muslim, but others had truly converted. Of course, we have to take into account that the first *memorial* was presented in 1567 and the others in 1602 and 1612: things had changed a lot in the intervening years.

In order to further contextualize the *memoriales* we discuss here, and in particular that of 1612, we must take into account that the latter's strong apologetic tone is a response to the many attempts of the Spanish State to justify its Morisco policies. The edict of expulsion of 22 September 1609, was published not only in Spanish but also in various translations.³⁷ The final decision to expel all of the approximately 300,000 persons known to be descendants of Moriscos was taken in 1609 by the Spanish authorities, and was justified on grounds of state interest (*crimen de lesa patria*), viz. alleged Morisco conspiracies with foreign (Muslim and Protestant) powers. In the official propaganda, King Philip III was pictured as the Christian sovereign who had finally purged Spain of all its heretics. It immediately proved to be a very controversial measure.³⁸ Small wonder, then, that those seeking the help of possible host countries or military allies in the face of this measure sought to contradict the allegation of illegitimate rebellion and of being morally despicable. It is such an apology that we find in our memorial of 1612, since it justifies Morisco resistance on the basis of a rights discourse and on religion.³⁹

Conclusion

Petitions and *memoriales* presented by Moriscos after their expulsion from Spain shed important light on the developing discourse and shifting self-images of one of the largest refugee communities of early modern Europe. They also illuminate how public diplomacy and informal lobbying guided these processes of identityformation of a European refugee group that has been less studied than other early modern refugees so far. The original *memorial* of 15 September 1612, discussed here on the basis

of a unique summary preserved in the Archivo General de Simancas, was presented to the Ottoman authorities three years after the beginning of the expulsion, and still two years before the process ended, is perhaps the best example of how (predominantly) Granadan Moriscos presented themselves as *refugees*, offering their assistance to the Ottomans and asking for a favourable immigration policy in the Regency in Tunis in return. The author of the memorial uses a historical argument in order to present the Granadan Moriscos as loyal Muslim subjects of the Spanish kings, but subjects whose rights have been infringed upon time and again by them. They have been persecuted, tried by the Inquisition and burned at the stake because of their beliefs. Then, after their revolt against these unjust measures, they had to go into exile in Castile, and subsequently were expelled. The anonymous Morisco author uses Miguel de Luna's *Verdadera Historia* to support his discourse and to propagate the Islamic ethical values which the alleged unique Arabic historical source embodies: tolerance towards minorities, a balanced style of governing and fairness. While the 1612 memorial is anonymous, I have argued that it can very likely be situated in the circles of the Morisco elite from Granada and Castile who maintained contacts in the Diaspora and tried to promote their cause and that of their fellow Moriscos. These Moriscos were probably using this discourse most successfully in relation to the Ottoman powers, and in particular in Tunis, where cities such as Testour, founded by immigrating Moriscos, became a 'new Granada'. Thus, the memorandum sheds light on an important phase in the lives of these religious exiles.

Appendix: Transcript of Archivo General de Simancas, Estado, Leg. 1166, fol. 105–6 and English translation⁴⁰

[Contemporary summary]

Palermo A su Mad. 1613. El Duque de Osuna a 20 de dexbre. Respuesta a 5 de hebrero 1614].

Que despues que despachó el correo de 28 de nouiembre llego alli el chاوز del Turco que entonçes auiso que ha tenido mas nuevas de las que scribio sino confirmacion de los prevençiones que haze el turco amenaçando aquel Repu[blica], el qual va poniendo tan en orden que quando vaxe sobre el no reçiuiरा daño. Embia copia de un memorial que dio un morisco en Constantinopla al Turco el qual lleuaua el chاوز a otro que se hallan en Tunez. Y apunta quan açertada ha sido la espulsion desta gente.

[The letter by the Duke of Osuna which accompanies the document reads as follows]:

Al Rey *nuestro* Señor En manos de Antonio de Aroztegui, su secretario de Estado

Señor

Despues de la partida del correo que despache a V.Md. a 28 del pasado ha llegado aqui el chاوز de quien no he sauido mas nuevas ni las he tenido sino de la confirmacion

de las que di cuenta entonces a V. Md., de armar el Turco contra este reyno, y assi le voy preuiniendo de manera que quando sea çierta su venida se haga el seruiçio de V.Md. y sin que V.Md. se aya de poner en cuidado ni tenerle de mandar prouer gente ni dinero como mas en particular dare quenta a V.Md. con el primer correo que despachare.

La copia de la carta que va con esta, de un morisco de Costantinopla que traya el chaus, para otro de Tunez, embio solo a fin de que V.Md. pueda mandar ver, lo que cada día la esperiencia muestra de quan acertada resoluçion fue el hauer mandado V.Md. hechar esta gente de España. Dios guarde la Catolica persona de V.Md. como la xpianidad ha menester. De Palermo a 20 de diziembre de 1613. El Duque de Osuna.

Parte del memorial que di en 15 de setiembre de 1612 al biçir en el duar⁴¹ de su Magestad.⁴²

Illustrisimo y exçelentissimo señor: ya le constara a Vuestra Alteza como aora 800 años el Rey miramolin⁴³ Yacob Almançor y alifa⁴⁴ embio contra España sus capitanes y gente y la gano en termino de ocho meses eçepto unas montañas agras adonde se retiraron huidos los christianos en donde yendose rehaciendo y no teniendo socorro los moros setecientos años mantuuieron guerra con ellos hasta que aora 100 años, conuençidos por una traición, entró el Rey de España en el Alçaçar de Granada, que hera la fortaleça de aquel Reyno y la ciudad, biendo perdida su fuerça y que no podia recobrarla se dio apartido con condiçion que les dejasen biuir en la ley de nuestro santo profeta y que no les harian fuerça ni agrauio alguno.

Y despues de dos años les quebrantó esta condiçion y les esforçó a bautiçarse y reçiuir la ley de los christianos por fuerça con pena de muerte y de quemallos biuos si de alli adelante ellos y sus deççendientes no fuesen christianos. Y como esto fue de por fuerça y *nuestra santa ley* es la uerdadera, siempre en lo imtimo [sic] de los coraçones de *nuestros* passados estuuu firme, y todos ellos a sus hijos y herederos nos encargauan y enseñauan la ley de *nuestro santo profeta* y usauan y usabamos della aunque con las penas dichas de quemar al que cogian en hacto de oraçion de moro, y esta con grandissima siguridad sobre que han quemado mas de 20V personas, puestos en galeras y dado mil generos de tormentos crueles a infinitos. Y biendo esta aora 43 años se alçaron en el Reyno de Granada *nuestros antepassados* en parte de las montañas de aquella prouinçia y lebantaron bandera de moros, y enbiaron a pedir socorro a sultam⁴⁵ Selim, que Dios tenga en el çielo, y por estar entretenido en otras // guerras no les socorrio y mantuuieron dos años la guerra. A cabo de los quales, biendose apretados de los christianos y que no tenian socorro ni bastimentos ni en que pasarse a tierra de moros se dieron apartido. Y temiendo el Rey christiano de que no boluiesen a lebantarse los de aquel Reyno otra bez, porque le mataron infinita gente, los desterró de aquella prouincia y los mando repartir por todo su reyno y los mando quitar las armas y les apremio con pena de muerte a boluerse a reconçiliar por christianos.

Y aora tres años biendo el dicho rey de España, que en tanto tiempo no heran christianos y que no podia reducirlos a serlo de coraçon aunque hazia en ellos los castigos de fuego y los demas dichos sino que heran moros y que por no quebrantar su ley no bebian ni [co]mian cosa de las bedadas por *nuestro santo profeta* y que no aprobechaua hazer en ellos castigos, mando que todos los que auia en su Reyno que fuesen moros saliesen dél dentro de terminos breues con los bienes muebles que

tuuiesen y que las rayçes se quedasen para él y no los pudiesen bender de forma que los que tenian 4 de *hazienda* sacaron uno, y muchisimos nada. Y la mayor parte de los dichos moros [fueron]⁴⁶ a Tunez y Argel y costa de Berueria por estar çerca de España en cuyo viaje a perecido la mayor parte de los dichos moros a manos de los marineros christianos que les robauan y matauan. Y luego en las costas del mar de Berueria los alarbes, que por quitarles lo poco que les auia quedado, hizieron en mucha dellos muertes y latroçinios crueles. Forçaron mugeres y niños, y en los caminos hasta oy los matan, con que los coraçones desta pobre naçion estan aflixidos y pidiendo vengança a su *Magestad* y *Vuestra Alteza* de cuyas referidas calamidades y otras muchas que no digo todos. La mayor parte desta gente estan pobres y neçessitados, y temiendo consideraçion a algunas dellas en tiempo passado el baxa y Ozman day y el duan de Tunez conçedieron a los dichos moros Españoles que gozasen de las libertades que gozaua la gente de guerra de aquel Reyno por siete años, la qual *merçed* supplico a *Vuestra Exçelencia* les mande confirmar para siempre, pues en ello la *hazienda* de su *Magestad* no pierde nada y a ellos se les haga mucha *merçed* y limosna, y se mande al day y duan del dicho reyno reçiuia en la milicia y pagas bacantes de todas suertes a los dichos moros y que no consientan que nadie les haga agrauio porque la gente de guerra haze y ha hecho infinitos a los dichos moros, cuyo remedio con los demas que tengo supplicando a *Vuestra Alteza* ordene en el inter que su Md. se determina a cumplir las profeçias y conquistas de Europa⁴⁷ cumplimiento a dos pliegos de papel refiriendo las riqueças, fuerças y comodidades, façilitandolas lo posible con offreçimiento de personas sin declarar cantidad por no ser fodoli⁴⁸ en mas de hazer bien, Dios lo encamine.

El dicho memorial por ser largo mando el biçir al Ruez Quetrof⁴⁹ lo tomase y guardase para leerlo en su casa despaçio y a mi el uno y el otro me mandó acudir a su casa. Estos dias todos a hecho grandes fiestas el biçir por hauer hecho cunet⁵⁰ a sus hijos con que hasta aora no ha tenido lugar de leerlo. E acudido a casa del Ruez Quetrof, y me ha dicho ben de mañana, *que* hemos menester hablar a solas. No se si quiere comer algo o si quiere desaminarme para satisfaçerse de lo escrito y dar *relaçion* a nuestro amo que puede quanto quiere, Dios lo encamine, y a mi me de graçia para que le sirua, supplicando a todos *Vuestras merçedes* los que oyeren el memorial lo encomienden a Dios y mi con vna fateha.⁵¹

[Contemporary summary, probably by a scribe of the Council of State]

Palermo. To His Majesty. 1613. The Duke of Osuna⁵² on December 20. [and, added in a later hand:] Reply [sent] on February 5, 1614.

After he [the Duke of Osuna] dispatched the courier of November 28, the Turk's *çavuş* arrived there. He then reported that he has had no more news than those he had written except for the confirmation of the preparations made by the Turk, threatening that Repu[blic], which he is arranging such that when he falls upon it he will receive no harm. He [the duke] sends a copy of a petition [*memorial*] that a Morisco in Constantinople gave to the Turk, which the *çavuş* was carrying to another [Morisco] who is in Tunis. And he points out how right it was to expel these people.

To the King, my Lord. In the hands of Antonio de Aroztegui, his secretary of [the] State [Council]⁵³

My Lord

After the departure of the courier whom I sent to Your Majesty on the 28th of last [month], the *çavuş*⁵⁴ has arrived here; from whom I have heard no further news, except for the confirmation of what I related to Your Majesty about arming the Turk against this kingdom. And therefore I am alerting you so that when his arrival is certain Your Majesty may be served, without Your Majesty's needing to be concerned, or having to supply him with people or money, as I will tell Your Majesty in more detail with the first courier I will send. The copy of the letter that accompanies this one, by a Morisco from Constantinople, which the *çavuş* brought with him for another [Morisco] from Tunis, I send only so that Your Majesty may see what experience proves to us every day: what a correct decision it was for Your Majesty to have ordered these people expelled from Spain. May God save the Catholic person of Your Majesty, as Christendom has need of you. From Palermo on December 20, 1613. [signed] The Duke of Osuna.

Part of the petition that I gave on September 15, 1612 to the vizir in the *duar*⁵⁵ of His Majesty.

Most illustrious and excellent sir:

Your Highness will already know that, 800 years ago now, the Commander of the Faithful⁵⁶ and Caliph Yaccob Almançor sent his captains and his people against Spain and conquered it in the space of eight months, except for some remote mountains⁵⁷ to which the Christians fled; where, as they slowly recovered and received no aid, the Moors continued to make war on them for seven hundred years; until 100 years ago now, when they were persuaded by an act of treason,⁵⁸ the King of Spain entered the Alcázar⁵⁹ of Granada, which was the fortress of that kingdom and the city.⁶⁰ Seeing that its [the city's] power was lost and could not be recovered, it yielded on the condition that they be allowed to live in the religion of our holy Prophet, and that they would not be forced or offended in any way.

And two years later he [the King of Spain] broke this condition, and forced them to be baptized and to receive the religion of the Christians by force, on pain of death and of being burned alive if from then on they and their descendants did not become Christians. And since this was done by force and our holy religion is the true one, it remained firm in the innermost hearts of our forefathers, and all of them passed on and taught to us their children and heirs the religion of our holy prophet, and they and we followed it, even with the aforesaid punishments of burning anyone whom they caught in the act of praying like a Moor. And in absolute truth they have burned more than twenty thousand persons, sent [others] to the galleys, and inflicted a thousand kinds of cruel tortures on an infinity of others. And seeing this, 43 years ago⁶¹ now our ancestors rose up in the Kingdom of Granada, in an area of the mountains of that province, and raised the banner of the Moors, and send to ask help from Sultan Selim⁶² (may God keep him in heaven); and, being involved in other wars, he did not help them, and they continued the war for two years.⁶³ At the end of which, seeing themselves pressed by the Christians and that they had no help or provisions or any way going to Moorish lands, they surrendered. And the Christian king,⁶⁴ fearing that those of that kingdom would rise up again (because they had killed great numbers of

his people), exiled them from that province and ordered them dispersed throughout his kingdom, and ordered them disarmed, and forced them on pain of death to be reconciled again as Christians.

And three years ago now, since the said king of Spain saw that in all that time they were [still] not Christians, and that he could not make them be so in their hearts, even though he punished them with fire and in the other ways described; rather, that they were Moors, and so as not to break their laws they would not drink or eat anything forbidden by our holy prophet, and that it was of no use to punish them; he decreed that all those in his kingdom who were Moors must leave it within a short time, with their moveable property – their real estate remained for him and they could not sell it, so that those who owned 4 shares could keep [only] one, and very many [kept] nothing. And most of those Moors [went] to Tunis and Algiers and the coast of Barbary, since those were close to Spain; in which journey most of those Moors perished at the hands of Christian sailors, who robbed them and killed them. And then on the seacoasts of Barbary the Bedouins,⁶⁵ in stealing from them the little they had left, inflicted many cruel deaths and robberies upon them. They forced women and children, and up until today they still kill them on the roads, so that the hearts of this poor nation are afflicted and crying for revenge to Your Majesty and Your Highness for these calamities and many others, for I have not related them all. Most of these people are poor and needy, and out of concern for some of them in the past the pasha and Ozman Dey and the diwan of Tunis allowed the said Spanish Moors to enjoy the privileges which the warriors⁶⁶ of that kingdom enjoyed for seven years, a grace which I implore Your Excellency to confirm for them forever. For in [doing] this Your Majesty's estate loses nothing and much mercy and charity is done to them, and let the Dey and the diwan of that kingdom receive those Moors into the militia and in every kind of vacant post; and let no one be permitted to injure them, for men of war make and have made infinite [injuries] against those Moors; for the relief of which, among many others, I implore Your Highness to order in the meantime that His Majesty resolve to fulfil the prophecies and conquests of Europe.

There are also two sheets of paper naming the wealth, forces, and equipment, making them available so far as possible and offering persons without naming the number, so as not to be a busybody in trying to do good, may God place him on the right path.

Since the petition was long, the vizir instructed the Rais Quetrof to take it and keep it to read at home at leisure, and both of them summoned me to his house.

In these days the vizir has held great feasts for the circumcisions of his sons, so that he has not yet had time to read it. I went to the home of the Rais Quetrof; he had told me to come early in the morning, for we needed to speak alone. I do not know if he wants to eat something, or if he wants to interrogate me to satisfy himself about the document and give an account to our master. He can do what he wishes (may God place him on the right path), and may He give me grace to serve him, imploring all of you who may hear this petition to commend him and me to God with a *fātiḥa*.

Notes

- 1 I thank Consuelo López Morillas very much for her critical reading, careful correction of and comments on the draft version of the present article, and for translating the document included in the appendix to this article into English. I also thank García-Arenal, Geert Janssen and David de Boer for their valuable comments on an earlier draft. I am grateful to Ana Struillou for allowing me to read her article on Morisco diplomacy in France before the expulsion before publication.
- 2 Nicolas Terpstra, *Religious Refugees in the Early Modern World: An Alternative History of the Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 108ff.
- 3 Gerard A. Wiegiers, 'Moriscos', in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, THREE, ed. Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas and Everett Rowson. Consulted online on 22 December 2022, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_36525. The Arabic term *Muriskiyyūn* is a modern loan word.
- 4 G. A. Wiegiers, 'Moriscos in North Africa after the Expulsion from Spain in 1609 and their Discourse about Exile and Diaspora', in *Early Modern Ethnic and Religious Communities in Exile*, ed. Y. Kaplan (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2017), 165–78.
- 5 See, for example, Pieter Sjoerd van Koningsveld and Gerard Wiegiers, 'The Islamic Statute of the Mudejars in the Light of a New Source', *Al-Qanṭara* 17 (1996): 19–58.
- 6 Susanne Lachenicht, 'Refugees and Refugee Protection in the Early Modern Period', *Journal of Refugee Studies* 30, no. 2 (2016): 261–81; see on refugee agency and petitions 270–2.
- 7 Mercedes García-Arenal, 'The Moriscos in Morocco. From Granadan Emigration to Hornacheros in Salé', in *The Expulsion of the Moriscos of Spain. A Mediterranean Diaspora*, ed. Mercedes García-Arenal and Gerard Wiegiers (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014), 295.
- 8 García-Arenal, 'The Moriscos in Morocco', 305; Hossain Bouzineb and Gerard Wiegiers, 'Tetuán y la expulsión de los moriscos', in *Titwān khilāl al-qarnayn 16 wa 17* (Tétouan: Université 'Abd al-Mālik al-Sa'dī, 1996), 73–108.
- 9 See on Morocco the aforesaid article by García-Arenal, 'The Moriscos in Morocco', and also Mohamed Razouk, *The Andalusians and their Migrations to Morocco during the 16th and 17th Centuries* (Casablanca: Aaron & Babel, 2018).
- 10 Tijana Krstić, 'Moriscos in Ottoman Galata. 1609-1620s', in *The Expulsion of the Moriscos from Spain*, ed. García-Arenal and Wiegiers, 272.
- 11 Ibid.; Tijana Krstić, 'The Elusive Intermediaries: Moriscos in Ottoman and Western European Diplomatic Sources from Constantinople, 1560s to 1630s', *Journal of Early Modern History* 19, nos. 2–3 (2015): 129–51.
- 12 Luis Bernabé Pons, 'Notas sobre la cohesión de la comunidad morisca más allá de su expulsión de España', *Al-Qanṭara* 39, no. 2 (2008): 332.
- 13 The document is extant in the Archive of Simancas, among the State papers of the Consejo de Estado, Legajo 1166, fol. 105–6. It is one among a series of documents that were published in the Spanish historical series *Colección de Documentos Inéditos* in the nineteenth century. The request to copy for the series it is still found on the document. It is included in the appendix.
- 14 Bernabé Pons, 'Notas sobre la cohesión', 332, and in the introduction to his facsimile edition of Miguel de Luna's *Verdadera Historia*, as we will see below. Bernabé bases

- himself on the version published in CODOIN; I will base myself below on the original documents in the Archivo General de Simancas.
- 15 Pieter Sjoerd van Koningsveld and Gerard Wiegers, 'An Appeal of the Moriscos to the Mamluk Sultan and its Counterpart to the Ottoman Court: Textual Analysis, Context, and Wider Historical Background', *Al-Qanṭara* 20, no. 1 (1999): 161–89.
 - 16 Kenneth Garrad, 'The Original Memorial of Don Francisco Núñez Muley', *Atlante* 2, no. 4 (1954): 199–226.
 - 17 Studied by Mayte Green-Mercado, *Visions of Deliverance. Moriscos and the Politics of Prophecy in the Early Modern Mediterranean* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2019), 223–6. A French translation of this memorial, on which Green-Mercado bases herself, was published in Jacques Nompars de Caumont, duc de la Force, *Mémoires* (Paris, 1843), I, 341–5. This is also the version consulted here. See on the original text and Morisco diplomacy in France before the expulsion: Ana Struillou, 'From Segorbe to Pau: Morisco Diplomacy in France Before the Expulsion' (forthcoming).
 - 18 Al-Ḥajarī, *Kitāb Nāṣir al-Dīn 'Alā 'l-Qawm al-Kāfirīn*, Arabic text, 227–8, English translation, 226–7.
 - 19 I do not know whether the court documents are still extant.
 - 20 In the passage above I make use of my article 'Moriscos' in EI3; see also L. P. Harvey, *Muslims in Spain 1500 to 1614* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005), 45ff.
 - 21 See Fernando Rodríguez Mediano, 'Seeing Oneself through the Eyes of a Morisco: European Translations of Miguel de Luna's *Historia Verdadera del Rey d. Rodrigo*', in *Through your Eyes. Religious Alterity and the Early Modern Western Imagination*, ed. Giovanni Tarantino and Paola Wyss-Giacosa (Leiden: Brill, 2021), 67–102. Fernando Rodríguez Mediano does not mention the use of Luna's work in the Morisco petitions.
 - 22 Miguel de Luna, *Historia Verdadera del Rey Don Rodrigo*, ed. Luis Fernando Bernabé Pons, facsimile of 1603 ed. (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 2001), 39.
 - 23 Green-Mercado, o.c. 226, thinks that the name mentioned in that source refers to the Almohad caliph Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb al-Manṣūr, but, as we have seen, this cannot be correct.
 - 24 Krstić, 'The Elusive Intermediaries'; see also Wiegers, 'History and the Study of Religion. Prophecy, Imagination and Religion in the Granadan Lead Books, the works of Jacobus Palaeologus and of Nicholas of Cusa', *Journal of Religious History*, published online 1 December 2022.
 - 25 Cornell H. Fleischer, 'A Mediterranean Apocalypse: Prophecies of Empire in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries', *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, published online 14 March 2018, 22, 23. See on *jofores* in Spain Green-Mercado, *Visions of Deliverance*, 3–4, and *passim*.
 - 26 Olatz Villanueva Zubizarreta, 'The Moriscos in Tunisia', in *The Expulsion of the Moriscos of Spain*, ed. García-Arenal and Wiegers, 365–9; on al-Qashshāsh see the hagiographic biography by al-Muntaṣir ibn al-Murābiṭ Abū Liḥya, *Nūr al-armāsh fī manāqib Abi 'l-Ghayth al-Qashshāsh*, ed. Hussein Boujarra and Lotfi Aissa (Tunis: Al-maktaba al-‘atīqa, 1998).
 - 27 Bernabé Pons, 'Notas sobre la cohesión'; Jorge Gil Herrera and Luis Bernabé Pons, 'The Moriscos Outside Spain: Routes and Financing', in *The Expulsion of the Moriscos of Spain*, ed. García-Arenal and Wiegers, 219–38; Aḥmad Ibn Qāsim Al-Ḥajarī, *Kitāb Nāṣir al-Dīn 'Alā 'l-Qawm al-Kāfirīn*, ed. Sjoerd van Koningsveld, Qasim al-Samarrafi and Gerard Wiegers (Madrid: CSIC, 2015); William Childers, 'An Extensive Network

- of Morisco Merchants', in *The Conversos and Moriscos in Late Medieval Spain and Beyond*. II. *The Morisco Issue*, ed. Kevin Ingram (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 135–60; Enrique Soria Mesa, *Los últimos moriscos. Pervivencias de la población de origen islámico en el reino de Granada (siglos XVII-XVIII)* (Valencia: Biblioteca de Estudios Moriscos, Universidades de Valencia, Zaragoza y Granada, 2014); Mercedes García-Arenal and Rafael Benítez Sánchez-Blanco, *The Inquisition Trial of Jerónimo de Rojas, A Morisco of Toledo (1601-1603)* (Leiden: Brill, 2022).
- 28 See Sjoerd van Koningsveld and Gerard Wiegers, *The Lead Books of the Sacromonte and the Parchment of the Turpiana Tower: Granada 1588-1606. General Introduction, Critical Edition and Translation* (forthcoming).
- 29 Gerard Wiegers, *A Learned Muslim Acquaintance of Erpenius and Golius: Ahmad b. Kâsim al-Andalusî and Arabic Studies in the Netherlands* (Leiden: Documentatiebureau Islam Christendom, 1988), translation of the letter on 33–44.
- 30 The Bedouins in Wiegers, *A Learned Muslim Acquaintance*, 38; the French robbers and how the author received permission from the Moroccan sultan to go to France, *ibid.*, 39–41. The communication with Moriscos in Istanbul was achieved through French diplomats. Our author also expresses his gratitude to the French ambassador.
- 31 See on the Lead Books, Mercedes García-Arenal and Fernando Rodríguez Mediano, *The Orient in Spain. Converted Muslims, the Forged Lead Books of Granada, and the Rise of Orientalism* (Leiden: Brill, 2013); van Koningsveld and Wiegers, *The Lead Books of the Sacromonte and the Parchment of the Turpiana Tower*.
- 32 See on him the recent study by Jaime Coullaut Cordero, 'Vida y obra de un médico morisco en el exilio: Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Abī l-'Āṣ (ss. XVI-XVII)', *Al-Qanṭara* 40, no. 1 (2019): 73–102.
- 33 See Lotfi Aïssa, Mouhamed Aouini and Housseem Eddine Chachia, eds, *Entre las orillas de dos mundos. El itinerario del jerife morisco Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Raḥf': de Murcia a Túnez* (Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 2017).
- 34 Archivo General de Simancas, Estado, Leg 627 (unfol.).
- 35 Bruno Pomara Saverino, *Refugiados. Los Moriscos e Italia* (Granada: Comares, 2022), 285–9.
- 36 Wiegers, *A Learned Muslim Acquaintance*, 33.
- 37 Gary K. Waite, 'Empathy for the Persecuted or Polemical Posturing? The 1609 Spanish Expulsion of the Moriscos as seen in English and Netherlandic Pamphlets', *Journal of Early Modern History* 17 (2013): 95–123; Pomara, *Refugiados*, 34.
- 38 Wiegers, 'Moriscos', in EI3.
- 39 That these Moriscos were vividly interested in such themes can be seen from their interest (and possible involvement) in the Lead Books of Granada and in the forgery of the so-called *Gospel of Barnabas*, writings which, in different ways, cast doubt on the historical and religious foundations of Christianity and legitimise an Islamic reading of history. See on the Gospel of Barnabas and Morisco writings Gerard Wiegers, 'Muhammad as the Messiah: A Comparison of the Polemical Works of Juan Alonso with the *Gospel of Barnabas*', *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 52, no. 3/4 (April–June, 1995), 245–91.
- 40 The original spelling has been preserved. Footnotes the Spanish original documents are of a philological and linguistic nature. Historical remarks are found in the footnotes to the English translation.
- 41 Maybe meaning tent, see van Koningsveld and Wiegers, *The Lead Books*, 400, note 70.
- 42 Part of these documents were published in an uncritical way in CODOIN, vol. XLV, no. CCXI, 8–11.

- 43 Ar. *Amīr al-mu'minīn* (the commander of the faithful), a caliphal title.
- 44 Sic. Ar. *khalīfa* (caliph).
- 45 Sic. for sultan.
- 46 A verb is missing here.
- 47 The reading Europe is tentative.
- 48 A *fodolí* is a busybody.
- 49 I have not been able to identify this person.
- 50 Ar. *sunna*; here it refers to the circumcision ritual.
- 51 I.e. the recitation of the first sura of the Quran, *sūrat al-fātiḥa*, a pious ritual.
- 52 The third duke of Osuna, Pedro Tellez Girón (1575–1624), viceroy of Sicily and Naples.
- 53 Antonio de Aróstegui y Zazo (1566–1623), secretary of the Council of State.
- 54 Ottoman official and envoy. The Spanish *haschauz*. I use *çavuş* throughout.
- 55 The reading is tentative. MS duar.
- 56 A reference to the Arabic expression *amīr al-mu'minīn*, a caliphal title.
- 57 This is a literal quote of the expression used by Miguel de Luna, *VerdaderaHistoria*; see Bernabé Pons in Luna, *VerdaderaHistoria*, XLIX.
- 58 Perhaps a reference to discussions in the city about plans in some circles to render it to the Catholic kings, see: Alfred Bustani, ed., *Fragmento de la Épocasobrenoticias de los Reyes Nazaritas o Capitulación de Granada y emigración de los Andaluces a Mar rucos/Kitābnubdhat al-'aşrftakhbārmulūkbaniNaşr aw taslīm Gharnāṭawanuzūḥ al-andalusiyūnilā 'l-Maghrib*, trans. Carlos Quirós (Larache: Instituto General Franco para la Investigación Hispano-Árabe, 1940), Arabic text, 41, Spanish translation, 47.
- 59 A reference the fortress of the Alhambra palace.
- 60 The city of Granada.
- 61 I.e. 1569, the start of the Granadan civil war.
- 62 Selim II (974/1566-982/1574).
- 63 It is interesting to observe that the Morisco author wishes to excuse the Ottomans for not helping the Moriscos. See also above.
- 64 Philip II.
- 65 Bedouins, see also al-Ḥajarī, letter of 15 May 1612, in Wieggers, *A Learned Muslim Aquiantance*, 38.
- 66 Sp. *gente de Guerra*.

Outsiders within

Internally displaced persons in Sweden, 1700–1721

Sari Nauman

I hear nothing else from people than angry and evil words, from which my heart may often break into pieces, and this over things I cannot amend, so help me God; that I am miserable, poor, and a refugee (Sw. *flykting*).¹

With these beseeching words, Annika Johansdotter Falk sought help from the Swedish queen Ulrika Eleonora (1688–1741, r. 1718–20).² Before arriving in Sweden, Annika had fled Ingria during the early years of the Great Northern War (1700–1721) but was captured and ‘pitifully impaired’ by ‘the tyrannical enemy’, the Russians. A ‘poor servant girl’ who had been ‘born unfinished’, she now had to rely on ‘gentle, Christian people’ for her survival. Yet even they turned her away. Addressing a plea to the queen was her last resort.³

Annika’s plight was far from unique. During the war, 20,000–30,000 refugees arrived in Sweden from Finland and Sweden’s provinces around the Baltic Sea, leaving behind friends, families, goods and homes. This situation can aptly be defined as a refugee crisis: it was exceptional and was perceived as unprecedented, and it quickly exceeded the ability of local and central authorities to address the situation immediately and effectively.⁴ When investigating the early modern refugee experience, researchers have tended to gravitate towards studying the considerable number of refugees fleeing confessional oppression, seeking shelter in more tolerant locations such as Amsterdam, Constantinople and Germany’s ‘refugee-cities.’⁵ Two crucial aspects distinguish the Finnish and Baltic refugees from these religious refugees. First, those in the former group were not fleeing religious oppression but rather were escaping war. Second, rather than fleeing *from* a kingdom, they fled *within* one. Still, the question of their reception is not less complicated than that of other refugees, nor was their experience of flight any less tumultuous. The Swedish king decided to receive his refugee subjects, but this policy was questioned by local communities who regarded them as troublesome beggars refusing to work and making the streets more dangerous.⁶ Moreover, though they were subjects of the same ruler as the recipient communities, several of the refugees knew little or no Swedish and came from other

political, social and economic cultures. In some ways they were domestic refugees, but at the same time they were foreigners in the land where they sought shelter.

This chapter investigates how the internal refugees arriving in new homes in Sweden during the Great Northern War presented themselves to the authorities and local communities to elicit support and solicit protection. In particular, it examines the precarious situation of internally displaced persons (IDPs) as simultaneous outsiders and insiders with respect to their new residences. It analyses how their multiple social identities interacted and clashed with one another. In doing so, it pays particular attention to the etymological and referential qualities of the terms these IDPs used to describe themselves. To ensure protection, the IDPs needed to strike a balance: they had to show themselves to be Swedish subjects as well as strangers in need of help, bringing issues of identity to the fore in their self-presentation.

To investigate how the IDPs positioned themselves, this chapter uses IDP petitions to King Charles XII (1682–1718, r. 1697–1718), his sister and later queen regent Ulrika Eleonora, the royal council and the newly instituted Refugee Commission (1712–22) in charge of the refugee situation. Used across the early modern world, petitions were a supposedly open channel between subjects and their rulers, in which individuals or groups could ask for support, alleviation or forgiveness. Although anyone could write or be part of a petition, most petitions in Europe came from the middle and upper strata of society.⁷ This was also the case for Swedish refugee petitions: most were written by civil servants or priests, mirroring the social makeup of the IDPs themselves, although a few were written collectively or individually by, for example, unpropertied widows.⁸

The petitions are located in the archives of the Royal Majesty or the Refugee Commission in Stockholm, Sweden. These collections are indubitably incomplete: such petitions could be addressed to several different authorities, and some may have ended up in other, possibly private, collections; moreover, a few petitions mention a missing attachment or consist of an attachment without a preceding letter, indicating several lost documents. Despite these shortcomings, the 285 preserved petitions – each ranging from one to several pages and often accompanied by letters of conduct and attestations – provide information on at least 870 IDPs.⁹ About 60 per cent of them were written by women, in line with Johanna Aminoff-Winberg's determination that women made up 56 per cent of the Baltic and Finnish refugee population as a whole. Other scholars have noted that in this period and in those that followed, male refugees tended to flee in greater numbers and to do so earlier than female and underaged refugees, who, besides, often go unmentioned in the sources.¹⁰ The reason for the higher percentage of women in the Swedish sources is most likely due to the fact that many of the female Finnish and Baltic refugees were wives or widows of Swedish soldiers, an advantageous position when it came to asking for help from the Swedish royal family. Since the soldiers had given their lives for the king, the king had a duty to protect their families in return.

A resolution is noted in the top left corner of a few petitions, but most give no such information. Most of them are undated. Estimations are often possible based on the petition's content, but the absence of a set date makes it difficult to establish change over time. Moreover, many petitions follow a given structure and use similar language, indicating the use of professional scribes who employed specific *topoi* to

help the refugees plead their cases persuasively.¹¹ Yet, even though the petitions are bound by generic conventions, each is nonetheless singular, telling a personal story and often providing information about the individual IDP's condition, family, previous occupations and flight to their current location in Sweden.¹² Taken together, the material provides a rare opportunity to directly address historical IDPs' self-representations.¹³

The analysis offered here follows the two most prominent terms used by IDPs in these sources: refugee and stranger. Today, both these concepts are heavily laden with particular connotations. Despite the UN's official definition, 'refugee' is a contested concept: defining who is a refugee deserving protection has become a central battleground in contemporary politics.¹⁴ 'Stranger' is equally intricate. Ever since Georg Simmel's short essay on the stranger in 1908, this figure has been recognized as occupying an in-between space of ambivalence, simultaneously outsider and insider with regard to the place where such a 'stranger' is encountered.¹⁵ In their petitions, the Finnish and Baltic IDPs evoked these two concepts to further their cases to the Swedish authorities, suggesting that the concepts carried connotations of someone in need of protection long before the UN definition and despite the notion of 'stranger danger'. This text argues that the two concepts' ambivalence was precisely what served the Finnish and Baltic IDPs' interests: they presented themselves at once as outsiders and insiders, both in need of protection and entitled to it, all the while making the implicit promise that they would leave as soon as circumstances allowed.

Protection of refugees in the Swedish Empire

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, humanitarian ideals and the obligation to receive and protect refugees slowly gained ground in European scholarly debate, with Grotius, Pufendorf and Kant the main protagonists. Hospitality towards those in need was framed as a Christian and natural duty to be extended especially, but not only, to co-confessionalists fleeing religious oppression.¹⁶ The Swedish Empire was no exception here. During the seventeenth century, it actively built up a reputation as a Protestant protective power harbouring religious refugees and combatting Catholic powers.¹⁷ At the same time, the Swedish Empire expanded its territory through successful warfare waged with the explicit aim of gaining dominion over the Baltic shores. At its height, the empire encompassed Sweden, Finland, Karelia, Ingria, Estonia, Livonia and Bremen-Verden, as well as territories in Pomerania. However, despite its self-proclamation as a great power, Sweden seems to have occupied only a brief fifteen minutes of fame, quickly brushed aside and forgotten by the major players. According to Erik Ringmar, the clash between Sweden's self-perception and its appraisal elsewhere in Europe is partly responsible for the country's presence on the continental stage: Sweden sought to prove itself to its counterparts.¹⁸ Thus, although its reputation as a Protestant protective power did not travel far and wide, it may still have carried significant weight internally. Sweden also welcomed certain groups of religious migrants during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: Protestants from the Habsburg Empire, Scottish Catholics and Episcopalians, and Jews.¹⁹

In international discourse, the humanitarian duty to provide hospitality to refugees was prompted by an unprecedented number of such migrants seeking protection during the early modern period due to colonization and escalated levels of warfare. In Europe alone, several hundred thousand refugees were on the move. The term 'refugee' initially denoted religious exiles, but in the late seventeenth century it was used exclusively for victimized Protestants in the wake of the Huguenot exodus.²⁰ Based on state and city records as well as publications by refugees of means, scholars have shown how these religious groups formed refugee communities and narrated their flight in terms of 'heroic exile', establishing networks across borders.²¹ Several refugees became influential voices in religious and political discourse, trading goods and information to benefit themselves and their recipient communities.²²

Less is known about the situation of IDPs in early modern Europe. For sure, certain religious refugees never crossed a state border during their journeys, instead migrating between, for example, the states of the Holy Roman Empire or within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.²³ An investigation of early modern IDPs does not necessarily exclude religious refugees but shifts the focus to their status of political belonging. Many IDPs stayed below the rulers' radar, lacking access to the kinds of support systems available to religious refugees. Nonetheless, IDPs could ostensibly make even stronger claims to hospitality, since it was widely recognized that rulers had a moral responsibility to protect their subjects.²⁴

The reception of IDPs has been sorely understudied. It is unclear to what degree local communities acquiesced with their rulers' calls to protect people hailing from other state territories, especially when under duress themselves. In composite states such as the Swedish Empire, individual territories often followed their own specific laws and customs, dampening potential feelings of shared nationhood. For example, although Swedish was the primary administrative language throughout the Swedish Empire, many of its overseas subjects did not speak it. What impact did the disparateness of different territories and peoples in composite states exert on IDPs' reception in local communities?

Previous studies of the Finnish and Baltic IDPs in Sweden have provided excellent data on numbers, escape routes and destinations.²⁵ Examinations of official policies have shown that the royal power encouraged its subjects to flee to Sweden but delegated the duties involved in its obligation to protect: it formed a commission responsible for overseeing the distributions of provisions to the newcomers and charged local officials with registering the refugees.²⁶ Research on the reception practices is scarce. Karin Snellman assumes that the refugees were well received locally and could 'easily blend into the new environment' due to their Swedish nationality, but Johanna Aminoff-Winberg stresses that their reception was not always favourable and asserts that further research is needed.²⁷ In a previous study, I have shown how the reception of the Finnish and Baltic IDPs was conditional on the expectation that they would remain only temporarily in Sweden. As the situation stretched out, the initial hospitality extended to the refugees turned to hostility, marked by clashes between IDPs and local communities. Moreover, the authorities' efforts to separate the IDPs deemed eligible for support from those deemed ineligible created tensions between the authorities and the IDPs that then spread to their relationship with local communities.²⁸

Refugees: Stories of flight

In August 1704, forces of Peter the Great's army conquered the Swedish town of Narva in Estonia and burned many houses to the ground, including the home of Samuel Nilsson and his wife. Taken as prisoners, the couple were brought to Moscow, tied behind the Russian soldiers' animals, 'not unlike the soulless beasts, the dogs'. They spent four years in prison 'with wails and misery', until they were sent to serve a nobleman. After another half year, they managed to escape. They travelled far, 'with great risk to our lives, hunger, and every other arising difficulty, through wretched roads, such as swamps, forests, and slough', all the way to Königsberg in Prussia, where they ultimately were aided by the captain of a Swedish ship who brought them to Sweden. In his petition, Samuel asked for a small share of the funds that His Royal Majesty had collected for the 'refugees (Sw. *flyktingar*) who have escaped the enemy'.²⁹

Samuel's narration of his flight takes up most of his petition, so he must have believed such an account would increase his chances of receiving help. He recounted the cruelty of the Russians and stressed the loyalty he and his wife felt towards their king, prompting them to confront any and all dangers in returning to their country, though it meant that many years were spent in misery and turmoil. Samuel was not the only one to tell such tales; many refugees gave similar accounts. Elizabeth Nilsdotter, for example, described herself as 'a refugee (Sw. *flykting*) from Livonia, who, together with my daughter, have managed to escape with our bare lives from the cruel enemy the Russian'. The two had

often hidden in the forest, mountain dens, and caves of the earth, lying there in the cold winter, having lost and left in enemy hands all my property, all my food, clothes, and all that I own through various escapes.³⁰

Another IDP, Elisabeth Larsdotter Enbär, had managed to escape

when the enemy ruthlessly invaded Ingria, not only lost my property so that I have become totally ruined, but also lost my two sons and suffered a fracture on my right arm, so that I, poor human, cannot possibly subsist without the assistance of generous good people.³¹

As a 'poor refugee (Sw. *flykting*)', Elisabeth now asked for alms to help support herself and her surviving underaged children.

Sixty per cent of the petitioners used the Swedish term *flykting* or one of its equivalents such as *flyktande*, *flyktig*, *flyktad* (alternately, if the petition was written in German, *Flüchtling*) when describing themselves.³² Authorities used the term as well, as is evident from the name given to the administrative body formed to manage the situation: the Refugee Commission (Sw. *Flyktingkommissionen*).

The noun *flykting* was new to the Swedish language. According to the Swedish Academy Dictionary, it first surfaced in a report of the Great Northern War written around 1710 by Colonel Nils Gyllenstierna, designating a couple of Russian soldiers who had fled a Swedish assault.³³ It was thereafter widely employed to designate the

people fleeing Finland and the Baltic provinces from Russian attacks.³⁴ In 1714, it made its way into Jesper Swedberg's dictionary of the Swedish language. Swedberg recorded its Latin roots and made several references to the Bible.³⁵ These are the first recorded incidences of the term *flykting* in the Swedish language, marking it as the first refugee crisis recognized as such by the Swedish authorities.³⁶ The term's early connotations, however, have not yet been investigated.

As noted above, the term 'refugee' had confessional connotations in Europe, signalling that those so designated were Protestants in need of protection. The Finnish and Baltic IDPs were Lutherans whereas the occupying army were Russian Orthodox, but the latter had no ambition to impose Orthodoxy in the occupied territories. Their faith unthreatened, the Finnish and Baltic IDPs did not explicitly evoke it in their recipient communities.³⁷ Instead, they used 'refugee' in relation to the dangers they had overcome to get to Sweden and to their vulnerable present situation. An explanation for this usage may be found in the connotations of the Swedish and German terms for refugee. In English, 'refugee' denotes a person seeking shelter (refuge), stemming from the Latin *re-fugere*, 'flee/fly back to'.³⁸ The English term thus emphasizes the destination and the aim of the refugee. The Swedish and German terms are built from the same Latin stem – and as noted above a contemporary dictionary mentions *flykting's* Latin origin – but they lack an equivalent to the prefix *re-*.³⁹ In taking away the meaning of fleeing back to something, *flykting* and *Flüchtling* are closer to the nouns *flykt* and *Flucht*, meaning escape, stressing the act of trying to get away from something. This emphasis strengthens the terms' connotative links to the verbs *fly* (Ge. *Flucht*, En. flee) and *flyga* (Ge. *Fliege*, En. fly), as well as the adjective *flyktig* (Ge. *flüchtig*, En. fleeing).⁴⁰ Together, these connotations give the Swedish and German terms a somewhat more acute sense than is present in the English term, which corresponds to how the Finnish and Baltic petitioners used them: they stressed the act of fleeing *from* rather than *to* something.

Flykting carried considerable and unmistakable religious connotations. As quoted above, Elizabeth Nilsdotter had hidden with her daughter 'in the forest, mountain dens, and caves of the earth'. Her choice of words recalls those of Hebrews 11:38, which narrates how the prophets 'wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth'.⁴¹ The similarities between the IDPs' narratives and those of the prophets suggest that by bringing such images to mind, the IDPs drew attention to the virtues their sufferings entailed. Rather than surrender their faith, hope and confessional allegiance, not to mention their loyalty to their king, they had endured hardships that were barely conceivable. According to the petitions, this fortitude, if nothing else, entitled the IDPs to the king's protection.

It is possible that the Finnish and Baltic IDPs had a greater chance of success if they stressed that they were already subjects of the Swedish king and thus were not asking to be let into the country – they were already there, and they belonged to the collective of his subjects. In fact, in 1711 Charles XII urged all his subjects in the occupied territories to flee to Sweden, promising to protect and provide for them once they arrived.⁴² These refugees thus came at the king's invitation. Accordingly, many IDPs used the term 'refugee' in relation to the Refugee Commission, emphasizing that their status fell within the legal framework governing the commission's responsibilities.

Individual petitioners, presenting themselves as one among many in need, praised 'His Royal Majesty's great mercy' to them all.⁴³

Others talked at length about their previous service to the Crown, either as civil servants or soldiers or as mothers or wives to soldiers.⁴⁴ Some even related their affiliations with the royal family, such as Sigrid Lund, who had looked after the king and his brothers as infants before she married the postal inspector in Narva. Her husband had fallen ill, and now, Sigrid wrote, they lived 'in great poverty [. . .] and own nothing more, nor can we with our hands earn anything'; she feared they might have to take up the 'beggar's staff'.⁴⁵ Although few had such a personal connection to the royal family, many underscored their loyalty to the Crown, not least towards the end of their petitions, which contained assurances that they would 'enclose your Royal Highness in my prayers day and night' and 'remain your Royal Highness's most devoted servant'.⁴⁶ Such *topoi* belonged to the petition genre, emphasizing humbleness and obedience towards the king, but their use also stressed the IDPs' position as insiders within Swedish society, bearing the right to address their ruler.

The IDPs expressed not only a certain feeling that they were entitled to help but also a desperate need for such assistance. *Flykting* and *Flüchtling* were frequently coupled with words such as 'poor' 'desolate' and 'miserable'.⁴⁷ These word clusters and their connotations brought certain risks, since, according to a few petitions, members of the recipient community reproached them for their situation. Such incidents are, for example, mentioned in Annika Johansdotter Falk's testimony, quoted at the beginning of this chapter. She stated that others had berated her for being 'miserable, poor and a refugee'. To Annika, to be a *flykting* was not to occupy a privileged or heroic position; it was in fact a perilous situation, rendering her vulnerable to other people's hostile attitudes. Her *flykting* status did not so much entitle her to support as provide a moral imperative for protection.

In a few instances, 'refugee' also encompassed foreignness. Two of the petitions use the term *landsflykting* or *landsflyktighet* (literally 'country refugee' but generally translated as expatriate). Elisabeth Nilsson pleaded for alms to ensure 'my scant sustenance in this my misery and poverty and my expatriation as well as my advanced age', hoping to receive the same help 'as other such expelled expatriates and destitute strangers (Sw. *främlingar*)'.⁴⁸ Petrus Carstenius, a dean from Vyborg who had fled to Stockholm, testified that the daughters of Georg Schroderus had suffered greatly in their expatriation from Narva.⁴⁹

It is unclear what these petitioners meant by calling themselves expatriates; they also used all the other tropes mentioned above in signalling their subjecthood to the king. The incidents raise the issue of the IDPs' status. The appointment of the Refugee Commission and the support system for the IDPs suggest that the king and state authorities regarded the IDPs as their responsibility. However the IDPs' treatment towards the end of the war suggests a more complicated stance. As more and more IDPs arrived in Sweden, it became clear that the provisions set aside for them would not suffice. In 1714 and 1715, increasing tensions between IDPs and recipient communities resulted in confrontations.⁵⁰ At the same time, conditions in Finland had stabilized as Russia's occupying army had settled in and, as a result, several IDPs asked to return home. Fearing that their return would strengthen the enemy, the king

refused, charging local authorities with the surveillance of coastal areas and the seizure of boats carrying people trying to return.⁵¹

Other subjects had chosen not to flee Finland. To provide for their families during wartime, many of them nevertheless took short-term trips to Stockholm to procure salt and other necessities. These traders did not use the term 'refugee' or its equivalents when describing themselves, but they still fell within the Refugee Commission's responsibility. And though at first they were tolerated, the city authorities soon began detaining them, questioning them about information on Russian troop movements.⁵² In their petitions to the king, the traders begged for permission to leave as they feared that the Russians would retaliate against their families, but all such petitions were denied.⁵³ Taken together, these situations indicate that although the Finnish and Baltic migrants were officially Swedish subjects, their status was precarious. Suspicions that they might collaborate with the enemy caused the king and the commission to treat them as outsiders, transforming their refugeehood into a mark of externality. When the war ended, all Finnish IDPs were encouraged to return to their previous homes, signalling that their status as insiders had only been temporary.⁵⁴ Sweden was their place of shelter, not their home.

In short, the petitioners' usage of the term refugee (*flyktning*) demonstrates that they drew from biblical and ethical notions of a people in need of protection. By using the same expression employed by the Swedish authorities, they claimed the legal protection of the Refugee Commission. They furthered their case by expounding on their loyalty and their often lengthy periods of service to the Crown. However, the authorities and local residents could still regard them with suspicion and they could still be reproached, their official status as subjects notwithstanding.

Strangers: Lost and unknown

Catharina Andersdotter was present when the Russians took over Nyenschantz (in present-day St Petersburg) in 1702: 'I saw nothing but death itself before my eyes.'⁵⁵ Now, 'as a stranger (*främmande*) to this place [Stockholm], [I] know not where to find house, shelter, or sustenance, but must perish in my misery', she bemoaned – unless the king could find it within his mercy to help her.⁵⁶

Although not as common as 'refugee', the words 'stranger' or 'strange' (Sw. *främling* or *främmande*, Ge. *Fremder* or *fremd*) occur in 21 per cent of the petitions studied here. IDPs coming from Sweden's Baltic territories were slightly more prone to use the term (24 per cent) than those coming from Finland (16 per cent), suggesting that the Finnish IDPs may have felt more at home in Sweden than their Baltic counterparts did. As it is plausible that professional scribes wrote many of the petitions, it is impossible to determine whether the petitioner's language skills played a part in his or her identification as a stranger, although the Finnish IDPs tended to originate from Finland's Swedish-speaking coastal areas, whereas several of the Baltic petitions were written in German.⁵⁷ What were the IDPs alluding to by positioning themselves as strangers? In this section, I explore three possible connotations of the term: a virtuous guest, a person lacking a network and a temporary visitor.

First, and parallel to their usage of 'refugee' the IDPs may have used 'stranger' in the hopes of evoking biblical associations. Due to its prominent place in the Bible, 'stranger' was a concept with strong ethical connotations throughout early modernity.⁵⁸ According to Matthew 25, Jesus promised salvation to those who fed the hungry, gave drinks to the thirsty and took in the stranger, for 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.'⁵⁹ The stranger is also a virtuous figure in Exodus 2, and in Hebrews 13 the stranger is potentially an angel in disguise.⁶⁰ That the Swedish noun *främling* carried similar connotations is suggested by Swedberg's treatment of the term: he gave six Latin translations (*peregrinus*, *advena*, *alvenigena*, *alienigenus*, *adventitius*, *hospes*) and referenced Genesis, Exodus, Psalms and Hebrews.⁶¹ In the Swedish Bible, however, the word used in these places is not *främling* or *främmande*, but *husvill* (Matthew 25, literally translating as 'house lost'), *uthländning* (Exodus 2, 'foreigner') and *att herberga* (Hebrews 13, 'to house someone'). *Husvill* and *hårbärga* are sporadically used in the IDPs' petitions, but not nearly as frequently as *främling*, and *utlänning* is not used at all. Yet the concepts are linked. Although the Swedish terms *främling* or *främmande* are most often translated as 'stranger', for which there is no other word in Swedish, it can (and could) also mean 'foreigner' (as in *från främmande land*, from a foreign country) or 'guest' (an alternative word in Swedish is *gäst*).⁶² In the petitions, as in the Bible, the word *främling* seems to be embedded in its multiple connotations to place the petitioner in the in-between, perilous, but also somewhat virtuous position of a stranger, foreigner and guest. By emphasizing their utter need in relation to their position as strangers – most often, *främling* or *främmande* was joined by the word *fattig* (poor) or mentions of the lack of food or shelter – the IDPs spoke to the conscience and ethics of those receiving them, urging these residents to extend their hospitality.

Female IDPs tended to use the word *främling* more often in their petitions than males did; of the petitions using this term or one of its equivalents, about 80 per cent were composed by women. This tendency may indicate how female IDPs occupied a more perilous position, since to obtain food and shelter they were more dependent than males on the kindness of others. In contrast, men may have had more opportunities in terms of occupations and connections. Many of the women were widows, often caring for small children, and they lamented that they now had to rely on 'kind Christian people for help'.⁶³ Being a stranger was thus connected to being exposed and alone in an unfamiliar place, where only Christian mercy compelled others to help you.

As for the second connotation of 'stranger', whereas 'refugee' during this period generally signalled insider status in terms of religion, 'stranger' bears connotations of an outsider. The stranger interacts with community members but is simultaneously situated outside of that community, confronting and destabilizing it. The stranger is 'out of place', a position of ambiguity or liminality.⁶⁴ This position is not permanent but is situationally contingent, closely connected with a certain feeling, an uncanniness – that of strangeness.⁶⁵ In the petitions, *främmande* was used not only to denote the IDPs' subject position but also as an adjective describing their new location, most often Stockholm.⁶⁶ The strangeness was the basis of a mutual relationship between them and the city, portrayed as an inhospitable place.

Particularly intriguing is the connection made by the petitioners between their strangerhood and their economic challenges. While most petitioners lamented their lack of funds, 'strange' or 'stranger' was almost invariably placed in direct proximity to words describing penury, for example, 'a destitute stranger' or 'this strange and expensive place'.⁶⁷ This association implies an integral economic aspect to strangerhood that is lacking today. The everyday economy of the early modern period rested heavily on credit.⁶⁸ This was also the case in Sweden, and even more so in Stockholm, where in 1700 household debt as a share of gross wealth was 50.2 per cent.⁶⁹ The Bank of the Estates of the Realm had its office in Stockholm and provided government, businesses and individual borrowers with loans. As Christopher Pihl has shown, borrowers frequently used rural properties as securities. The bank also sought to determine credit rating via personal knowledge of the borrowers or the use of guarantors.⁷⁰ Most credit transactions, however, transpired outside of the sphere of the bank, in the everyday economy of small micro-loans negotiated between families and friends; in his influential study of credits and obligations in early modern England, Craig Muldrew estimates that more than 90 per cent of all household transactions were transacted on credit.⁷¹ According to several scholars, the situation in Stockholm seems to have been similar.⁷²

Having lost their property, many IDPs would have had extreme difficulties in procuring securities, but more importantly they lacked personal networks connecting them to bank officers, eligible guarantors or private lenders. The absence of a credit network severely challenged a refugee's ability to acquire food and lodgings, and the petitioners explicitly linked this lack to their strangerhood. So wrote Margareta Lundh, a refugee from Narva: 'In the utmost poverty with two small children, I have come here, to such a strange place, where I have no one, friend or acquaintance, whom I can trust in my privation.'⁷³ The petition of Ingeborg Lithorenia further indicates that it was the lack not only of potential lenders but also of potential borrowers that was troublesome: 'I have no one here to either borrow to or from.'⁷⁴ Through micro-loans, individuals could build networks to help cope not only with poverty but also with loneliness and sickness. Without money or an initial contact, such networks were hard to enter into. Other petitioners lamented being 'unknown' or otherwise lacking contacts.⁷⁵ 'Stranger' in these petitions indicates that the petitioner stood outside the everyday economy.

The IDPs had come to Sweden during an exceptionally costly time. The war, coupled with periods of dearth and pestilence, had crippled the Swedish economy. Hoping to move the Crown towards solvency, King Charles XII started to print money, *notgeld*, on an unprecedented scale during the late 1710s. Whereas the value of previous copper plates was based on weight, the new fiat coins' nominal value was disconnected from their physical worth. To convince the population to accept the currency, the king guaranteed its value by promising to exchange the coins for silver in the future, after the war ended. Despite the risks involved, people seem to have accepted the novel currency, which, due to the Crown's legitimizing efforts, was used widely at the end of the decade. However, when the king died in 1718, the council of the realm backed out of the previous promise to reimburse those possessing the new money, a decision that resulted in high inflation.⁷⁶ As most petitions lack dating, it is hard to assert whether these developments were behind the many references to Stockholm as an 'expensive city', but in any case

these monetary problems certainly did not improve things for the IDPs.⁷⁷ Moreover, Stockholm was an exceedingly unequal city for its time. Recent estimates claim that the top decile owned 94 per cent of the city's gross wealth in 1715, an estimation that excludes all refugees, which would probably take the percentage even higher.⁷⁸

The third connotation of 'stranger' that petitioners might have been evoking is the temporariness of their stay. In his discussion of the stranger, Georg Simmel distinguishes between two different strangers: the one 'who comes today and goes tomorrow' and the other 'who comes today and stays tomorrow'.⁷⁹ For the IDPs, the duration of their stay was unpredictable from the start. Most of the relief measures put in place by the authorities were short-term, such as forcing residents to accommodate IDPs in their homes and urging subjects to donate money for their sustenance, which proved detrimental to morale as the war dragged on. From 1715 onwards, reports on increasing discord between residents and IDPs reached the authorities, who, as we have seen, also started to cast their suspicions on the IDPs. In light of this distrust, designating oneself a 'stranger' seems like a damning strategy. In Simmel's terms, the IDPs were the strangers who stayed, exhausting the hospitality of the resident population. This aspect, with the stranger signalling a potential danger, was certainly also present in early modern society, where strangers were frequently banished from cities all over Europe. Official authorities often eyed them with the utmost suspicion – unless they could present some proof of their status or network to help their prospective hosts situate them.⁸⁰

Yet, the usage of 'stranger' was not limited to those petitioners who had just arrived in Sweden. Although many petitions lack dating, several of those portraying themselves as strangers mention having been in Sweden for a few years. Lischen Johansdotter is an extreme example, having fled to Stockholm from Raumo in Finland nine years before writing her petition.⁸¹ As Simmel observes, even the stranger who stays retains a potentiality for moving on.⁸² That Lischen continued to call herself a stranger after nine years in Stockholm surely indicates that she had not made a home for herself there, despite her prolonged stay. Ernst Heinrich Paulsen, a landholder and officer from Livonia, was adamant in describing himself as a stranger and refugee, even though he had lived in the area around Stockholm for twelve years. Paulsen had been denied support on the grounds of being resident in Sweden, but contested this claim: 'no one could claim that I [. . .] am or have been resident in Sweden, as long as I do not have my own farm or place, nor have I had the intention of being resident here in Sweden.'⁸³ Besides indicating a virtuous position of extreme vulnerability, due in part to the lack of economic networks, positioning oneself as a 'stranger' may thus have relayed refugees' intention to return from whence they came as soon as circumstances would allow it. The aid given was short-term, and in describing themselves as perpetual strangers, the petitioners accepted this stipulation.

Conclusion

Refugees were often depicted during early modernity as 'strangers', 'foreigners' or 'exiles', whereas the term 'refugee', as employed during the late seventeenth and early

eighteenth centuries, was generally reserved for the displaced persons of the Protestant diaspora. During the eighteenth century, the concept slowly spread to other religious groups, ultimately encompassing the diverse array of displaced persons we think of as refugees today. This context, together with their overall visibility in the source materials, has led scholars of the early modern period to focus on religious refugees. Confessional exiles, narrating their flight in terms of 'heroic exile', exerted a decisive impact on the establishment of a proto-humanitarian culture and helped enable an international charity system to emerge.

The narrative accounts that the Finnish and Baltic refugees in the Swedish Empire provided to describe their experiences do not fit into this picture. Rather than focusing on the heroic qualities of their flight, they lamented their many misfortunes. They emphasized their lack of networks, which forced them to rely on alms and beggary. Hoping for protection, the Finnish and Baltic IDPs nevertheless positioned themselves as 'refugees', though also as 'strangers.' Drawing from these concepts' biblical and ethical – but also legal and economic – associations, they navigated between stressing their belonging to their new place of residence and expressing their alienation in it, effectively balancing their status as outsiders within.

One reason for the differences between how religious refugees and the Finnish and Baltic IDPs presented themselves might lie in the character of the source material. In publicized sources, religious refugees propagated their journeys as success stories, urging others to take inspiration from their experiences. The petitions used here were instead earmarked for pleas for help – to be heard, the Finnish and Baltic refugees were required to present their needs convincingly. Still, even petitions could be used to convey one's usefulness to the host community, as Alexander Schunka has shown in a study of Saxon immigrant petitions.⁸⁴ In a period when paupers were banished from cities all over Europe, the IDPs' decision to draw attention to their poverty rather than what they had to offer can only be understood if put into proper context. As subjects to the king, they had an undeniable right to protection, a right the king had asserted for them when he urged them to take flight. King Charles XII's decision to receive and protect his subjects from Finland and the Baltic provinces was, in many ways, extremely ahead of his time: international calls for protecting IDPs did not surface until the late 1980s. His strategy for doing so, however, betrays a decidedly early modern perspective. With only rudimentary instructions, he delegated the practical responsibility to protect to local authorities and communities, urging them to extract resources from his subjects to cover their expenses.

A chief reason behind the IDPs' 'self-fashioning' strategies was to emphasize their subjecthood to the Swedish king. A second reason is to be found in the temporal aspects of their flight. The IDPs had left behind all they owned, fleeing out of loyalty to the king; nonetheless, they hoped to be able to return to their homes after the war ended. Their stay was short-term, not permanent, and thus their burden on society was only temporary. In their official narrations of their flights, Calvinists had presented themselves as 'perpetual refugees', and other religious refugees shared the expectation of long-term exile.⁸⁵ Nevertheless, many actually kept open the option to return, postponing integrative actions until all possible passages back were closed.⁸⁶ Still others, such as the Catholic exiles of England, maintained strong bonds to their

previous homes, in effect extending the English Catholic community across the Channel.⁸⁷ The IDPs' situation differed, though, since both they and their recipient communities seem to have envisaged a quick return. The protective measures were all interim solutions that could not be sustained for long.

The main conclusion of this study, then, is that despite the perceived unanimity as to who were designated 'refugees' during this period, the group was markedly heterogeneous. Refugees' strategies for survival depended on how they perceived their situation: Was it temporary or permanent? Did they arrive in a place with an established network of exiles, or did they have to fend for themselves? Did they have a legitimate claim to protection, or did they need to argue for their usefulness? Acknowledging these differences among religious refugees, war refugees and IDPs is crucial to understanding their disparate narratives.⁸⁸

Notes

- 1 'Jag får intet annat höra av folket, än arga och onda ord, varöver mitt hjärta mången gång må brista uti stycken, och varöver jag ej råder Gud bättre :/ att jag är eländig, fattig och en flyktig.' Annika Johansdotter Falk's petition was probably written between 1718 and 1720, based on the title of the queen, and is currently held in Letters to the king, vol. 32, Swedish National Archive (SNA). All archival material in this chapter is located at SNA.
- 2 Ulrika Eleonora ceded the crown to her husband in 1720, after which she acted as queen consort and heir to the throne. As sister of the king, she was a member of the Royal Council and acted as Charles XII's representative during his absence from 1713 onwards. She was thus highly influential, which may explain why some petitions were addressed to her even before her period as queen regnant.
- 3 Annika Johansdotter Falk's petition, Letters to the king, vol. 32.
- 4 On the framing of migration as a 'crisis', see Cecilia Menjivar, Marie Ruiz and Immanuel Ness, 'Migration Crises: Definitions, Critiques, and Global Contexts', in *The Oxford Handbook of Migration Crises*, ed. Cecilia Menjivar, Marie Ruiz and Immanuel Ness (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 4–6.
- 5 Research on early modern religious refugees has grown exponentially during the past few years, see, e.g. Peter Burke, *Exiles and Expatriates in the History of Knowledge, 1500–2000* (Waltham: Brandeis University Press, 2017); Geert H. Janssen, *The Dutch Revolt and Catholic Exile in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014); Benjamin J. Kaplan, 'The Legal Rights of Religious Refugees in the "Refugee-cities" of Early Modern Germany', *Journal of Refugee Studies* 32, no. 1 (2018); Susanne Lachenicht, 'Refugees and Refugee Protection in the Early Modern Period', *Journal of Refugee Studies* 30, no. 2 (2017); Johannes Müller, *Exile Memories and the Dutch Revolt: The Narrated Diaspora, 1550–1750* (Leiden: Brill, 2016); Jesse Spohnholz and Gary K. Waite, eds, *Exile and Religious Identity, 1500–1800* (New York: Routledge, 2014); Owen Stanwood, *The Global Refuge: Huguenots in an Age of Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020); Adam Teller, *Rescue the Surviving Souls: The Great Jewish Refugee Crisis of the Seventeenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020); Nicholas Terpstra, *Religious Refugees in the Early Modern World: An Alternative History of the Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

- 6 Sari Nauman, 'Conditional Hospitality towards Internal Refugees in Sweden, 1700–1720', in *Baltic Hospitality from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century: Receiving Strangers in Northeastern Europe*, ed. Sari Nauman, Wojtek Jezierski, Christina Reimann and Leif Runefelt (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2022).
- 7 Martin Almbjär, 'The Problem with Early-Modern Petitions: Safety Valve or Powder Keg?', *European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire* 26, no. 6 (2019); Zachris Haaparinne, 'Voice of the People or Raving of the Rabble? Petitions and Disputes on Political Representation in Britain, 1721–1776' (PhD diss., University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, 2021); David Martin Luebke, 'How to Become a Loyalist: Petitions, Self-fashioning, and the Repression of Unrest (East Frisia, 1725–1727)', *Central European History* 38, no. 3 (2005): 353–83.
- 8 Most of the recorded refugees were merchants, civil servants, or priests, see Johanna Aminoff-Winberg, *På flykt i eget land: Internflyktingar i Sverige under stora nordiska kriget* (Åbo: Åbo Akademis förlag, 2007), 125–71.
- 9 A few of the petitions are written collectively, by, e.g. 'all refugees from Vyborg and Ingria'. Since it is impossible to say how many were in these sorts of groups, such collectives have been counted as one individual, making the estimated number an absolute minimum.
- 10 Janssen, *The Dutch Revolt*, 73–6; Terpstra, *Religious Refugees*, 169–70.
- 11 Catharina Andersdotter, for example, claimed to speak only Livonian but submitted a petition in perfect Swedish, indicating that someone wrote it for her, see her petition in *Letters to the king*, vol. 32. Still, there are many different hands at work in these sources and several petitioners seem to have both written and signed their own documents.
- 12 On the potential of using petitions when investigating migrant narratives, see Alexander Schunka, 'Immigrant Petition Letters in Early Modern Saxony', in *Letters Across Borders: The Epistolary Practices of International Migrants*, ed. Bruce S. Elliot, David A. Gerber and Suzanne M. Sinke (New York: Palgrave, 2006).
- 13 Individual voices of early modern refugees are rare, see J. Olaf Kleist, 'The History of Refugee Protection: Conceptual and Methodological Challenges', *Journal of Refugee Studies* 30, no. 2 (2017): 166.
- 14 See, e.g. Tazreena Sajjad, 'What's in a Name? "Refugees", "Migrants" and the Politics of Labelling', *Race & Class* 60, no. 2 (2018): 40–62; David De Coninck, 'Migrant Categorizations and European Public Opinion: Diverging Attitudes Towards Immigrants and Refugees', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 26, no. 9 (2020), and references therein.
- 15 Georg Simmel, 'The Stranger', in *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, ed. K. H. Wolff (1908; Glencoe: Free Press, 2018). See also Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and Ambivalence* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993), 53–74; Felix Berenskötter and Nicola Nymalm, 'States of Ambivalence: Recovering the Concept of "The Stranger" in International Relations', *Review of International Studies* 47, no. 1 (2021).
- 16 Marc de Wilde, 'Offering Hospitality to Strangers: Hugo Grotius's Draft Regulations for the Jews', *The Legal History Review* 85, nos. 3–4 (2017); Lachenicht, 'Refugees and Refugee Protection'; Georg Cavallar, *The Rights of Strangers: Theories of International Hospitality, the Global Community, and Political Justice since Vitoria* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002); Gideon Baker, 'Right of Entry or Right of Refusal? Hospitality in the Law of Nature and Nations', *Review of International Studies* 37 (2011); Jeremy Fradkin, 'Christian Hospitality and the Case for Religious Refuge in Interregnum England', *Past & Present* 254, no. 1 (2022).

- 17 Peter Thaler, 'Skyddsmakt och tillflyktsort: Sveriges stormaktsställning och protestanterna från de habsburgska arvländerna', *Scandia* 79, no. 1 (2013); Erik Ringmar, *Identity, Interest and Action: A Cultural Explanation of Sweden's Intervention in the Thirty Years War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- 18 Ringmar, *Identity, Interest and Action*.
- 19 Steve Murdoch, *Network North: Scottish Kin, Commercial and Covert Associations in Northern Europe, 1603–1746* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 93–107; Thaler, 'Skyddsmakt och tillflyktsort'; Anna Brismark and Pia Lundqvist, 'A Diaspora on the Edge of Modernity? The Jewish Minority in Gothenburg in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century', in *Connecting Worlds and People: Early Modern Diasporas*, ed. Dagmar Freist and Susanne Lachenicht (London: Routledge, 2017).
- 20 Geert H. Janssen, 'The Legacy of Exile and of Humanitarianism', in *Remembering the Reformation*, ed. Alexandra Walsham, Brian Cummings, Ceri Law and Karis Riley (London: Routledge, 2020), 230; Kaplan, 'The Legal Rights of Religious Refugees', 87; Philipp Ther, *The Outsiders: Refugees in Europe since 1492* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019), 28.
- 21 See, for example, Geert H. Janssen, 'The Republic of the Refugees: Early Modern Migrations and the Dutch Experience', *Historical Journal* 60, no. 1 (2017); Terpstra, *Religious Refugees*, 4; Müller, *Exile Memories*; Susanne Lachenicht, 'Refugee "Nations" and Empire-building in the Early Modern Period', *Journal of Early Modern Christianity* 6, no. 1 (2019).
- 22 Lachenicht, 'Refugees and Refugee Protection'; Kaplan, 'The Legal Rights of Religious Refugees'; Thaler, 'Skyddsmakt och tillflyktsort'. This was also the case for Jewish refugees, see Daniel Jütte, *The Age of Secrecy: Jews, Christians, and the Economy of Secrets, 1400–1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015).
- 23 Adam Teller's research on Jews fleeing within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth is an excellent reminder here; see Teller, *Rescue the Surviving Souls*, part 1.
- 24 Annabel Brett, 'Protection as a Political Concept in English Political Thought, 1603–51', in *Protection and Empire: A Global History*, ed. Lauren Benton, Adam Clulow and Bain Attwood (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017); Luke Glanville, 'The Antecedents of "Sovereignty as Responsibility"', *European Journal of International Relations* 17, no. 2 (2010).
- 25 See particularly Aminoff-Winberg, *På flykt i eget land*; Antti Kujala, 'The Breakdown of a Society: Finland in the Great Northern War 1700–1714', *Scandinavian Journal of History* 25, no. 1–2 (2000); Karl K:son Leijonhufvud, 'Kring finska församlingen i Strängnäs och finska flyktingar i Strängnäs stift i början av 1700-talet', *Historisk tidskrift för Finland* 8 (1923); Karl K:son Leijonhufvud, 'Flyktingarna från Finland och Östersjöprovinserna 1700–1722 i Strängnäs stift', *Svensk militär tidskrift* 14 (1925); Christer Kuvaja, *När Finland stod i brand: Rysshärjningarna 1713–1721* (Stockholm: Svenskt Militärhistoriskt Bibliotek, 2020).
- 26 Karin Snellman, 'Svensk flyktingpolitik under stora nordiska kriget åren 1700–1712', *Karolinska förbundets årsbok* (1970): 85–132; Karin Snellman, 'Svensk flyktingpolitik under stora nordiska kriget åren 1712–1722', *Karolinska förbundets årsbok* (1971): 77–124; Aminoff-Winberg, *På flykt i eget land*; Karin Sennefeld, 'Ordering Identification: Migrants, Material Culture and Social Bonds in Stockholm, 1650–1720', in *Migration Policies and Materialities of Identification in European Cities: Papers and Gates, 1500–1930s*, ed. Hilde Greefs and Anne Winter (London: Routledge, 2019), 79–82; Linda Wikland, 'Flyktingar i Stockholm 1713–1721: Kungens undersåtar – stadens ansvar', *Karolinska förbundets årsbok* (2020): 25–59.

- 27 Snellman, 'Svensk flyktingpolitik', 1970; Aminoff-Winberg, *På flykt i eget land*, 399–411.
- 28 Nauman, 'Conditional Hospitality'.
- 29 'Av fienden undkomna flyktingar', Letters to the king, vol. 32.
- 30 '[G]ömma oss ofta i skogen, bergsskrevor och jordkuler, och där ligga uti kalla vintern, och all min egendom genom mångahanda undanflykter, alla mina föda, kläder, och all vad jag ägt förlorat och lämnat i fiendens händer', Letters to the king, vol. 32.
- 31 'Då fienden grymligen inföll uti Ingermanland, blivit ej allenast till min egendom totaliter ruinerad utan ock mist 2 mina söner så ock blivit bräckter på min högra arm, så att jag arma människa mig utan givmilt gott folks assistans omöjligen kan subsistera', Letters to the king, vol. 32.
- 32 This is the same term used for refugees in Sweden today.
- 33 Nils Gyllenstierna, 'Nils Gyllenstiernas berättelse', in *Karolinska krigares dagböcker jämte andra skrifter*, vol. 8, ed. August Quennerstedt (c. 1710; Lund: Berglingska boktryckeriet, 1913), 75.
- 34 'Flykting', *Swedish Academy Dictionary = Ordbok över svenska språket, 1893–* (Lund: Svenska Akademien, 1925).
- 35 Jesper Swedberg, *Swensk ordabok* (1714; Skara: Acta Bibliothecae Scaensis, 2009), 'flychting'.
- 36 'Flykting', *Swedish Academy Dictionary*.
- 37 They did, however, depict the Russians as 'barbarians', 'cruel', and the like, which may have signalled the presence of a religious conflict and helped to invoke the obligation to protect among the recipients.
- 38 <https://philolog.us/ls/fugio>; <https://philolog.us/ls/refugio>; <https://philolog.us/ls/refugium>.
- 39 See Swedberg, *Swensk ordabok*, 'flychting'.
- 40 'Flykting', *Swedish Academy Dictionary*; 'Flüchtling', in *Digitales Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, <https://www.dwds.de/wb/Fl%C3%BCchtling>.
- 41 According to the King Charles XII Bible of 1703, 'hafwa gått i älande i ökner / och i berg / och i skrefwor / och i jordkuler', to be compared with Elizabeth's 'gömma oss ofta i skogen, bergsskrevor och jordkuler'. See also 1 Kings 18 and 19. For English quotations, I have used the King James Bible. I am grateful to the participants in the staff seminar at the Centre for Privacy Studies at the University of Copenhagen (esp. Mette Birkedal Bruun and Lars Cyril Nørgaard) and the seminar Pre-Modern Conversations at Oxford University (esp. Godelinde Perk and Alicia Smith) for helping me with the biblical references for this section and the section that follows.
- 42 Letter of 9 March 1711, Riksregistraturet (the Royal Registry, hereafter RR), vol. 651, p. 99.
- 43 'Eders Kungl. Höghets stora barmhärtighet', see e.g. Märten Klockare's petition in *Äldre Kommittéer* (Older Committees, hereafter ÄK), vol. 449:1; Elisabeth Nilsdotter's and Christoph Gahmborg's petitions in Letters to the king, vol. 32; Anna Lund's petition in Letters to the king, vol. 31.
- 44 See e.g. the petitions of Claes Georg Alanus and Benjamin Jab, Lorentz Asker and Jacob Nidelberg, or Beata Hägg, all in Letters to the king, vol. 31.
- 45 'Uti stor fattigdom, [. . .] äga nu intet mera något, ej heller kunna med våra händer ringste förtjäna, [. . .] gripa till tiggarestaven', Sigrid Lund's petition, in Letters to the king, vol. 32.
- 46 'Eders Kungl. Maj:t i mina böner jag dag och natt innesluta skall, [. . .] Allerunderdån-ödmjuk och troppliktigaste undersäte och förbedjerska', see, e.g. the petitions of Sigrid Lund, Gertrud Martens Grafs, and David Litzen, all in Letters to the king, vol. 32.

- 47 'Fattig', 'eländig', or 'usel'.
- 48 'Till mitt nödortfirtiga uppehälle i denna min eländighet och fattigdom och min landsflyktighet samt min höga ålderdom', 'såväl som andra sådana fördrivna landsflyktingar och utfattiga främlingar', Letters to the king, vol. 32.
- 49 Gertrud, Elisabeth, and Anna Schrodera's petition, Letters to the king, vol. 32.
- 50 Nauman, 'Conditional Hospitality'.
- 51 The request was refused in a letter dated 19 February 1715, see RR vol. 680, but similar requests had earlier been denied locally as well. On the coastal surveillance, see Aminoff-Winberg, *På flykt i eget land*, 338–42.
- 52 A record of one such questioning is kept in ÄK 449 vol. 1.
- 53 See e.g. the petitions of Johan Bengtsson and others, 10 May 1721, and Johan Andersson and others, 31 October 1715, both in Letters to the king, vol. 31. Men and women alike made this perilous journey.
- 54 Aminoff-Winberg, *På flykt i eget land*, 342–53. The Baltic territories were ceded to Russia, so these IDPs were allowed to stay in Sweden.
- 55 'Intet annat såg för mina ögon än själva döden', ÄK 449, vol. 1.
- 56 'Här på orten som jag främmande är vetandes mig varken hus, härbärke, eller livsmedel utan måste i mitt elände förgången bliva', ÄK 449, vol. 1.
- 57 Of these twenty-eight petitions in German, however, only six (21%) used the term *Fremd*.
- 58 Fradkin, 'Christian Hospitality'; de Wilde, 'Offering Hospitality to Strangers', 412–13.
- 59 Matthew 25:40.
- 60 Arthur Sutherland, *I Was a Stranger: A Christian Theology of Hospitality* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2006). Hospitality is, of course, a duty in many cultures and religions; see, for example, Andrew Shryock, 'Thinking about Hospitality, with Derrida, Kant, and the Balga Bedouin', *Anthropos* 103, no. 2 (2008). In this case, however, it was evoked in the context of a shared Christian/Lutheran faith. See also Hebrews 13:2, 'Be not forgetful to entertain strangers: for thereby some have entertained angels unawares', and Exodus 2:22.
- 61 Swedberg, *Swensk ordabok*, 'främling'.
- 62 'Främmande', *Swedish Academy Dictionary*, 1926.
- 63 See, e.g. the petition of Anna Olofsdotter, Maria Pettersdotter, and Annika Eek, Letters to the king, vol. 31.
- 64 Berenskötter and Nymalm, 'States of Ambivalence', 26.
- 65 Ibid.; Jef Huysmans, 'Security! What do You Mean? From Concept to Thick Signifier', *European Journal of International Relations* 4, no. 2 (1998): 226–55; Bauman, *Modernity and Ambivalence*.
- 66 See, e.g. the petitions of Catharina Thauvonia, Maria Jörgensdotter, and Elisabeth Matsdotter Åkerlund, all in Letters to the king, vol. 31.
- 67 See, e.g. the petitions of Andreas Baer, Anna Larsdotter, and Catharina Andersdotter, all in Letters to the king, vol. 32.
- 68 Jan Luiten van Zanden, Jaco Zuijderduijn and Tine de Moor, 'Small is Beautiful: The Efficiency of Credit Markets in the Late Medieval Holland', *European Review of Economic History* 16, no. 1 (2012); Judith M. Spicksley, "'Fly with a Duck in thy Mouth": Single Women as Sources of Credit in Seventeenth-Century England', *Social History* 32, no. 2 (2007); Sheilagh Ogilvie, Markus Küpker and Janine Maegraith, 'Household Debt in Early Modern Germany: Evidence from Personal Inventories', *Journal of Economic History* 72, no. 2 (2012); Craig Muldrew, *The Economy of*

- Obligation: The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England* (New York: Palgrave, 1998).
- 69 Erik Bengtsson, Mats Olsson and Patrick Svensson, 'Mercantilist Inequality: Wealth and Poverty in Stockholm, 1650–1750', *Economic History Review* (2022): 11. Since the result is based on probate records, the authors admit to a possible overestimation but conclude that debts were 'very important in Stockholm during this time'.
- 70 Christopher Pihl, "'Learning to Bring Dead Capital to Life": The Rikens Ständers Bank and the Credit Market in Seventeenth-Century Sweden', *Continuity and Change* 34, no. 2 (2019).
- 71 Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation*, 117.
- 72 Bengtsson, Olsson and Svensson, 'Mercantilist Inequality'; Maria Ågren, 'Providing Security for Others: Swedish Women in Early Modern Credit Networks', in *Women and Credit in Pre-industrial Europe*, ed. Elise M. Dermineur (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018).
- 73 'Är i största fattigdom med 2:ne små barn hit kommen på så främmande ställe, varest jag ingen huld el[ler] bekant haver som jag mig i min nöd tillita kan', Margareta Lundh's petition, Letters to the king, vol. 32.
- 74 'Här jag ingen haver skuld eller huld', Ingeborg Lithorenia's petition, Letters to the king, vol. 32.
- 75 See, e.g. Erik Hutaja's and Beata Hägg's petitions, both in Letters to the king, vol. 31.
- 76 Peter Ericsson and Patrik Winton, 'Surge, Retraction and Prices: The Performance of Fiat Coins in Sweden, c. 1715–1720', *Financial History Review* 27, no. 2 (2020).
- 77 A few of the petitioners in 1719 and afterwards also mention having exchanged their other money for these new fiat coins and pleaded for the opportunity to exchange them back, as they lacked other funds. See e.g. Christoffer Danielsson's and Lischen Johansdotter's petitions, both in Letters to the king, vol. 31.
- 78 Bengtsson, Olsson and Svensson, 'Mercantilist Inequality', 18.
- 79 Simmel 2018, 'The Stranger', 402.
- 80 Jason Philip Coy, *Strangers and Misfits: Banishment, Social Control, and Authority in Early Modern Germany* (Leiden: Brill, 2008). Despite official disapproval, strangers could receive support from individual residents, see Sennefelt, 'Ordering Identification', 72–7.
- 81 Lischen Johansdotter's petition, in Letters to the king, vol. 31. For others, see, e.g. Helena Libelt's and Jacob Sylvius's petitions, in Letters to the king, vol. 31; Anna Schroedderer's petition, in Letters to the king, vol. 32.
- 82 Simmel, 'The Stranger'.
- 83 Paulsen arrived in Sweden in 1701; see his petition in Letters to the king, vol. 32.
- 84 Schunka, 'Immigrant Petition Letters', 277.
- 85 On religious refugees as 'perpetual refugees', see, for example, Jesse Spohnholz and Gary K. Waite, 'Introduction', in *Exile and Religious Identity, 1500–1800*, ed. Jesse Spohnholz and Gary K. Waite (New York: Routledge, 2014), 2.
- 86 Alexander Schunka, 'No Return? Temporary Exile and Permanent Immigration Among Confessional Migrants in the Early Modern Era', in *Migrants in the German Lands, 1500–2000*, ed. Jason Coy, Jared Poley and Alexander Schunka (New York: Berghahn, 2016).
- 87 Liesbeth Corens, *Confessional Mobility and English Catholics in Counter-Reformation Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019).
- 88 The research for this article was carried out within the Pro Futura Scientia Program, funded by Riksbankens Jubileumsfond.

Part II

Humanitarianism

Refugees, poor relief and the birth of philanthropy in Protestant Europe¹

Alexander Schunka

Introduction

For many years, politicians and voices in the media in the Global North have debated the costs of receiving and integrating asylum seekers, refugees and migrants, often weighing the actual or potential financial burdens of immigration for host countries against possible benefits (economic, social or cultural). As is well known, a journey to Europe by a migrant or a refugee from the so-called Third World can cost several thousand euros. From a historical perspective, however, none of this is fundamentally new. Similar problems and debates can easily be found in earlier centuries. Migrations have always been costly affairs, and migrants have always needed money.

This chapter addresses certain historical possibilities for, and strategies to attract, funding and material support among early modern European migrants. Drawing on evidence from Central and Western Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, I will investigate here the relationship between mobility and charity. My discussion will be especially focused on the terms under which early modern political and ecclesiastical authorities deemed certain migrants and newcomers eligible to receive support, excluding other migrants from such funding or requiring that they struggle harder for it. As in our own day, quarrels and competition over resources and support were likely to occur between migrants and locals as well as among different groups of needy individuals. The circumstances of and justifications for receiving (or not receiving) support point to certain structural particularities of a given society and culture. As will be demonstrated in what follows, early modern support for migrants and people on the move had much to do with religion and with notions of a well-ordered society, as well as with communications and media, the interests of political elites and finally, the general mobility options available at the time.

My analysis here is based upon evidence from several larger migratory phenomena that occurred in early modern continental Europe, including migrations from the Habsburg lands earlier in the seventeenth century, the movements of the Huguenots, Orangeois and Vaudois that peaked less than 100 years later, and the famous Salzburger Emigration in the 1730s. I will argue that contemporary mechanisms of support and

charity directed towards these migrant groups were based on similar structures of poor relief, though they may have differed in their implementation. Funding perspectives strongly influenced migrants' agency and self-fashioning, and even caused the actions and strategies of charity-seeking refugees to reverberate in the political and public spheres. In the long run, the relationships and evolving connections between immigrants and their supporters contributed to broader schemes of philanthropy, and they helped shape the particular images of early modern (religious) migrants and diaspora communities that would persist in the centuries that followed.

The present chapter is divided into four parts. Following the introduction, part two analyses schemes and strategies adopted by individuals seeking charity. Part three moves on to consider institutional mechanisms of support and the evolution of philanthropy. The fourth and final part addresses the relationship between charity collections and the creation of lasting images and stereotypes evoking a 'poor and persevering religious refugee'.

Charity on an individual level: Fundraising practices

Recent research has amply illustrated that the early modern era was an age of mobility.² Movement entailed many costs: food, accommodation, transport (unless people were moving on foot) and other possible daily expenses. Such exigencies, not easily covered by sporadic income or savings, meant that many travellers and migrants were at least occasionally dependent on charity, received in cash or in kind from the people they met and the communities they passed through during their journeys. In local societies, however, migrants would be given assistance only if they satisfied certain preconditions of poor relief. From a Central European perspective (roughly applicable to other regions of the Continent), charity given to foreigners differed greatly from the assistance provided to the local poor. Since municipal and ecclesiastical institutions usually limited themselves to supporting their 'house poor' (*Hausarme*), they gave foreign beggars a small *viaticum* (trail food) and encouraged them to be on their way as quickly as possible. Therefore, travellers in need of material support often had to beg – sometimes even taking the form of extended, well-organized and pre-planned round trips, as occasionally revealed in early modern beggars' diaries.³ Pre-modern practices of charity, because they were ideally meant to serve the local population, unintentionally and somewhat paradoxically fostered the further mobility of the itinerant.

It was thus entirely commonplace to encounter a vast variety of mobile beggars on early modern roads and in almost any city. These were people from different geographic and social origins who, for a number of reasons, could not rely on their home communities to provide for them. It seems that most of them were not 'professionals' in the sense that they would spend their whole lives begging for a living. Rather they were dependent on charities only for a certain period, which ranged between a few months to several years. Several well-known early modern egodocuments that have attracted the attention of researchers in recent years, such as the diaries of the student and later physician Thomas Platter in the sixteenth century and of the travelling

journeyman Augustin Gützer in the seventeenth, mention that their authors took to begging as a form of temporary support.⁴ Although some first-person accounts of 'beggars' have survived and have been analysed, no systematic research on begging in (other) egodocuments has been undertaken. However, it is hardly surprising that moving, writing and begging were linked: many early modern egodocuments written by ordinary people were initially meant to be somewhat multifunctional travel diaries.⁵

Besides the classic first-person narratives, a wide range of other sources (such as petition letters, alms registers, memoirs and collection books) reveals the broad spectrum of beggars and uprooted people in early modern societies. Among them were people with disabilities as well as deserter soldiers, travelling students, artisans, impoverished noblemen, converts and the more or less typical 'migrants' who had left their homes in search of a better and safer future elsewhere. The latter category would include families or groups from certain villages as well as single women, men and occasionally even children. In contemporary records of poor relief, many of these people appear as 'Exulanten' or 'Refugierte', sometimes given a certain geographic epithet (i.e. from Bohemia, Hungary, France and so on). When they used petition letters to ask for money and other forms of support, they provided the authorities with dramatic stories of the events that led to their migration – stories they may have used during oral communications as well.⁶ Apart from a certain amount of individualized information given by these protagonists, the similarities in their stories and the strategies they adopted in their petition letters are quite striking.⁷

While migrant beggars from abroad usually aimed to secure their own immediate and personal support, larger communities, such as villages and church congregations, often sent out emissaries to various places to collect money in times of need. These travelling fundraisers collected charitable donations on behalf of a particular group, for instance to rebuild villages damaged by war or fire or to (re-)construct and enlarge churches, schools or other communal facilities. This form of organized begging was particularly attractive for religious minorities and stranger churches in contexts of diaspora and exile. Many European expatriate communities regularly sent out emissaries – usually parties of two – to raise funds abroad and to attract the attention of potential sympathizers. The networking dimension of these journeys can hardly be underestimated.⁸

Most travelling beggars covered rather manageable geographical areas, about which they had precise knowledge.⁹ By contrast, migrants and fundraisers for minority groups sometimes travelled long distances. There is evidence of journeys crisscrossing half of Europe, often from the poorer East to the wealthier West and back.¹⁰ Routes and destinations were chosen according to pre-existing contacts, the location of (and knowledge about) other, potentially supportive and solidary diaspora communities, and, finally, the expected financial outcomes resulting from visits to certain regions and meetings with important donors, deemed valuable not only for their own contributions but also because they could introduce fundraisers to their local networks.

It is no surprise that larger cities, especially those with princely courts, important religious institutions and influential residents, attracted fundraisers more frequently than other places. London, since at least the seventeenth century, was a particularly popular destination for charity-seeking minorities from the European continent.

Along with its position as political, economic and ecclesiastical centre, the city was home to a large number of different religious minorities, which allowed fundraisers to find supporters from almost every confessional and national background. Moreover, the English pound's comparatively favourable exchange rate meant that donations from England possessed considerable purchasing power on the Continent.¹¹ Thus numerous collectors from France, the Netherlands, the German States, Switzerland, Poland-Lithuania and even from the Ottoman Levant made the long, arduous journey westward and across the Channel.¹²

Fundraisers journeying from the Continent to England had to possess the financial means to afford the trip in addition to language skills and necessary information – and here it should be kept in mind that up until about 1700, neither knowledge of the English language nor information about the country was readily available among continental Europeans.¹³ Those unable to make the journey were restricted to intra-European fundraising. The exiled Bohemian pastor Georg Holyk (Jiří Holík), for example, collected money on behalf of his Bohemian emigrant community in the Holy Roman Empire, Sweden and East Prussia during the late seventeenth century; a generation later, the Hungarian-Slovak scholar Daniel Krman mounted and kept a diary (still extant) of an extensive fundraising trip through East Central Europe in the early eighteenth century.¹⁴ The travels of Holyk and Krman point to how frequently pastors and/or students of theology undertook wider journeys: these men were well educated and could avail themselves of a wide network of contacts. Apart from the very purpose of their journey, namely fundraising, these travels also served educational and networking purposes for those tasked with collecting donations. Several leading ecclesiastics from various diasporic contexts (Bohemians, Austrians, Hungarians, members of the Unity of Brethren in Poland, Huguenots, Vaudois, Orangeois and others) seem to have spent some time – often early in their careers – travelling on behalf of their groups. The practicalities as well as the narratives of their journeys bear frequent similarities, although there has been little systematic research that would help sketch a broader scholarly picture of these excursions.¹⁵

Sending young, single males abroad (with other family members remaining at home) was a widespread migration pattern (as it still is),¹⁶ and early modern religious groups and minority communities seem also to have frequently dispatched younger men on fundraising journeys. Young, unmarried men made up a particularly mobile social group suitable for such trips: their journeys had an educational dimension, and these young men would be far better suited than others to deal with possible dangers along the way. Therefore, money collectors often travelled in pairs because doing so was better for their safety and made for an apt division of labour; they were by turns diverted and edified, and these men possessed a certain credibility vis-à-vis potential donors.¹⁷

Since personal contacts were fundamental to pre-modern societies, agents collecting funds abroad usually needed to convince local authorities that their aims were legitimate. It was in the interest of mobile beggars to tell their stories and bring forth their concerns to potential donors (such as individuals, churches and administrative bodies in the receiving countries) and to support their statements with written documentation. Therefore, these agents equipped themselves with identification

documents of various origins that spanned several categories, such as testimonies, handwritten passports and the like.¹⁸ In theory, at least, local authorities would have approved these documents before someone could begin soliciting money in public. In England, the local administrative hurdles were extremely high for someone seeking to be recognized as a legitimate fundraiser. He (or perhaps she)¹⁹ had to be provided with documents issued by London's institutions (above all the 'Church Brief'), which officially legitimized the cause and the need for the fundraisers to collect money on behalf of their home communities. Around 1700, several representatives of Protestant expatriate congregations from Poland-Lithuania and Hungary/Transylvania competed with each other for such ecclesiastical permission to collect money. Most foreign fundraisers, however, were not as lucky as the Huguenots in the late seventeenth century: their collections, indeed based on an official Church Brief, ultimately were extremely successful.²⁰

In London as elsewhere in Europe, fundraisers used documents to vouch for their personal integrity and to show that their collection activities were legitimate. Letters of recommendation and certification, petitions and printed tracts provided information about the specific situation and needs of the travelling representatives and of the groups they represented. In this respect it was helpful (and may well have been necessary) to rely on local supporters who, in person or in writing, could facilitate access to the authorities and to high-ranking donors. Sometimes these local supporters would assist with the printing of propaganda pamphlets and act as trustees for the collection funds, which only later were transferred to the visitors' respective home countries.²¹

Besides all these pre-modern ways of creating and securing the trustworthiness of foreign fundraisers, there always remained other, less official ways to solicit donations. It was relatively easy to sneak into cities, to ask for money without a permit and even to adopt a false identity (including forged documentation) as a victim of religious cruelty in order to benefit from donations. Impostors and fraudsters were caught time and again. With the help of false information, they pretended to be soliciting funds for a legitimate cause, and sometimes even invented persecuted groups to be raising funds for.²²

On the one hand, these cases point to how communication and the flow of information across Europe were spotty and unverifiable, leaving room for cheaters and fraudsters to do their deceptive work. On the other hand, the travels of fundraisers, the contacts they made, as well as the documents and prints surrounding their journeys helped make specific religious groups known far from their homelands (or from their places of temporary settlement). Therefore, fundraising journeys often combined structural elements of pre-modern poor relief with supra-regional support and information exchange on behalf of minority congregations. Organized financial solicitation and fundraising were helpful, if not vital, activities for diaspora communities. Along with the acquisition of financial resources, these journeys contributed to the evolution of communication structures that spanned Europe and connected contacts and networks of like-minded people and influential supporters. Older and more recent research concepts, such as 'International Calvinism', the 'Calvinist International', the 'Huguenot International', the 'Protestant International', 'International Protestantism' and 'Pan-Protestantism', rely to a certain extent on or even originate from this type of

networking, and it is somewhat ironic that scant systematic research has been devoted to its very basis, namely the practices of fundraising and material support.²³ At any rate, it can be argued that fundraising trips strongly contributed to the evolution and stability of early modern religious diasporas.

Charity on a collective level: Governments, foundations and philanthropy

Let us now move beyond the perspective of individual actors. From a more collective, institutional angle, the securing of funds for immigrants relied to a lesser extent on governmental initiatives and was more dependent on ecclesiastical structures. This was the case in several regions within early modern Europe, where an important function of minority churches was to distribute funds and provide material assistance to others, especially to incoming compatriots. The numerous minority congregations often dated back to earlier decades, as with Huguenot communities in England and the Walloons in the Netherlands. Another phenomenon that emerged in the years around 1700 were broader philanthropic initiatives of clergy and laypeople that also catered to fund-seekers from abroad, such as the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK) and other charitable societies in London.

Broadly speaking, the role of early modern states in these efforts was ambiguous. In England, the 'Royal Bounty' provided money for Huguenots and others on several occasions.²⁴ In several other European regions, aid for the settlement of Huguenots was not provided by the monarchy but rather materialized through individual and community donations, sometimes following calls made by ecclesiastical and secular authorities. Occasionally, as in the Netherlands, lotteries were held, with proceeds benefitting migrants. Otherwise, a monarch would call on the local clergy to encourage churchgoers to make donations, or pastors of immigrant communities would initiate collections for their exiled congregations. If people showed themselves unwilling to donate, the sovereign – as in Brandenburg-Prussia in 1686 – would even demand compulsory contributions from his subjects.²⁵

Sometimes these money collections served not only to directly provide for immigrants but to build and expand churches within the framework of a territory's confessional politics. For instance, the prince-elector of Brandenburg, Frederick III (later King Frederick I), even turned to the English monarch William III with a request to finance a church building in Berlin after his Lutheran subjects had resisted the shared use of their churches by the Reformed Huguenots.²⁶

This episode points to the evolution of occasional schemes of inter-state solidarity around 1700, depending on whether a monarch was considered to be – or saw himself or herself as – the protector of a particular minority. Such schemes were, obviously, not rooted in genuine benevolence but rather originated from heavy lobbying by the immigrant side, combined with the ruler's own political considerations. In this respect, financial support for the Reformed Orangeois, evicted from their native lands in southern France in 1704, became a particular matter of prestige for England and Prussia alike.

The status of their situation yielded a joint funding scheme and even a sort of charity competition between the two Protestant powers of Europe; just as William III did, the Prussian monarch Frederick I considered himself the legitimate heir to the principality of Orange and thus felt obliged to provide aid to the Orangeois refugees – using, in part, funds from England. Following fundraising initiatives by Church of England clergymen and lengthy diplomatic negotiations, the ‘Maison d’Orange’ was established in Berlin with the help of English money. Financially it was supervised by the British envoy, a source of almost continuous Prussian suspicion over the following decades. But why had Englishmen even wanted to donate to relieve the plight of continental refugees? The answer can only be guessed from contemporaneous popular attitudes towards immigration: perhaps it seemed cheaper to support migrants elsewhere than letting them enter Britain. For the Stuart monarchy, support for the Orangeois in Berlin offered an excellent opportunity to secure a Protestant interest on the Continent.²⁷

Another case of cross-border fundraising that became a political issue at roughly the same time was support for Protestant galley slaves. Fundraising for the liberation of Protestants arrested while attempting to leave France who were then forced to serve on Louis XIV’s warships is a good example of broader solidarity within the Huguenots. Clergymen, philanthropists and governments campaigned for the liberation of these Huguenot prisoners, using propaganda such as petitions, appeals for donations and captivity stories that circulated in manuscript and print. The initiative was spearheaded by several influential Huguenot exiles such as the Marquis de Roche-gude, who even advocated for the galley slaves at the Utrecht peace negotiations in 1713.²⁸ Contemporaries regarded the ransoming of Protestant galley slaves as analogous to the liberation of Christian captives from Muslim corsairs in the Mediterranean. For France, ironically, this opened up a source of revenue, which illustrates that there was indeed money to be made in the Catholicization of the monarchy. Within the diaspora, the commitment to the galley slaves strengthened solidarity among the Huguenots.

In terms of broader fundraising and solidarity initiatives, London, again, was an important hub for European Protestants. Material support for galley slaves as well as incoming French converts from Catholicism was organized by several charitable societies surrounding the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK), consisting of Anglican clergymen and bishops, lay philanthropists, bankers, merchants and government officials.²⁹ Their members were often involved in other schemes and charitable undertakings, such as government commissions dedicated to the raising of funds for certain purposes, committees for the administration and distribution of charitable support connected to the Royal Bounty, and the like. From this context, an impressive though undated list of almost forty memorials directed to Queen Anne has survived from the early eighteenth century, probably from around 1710. Since the actual memorials and petitions are not part of the file, we find here only an interesting snapshot, but one that nonetheless illustrates the scope, hopes and Protestant outlook of English support. The several groups from the Continent mentioned in this list as aid-seekers in England had both Reformed and Lutheran backgrounds. As is known from other cases, each community’s representatives most likely built on previous personal contacts with the royal court, using the help of church and migrant lobbyists from the SPCK and other institutions. According to this list of memorials, six

petitions concerned Protestants in the German Palatinate, three memorials dealt with Protestants in Poland and Lithuania, and two with Hungarian Protestants. Six more concerned Silesia, two mentioned Bohemia and Moravia, seven were related to the Vaudois and Protestantism in Piedmont, two addressed the confessional situation in Strasbourg, one referred to Neuchâtel, another to the restitution of Protestantism in France and four to the situation of Protestants in the Holy Roman Empire in general. While it is currently impossible to say whether these petitions were successful in a material respect, the list amply illustrates the expectations of contemporaries regarding institutional support from the British, be it financial or political.³⁰ It also sheds light on how certain funds were often targeted exclusively at a single migrant group; this was not just true for Britain. In late seventeenth-century Dresden, the capital of Electoral Saxony, for instance, one particular charity was devoted to Hungarian refugees. Soon, though, there were no more Hungarians to support, so it shifted to catering to immigrants of a completely different origin – to the disapproval of the donors and authorities. Nonetheless, it retained its original label as a ‘Hungarian’ charity.³¹

Similar claims, albeit unfulfilled, of dedicating money to a particular group played a role in the diplomatic negotiations between England and Prussia on behalf of the Vaudois and Orangeois. The proceeds of an English collection taken up for the Vaudois in 1699, for instance, were distributed among various countries of refuge. Some money went to Brandenburg-Prussia, where, due to the favourable exchange rate, it could buy five times as much as similar collections from elsewhere. In the end, however, the money came to benefit the monarchy quite directly, not the migrants.³² This episode illustrates how donations did not always reach the people they were intended to support, as in the case of Dresden’s famous Frauenkirche, constructed in the early 1730s on behalf of the King of Poland-Saxony with money originally intended to support the Salzburger emigrants.³³

Thus, some philanthropic endeavours failed due to particularist interests and regional power structures. Other fundraising schemes illustrate the possibilities of supranational action with regard to charity and philanthropy. Not only did the Huguenot diaspora extend across territorial borders, but solidarity on behalf of the persecuted also evolved along the lines of an international Protestantism, influencing and motivating the cooperation of European monarchies. There can hardly be any doubt that British money, to a certain extent, financed Protestant initiatives on the Continent (and beyond) – as is also evident vis-à-vis the Salzburger migration to Britain’s Georgia colony in America in the 1730s.³⁴ Some of these early philanthropic enterprises paved the way for broader humanitarian projects in the following decades.³⁵ But like the humanitarian aid campaigns of later times, these cooperative ventures were rarely free from the influence of particular interests.

Fundraising, charity and the construction of the religious refugee

Generally speaking, the success of fundraising initiatives largely depended on whether the migrants or their representatives were deemed to belong to the ‘right’

faith and had credible stories to tell. In the case of the Palatine immigrants to Britain in 1709, a closer examination by London pastors revealed that many of these poverty-stricken migrants were in fact not Protestants but Catholics, and thus did not qualify as religious exiles whose support would have conformed to the confessional preconditions of the donors and the receiving country.³⁶ This, again, points to the nearly inevitable political implications ensuing from the support of migrants. The Salzburger Protestants were guided through the Holy Roman Empire and financed by Brandenburg-Prussia not because of their emerging public image as steadfast believers but because there were political and demographic reasons to support them. When they finally arrived in Prussian Lithuania in 1732, some had to be properly re-educated in a Lutheran manner by Pietist pastors, as it seemed that a number of former Salzburgers were still carrying rosaries and images of Catholic saints.³⁷

Thus the particular status of being a poor religious migrant – and acting like one – was what qualified potential victims of persecution for support by their fellow Christians. Stories of expulsion, flight and undeserved poverty, however much they may have helped individuals deal psychologically with their specific hardships, also had a very practical purpose, namely the securing of funds.³⁸ The classic images and narratives of the sufferings endured by steadfast Protestant exiles were presented in petition letters, printed narratives and other material. Petition letters in particular had to follow certain rhetorical and narrative standards in order to satisfy an administration's expectations. Whoever did not conform to the unwritten conventions of this genre could find it hard to secure funds, as in the cases of an Egyptian bishop in London and a Polish-Lithuanian petitioner in the 1710s, both of whom lacked sufficient command of the local language and, what was more, did not possess the knowledge (and could not avail themselves of assistance) of how to properly tell their stories in a petition letter.³⁹

Quite a few printed tracts about the martyrdom of Protestant 'religious refugees' in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, sometimes regarded by later historians as authentic eyewitness accounts of confessional persecution, were originally conceived as advertising pamphlets for the concerns of fundraisers and were intended to stimulate donations. And to a large extent, the collection journeys were what made the needs of certain migratory and diasporic groups known in Protestant Europe. Even August Hermann Francke's Pietist periodical *Segensvolle Fußstapffen* (Blessed Footsteps) and its translation into English were linked to money collection practices, combining information and propaganda with fundraising on behalf of a Protestant minority group (the Halle Pietists) for a broad reading public.⁴⁰

In sum, a good deal of the documentary material relating to early modern migrations stems from a context of charity collections and from the need to draw the attention of the receiving authorities to the needs, wishes and expectations of the newcomers.⁴¹ It is therefore, to a certain degree, not the actual emigration or flight but the material needs of mobile people during and after their journeys that contributed to the creation and shaping of refugee images in the early modern era – images that have often persisted over centuries.

Notes

- 1 My thanks go to the editors of this volume as well as to the participants in the Amsterdam Workshop in June 2021 for their valuable comments and discussions, and especially to Jasmine Schweizer (Berlin) for assistance in finalizing the text.
- 2 See, for instance, the recent overview by Márta Fata, *Migration und Mobilität in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2020), as well as Martin Rheinheimer, *Arme, Bettler und Vaganten: Überleben in der Not 1450–1850* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 2000).
- 3 See the example of the Bohemian migrant and begging pastor Wenzeslaus Altwasser: Alexander Schunka, 'Exulanten, Konvertiten, Arme und Fremde: Zuwanderer aus der Habsburgermonarchie in Kursachsen im 17. Jahrhundert', *Frühneuzeit-Info* 14 (2003): 66–78. Another interesting case is presented by Otto Ulbricht, 'Die Welt eines Bettlers um 1775: Johann Gottfried Kästner', *Historische Anthropologie* 2 (1994): 371–98. On early modern poor relief see Robert Jütte, *Poverty and Deviance in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- 4 See Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, *Eine Welt im Umbruch: Der Aufstieg der Familie Platter im Zeitalter der Renaissance und Reformation* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1998; Paris, 1995), 37–43; Augustin Güntzer, *Kleines Biechlin von meinem gantzen Leben: Die Autobiographie eines Elsässer Kannengießers aus dem 17. Jahrhundert*, ed. Fabian Brändle and Dominik Sieber (Köln: Böhlau, 2002), 129 and *passim*.
- 5 Apart from day-to-day entries, they served as objects to store items containing personal and travel information as well as account books recording expenses, and they were sometimes even used for prayer and meditation, as in some of the examples mentioned above.
- 6 See Alexander Schunka, *Gäste, die bleiben: Zuwanderer in Kursachsen und der Oberlausitz im 17. und frühen 18. Jahrhundert* (Hamburg: Lit, 2006), esp. 288–308.
- 7 Alexander Schunka, 'Immigrant Petition Letters in Early Modern Saxony', in *Letters across Borders: The Epistolary Practices of International Migrants*, ed. Bruce Elliott et al. (New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2006), 271–90.
- 8 See the examples in: Ole Peter Grell, *Brethren in Christ: A Calvinist Network in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Graeme Murdock, *Beyond Calvin: The Intellectual, Political and Cultural World of Europe's Reformed Churches* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2004), 32–41.
- 9 See Schunka, 'Exulanten'; Ulbricht, 'Welt eines Bettlers'.
- 10 See Wojciech Kriegseisen, *Die Protestanten in Polen-Litauen (1696–1763): Rechtliche Lage, Organisation und Beziehungen zwischen den evangelischen Glaubensgemeinschaften* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011), 143–4; Alexander Schunka, 'Collecting Money, Connecting Beliefs: Fundraising and Networking in the Unity of Brethren of the Early Eighteenth Century', *Journal of Moravian History* 14 (2014): 73–92.
- 11 See Alexander Schunka, *Ein neuer Blick nach Westen. Deutsche Protestanten und Großbritannien (1688–1740)* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2019), 261.
- 12 See Sugiko Nishikawa, 'The SPCK in Defence of Protestant Minorities in Early Eighteenth-Century Europe', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 56 (2005): 730–48.
- 13 See Schunka, *Ein neuer Blick nach Westen*, 387–418.
- 14 On Holyk/Holík see, including an edition of his writings, Marie Ryantová, *Konvertita a exulant Jiří Holík: Příspěvek k dějinám exilu a problematice konverze v období raného*

- novověku (Pelhřimov: Nová tiskárna Pelhřimov, 2016); Krman's diary is printed as: Daniel Krman, *Itinerarium: Cestovný denník z roků 1708–1709*, ed. Jozef Minárik and Gustáv Viktory (Bratislava: SAV, 1969).
- 15 See, for instance, Mark Greengrass, 'The Financing of a Seventeenth-Century Intellectual: Contributions for Comenius, 1637–1641', *Acta Comeniana* 11 (1995): 71–87; Alexander Schunka, 'Mit Geld zu Gott: Kollektenreisen zwischen Pietismus und internationalem Protestantismus', in *Pietismus und Ökonomie (1650–1750)*, ed. Wolfgang Breul, Benjamin Marschke and Alexander Schunka (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2021), 197–218, and 'Migrationen evangelischer Geistlicher als Motor frühneuzeitlicher Wanderungsbewegungen', in *Konfession, Migration und Elitenbildung: Studien zur Theologenausbildung im 16. Jahrhundert*, ed. Herman Selderhuis and Markus Wriedt (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 1–26.
 - 16 On migration as disruption of families see, from a Huguenot context, Carolyn Chappell Lougee, *Facing the Revocation: Huguenot Families, Faith, And The King's Will* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).
 - 17 See Marie Ryantová, 'Der Konvertit und Exulant Jiří Holík und seine antikatholischen Schriften', *Acta Comeniana* 25 (2011): 199–219, 209; Schunka, 'Collecting Money', 77.
 - 18 On early modern forms of identification see Valentin Groebner, *Der Schein der Person: Steckbrief, Ausweis und Kontrolle im Europa des Mittelalters* (Munich: Beck, 2004).
 - 19 Adopting a pan-European perspective I did not come across references to female fundraisers in the context of these collections, which leads me to assume that this sort of fundraising in Europe was largely a male phenomenon.
 - 20 See Sugiko Nishikawa, 'English Attitudes toward Continental Protestants with Particular Reference to Church Briefs c.1680–1740' (PhD diss., University of London, 1998).
 - 21 See the case study on a fundraising journey by members of the Bohemian/Polish Unity of Brethren: Schunka, 'Collecting Money'.
 - 22 On the problem of impostors see, with several examples, Alexander Schunka, 'Die Grenzen der Solidarität: Armut, Mobilität und Betrug im frühneuzeitlichen Europa', in *Migration als soziale Herausforderung: Historische Formen solidarischen Handelns von der Antike bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Joachim Bahlcke, Rainer Leng and Peter Scholz (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2011), 233–54.
 - 23 See, among others, *International Calvinism, 1541–1715*, ed. Menna Prestwich (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985); John F. Bosher, 'Huguenot Merchants and the Protestant International in the Seventeenth Century', *The William and Mary Quarterly* 52 (1995): 77–100; Mark Greengrass, 'Thinking with Calvinist Networks: From the "Calvinist International" to the "Venice Affair" (1608–1610)', in *Huguenot Networks, 1560–1780: The Interactions and Impact of a Protestant Minority in Europe*, ed. Vivienne Larminie (London: Routledge, 2018), 9–27, 9–11. I discuss the concept of Pan-Protestantism more extensively in Alexander Schunka, 'Reformed Irenicism and Pan-Protestantism in Early Modern Europe', in *Searching for Compromise: Irenicism and Toleration in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Maciej Ptaszyński and Kazimierz Bem (Leiden: Brill, 2023), 299–329.
 - 24 See Margaret M. Escott, 'Profiles of Relief: Royal Bounty Grants to Huguenot Refugees, 1686–1709', *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society* 25, no. 3 (1991): 237–78; Robin Gwynn, *The Huguenots in Later Stuart Britain*, vol. 2: *Settlement, Churches, and the Role of London* (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2018), 262–91.

- 25 See Ulrich Niggemann, *Immigrationspolitik zwischen Konflikt und Konsens: Die Hugenottenansiedlung in Deutschland und England (1681–1697)* (Cologne, Weimar: Böhlau, 2008), 118–46.
- 26 On Brandenburg-Prussian church-building programs see Walter Wendland, *Siebenhundert Jahre Kirchengeschichte Berlins* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1930), 135–7; Schunka, *Ein neuer Blick nach Westen*, 208–9, 262–3.
- 27 I deal with this episode extensively in Schunka, *Ein neuer Blick nach Westen*, 264–79.
- 28 Émile Jaccard, ‘Le marquis Jacques deRocheGude et les protestants sur les galères’, *Revue de théologie et de philosophie* 38 (1898): 35–73, 131–67.
- 29 On the SPCK see Brent Sirota, *The Christian Monitors: The Church of England and the Age of Benevolence, 1680–1730* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014).
- 30 TNA, SP 34/24, No. 78, 129–30 (no date, ca. 1710). Almost identical, but kept in the collection of Archbishop William Wake, is: Catalogue de Mémoires touchant les Églises Protestantes. ChChOx, WL 17, 426–7 (no date, before 1712).
- 31 Stadtarchiv Dresden, Ratsarchiv, B XIII 14, Almosen vor die Exulanten aus Ungarn, aus der Sophien-Kirche gegeben (1674), and B XIII 14a, Oberconsistorial-Verordnungen das Almosen der Ungarischen Exulanten betr., 2 vols (1674–1700).
- 32 See Schunka, *Ein neuer Blick nach Westen*, 261–2.
- 33 See Hedda Baerfacker, ‘Die Salzburger Emigranten in Sachsen (1732). Beitrag zur Dokumentation “Die Salzburger Emigranten in Sachsen und Thüringen”’, *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde* 130 (1990): 485–99.
- 34 On the financing and support strategies related to the Georgia migration see Alexander Pyrges, *Das Kolonialprojekt EbenEzer: Formen und Mechanismen protestantischer Expansion in der atlantischen Welt des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2015), 213–76.
- 35 See Brendan Simms and D. J. B. Trim, eds, *Humanitarian Intervention: A History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- 36 On the Palatines see Philip Otterness, *Becoming German: The 1709 Palatine Migration to New York* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004), 62 and *passim*.
- 37 On the Salzburgers see Gerhard Gottlieb Günther Göcking, *Vollkommene Emigrations-Geschichte: Von denen aus dem Erzbistum Salzburg vertriebenen und größtenteils nach Preussen gegangenen Lutheranern*, vol. 2 (Frankfurt: Wagner, 1732), 297–300.
- 38 One example is Georg Holyk, see, among other writings, his *Blutige Thränen des Höchst bedrängten und geängsten Böhmer-Landes* (1673), reprinted in Ryantová, *Holík*, 568–83.
- 39 See Sugiko Nishikawa, ‘Die Fronten im Blick: Daniel Ernst Jablonski und die englische Unterstützung kontinentaler Protestanten’, in *Daniel Ernst Jablonski. Religion, Wissenschaft und Politik um 1700*, ed. Joachim Bahlcke and Werner Korthaase (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008), 151–68.
- 40 See Veronika Albrecht-Birkner, ‘Die Fußstapfen [...] Gottes: Theologisches Argumentieren mit “Wirtschaftswundern” im hallischen Pietismus bis zum Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts’, in *Pietismus und Ökonomie*, ed. Breul, Marschke and Schunka, 87–100.
- 41 A good example is Charles Ancillon, *Historie de l’Etablissement des François Refugiez dans les Etats de son Altesse Electorale de Brandebourg* (Berlin: Roger, 1690).

In face of xenophobia

Polish-Lithuanian Jewish refugees and their survival strategies in the 1650s

Adam Teller

It is probably the case that there is never a really good solution to a refugee crisis. There is too much suffering on a mass scale and too many attendant problems to allow for really satisfactory treatment. Even today, it is still very often a matter of responding to urgent problems as they arise and improvising answers on the spot. It goes without saying, then, that this was the case in the seventeenth-century Jewish refugee crisis I will be discussing here, particularly since there were no strong central authorities, non-Jewish or Jewish, which could devise and implement broad principles of policy. In order to understand it, then, I shall begin by narrowing the focus from the refugees as a whole to individual groups within the larger body and from the global or continental scale to single regions, or even just locations. This is not to say that broader responses will not be examined, just that since they developed as the result of cooperation between individual locales, they will be viewed first and foremost from that perspective.

The flight of Jews from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the mid-seventeenth century, which is at the heart of this study, was complex and developed in stages: sparked by the anti-Jewish violence of the great Khmelnytsky uprising in 1648 Ukraine, it continued during the subsequent Russian invasion from 1654–67 and also in the fight against the Swedish occupation, which lasted from 1655–60, both of which targeted Jewish communities among others.¹ As a result, a huge wave of Jewish refugees and forced migrants from Eastern Europe spread out across the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth itself, as well as the Ottoman Empire and the Holy Roman Empire.²

Destitute, often traumatized by their experiences, and lacking any means of support, these refugees posed a huge social, economic and ethical challenge to the Jewish world of their day. Communities across that world, touched by all the suffering, answered this challenge in unprecedented ways and began to organize relief for the Polish-Lithuanian Jews.

Taken as a whole, the flood of refugees was too heterogenous and was handled in too many different ways, to be treated in a single article. Instead, this chapter will focus

on just one group within it – those who fled to Central and Western Europe in the 1650s. It will ask three basic questions: How did the non-Jewish authorities in the Holy Roman Empire react to the arrival of so many Jewish refugees? What strategies did the refugees themselves and the individual Jewish communities to which they fled develop in order to both deal with the authorities and to relieve the suffering of the displaced? How did Jewish communities cooperate with each in providing refugee relief on a trans-regional basis (using the community of Vienna as a case study)?

The study of Jewish refugees in the pre-modern world in general and in the seventeenth century in particular, is still in its infancy. There is only one full-length study of the refugee crisis we are examining here,³ and barely half a dozen articles or book chapters dealing with various aspects of the Jewish refugee experience in the seventeenth-century Holy Roman Empire.⁴ The topic is, however, not uncontroversial: recently Robert Chazan published a monograph on pre-modern Jewish population movements, arguing that, for the most part, these were voluntary rather than forced migrations. While he is willing to concede that one or two significant expulsions did take place, he argues that they were the exception rather than the rule.⁵ He concludes by rejecting what he calls ‘the broad sense of Jews as overwhelmingly refugees, of involuntary displacement as a standard feature of historic Jewish existence, which it in reality was not.’⁶

Though, this argument obviously has some merit – clearly not every migration of Jews was forced upon them – it also seems to confuse as much as it clarifies. In his eagerness to prove his point, Chazan largely overlooks the mid-seventeenth century, devoting to it barely a couple of pages, in which he focuses only on the first stage of the events, the Khmelnytsky uprising. He notes that the majority of the refugees from that outburst of violence, though they did flee Ukraine, did not leave the Commonwealth, which allowed many eventually to return to their previous homes. His verdict: ‘Once again, a severe crisis does not seem to have provoked significant Jewish demographic displacement.’⁷

Quite apart from the fact that it ignores the subsequent large waves of Jewish refugees, who did in fact settle in the Holy Roman Empire, this statement also raises the question of what exactly a ‘significant demographic displacement’ is. The forced flight of tens of thousands of people from their homes and their resettlement in distant locales for periods which could last as long as twenty years should surely not be dismissed as insignificant. Another question, which the sweeping assertion does not even permit asking, is what the factors were that allowed those refugees to survive their experiences both on the road and in their temporary homes, so that they could eventually return to Ukraine and rebuild their lives. These things, too, should not be taken for granted.⁸

The first step towards understanding pre-modern Jewish migration – voluntary as well as forced – must surely be to take each individual case on its own terms, reveal and examine its complexities and nuances, and assess its significance in human rather than panoramic terms. That is certainly the goal here.

The reactions of the non-Jewish authorities

There were two major waves of Polish-Lithuanian Jewish refugees to the Holy Roman Empire in the mid-seventeenth century. The first, which does not seem to have been

very large, came after the Khmelnytsky revolt of 1648, which hit the Jews of Ukraine very hard, and was largely overland from Ukraine via Little Poland (the Kraków region).⁹ The second came following the Russian and Swedish invasions of 1655 and included a movement west, not only from Little Poland, but from the more northerly Great Poland into Brandenburg and Silesia, and from Lithuania to Königsberg in East Prussia and then to Hamburg. Following that, starting in the 1660s, many more Jews left the Commonwealth for the Empire, first as economic refugees, then as economic migrants.¹⁰ J. Friedrich Battenberg has estimated the total number of Jewish refugees in the Empire in the 1650s at somewhere between 10,000 and 15,000, and that they were joining an established Jewish community in the German lands of no more than about 40,000 Jews.¹¹

For the most part, the Jewish refugees did what they could to avoid the attention of the non-Jewish authorities, which they rightly assumed would be hostile. Whether for specifically anti-Jewish or general xenophobic reasons, the arrival of a wave of destitute Jews was seen as unwelcome in the places they reached. Worse, the local Jews often found it difficult to help them. Since their right of residence was anchored in personal or local privileges, not only did they not have the authority to bring in large numbers of Jews from elsewhere, but they also knew that if they did so, they risked bringing down on their own heads the anger of their Christian neighbours.¹²

It did not take long for the hostility towards the Polish Jewish refugees to manifest itself. As early as 1650, Frederick William of Brandenburg, the 'Great Elector', set his face against the settlement of Jews from Poland-Lithuania in his lands, even at a time when he was encouraging Jewish economic activity there. He had been approached by a delegation of Polish Jews, with a request that he renew the trading privileges his predecessors had granted them in the Mark.¹³ True to his mercantilist principles, he granted the request, citing his concern, 'to promote the general [art of] negotiation, trade, and commerce in our lands, so that our subjects may thrive, prosper, and succeed.'¹⁴ Nonetheless, he made this conditional 'that they [the Jews] do not, either *de facto* or by acquiring a house, settle or stay [in our lands].'¹⁵

A few years later, when the number of refugees had grown enormously, particularly in East Prussia, Frederick William was considerably harsher, expelling the Jews from the towns there, if not from the Duchy as a whole, with only three days' notice, citing fear of the plague as his reason.¹⁶

Even more hostile were the inhabitants of the towns to which the Jewish refugees fled, as can be seen in the Margraviate of Moravia. Though the Holy Roman Emperor, as King of Bohemia, supported Jewish settlement, largely of refugees, there for economic reasons, the local urban authorities were implacably opposed to it. Their immediate response to a Royal privilege of 1657 that was supportive of Jewish trade and settlement was to impose stringent new taxes on the Jews who came to their towns. They followed this up with a long letter to their ruler questioning the rights he was giving the Jews in light of all the damage they were causing the towns (as the towns saw it). They expanded on this theme in two long documents in which they presented the case not for supporting but for expelling the Jews.¹⁷ Fortunately for the latter, the King, concerned for his treasury, would hear none of it and the towns' opposition to refugee settlement was effectively silenced by a royal order in 1662.

The Jews were not always so lucky, however. On 1 August 1656, a correspondent of the Hamburg paper, *Wochentliche Zeitung*, filed the following story from the Baltic coast, informing the burghers back home:

In addition to the Jews who have so far left Poland, a big Vistula barge full of [another] 400 has just arrived here today to go to Germany. They [i.e., the Jews] cannot bear to stay in Poland any longer on account of the hatred of the nobility which has been stirred up by their excessive privileges in Poland and their self-serving behavior in the towns.¹⁸

Hamburg was a major draw for those Polish-Lithuanian Jews fleeing by sea and, as the tone of the article suggests, it did not welcome them at all. Here, though, no one came to their aid: with the arrival of the refugees from Eastern Europe, the local community had to deal with the hostile and angry urban authorities entirely on its own.

Evading the non-Jewish authorities

In such a situation, the Jews of Hamburg seem to have felt that the best idea was to keep the refugees as far away from the public gaze as possible. However, as the situation that developed there demonstrates, that strategy, too, had its dangers. The memoirist Glikl of Hameln, who was then a young girl living with her family in Altona, just outside Hamburg, has left a description of what happened when Jews were hidden away:

After this, the Jews of Vilna fled Poland and many of them came to Hamburg, suffering with contagious disease [. . .] At least ten of them were sent to rest in our attic and father had them looked after. Some of them recovered, others died. My sister, Elkele, and I also contracted the disease. My pious Grandmother visited the sick and ensured that they had everything they needed. [. . .] She would visit them in the attic three or four times a day. Eventually, she also caught the disease and languished for ten days before she died.¹⁹

In the end, however, whether they were concerned about public health issues or about how non-Jewish society would react to the arrival of these refugees, the local Jews seem to have decided that they could not let them remain.²⁰ How this played out can be seen with the arrival of a large group of refugees in May 1656. On 22 May, the Hamburg community noted in its record book:

130 of our brothers-in-faith from Poland have arrived in Lübeck in great distress. They will reach here by tomorrow. [. . .] It was decided to grant them twenty Reichsthaler to cover the cost of the journey [from Lübeck]. Once they get here, we will see how they can be helped further.²¹

Initially, the treatment of the refugees was nothing out of the ordinary. On 25 May, the community made a special announcement proclaiming an extraordinary fundraising drive, to include prayers in the synagogue, a special sermon by rabbi David Coen, and a collection:

Since our poor brothers, who, for our sins, have been forced to leave Poland on account of the war and the atrocities are, unfortunately, increasingly exposed to suffering, persecution, and misery, we should extend them our compassionate assistance, as we have done on many occasions. The expense involved is more than our community can bear, so the *Ma'amad*²² has decided to hold a charitable meeting for us to help the many souls who have recently come here, hungry and naked – and may still be to come [. . .] This [support of the refugees] is an act of pure kindness in which many religious commandments are involved, and it is our most fervent hope that our pious and open-hearted people will once again demonstrate their usual grace and great-heartedness.²³

Following the philanthropic effort, however, the community decided not to house the refugees in Hamburg.²⁴ Instead, they had them moved to what the sources call 'a village, two miles distant'.²⁵ Clearly, the local Jews knew that their non-Jewish neighbours would not tolerate the arrival of so many Jewish refugees and so, to avoid conflict, they decided to house the refugees out of town, in a nearby village whose peasant inhabitants were presumably easy to buy off.

Unfortunately, that arrangement lasted for only a few months. On 21 September the Hamburg community learned that, for reasons unspecified, remaining in the village was no longer an option for the refugees. The solution to the problem that the community found was even more radical. It decided to get rid of the Polish Jews entirely, noting in their communal record book: 'It is therefore essential that we hire boats to take them somewhere else'.²⁶ Whether the plan was to ship the unfortunate refugees upriver on the Elbe to towns such as Magdeburg, Dessau, Wittenberg or Dresden, or for the boats to take them down to the coast and on to Amsterdam, is unclear. Still, whatever the case, the Jews of Hamburg had decided quite simply to wash their hands of their now unwanted guests.²⁷

Even in Amsterdam, a town usually noted for its relatively tolerant attitude towards Jewish settlement, the local Jewish community seems to have been afraid of a backlash caused by an influx of Polish-Lithuanian Jews. It too decided to hire ships to take various boatloads of Jewish refugees up the Rhine rather than let them remain, as the Dutch news chronicle *Hollantse Mercurius* reported for June 1656:

Three ships came to Amsterdam with 300 Jews from Poland fleeing the war looking very miserable. The Jews of Amsterdam first put them up in two warehouses, where they refreshed [themselves] and recovered. Afterwards, some were provided with accommodation, while others were sent on.²⁸

Notarial records add further detail. The community signed two contracts with Dutch boat captains to transport the refugees up the Rhine. The first was made with Captain

Jan Goosens on 12 July 1656. Its terms were that 125–30 Polish Jewish refugees – men, women and children – were to be shipped to Mainz, more if his boat could carry them. For this, the community would pay him ‘550 guilders.’²⁹ The second contract was made a week later with Captain Aert Janssen Reulse. He was to ship forty Polish Jews of both sexes, half of them adults and half children, to Deutz, a small town near Cologne.³⁰ For that he would be paid five guilders per adult and two and a half per child. Infants were to be carried free of charge.

That was not the end of the story, however. Having shipped the refugees out, the Jews of Amsterdam became concerned that they might return and cause further problems. Therefore, on 9 May 1658, the Sephardic community issued the following declaration:

As everyone knows, [when] our brothers fled here following the wars in Poland, we helped them generously. However, after we had supported them and moved them on to Germany, these people, most of whom are dangerous, found that the beggar’s life suited them and came back here.³¹

Its solution was to ship the refugees out again, this time back to Poland-Lithuania, under the pretext that the war there was over: ‘If they [i.e., the beggars] do not go back to their own countries, where, with the Grace of Blessed God, peace is spreading [...] they will be given no help at all’. The logic behind the harsh ruling was made quite clear:

Their suffering [without relief money from the community] will cause the [indigent refugees] to make use of the help that we give to all those who want to return to their own countries. In that way, we will also prevent the arrival of more [refugees] from other places to live a life of shame [here in Amsterdam].³²

It is worth noting at this point that, despite the xenophobia and the fears of the local Jews in both Hamburg and Amsterdam that allowing the Polish Jews to remain would lead to a backlash from their non-Jewish neighbours, they did not simply abandon their coreligionists. Both communities seem to have been willing to pay quite significant sums to ensure the welfare (and safe onward passage) of the refugees from Poland.

Pre-organized flight

One of the ways in which the refugees themselves tried to deal with the problem of hostility in the places they were making for, particularly during mid-1650s, was to organize group flight ahead of time. In addition to the usual phenomenon of individuals and single families fleeing for their lives, some communities left as a unit. In his personal chronicle, Yuda ben Ephraim of Pila tells of his own flight westwards in 1655/56, which he initially broke, for lack of money, in the town of Grodzisk in Great Poland:

When we got there, there was no way through Jews’ Street because it was full of carts ready to flee to Silesia. They were completely full [with goods and possessions] and the children – of all ages – were sitting on top of them. They all left together.³³

We know of other cases of such organized flights in these years, from Olkusz in Little Poland, and from Vilnius and Pinsk in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.³⁴

Obviously organizing such a flight required prior knowledge of advancing danger, but the slow movement of armies in the seventeenth century made this possible. Fleeing as a group provided significant benefits, most prominently reducing (though not eliminating) the threat of violence faced by an individual refugee on the road. It also made the experience on the other side of the border somewhat easier. When Yuda ben Ephraim did eventually make his way to Silesia, he stopped at the border village of Lipiny where he found no less than twenty-five families from Grodzisk, encamped just over the border, presumably waiting for the first opportunity to return home. By that time, he had run out of money and he and his family were on the brink of starvation. However, the remnants of the Grodzisk community gave him employment that allowed him to eke out a living as a teacher and slaughterer.³⁵

Coordinated flight also meant better organized flight. Before the Swedish invasion force of July 1655 reached Great Poland, a group of Jews from there wrote to the Holy Roman Emperor, Ferdinand III, asking permission to enter his territory. They did so because Jews from outside Silesia were officially forbidden to stay there, except for short periods during each town's annual fair. Unfortunately for them, however, the Swedish army got to them before Ferdinand's response, so they were forced to cross into Silesia without permission.³⁶

Once there, they wrote a second letter to the emperor, dated 19 August 1655, in which they gave a moving description of their sufferings:

We do not want to stop, particularly because we find ourselves in uninhabited places, and cannot live with our poor wives, children, and child-minders in the open country under the open sky. Worse still, fall is coming on and the nights are already cold [. . .] [Quite] helpless, we are terrified of the wicked who might attack us violently at night, take away our possessions, and rob us of everything.

The refugees explained that even though the Swedish forces were by then willing to grant them safe conduct to return home, they were unable to take advantage of it, presumably because they feared reprisals from the non-Jewish locals who had remained behind. Instead, they renewed their request to be allowed to travel through, and stay in, Silesia, adding a further appeal that the permission they sought should be extended to cover other Habsburg holdings, such as Bohemia and Austria.³⁷

The emperor gave them the permission they wanted.³⁸ However, concerned that such an influx of Jews might cause unrest among the settled Christian population in his lands, he also ordered that some effort be made to collect statistical data concerning Jewish settlement and that care be taken to ensure that not too many Jews were allowed to settle in any single locality.³⁹

Perhaps the most striking aspect of this story of refugee self-organization is the creation of a refugee council to represent 'the Jews of Great Poland' in Silesia. In May 1657, the refugee community in Milicz elected a representative, Markus Magnus, originally from Krotoszyn, to negotiate with the Oberamt the level of taxes they were to pay. In parallel, the refugees in Vartemberk and in Bytom elected their own representatives to act alongside Magnus.⁴⁰

On one level, there was little unusual about the creation of such a body: the need to negotiate the levels of taxation paid by Jews had led to the foundation of many Jewish representative bodies over the previous century and a half, including the Council of Four Lands in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the *Landjudenschaften* in the Holy Roman Empire.⁴¹ However, those were bodies created by Jews long settled in those regions, while the refugee body, was by its very nature, new and created by transient strangers. Particularly remarkable was the speed with which the refugees were able to organize; for the most part, they had been in Silesia for less than two years. The reasons for their success should perhaps be sought in the relatively organized nature of the Jews' flight in the mid-1650s, in which the settlement of groups from individual Polish communities in single towns and settlements in Silesia made cooperation much easier.

Local relief

The situation in Silesia was not typical, however. For the most part, the Jewish refugees arrived in the Empire individually or in small groups and threw themselves on the mercy of the local Jews. The responses they received from German Jewry, itself still poor and unsettled following the Thirty Years' War, seem to have been ambivalent and full of tension.

In fact, the problem was widespread enough that it was made the subject of a satirical chapbook in Yiddish printed in Prague in the second half of the seventeenth century. Entitled *Di bashraybung fun Ashkenaz un Polak* ('The Description of a German and a Polish Jew'⁴²), it provided, in poetic form, a humorous look at the interaction of the Polish Jewish refugees with the German Jews they came to for help.⁴³ The content of the poem took the form of an argument between a Polish Jewish refugee and an unhelpful German Jew. Through witty descriptions of each other's behaviour, a kind of satirical slanging match developed.

The sense of xenophobia and distrust between the two in the poem is palpable: 'When a Polish Jew comes to a German's house/ he plays with him like a cat with a mouse.'⁴⁴ As far as the refugee is concerned, his German Jewish host is a terrible miser, initially unwilling to give him a bed to sleep in or food to eat. When finally prevailed upon to do the right thing, the German Jew is only prepared to give the poor refugee a pot of groats and some wormy cheese before sending him up to sleep in a cold room under the eaves which he locks from the outside.⁴⁵ On his side, 'The German Jew thinks: "Why do I have anything to do with this Pole/ who comes running round to my house and home?" The German is never happier and without a care/ than when the Pole has gone and is no longer there.'⁴⁶ Finally, the Polish Jew accuses his German cousin not only of ignorance but of sneering at Jewish learning and scholars, particularly those from the Commonwealth. 'In Torah learning you would be deaf and dumb/ without the teachers from Poland who to Germany come.'⁴⁷

The German Jew has his own diatribe against the Jewish refugees from Poland, the vast bulk of which deals with the dishonest, not to say criminal, tendencies of the refugee:

Unscrupulous, he does not miss an opportunity/
To rob Jews and bring them to poverty.
He breaks into gentile homes whenever he can/
And often needs to be saved from the hangman.⁴⁸

A major source of humour in the poem is, of course, its use of stereotypes – in particular, those of the stingy German Jew and the unscrupulous Polish refugee. There was very probably some basis in reality for these images (otherwise the poem would not have been funny). However, though it assumes that they were inherent qualities of the two groups, it seems much more likely that there were more immediate causes. The low levels of enthusiasm and help given to the refugees by the German Jews probably had more to do with the very real social and economic difficulties they had to face in their daily lives. For their part, the refugees, struggling with the terrible situation in which they found themselves, must sometimes (if not often) have been driven to desperate measures.

A closer reading reveals, however, that the poem was not accusing the Jews of the Empire of refusing to help the refugees. Quite the reverse. Though the Polish Jewish refugee had endless complaints, he was moaning about help that he had actually received. And while the German Jew might not have liked or trusted the refugee from the Commonwealth, he did not turn him away completely empty-handed. So, the situation the poet was satirizing was in fact one of basic solidarity, though overlaid with a range of cross-cultural misunderstandings and tensions.

In fact, xenophobia notwithstanding, Jewish solidarity towards the refugees extended far beyond the kind of individual help described in the chapbook. The poem itself tells of refugees in the following locations: Frankfurt am Main, Worms, Fürth, Bamberg, Halberstadt, Hamburg, Hildesheim, Minden, Friedberg, Hanau, Kassel, Witzenhausen, Eschwege and Wanfried. The Jews in each of these places would have had to organize in order to help the indigent Jews from Poland-Lithuania.⁴⁹ Beyond that, when the numbers of refugees and the amounts of money needed to deal with them became too much for any single community to handle, there was a trans-regional Jewish philanthropic network in place which could also be called upon to help defray the expenses. An examination of the situation in the imperial capital, Vienna, will help clarify its nature and its role.

Vienna and the trans-regional Jewish response

Vienna was home to one of the empire's major Jewish communities. Though it had only resumed existence in 1570 after its medieval expulsion, it had, by the 1650s, become one of the richest and most important Jewish centres in Europe, boasting a well-organized communal administration, which devoted much of its resources to philanthropy, an activity of which it was very proud.⁵⁰

Although the community had been restricted to just one part of the town (called 'Unterer Werd') since 1626, its position vis-à-vis the urban authorities was not as

weak as might be assumed. The Jews of Vienna remained subjects of the emperor, who, since he viewed them as important creators of wealth, granted them a number of royal privileges that guaranteed their rights to do business and make their living (relatively) freely, thus protecting them to a great extent from the depredations of the townspeople.⁵¹ This seems to have made the community something of a magnet for Jewish refugees. A large wave arrived in 1645, following the defeat of the imperial army by the Swedes at Jankov in Bohemia. Others began to arrive from the Commonwealth after 1648.⁵²

The Vienna community apparently allowed the refugees to settle in the Jewish quarter and make their living there. However, it did not take long for the number of refugees to grow and their economic activity to become increasingly visible. Because they were not official residents of the community (and thus were called 'foreign Jews'), the refugees were not covered by the privileges of the Vienna community and did not enjoy imperial protection. This left them open to reprisals from the town council, which did not take long to materialize. On 9 June 1650, the following order was proclaimed:

Since it is daily apparent that foreign Jews [. . .] have crept in in large numbers, and now [. . .] all those foreign Jews who have no special Royal privilege [. . .] shall within at most fourteen days from this date be well and truly driven out.⁵³

Of course, as was so often the case, the order proved impossible to enforce for long and Jewish refugees continued to settle in Vienna.

Nonetheless, Viennese Jewry's contribution to helping the victims of the wars in Poland did not end with refugee resettlement. In 1652, it sent financial help to the Kraków community, which had taken in so many refugees from Ukraine that plague had broken out there. In fact, the request made of the Jews of Vienna by the Jews of Kraków was not just to send money. They also asked them to spread the news of Kraków's distress to other Jewish communities so that they would send money too.⁵⁴ This, the Jews of Vienna did, making copies of the letter and sending them on to Frankfurt am Main and Venice, as well as a range of smaller towns in both the Empire and Italy.⁵⁵ By doing this, the Viennese Jews were connecting their brethren in Kraków with an already existing extensive Europe-wide philanthropic network.⁵⁶

The primary role of this network, which was spearheaded by Venice, had nothing to do with Polish Jewry. Its function was to collect money both for ransoming Jewish merchants captured by Mediterranean pirates and for supporting Jewish settlement in the Holy Land.⁵⁷ It seems to have developed at the turn of the seventeenth century, by exploiting for fundraising purposes a pre-existing range of connections between various individual communities. So, when the refugee crisis broke, and particularly when thousands of Jewish captives from Eastern Europe were brought to the slave markets of Istanbul for sale, it quite naturally also turned its attention to their fate.

It was not only the Jews of Istanbul that sent out emissaries to exploit the network for fundraising purposes; the ruined communities of Poland-Lithuania did so, too. In addition, individuals desperate to ransom family members took to the roads in search of the requisite funds. Thus it was that Jewish communities as far apart as Hamburg, Amsterdam, Frankfurt am Main, Rome, Ragusa, Yanina and Belgrade were all drawn

into the effort of helping the Polish refugees.⁵⁸ While the vast majority of the money raised seems to have gone to save Jews from enslavement in the Ottoman Empire, there were also some funds to help the Jewish communities of Northern Europe who were struggling with the influx of refugees.

Vienna's activity as part of this philanthropic network did not end in 1652. As the number of refugees from the Commonwealth continued to rise, the community ran out of space in the Unterer Werd and began to rent rooms in the rest of town, incurring further expense.⁵⁹ To defray the costs, it turned to the network, writing for help to other communities outside the Empire.

There are no firm data on either the numbers of refugees who reached Vienna or the costs to the community of helping them. All that can be said with some confidence is that since the Jewish population of Vienna at this time was 2,000–3,000, the appearance of just a few hundred people would have amounted to a population increase of as much as 10 to 20 per cent.⁶⁰ In consequence, the economic burden that supporting the refugees caused the community was such that it was forced to write in desperation to the Jewish community of Mantua (among others, presumably) asking for money. The letter to Mantua, dated 2 June 1656, told plaintively of the thousands of starving, sick and wounded Jewish refugees fleeing Poland, and particularly of the hundreds who had come to Vienna, adding, 'We have done what we could [for the refugees] for some time now [. . .] but we no longer have what we need to cover all their needs at the present, let alone in the future [. . .]'.⁶¹

There is no record of the amount of funds sent to Vienna via the network, but refugees continued living outside the Unterer Werd, presumably with the help of money it provided, until the Emperor, in a change of policy, ordered them back into the Jewish quarter in 1661.⁶²

Conclusion

The Jews fleeing the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth for the Empire must have known that they would encounter hostility there. The non-Jewish authorities (in fact, non-Jewish society in general) did not welcome strangers even at the best of times, all the more so if they were Jews.

The Jews themselves, both the refugees and those to whom they fled, were thus forced to develop their own strategies to overcome this problem. The most obvious was simply for the refugees to throw themselves on the mercy of fellow Jews wherever they ended up, leaving them to find (or improvise) a solution, which they usually seem to have done. Religious solidarity and a sense of shared fate among Jews was nothing new in the seventeenth century, and the refugees knew they could rely on it.

Unfortunately for them, they were coming to a weak and impoverished Jewish settlement in the Empire, only just emerging from the Thirty Years' War, which by no means always found it easy to deal with the hostility of the urban authorities. As a result, in some cases the support the refugees received from local Jews was meagre and in others amounted to little more than a boat out. Nonetheless, some support was always forthcoming and even those shipped elsewhere had their passage and some of

their expenses paid for. Of course, there were also communities like Vienna, whose sense of solidarity was such that it was willing not only to spend more than it could afford to help the refugees, but also to stand up to the opposition it faced on the part of its non-Jewish neighbours.

Another refugee strategy was to develop organized responses to flight. These took a number of forms: sometimes a single community would organize ahead of time to leave as a unit, at other times a group of refugees would remain together in a settlement on the other side of the border and on one occasion all the refugees in Silesia organized their own council to negotiate the burden of taxes imposed upon them. The principle here was not just safety (and strength) in numbers, but the structured deployment of internal solidarity. These refugees were determined to take their fate in their own hands by sticking together.

The final issue discussed here was not strictly speaking a refugee strategy, for it was aimed not directly at the helping refugees themselves but at supporting host communities which had run out of the resources to support them. It involved raising money from other Jewish centres, sometimes far distant, by means of a long-range philanthropic network. The money raised this way was received by the communities that needed it only sporadically and was almost always far less than was necessary, but it could constitute an important additional source of help in times of crisis. This, then, was religious solidarity writ large on a regional and even trans-regional scale.

The remarkable thing about all these efforts was that they were made more or less under the noses of the hostile non-Jewish authorities. For all their animosity, those authorities simply did not have a dense enough administrative system to stop either the refugees or those helping them; people and money seem to have crossed multiple political borders unhindered and Jews managed to settle in most places they chose regardless of what non-Jewish society thought. So, in just the same way that the fleeing Jews were aware of the hostile reception they might meet in the Empire, they must have known that they would be able to work around it in one way or another.

That confidence was, to a very great extent, based on the ability of the refugees and their hosts to bring into play an extensive network of Jewish solidarity and self-help which, though it was not centrally organized and its constituent parts were by no means integrated with each other, was of a size and sophistication unknown in early modern Christian Europe.

Notes

- 1 There is still no comprehensive study of the fate of Polish-Lithuanian Jewry during these wars. For a brief survey: Majer Bałaban, *Historia i literatura żydowska*, vol. 3 (Lwów-Warszawa-Kraków: Ossolineum, 1925), 259–72.
- 2 And not only there: some refugees ended up in other places, such as the Netherlands, Russia, and even Iran. For a full treatment of the refugee crisis and the responses to it: Adam Teller, *Rescue the Surviving Souls: The Great Jewish Refugee Crisis of the Seventeenth Century* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2020).
- 3 Teller, *Rescue the Surviving Souls*.

- 4 Moses Shulvass, *From East to West: The Westward Migration of Jews from Eastern Europe during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1971), 25–50; Yis'rael Halperin, ‘‘Ezrah ve-siyu`a le-kehillot Polin be-`ikvot gezeirot ta”h ve-ta”t, in *Sefer yovel le-Yitzhak Ber*, ed. Sh. Ettinger et al. (Jerusalem: Ha-ḥevrah ha-historit ha-yisra'elit, 1960), 338–50; Yosef Kaplan, ‘Pelitim yehudim me-Ashkenaz u-mi-Polin be-Amsterdam bi-yemei millḥemet shloshim ha-shanah u-bi-yemei ha-gezeirot she-bein 1648–1660’, in *Tarbut ve-ḥevrah be-toledot Yisrael bi-yemei ha-beinayim: Kovetz ma'amarim le-zikhro shel Hayim Hillel Ben-Sasson*, ed. R. Bonfil, M. Ben-Sasson and Y. Hacker (Jerusalem: Merkaz Zalman Shazar, 1989), 587–622; Shlomo Eidelberg, ‘Rabbanim mehagrim mi-Polin le-Ashkenaz ba-me’ah ha-17’, *Ha-kongres ha-`olami le-mada`ei ha-yahadut* 5, no. 2 (1969): 49–54. See also: Louis Lewin, ‘Die Judenverfolgungen im zweiten schwedisch-polnischen Kriege (1655–1659)’, *Zeitschrift der historischen Gesellschaft für die Provinz Posen* 16 (1901): 79–101; Yisra'el Halperin, ‘Sheviyah u-pedut ba-gezeirot Ukra'ina ve-Lita’ she-mi-shenat ta”h ve-`ad shenat ta”kh’, *Zion* 25 (1960): 17–56.
- 5 Robert Chazan, *Refugees or Migrants: Pre-Modern Jewish Population Movement* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2018).
- 6 *Ibid.*, 224.
- 7 *Ibid.*, 119.
- 8 I explore some of the issues raised here in a little more depth in: Adam Teller, ‘Revisiting Baron’s “Lachrymose Conception”: The Meanings of Violence in Jewish History’, *AJS Review* 38, no. 2 (2014): 431–9.
- 9 In fact, the majority of the refugees from 1648 Ukraine seem to have remained in the Commonwealth: Teller, *Rescue the Surviving Souls*, 40–50.
- 10 Shulvass, *From East to West*, 25–50. Economic refugees are people who have been forced to leave their homes because economic conditions make it impossible to survive there, while economic migrants are those who have chosen to move to a new place in search of better living conditions.
- 11 J. Friedrich Battenberg, *Die Juden in Deutschland vom 16. bis zum Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts* (München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2001), 10–13, 46.
- 12 Adam Teller, ‘Telling the Difference: Some Comparative Perspectives on the Jews’ Legal Status in Poland and in the Holy Roman Empire’, *Polin* 22 (2010): 109–41.
- 13 Selma Stern, *Die Preussische Staat und die Juden*, vol. 1, part 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1952), 1–3.
- 14 *Ibid.*, vol. 1, part 1, 51–2.
- 15 *Ibid.*
- 16 Heimann Jolowicz, *Geschichte der Juden in Königsberg i Pr.* (Posen: Joseph Jolowicz, 1867), 16–18. Though firm data are lacking, it is likely that the expelled would have taken ship to Hamburg or Amsterdam.
- 17 Willibald Müller, *Urkundliche Beiträge zur Geschichte der mähr. Judenschaft im 17. Und 18. Jahrhundert* (Olmütz: Laurenz Kullil-Otto Harassowitz, 1903), 24–5, 26–8; Michael Miller, *Rabbis and Revolution: The Jews of Moravia in the Age of Emancipation* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012), 22.
- 18 *Wöchentliche Zeitung auß mehrerley örther: Ordinari Diengstag Zeitung* 33 (1656): 4.
- 19 Hava Turniansky, ed., *Glikl: Zikhronot 1691–1716* (Jerusalem: Merkaz Zalman Shazar le-Toledot Yisrael, 2006), 76–7.
- 20 Accusing refugees of carrying contagious disease as a reason for denying them the right to remain in any given place was clearly then, as now, a trope of official

- xenophobic argumentation. On the other hand, Glikl's memoir is a personal memoir rather than an official document and so may be believed. That might suggest that, in this period at least, the fear of the plague expressed in the official trope may not always have been entirely unfounded.
- 21 J. C., 'Aus dem ältesten Protokollbuch der Portugiesisch-Jüdischen Gemeinde in Hamburg', *Jahrbuch der Jüdisch-Literarischen Gesellschaft* 7 (1909): 172–3.
 - 22 The community council.
 - 23 'Aus dem ältesten Protokollbuch', 173–4.
 - 24 Nor in Altona, which was the suburb where the Ashkenazi Jewish community (those with the closest ties to the Jews of Poland) was settled.
 - 25 'Aus dem ältesten Protokollbuch', 185–6. Other refugees did not come to Hamburg at all but founded a community in Moisling close to Lübeck: Peter Guttkuhn, *Die Geschichte der Juden in Moisling und Lübeck von den Anfängen 1656 bis zur Emanzipation 1852* (Lübeck: Schmidt Römhild, 1999), 18–21.
 - 26 'Aus dem ältesten Protokollbuch', 185–6.
 - 27 There is evidence, however, that some Polish Jews did remain there. J. C. 'Aus dem ältesten Protokollbuch der Portugiesisch-Jüdischen Gemeinde in Hamburg', *Jahrbuch der Jüdisch-Literarischen Gesellschaft* 9 (1911): 346–7; 10 (1912): 249–50; 11 (1916): 3.
 - 28 *Hollantse Mercurius Behelzende De voornaemste Geschiedenissen in Christenryck In't jaer 1656* (Haarlem: Pieter Casteleyn, 1657), 75. See: Kaplan, 'Pelitim yehudim', 587–622. It is important to note that the Amsterdam community paid for the boats as well as for the refugees' provisions for the journey: *ibid.*, 611.
 - 29 A. M. Vaz Dias, 'Merkwaardige Documenten voor de Geschiedenis van de Amsterdamsche Joden', *De Vrijdagabond* jrg. 9 (1932): 255, no. 16 and 268–71, no. 17.
 - 30 Deutz had been home to refugees from the Commonwealth before this. See Adolph Jellinek, *Martyrer- und Memorbuch* (Wien: Druck von Löwy & Alkalay, Pressburg, 1881), 16.
 - 31 Cited in Kaplan, 'Pelitim yehudim', 615–16. It was the Sephardic community that had the resources to deal with the refugees. The Ashkenazic community was considerably smaller and poorer, consisting mostly of refugees who had fled the Empire during the Thirty Years War.
 - 32 Kaplan, 'Pelitim yehudim', 615–16.
 - 33 On the chronicle, see: Louis Lewin, 'Ein grosspolnischer Bericht aus der Zeit des ersten Schwedenkrieges', *Historische Monatsblätter für die Provinz Posen* 5 (1904): 33–8. There is a photostat of the manuscript and a transcription in the Halperin collection in the Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People in Jerusalem. CAHJP P127/399. The quotation is from p. 77b.
 - 34 Teller, *Rescue the Surviving Souls*, 68–75.
 - 35 CAHJP P127/399, p. 78a; Lewin, 'Ein grosspolnischer Bericht', 37.
 - 36 Fritz Bloch, *Die Juden in Militsch: Ein Kapital aus der Geschichte der Niederlassung von Juden in Schlesien* (Breslau: Schüler & Rottengerg, 1926), 4.
 - 37 Bloch, *Militsch*, 40–1, Doc. 1. The quote is from p. 40.
 - 38 Unfortunately, the sources record no explanation for this decision.
 - 39 Bloch, *Militsch*, 41, Doc. 2.
 - 40 Bloch, *Militsch*, 47, Doc. 9.
 - 41 Jacob Goldberg, 'The Jewish Sejm: Its Origins and Functions', in *The Jews in Old Poland, 1000-1795*, ed. A. Polonsky et al. (London and New York: I.B. Tauris 1993), 147–65; Shmuel Ettinger, 'The Council of the Four Lands', in *ibid.*, 93–109; Mordechai Breuer, 'The Landjudenschaften', in M. Breuer and M. Graetz, *German Jewish History*

- in Modern Times*, vol. 1: Tradition and Enlightenment, 1600-1780, ed. M. A. Meyer (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 194–208.
- 42 Literally, ‘The Description of a German and a Polish Jew’. I should like to thank Agnes Romer-Segal for her help in translating the text. I have tried to retain a sense of the original by using rhymed couplets.
- 43 The text is published in, Max Weinreich, ‘Tsvey yidishe shpotliders oyf Yidn’, *YIVO Filologishe Shriftn* 3 (1929): 537–53.
- 44 *Ibid.*, ll. 25–6.
- 45 *Ibid.*, ll. 49–6.
- 46 *Ibid.*, ll. 65–8.
- 47 *Ibid.*, ll. 159–60.
- 48 *Ibid.*, ll. 241–8.
- 49 *Ibid.*, ll. 19–21.
- 50 On the community in this period, see Max Grunwald, *Vienna* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1936), 75–12; David Kaufmann, *Die letzte Vertreibung der Juden aus Wien und Niederösterreich: Ihre Vorgeschichte (1625-1670) und ihre Opfer* (Wien: Carl Konegen, 1889). See also Yankev Hakhazn, *Eyn Sheyn lid fun Vin benignen Akeyde* (Prague, [1670]), Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford, England, Opp. 8° 1103 (38), 2a.
- 51 Grunwald, *Vienna*, 89–92; John P. Spielman, *The City and the Crown: Vienna and the Imperial Court, 1600–1740* (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 1993), 123–7.
- 52 Kaufmann, *Die letzte Vertreibung*, 41–2.
- 53 The document is published in: Alfred F. Pribram, ed., *Urkunden und Akten zur Geschichte der Juden in Wien*, vol. 1 (Wien-Leipzig: K.K. Universitäts Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1918), 158, no. 96.
- 54 Halperin, ‘Ezrah ve-siyu`a’, 256–8.
- 55 In fact, the only copy of the letter to have survived can be found in the Mantua Jewish Community archives, filza 30, document (10)36. Microfilm: The Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People in Jerusalem, HM 243.
- 56 On this, see: Halperin, ‘Sheviah u-pedut’, 33–56.
- 57 Teller, *Rescue the Surviving Souls*, 132–6, 143–5.
- 58 *Ibid.*
- 59 Kaufmann, *Die letzte Vertreibung*, 60–2.
- 60 Jean Berenger, ‘La communauté juive de Vienne au XVIIème siècle’, in *Politique et religion dans le judaïsme moderne: Des communautés à l’émancipation*, ed. D. Toller (Paris: Presses de l’Université de Paris, Sorbonne, 1987), 23–4.
- 61 Mantua Jewish Community archives, filza 32 document 13. Microfilm: The Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People in Jerusalem, HM 245.
- 62 Pribram, ed., *Urkunden und Akten*, 188, no. 106.

The newspapers of Holland make a great noise

Newspapers and humanitarian culture in Britain and Europe, 1715–45

Catherine Arnold

‘The gazettes of Frankfurt and of Holland and the newspapers of London make a great noise,’ warned the marquis de Trivié, Savoy’s ambassador to Britain, in 1714.¹ In a draft letter to the duke of Savoy’s son, the prince of Piedmont, he reported that the Vaudois (also known as Waldensians) ‘have written again to Mr. Chetwynd and Mr. Hill, complaining that someone is trying to alter the liberties [. . .] granted them for the exercise of their religion.’² The ambassador urged the prince, who was the regent of the Duchy of Savoy, to ‘defer whatever has given rise to this commotion until another time.’³ In another letter written the same day, the marquis sounded the alarm again, this time cautioning the duke of Savoy, Victor Amadeus II, that ‘in Germany, in Holland and here, there is great attention given to spreading these rumours [about the Vaudois]: I am enclosing the translation of some *imprimés* on this subject.’⁴

Thirty years later, as newspapers flourished in urban centres and provincial towns across Europe and the Atlantic world, another group of refugees and their allies made a similar use of newspapers’ potential to disseminate information further, faster and to more people. In March 1745, the leaders of the Ashkenazi communities in Amsterdam, Josele Elkana, Nathan Scheier, Susskind Emden, Gerson Binga and Elia Gompertz, leaked a copy of a British diplomatic dispatch to two of Europe’s leading newspapers, the *Gazette d’Amsterdam* and the *Gazette de Leyde*.⁵ There for the newspapers’ subscribers to read was Britain’s harsh condemnation of Maria Theresa, queen of the Habsburg monarchy and claimant to the imperial throne, for her decision to expel Jews from the city of Prague and the Kingdom of Bohemia. If Maria Theresa expelled ‘so many thousand innocent Families’, the leaked dispatch warned, her actions ‘could not but be esteemed by all Mankind as an indelible Stain both in point of Justice and Clemency, upon her hitherto moderate and equitable Government.’⁶ The news item was copied and reprinted by other European newspapers and, within a month, the words of the dispatch had circulated from Amsterdam east to the German states and west as far as British North America.

Neither 1745 nor 1714 was the first time that refugee and diaspora networks had campaigned to influence the perceptions of foreign governments and religious communities. They had done so throughout the long seventeenth century. Recent studies by Ole Peter Grell, Nicholas Terpstra, David van der Linden, Daniel Hershenzon and Adam Teller have explored how refugees and their networks coordinated relief for refugees and prisoners. Reformed merchants and ministers in England and the Dutch Republic created a corresponding committee to solicit and administer charitable donations for exiled schoolteachers and ministers from the Palatinate during the Thirty Years' War, while Jewish and Christian ransoming networks developed to redeem captives in the Ottoman empire.⁷ Information networks, personal and institutional correspondence networks, and emissaries or religious leaders who could make personal appeals, formed the backbone of these philanthropic campaigns, but, as the recent historiography has shown, these methods were often complemented by the use of print media. Letters from the exiled Palatine ministers, for instance, were published as part of Dutch Reformed fundraising on the exiles' behalf, while French, Spanish, Portuguese and Italian ecclesiastics wrote and published narratives of the suffering of Christian captives in the Maghreb as a means of convincing the Catholic faithful to donate alms for their redemption.⁸

On occasion, minority communities used similar methods to appeal to foreign rulers. Scholarship on early modern diasporas, including Joseph Dédieu's magisterial work on the political activities of Huguenot exiles, has indicated, in passing, how specific communities in exile appealed to foreign rulers to negotiate their repatriation and the restoration of their rights and privileges by working personal and religious correspondence networks and diplomatic backchannels.⁹ More recent studies of early modern states' cross-border interventions, like David Trim's account of the English Commonwealth's response to the massacre of Waldensians in the Duchy of Savoy in 1655, have likewise illuminated how some seventeenth-century minority communities used correspondence networks to solicit foreign governments' financial support or diplomatic intervention in moments of crisis.¹⁰ This picture of seventeenth-century minorities' transnational advocacy has been further fleshed out by David de Boer's recent work on Waldensian publishing in 1655, which indicates that when Waldensian exiles planned a campaign against the duke of Savoy's army in Piedmont, they deliberately chose to appeal for foreign rulers' aid in print – and in more secular language – so as to avoid accusations of *lèse-majesté* and appeal to a broad transnational audience.¹¹

This chapter takes the story of religious minorities' transnational advocacy into the early eighteenth century. It explores how religious minorities used the fast-growing medium of printed news to advocate for foreign intervention early in the century. The chapter shows that the growth of newspapers and news periodicals made it possible for minority communities to disseminate stories about atrocities faster and to a greater number of readers. As a result, persecuted communities were able to evade state censorship and embarrass governments very publicly both at home and abroad. As the century wore on, eighteenth-century princes became increasingly concerned that they be portrayed in foreign news media as compassionate rulers who supported religious toleration and treated their subjects with 'humanity'. Newspapers and news

periodicals, in sum, increased minority communities' power to influence their own, often absolutist, rulers and safeguard themselves from persecutory policies.

Altering the course of diplomacy

Minority communities' use of international newspapers meant that their stories reached a far greater number of readers – and reached them faster – than in the past. To return to the example with which this chapter began, in the winter of 1714, Vaudois leaders began a transnational campaign to win legal toleration for Protestants living in the valley of Pragelas, situated on Savoy's border with France. As part of this effort, Vaudois representatives sent letters and petitions to their contacts in London, Geneva and the German states.¹² They also turned to newspapers – and it was this fact that concerned the Savoyard ambassador to London. In March 1714, a letter written by a Vaudois 'at Bern' was published in London's first daily newspaper, the *Daily Courant*.¹³ The letter accused Victor Amadeus of persecuting Protestants living in Pragelas.¹⁴ According to its author, five prominent citizens of the valley had been arrested and imprisoned for trying to restore Protestant worship there.¹⁵ From his post in London, the marquis de Trivié reported that the news item had 'come here from Holland', a comment which suggests that the publisher of the *Daily Courant* copied the item from a Dutch paper, a common practice among British and European newspaper publishers at the time.¹⁶ The following month, the marquis sent another report, this time detailing how the Protestant Deputies to the Imperial Diet of the Holy Roman Empire were reacting to news of the Vaudois' plight, which he copied from the *Flying Post*. The story of the Vaudois' persecution, which he reported to his superiors, had circulated in Dutch newspapers, in British newspapers and perhaps in the German states as well, stirring up public outrage against Savoy.¹⁷

The author of the 'Letter' made a canny choice by publishing in the Dutch gazettes. As Arthur der Weduwen and Andrew Pettegree have demonstrated, the Dutch news trade flourished in the seventeenth century, leading the way in the development of a national market for news and paid advertisements in newspapers.¹⁸ By the early eighteenth century, Dutch newspapers had a 'wide reach', both within the Dutch Republic and beyond its borders. For example, according to der Weduwen, in 1734 the tri-weekly's *Graevenhaegse Courant* was sent to twenty-six towns in the Dutch Republic, eight towns in the southern Netherlands, three in Germany and to London and der Weduwen's research indicates that competing newspapers in Amsterdam, Leiden and Haarlem had a comparable circulation.¹⁹ Additionally, by the turn of the eighteenth century, five French-language newspapers were published in the Republic and circulated in France and French-speaking Switzerland as well as in the Dutch provinces.²⁰ The Republic also boasted a number of monthly news periodicals which circulated across Europe.²¹ Given the wide circulation of Dutch papers and the fact that many European newspaper publishers re-copied news items from them, when the 'Letter from a Vaudois' appeared in 1714, it circulated more widely and reached a far greater audience than Vaudois leaders' letters or petitions had in 1655 or even in 1686, when Victor Amadeus II had authorized *dragonnades* against Vaudois towns.²²

Vaudois communities were not the only persecuted minority group to make use of the Dutch gazettes. In the winter of 1745, so, too, did Ashkenazi communities. The Habsburg queen and claimant to the imperial throne, Maria Theresa, had moved to expel the Jewish community of Bohemia from their homes, starting with the Jewish residents of Prague, who were forced to leave the city by 31 January 1745. In response, Ashkenazi and Sephardi communities across Europe and Jewish notables like the German financier, Wolf Wertheimer, mobilized to raise funds for the exiles and to try to negotiate the community's return to Prague. Wertheimer's wide-ranging campaign to convince European heads of state to intercede with Maria Theresa on behalf of the exiles has been well-documented by Baruch Mevorah and François Guesnet.²³ Mevorah and Guesnet both emphasize that Jewish notables like Wertheimer prioritized making direct, personal contact with Christian officials in 1745 and, in some cases, took pains to keep these discussions secret.²⁴ Mevorah explains Wertheimer's preference for such personal negotiations as a result of his previous experience acting as a diplomatic mediator for the Habsburgs in his role as imperial Court Jew, while Guesnet concludes that Jewish notables' focus on Christian courts comes from the older Jewish political tradition of *shtadlanut*, the practice of interceding with Christian rulers on behalf of a Jewish community.²⁵ What both accounts overlook is the extent to which some Jewish notables involved in campaigning on behalf of Jews in Prague – including Wertheimer and a group of Ashkenazi notables in the Dutch Republic – also recognized the consequences of good or bad publicity and, on more than one occasion, tried to ensure that European newspapers published stories about the ongoing expulsion crisis.

News of the expulsion began to circulate in European newspapers from January 1745. Many of these reports were nearly identical, as, in many cases, gazetteers copied paragraphs of foreign news directly from foreign newspapers and journals.²⁶ As Baruch Mevorah has indicated, German-language newspapers in Hamburg, Augsburg, Hanover, Erlangen, Nuremberg and Berlin published news of the expulsion.²⁷ My survey of English- and French-language newspapers and news journals in the *17th and 18th Century Burney Collection Database*, the *Le gazetier universel: ressources numériques sur la presse ancienne*, and the *Gazettes européennes du 18e siècle*, indicates that French- and English-language newspapers also regularly published reports on the progress of the expulsion from January to June 1745. French-language newspapers in the Dutch Republic, in Paris and along the southern borders of France, in Avignon and Luxembourg, all printed news of the expulsion controversy, as did four French-language monthly news journals in the Dutch Republic.²⁸ The Dutch gazettes were also an important source of news for London newspapers, which frequently translated and printed the Dutch gazettes' reports on the expulsion.²⁹ British provincial and colonial newspapers re-copied news of the expulsion from London newspapers, spreading reports on the expulsion in English provincial towns, like Salisbury, and to colonial cities, like Dublin, New York and Philadelphia.³⁰

News of the expulsion also spread beyond the towns and cities where these newspapers were published. For instance, the main market for French-language gazettes published in the Dutch Republic was France.³¹ Likewise, although the *Courrier d'Avignon* was printed in the papal city of Avignon, it was distributed primarily in southern France.³² The same held true in Britain. In England, London newspapers also

circulated in English provinces.³³ German newspapers, like the *Augsburger Zeitung*, circulated across the Holy Roman Empire.³⁴ Readers across the Holy Roman Empire, Western Europe and the British Atlantic world, then, learned of the controversy over the expulsion of Bohemian Jews.

From the first, some Jewish notables worried about the impact that news coverage of the expulsion might have on readers' opinions and tried to ensure that reports of the mistreatment the men and women of Prague had suffered were printed in European newspapers. In December 1744, for instance, a Jewish letter-writer from Prague asked his correspondent in Fürth to place a news item about the 'plunder[ing]' of the synagogues of Prague in the newspaper of Nuremberg.³⁵ In January 1745, Samuel Wertheimer, Wolf Wertheimer's son, also attempted to influence the news coverage of the expulsion in Vienna. Wertheimer reported to his father that 'in the newspaper here [in Vienna], everything is printed that could put the Jews in a bad light, and it cannot be redressed, not even when applying all advocacies.'³⁶ In the same letter, Wertheimer noted that although a more favourable article, reporting before the complete pillaging in Prague of the Jews's synagogues, had appeared in an 'extra edition' of the *Augsburger Zeitung*, he had not been able to find copies of the edition in 'the coffee houses.'³⁷ Wertheimer later speculated that the printer of the *Augsburger Zeitung* in Augsburg 'inserts news favourable to the Jews in the paper which he delivers to my father [Wolf Wertheimer]', because of 'the benefits he receives from my father', but that he 'leaves it out in the issues he sends to the public in other places.'³⁸

The leaders of the Ashkenazi communities in Amsterdam, Josele Elkana, Nathan Scheier, Susskind Emden, Gerson Binga and Elia Gompertz, also seem to have worked to ensure that news of the ongoing crisis appeared in European newspapers. Over a two-week period in March 1745, shortly after the group had petitioned the States General to intercede more forcefully on behalf of Bohemian Jews, three reports about the expulsion appeared in the *Gazette de Leyde* and the *Gazette d'Amsterdam*. Each time, the wording of the reports in the two papers was nearly identical, suggesting that a single source gave them to both papers, rather than that one gazette copied from the other.³⁹ Circumstantial evidence points to a member of the Amsterdam delegation – or someone familiar with the group's activities – as the most likely source.

On 5 March, for instance, both papers reported that they had received news about negotiations in Vienna from the group. The *Gazette d'Amsterdam* reported that 'before yesterday the Jews established here received the pleasing news that the Queen of Hungary had finally agreed to revoke the Edict that she had published forcing Jews to leave the Kingdom of Bohemia.'⁴⁰ That same week, a diplomatic document – a report on the Dutch government's most recent efforts on behalf of the Prague community – appeared in both the *Gazette de Leyde* and the *Gazette d'Amsterdam*.⁴¹ This news items included excerpts from the Dutch government's new instructions to the Dutch ambassador, ordering him to intercede with Maria Theresa to halt the expulsion.⁴² It also described why Elkana, Scheier, Emden, Binga and Gompertz had decided to petition the States General to intervene more decisively on behalf of the Prague community.⁴³ The report's source was likely a member of the delegation, since all the same information appeared in a letter from the delegation to the Jewish communities of Vienna written on 12 March.⁴⁴ For instance, the letter noted that the

British ambassador at The Hague had written 'a valuable recommendation with many additions to the Envoy of England in your location,' while the news item in the *Gazette de Leyde* reported that the ambassador had 'granted the Leaders of the Synagogues a letter of recommendation to M. Robinson, ambassador plenipotentiary to Vienna, so that he will continue to act in concert with Mr. de Burmania.'⁴⁵

Then, on 19 March 1745, the *Gazette d'Amsterdam* and the *Gazette de Leyde* published the full text of a British diplomatic dispatch, which condemned the expulsion in humanitarian terms. In the dispatch, Britain's Secretary of State, the earl of Harrington, called the expulsion 'a terrible sentence [. . .] upon so many thousands of innocent Families.'⁴⁶ He instructed Sir Thomas Robinson to tell the queen of Hungary that 'Her persevering in that severe and merciless Resolution could not be esteemed by all Mankind, as an indelible Stain both in point of Justice and Clemency, upon her hitherto moderate and equitable Government.'⁴⁷ The *Gazette d'Amsterdam* implied that it had received a copy of the British dispatch from Elkana, Scheier, Emden, Binga and Gompertz. The newspaper's editor prefaced the text of the dispatch by reporting that 'some of the principal Jews of the German Nation received a copy of a letter written by Lord Harrington to Sir Thomas Robinson, Minister of His Britannick Majesty in Vienna. The letter is couched in the following terms.'⁴⁸ The fact that the news item appeared in both newspapers on the same day, 19 March, also suggests that a single source gave it to both papers, rather than that one gazette copied it from the other.⁴⁹

Once published, the text of Harrington's dispatch circulated across Europe over the following month. Eight days after the dispatch's first publication, on 25 March, the full text was reprinted in a German-language newspaper, the *Hamburger Reichs-Postillon*. From there the dispatch was published in Augsburg on 2 April, in the *Augsburgische Ordinari Zeitung* and the *Augsburgische Ordinari Post Zeitung*, and in Berlin, in the *Vossische Zeitung* and the *Haude Spenersche Zeitung*.⁵⁰ By then, the news had also travelled west to London. On 22 March, the *Daily Gazetteer* re-translated the news item into English and published a summary of the dispatch, which excerpted the French translation's final line, calling the expulsion 'altogether inconsistent with that Justice and Clemency by which the Reign of her Hungarian Majesty has been hitherto distinguished.'⁵¹ Between 24 and 27 March, three more London newspapers reprinted the *Daily Gazetteer's* translation.⁵² Then, on 27 March, the full text of the dispatch was published in a different translation in the *General Evening Post* and the *Daily Advertiser*.⁵³ Two days later, on 29 March, the *Penny London Post* reprinted the *Post's* translation of the dispatch.⁵⁴ In April, the dispatch was reprinted in three Dutch news journals – the *Journal Universel*, the *Mercure historique et politique* and the *Mémoires historiques pour le siècle courant* – as well as in the *Nouvelles lettres historiques et politique* in Amsterdam.⁵⁵ Thanks to the leaked British and Dutch dispatches, by the end of March 1745, Britain and the Dutch Republic were very publicly committed to ending the expulsion of Jews from Bohemia and Maria Theresa had been rebuked before thousands of readers from Berlin to Boston. As in the Vaudois case, European newspapers enabled Josele Elkana, Nathan Scheier, Susskind Emden, Gerson Binga and Elia Gompertz to reach thousands of readers beyond their own networks and, in so doing, to alter the course of diplomacy.

Influencing decision-making

Minority communities' use of news reports enabled them to quickly disseminate reports of atrocities and other damaging information which European rulers, particularly absolute monarchs, would have preferred to keep quiet. The nature of printed news – especially its use of the paragraph, which made news items easy to copy, and the fact that newspapers were printed frequently and circulated widely – made censorship difficult.⁵⁶ Indeed, historians of early modern print culture have shown that from the late seventeenth century, when newspapers and periodicals were first founded across Europe, governments worried about the subversive potential of foreign newspapers and sought to manipulate what foreign readers – and, potentially, their own subjects – learned about their affairs in increasingly subtle ways, by supplying foreign gazetteers with news stories and information, subsidizing foreign newspapers and distributing pro-government newspapers abroad.⁵⁷ It was precisely these kinds of fears about uncontrolled information flows and the political damage they might do which made newspapers a powerful tool for refugee networks, like the Vaudois in Savoy or the Ashkenazi networks in London and Amsterdam, who could now exert a greater degree of influence over the course of international affairs by publishing damaging information about a head of state.

In 1714, when the Vaudois published their 'Letter', for instance, Savoyard officials were used to controlling the flow of information from Vaudois communities in the Alps to Protestant governments like Britain's. This task grew considerably more difficult once Vaudois leaders published their complaints in the Dutch gazettes. One example will suffice to demonstrate the change. Traditionally, Vaudois leaders' first points of contact with foreign governments had been diplomats posted to Turin. In 1711, John Chetwynd, the British ambassador, reported that persecution in Pragelas was increasing and urged the Tory ministry 'to lay the matter home to the Duke's Minister in England'.⁵⁸ Because Chetwynd was the only person relaying Vaudois grievances to the British ministry, however, the Savoyard state was able to discredit him and convince the Tory ministry that nothing untoward was going on. The Savoyard ambassador to England eventually reported that Chetwynd would receive orders from the ministry to stop agitating for public worship in Pragelas and 'to think only of keeping the two Courts in perfect union'.⁵⁹ This strategy – deny, discredit, dismiss – worked well, even when the Vaudois wrote to their contacts in the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge in London. Because relatively few people with connections to the British ministry made the Vaudois' case, the Savoyard state was able to contain and control the impact of Vaudois advocacy in London. Indeed, Savoy's strategy was so successful that in 1712 Victor Amadeus II was able to negotiate a treaty with France which declared that Pragelas would remain legally Catholic and, implicitly, prohibited Protestant worship in the valley without alerting his British allies.⁶⁰

Publishing the 'Letter from a Vaudois' made it more difficult for Savoy to suppress the Vaudois' claims because so many people in London had read the news item. Rather than complaining about the exaggerations of one overzealous ambassador, Savoyard officials were now forced to try and counter the Vaudois' detailed public claims of

persecution, both in their conversations with British officials, who lodged a formal complaint against Savoy over the matter, and in the broader public sphere. Savoy's ambassador to Britain, the marquis de Trivié, and his superiors insisted that the claims of the 'Letter' had to be discredited, not only because British officials might begin to ask inconvenient questions about the valley's religious settlement – and perhaps pressure Victor Amadeus to grant legal toleration to Protestants in Pragelas, as his predecessors had done in other Alpine valleys – but also because the report might turn British public opinion against Savoy. When the 'Letter' appeared in March 1714, the Savoyard ambassador was in the midst of negotiating payment of the subsidies owed to Savoy for its participation in the War of the Spanish Succession. Savoy claimed that Britain still owed the duke £200,000. And by early April, the marquis de Trivié feared that the British ministry would use the public outcry over Savoy's actions in Pragelas as a pretext to avoid fulfilling Britain's commitments to the Duchy. 'The ministry is not unhappy to see these rumours spreading', he wrote, 'which diminish the goodwill of the nation towards those with whom they no longer wish to be engaged'.⁶¹ As public opinion in Britain turned against Savoy, the marquis worried, the ministry would find it easier to unburden itself of an increasingly inconvenient ally.

Thus, as the spring of 1714 wore on, Savoyard officials began to spread their own version of events in Pragelas. In Turin, Savoyard officials investigated the 'Letter's' claims and forwarded their findings to Trivié in London.⁶² These included both evidence that the five Protestant prisoners from Pragelas had not been arrested for 'cause of religion' and proof that Victor Amadeus had never granted Protestants in the valley the legal right to worship publicly in 1713.⁶³ The marquis then tried to use this information – and the very fact that the Vaudois had published their complaints – in his response to the British ministry's complaints about Savoy's treatment of Protestants in the valley. He suggested that British ministers had been swayed by the scandalmongering of the newspapers. 'I must tell you, My Lord', he wrote to the senior Secretary of State, Lord Bolingbroke, 'most of the complaints in the memorial you sent me have been circulating for at least two months in the gazettes of Bern, of Holland and in the daily papers in London'.⁶⁴ Trivié assured Bolingbroke that he had written to his superiors in Savoy for the 'true cause of these complaints' and they had proved to be 'partly false and totally exaggerated'.⁶⁵ He called the source of the grievances 'some individual trying to justify his own seditious conduct and turbulent character'.⁶⁶

Even as Trivié dismissed the 'Letter' as false, he tried to counter the Vaudois narrative of what he called 'pretended persecution' in the press. With the blessing of Victor Amadeus's son, the prince of Piedmont, the marquis published what he had already told the British ministry privately.⁶⁷ His statement appeared first in the *Post Boy*, the British ministry's *de facto* mouthpiece, which lent it an extra air of authority.⁶⁸ From there, it circulated in the Dutch Republic, appearing in the monthly news journal, the *Mercure historique et politique*, in June 1714.⁶⁹ Trivié's account was intended to demonstrate Savoy's generous toleration of Protestantism, in general, and to prove that, in this particular case, the five prisoners were really Catholics who had apostatized and, as a result, deserved to be punished for their crimes. 'The Physician Perron had his Patents of Doctor at Montpellier, as an Apostolic Roman Catholic', Trivié reported in the news item.⁷⁰

Despite Trivié's best efforts, Savoy's reputation suffered as a result of the 'Letter's' publication, and Vaudois leaders reaped the benefits. A few weeks before the marquis published his statement in the *Post Boy*, he urged his superiors in Savoy to 'defer whatever has given rise to this commotion until another time' because 'in Germany, in Holland, and here, there is great attention given to spreading these rumours [about the Vaudois]'.⁷¹ By the autumn of 1714, Victor Amadeus had done just that. The five prisoners from Pragelas were released and the religious settlement in the valley returned to the status quo.⁷² Protestants were allowed to travel to other valleys to attend services in the Vaudois churches and baptize their children in the Protestant faith. No more prosecutions for apostasy were reported. A year after the publication of the 'Letter', Vaudois pastors were able to report that 'the affairs of Pragelas are now more tranquil', although they lamented that Protestants were still not allowed to worship publicly.⁷³

Nor were the Vaudois the only religious minority in early eighteenth-century Europe to use newspapers as a tool for transnational advocacy. Like the Vaudois, in 1745, Ashkenazi networks used the medium of newspapers to intervene in international affairs and pressure an absolutist – in this case, Maria Theresa – to change her policies. When Josele Elkana, Nathan Scheier, Susskind Emden, Gerson Binga and Elia Gompertz leaked British and Dutch diplomatic papers condemning Maria Theresa's expulsion of Jews from Prague to the Dutch gazettes in March 1745, negotiations to end the expulsion had stalled. In January 1745, Maria Theresa received letters of intercession and condemnations from princes in the Holy Roman Empire and allies beyond its borders – an international response which was orchestrated, in large part, by Wolf Wertheimer and his networks, as Baruch Mevorah has shown. In response, the queen had agreed to extend the date set for Jews to leave Prague by a month but refused to rescind the order of expulsion.⁷⁴ A month later, with no resolution to the expulsion crisis in sight and Jewish families leaving Prague, leaders in London and at The Hague began to urge their respective governments to renew their negotiations with the Austrian court.⁷⁵ When Britain and the Dutch Republic responded by sending new instructions to their ambassadors in Vienna, each containing forceful condemnations of the expulsion, Gompertz and his colleagues took matters into their own hands, as we have seen. They leaked the papers to the Dutch gazettes, threatening Maria Theresa's public reputation and ratcheting up the pressure on the queen.

As the dispatches circulated in the pages of the newspapers across Europe and the Atlantic world, British, Dutch and Austrian diplomats and ministers all assessed that the leaks would damage the queen's standing. Even before the papers were published, British and Dutch diplomacy on behalf of Bohemian Jews had relied on threats to Maria Theresa's personal reputation as a tolerant and just ruler. To take just one example of this kind of rhetoric, the British ministry ordered the British ambassador in Vienna, Sir Thomas Robinson, to 'hint to [Maria Theresa and her advisors] . . . the prejudice the World might conceive against the Queen's Proceedings in this Affair, if such Numbers of innocent People are made to suffer for the fault of a few traitors'.⁷⁶

Once Britain's second and more condemnatory dispatch had been published and widely circulated in March 1745, British, Dutch and Austrian diplomats and ministers concluded that if Maria Theresa continued with her plan to expel Jews from Bohemia in the face of such a public rebuke, her reputation would inevitably suffer.

In early April 1745, Sir Thomas Robinson reported from Vienna, 'It is not easy to express the concern here [among Maria Theresa and her advisors] that My Lord's Letter to me of the 22d past about the Jews has been translated & published in all the Dutch Gazettes.'⁷⁷ Britain's ambassador to The Hague, Sir Robert Trevor, warned darkly that Maria Theresa would 'soon find the ill Effects of Her giving this Blow to the Popularity of Her Character', while the Dutch ambassador to Vienna, Barthold Douma de Burmania, cautioned the queen that she could not hope to 'prevent the bad impressions, reflections and causes of such a case [i.e. the expulsion Jews from Bohemia]'.⁷⁸ Just as the marquis de Trivié and Victor Amadeus II had feared the consequences of news items which portrayed the duke as a persecutor rather than a generous and tolerant ruler, so Austrian, Dutch and British officials concluded that Maria Theresa's refusal to rescind the expulsion edict and forcibly expel thousands of her subjects from their homes – which the leaked dispatches condemned very publicly – would damage her reputation as a good ruler.

In addition to endangering Maria Theresa's reputation, the leaked dispatches drew attention to the queen's relations with Britain and the Dutch Republic, two of her most important allies in the War of the Austrian Succession. British and Dutch diplomacy on behalf of Bohemian Jews was carried out by letters of intercession, which signalled friendly relations between sovereigns and were only exchanged between allies or neutral parties in eighteenth-century European diplomacy.⁷⁹ In these exchanges, one sovereign asked another to grant a request as an 'act of grace' and a sign of mutual obligation, trust and friendship.⁸⁰ Sir Thomas Robinson emphasised the intercession's symbolism in March 1745, in an effort to justify Britain's repeated intervention in Austria's domestic affairs. 'A Great Sovereign [. . .] *would* speak to a Great Sovereign', he told Ulfeld, 'An Ally *could* speak to an Ally – A Friend surely *might* open his heart to a Friend'.⁸¹ Burmania, the Dutch ambassador to Vienna, hinted at the consequences of refusing an ally's intercession. An intercession, he warned Ulfeld, 'cannot be refuted without damage to oneself', since it is 'nothing but petitions and friendly advice'.⁸² The pressure on Maria Theresa to accede to her allies' requests increased once those requests had been publicized; a news item, published in Frankfurt am Main and reprinted in London not long after the dispatches were leaked, hinted at dire consequences if Maria Theresa refused to heed Britain's pleas.⁸³ 'If the Queen stands out against such powerful Solicitations', the author warned, 'her Inflexibility may prove fatal to her'.⁸⁴

As in the Vaudois case, the gains which resulted from the decision to leak British and Dutch dispatches condemning the expulsion were modest. Two months after the dispatches' publication, in the face of mounting international pressure, Maria Theresa did suspend the edict of expulsion against Jews in Prague and the Kingdom of Bohemia indefinitely.⁸⁵ The edict was not revoked, however and the c. 14,000 men, women and children who had left Prague in the winter of 1745 were not allowed to return to their homes in the city until 1747.⁸⁶ The significance of the Amsterdam delegation's decision to publish the dispatches, then, is that it brought renewed attention to the expulsion and to the plight of the refugees fleeing Prague at a moment when negotiations had stalled, increasing pressure on Maria Theresa to acquiesce to her allies' pleas, warnings and threats about halting the expulsion.

Conclusion

By the mid-eighteenth century, European princes not only cared about what foreign readers thought of them, they cared specifically about their international reputations as tolerant and compassionate rulers. As we have seen, Victor Amadeus II sought to suppress reports that Protestants were being unjustly imprisoned in the valley of Pragelas and to propagate a narrative in the British and Dutch press which celebrated his generous toleration of Protestantism in the Duchy. Maria Theresa, meanwhile, was reportedly furious that 'her personal Conduct' had been publicly judged as unjust and lacking in compassion during the expulsion crisis.⁸⁷

The idea that rulers should treat all their subjects with 'humanity' and abstain from using the state's power to dictate their subjects' faith and modes of worship was not a new one; it had been widely debated in both the Protestant and Catholic worlds for decades, from at least the 1680s, when Louis XIV moved to suppress French Protestantism and James II of England was deposed.⁸⁸ But persecuted minorities' use of newspapers to widely publicize stories of atrocity and shame European states – with the adverse diplomatic consequences and loss of goodwill among foreign bankers, merchants and (occasionally) voters which this shaming often brought – gradually helped make this contested idea into a norm in early eighteenth-century European international affairs.⁸⁹ Princes like Victor Amadeus, who continued to believe that, as sovereigns, they had the right and obligation to care for their subjects' souls, nonetheless found it increasingly expedient to present themselves to European diplomats and readers, especially Protestant ones, as supporters of legal toleration for minority communities.

For minority communities like the Vaudois or the Ashkenazi networks involved in lobbying to halt the expulsion of Jews from Prague, foreign newspapers gave them new leverage over their own governments, by enabling them to exploit officials' concerns about international reputation and opinion. This may seem counter-intuitive, given that much of the historiography on eighteenth- and nineteenth-century public opinion and advocacy politics has focused on campaigners' use of *domestic* institutions. For example, historians of public opinion, particularly as it developed in early eighteenth-century Britain, have usually concluded that it drew its political power from participatory domestic political institutions like the franchise or the national debt. Politicians cared about what the public thought because the public had some power over them, whether through voting or through financing the state's activities.⁹⁰ So, too, historians of nineteenth-century humanitarian politics have explored how advocacy groups mobilized domestic public opinion to shame their own governments into *intervening* in humanitarian crises.⁹¹

The Vaudois and Ashkenazi cases show that in the absence of these participatory political institutions, in absolutist monarchies like Savoy or the Habsburg realms, minority communities could still influence the state's decision-making, to some extent. They did so, however, not through domestic institutions, but by turning to regional and transnational ones. By supplying a story to the Dutch gazettes – newspapers with transnational reach – the Vaudois were able to pressure the Savoyard state into easing its repressive policies in Pragelas. Considering how transnational institutions, like foreign

newspapers, could empower the subjects of absolutist states to take political action should help us to re-evaluate the nature of public opinion, as well as the development of humanitarian culture, in eighteenth-century Europe.

Notes

- 1 Draft. Marquis de Trivié to Victor Amadeus, Prince of Piedmont. 26 April 1714 (NS). Archivio di Stato, Turin, (hereafter AST), Lettere ministri, Gran Bretagna, Mazzo 20. My translation.
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 Ibid.
- 4 Marquis de Trivié to Victor Amadeus II, duke of Savoy. 26 April 1714 (NS). AST, Lettere ministri, Gran Bretagna, Mazzo 20. My translation.
- 5 William Stanhope, earl of Harrington to Sir Thomas Robinson, 22 February/5 March 1745. British Library, London (hereafter BL), Add MS 23819, fos. 304–5. *Gazette de Leyde*, 19 March 1745 (NS) (my translation). *Gazette d'Amsterdam*, 19 March 1745 (NS) (my translation), ed. Pierre Réat, 12 CDs (Oxford, 2000), vi. On the *Gazette de Leyde* and the *Gazette d'Amsterdam* see Pierre Réat, *La Gazette d'Amsterdam: Miroir de l'Europe au XVIIIe siècle* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), esp. 39–44. See also Jeremy D. Popkin, *News and Politics in the Age of Revolution: Jean Luzac's Gazette de Leyde* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989), esp. 36–9; Carroll Joynes, 'The *Gazette de Leyde*: The Opposition Press and French Politics, 1750-1757', in *Press and Politics in Pre-Revolutionary France*, ed. Jack C. Censer and Jeremy D. Popkin (Berkeley: Berkeley University Press, 1987); G. C. Gibbs, 'The Role of the Dutch Republic as the Intellectual Entrepôt of Europe in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', *BMGN – Low Countries Historical Review* lxxxvi (1971), <http://doi.org/10.18352/bmgn-lchr.1683> (accessed 25 February 2018).
- 6 Harrington to Robinson, 22 February/5 March 1745. BL, Add MS 23819, fos. 304–5.
- 7 Ole Peter Grell, *Brethren in Christ: A Calvinist Network in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), online edition, Location 3414. Nicholas Terpstra, *Refugees in the Early Modern World: An Alternative History of the Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), online edition, Location 4. David van der Linden, *Experiencing Exile: Huguenot Refugees in the Dutch Republic, 1680–1700* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015); Adam Teller, *Rescue the Surviving Souls: The Great Jewish Refugee Crisis of the Seventeenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020), 130–1; Daniel Hershenzon, *The Captive Sea: Slavery, Communication, and Commerce in Early Modern Spain and the Mediterranean* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018), online edition, Locations 1417–95 and Locations 2338, 2479–92, and 2573–86; Gillian Weiss, *Captives and Corsairs: France and Slavery in the Early Modern Mediterranean* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011); Nabil Matar, *British Captives from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, 1563-1760* (Leiden: Brill, 2014).
- 8 Grell, *Brethren in Christ*, Locations 5461–564; Hershenzon, *Captive Sea*, Locations 2350–63.
- 9 For recent work on seventeenth-century philanthropic campaigns, see note 7 above. For early modern cross-border interventions, see Andrew Thompson, 'The

- Protestant Interest and the History of Humanitarian Intervention, c. 1685-c. 1756', in *Humanitarian Intervention: A History*, ed. D. J. B. Trim and Brendan Simms (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 67–89; D. J. B. Trim, 'If a Prince Use Tyrannie', in *Humanitarian Intervention*, ed. Trim and Simms, 29–60. Within the historiography of early modern diasporas, there have also been studies of refugees' campaigns for foreign intervention. See, for instance, Baruch Mevorah, 'Jewish Diplomatic Activities to Prevent the Expulsion of Jews from Bohemia and Moravia in 1744–45 / ג'מוראביה ביהמיה יהודי של גירושם למניעת באירופה ההשתדלות מעשי, 1744 - 1745', *Zion / ציון*, no. 7/ג (1 January 1963): 125–64; François Guesnet, 'Textures of Intercession: Rescue Efforts for the Jews of Prague, 1744/1748', in *Jahrbuch Des Simon-Dubnow-Instituts / Simon Dubnow Institute Yearbook*, ed. D. Diner, vol. 4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), 355–75. <http://www.v-r.de/en/Diner-Jahrbuch-des-Simon-Dubnow-Instituts-Simon-Dubnow-Institute-Yearbook-IV-2005/t/352536931/>. See also François Guesnet, 'Negotiating under duress: The Expulsion of Salzburg Protestants (1732) and the Jews of Prague (1744)', in *Negotiating Religion: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives*, ed. François Guesnet, Cécile Laborde and Lois Lee (London: Routledge, 2017), 47–62. For studies of the Huguenot diaspora, see Joseph Dédieu, *Le rôle politique des protestants français (1685-1715)* (Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1920), 82–100; and Laurence Huey Boles, *The Huguenots, the Protestant Interest, and the War of the Spanish Succession, 1702-1714* (New York City: Peter Lang, 1997).
- 10 See, for instance, Trim, 'If a Prince Use Tyrannie', 57–60; Randolph Vigne, "Avenge, O Lord, thy Slaughtered Saints": Cromwell's Intervention on behalf of the Vaudois', *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 24 (1983): 10–25.
 - 11 David de Boer, 'Strategies of Transnational Identification: Images of the 1655 Massacre of the Waldensians in the Dutch Press', in *Revolts and Political Violence in Early Modern Imagery*, ed. Malte Griesse, Monika Barget and David de Boer (Leiden: Brill, 2021), 96.
 - 12 The Savoyard ambassador in London reported that the Vaudois had written to two former British ambassadors to Savoy, John Chetwynd and Sir Richard Hill, to complain that Savoy 'innovated against them on the subject of the liberties that [Victor Amadeus] has granted them for the exercise of religion'. See the following: Draft of Marquis de Trivié to Victor Amadeus, prince of Piedmont. 25 April 1714. AST, Lettere ministri, Gran Bretagna, Mazzo 20; Marquis de Trivié to Victor Amadeus II. 5 April 1714. AST, Lettere ministri, Gran Bretagna, Mazzo 20; Vaudois leaders to John Robinson, bishop of London. April 1714. The National Archives, Kew, [hereafter TNA] SP 92/27. Vaudois leaders also contacted officials in the Swiss Evangelical Cantons, Prussia, and other German states. See: Vaudois Pastors to Evangelical Swiss Cantons, enclosed in Abraham Stanyan to Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke. 10 March 1714 (NS). TNA, SP 96/15; Frédéric Bonet, resident of Prussia, 'Memorial from the Resident of Prussia on the Subject of Persecutions of the Protestants'. 5 April 1714 (NS). TNA, SP 100/46. See also *Daily Courant*, Issue 3860, 9 March 1714, Burney Collection Newspapers [hereafter BCN]. Accessed 7 August 2014; 'Traduction d'un article d'un imprimé de Londres nommé le Flying Post', enclosed in Marquis de Trivié to Victor Amadeus. 26 April 1714. AST, Lettere ministri, Gran Bretagna, Mazzo 20; *Flying Post or The Post Master*. Issue 3388. 13–16 June 1713. BCN. Gale. Yale University Library. Accessed 7 August 2014. On the negotiations at Rastadt, see Boles, *Huguenots*, 215–48.
 - 13 'A Letter from a Vaudois at Berne to a Friend at The Hague', *Daily Courant*, Issue 3871, 22 March 1714. On the *Daily Courant*, see Tony Claydon, 'Daily News and the

- Construction of Time in Late Stuart England, 1695-1714', *Journal of British Studies* 52 (2013): 59.
- 14 'A Letter from a Vaudois at Berne to a Friend at The Hague'.
 - 15 Ibid.
 - 16 Marquis de Trivié to Victor Amadeus II. 2 April 1714. AST, Lettere ministri, Gran Bretagna, Mazzo 20. I have not been able to identify the Dutch paper from which the *Daily Courant* copied the 'Letter'. On seventeenth- and eighteenth-century newspaper publishers' practice of selecting news items from foreign papers to edit and re-print, see Will Slauter, 'Le paragraphe mobile: Circulation et transformation des informations dans le monde atlantique du XVIIIe siècle', *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales*, livii (2012): 369–70; Arthur der Weduwen, 'Competition, Choice and Diversity in the Newspaper Trade of the Dutch Golden Age', *Early Modern Low Countries* 2 (2018): 12.
 - 17 Marquis de Trivié to Victor Amadeus, prince of Piedmont. 26 April 1714. AST, Lettere ministri, Gran Bretagna, Mazzo 20.
 - 18 See der Weduwen, 'Competition', 7–23; Arthur der Weduwen and Andrew Pettegree, *The Dutch Republic and the Birth of Modern Advertising* (Leiden: Brill, 2020); Andrew Pettegree and Arthur der Weduwen, 'News, Neighbours, and Commerce: Newspaper Advertising in the Information Culture of the Dutch Republic', *Early Modern Low Countries* 2 (2018): 103–18.
 - 19 Der Weduwen, 'Competition', 9.
 - 20 Gibbs, 'Dutch Republic', 331–3, <http://doi.org/10.18352/bmgn-lchr.1683> (accessed 25 February 2018).
 - 21 Ibid., 348.
 - 22 On re-copying news items, see note 16 above.
 - 23 Mevorah, 'Jewish Diplomatic Activities', 125–64; Guesnet, 'Textures', 355–75; Guesnet, 'Negotiating under duress', 47–62.
 - 24 Guesnet, 'Textures', 372; Baruch Mevorah, 'The Imperial Court-Jew Wolf Wertheimer as Diplomatic Mediator', *Studies in History* XXIII (1972): 201, fn 21.
 - 25 Guesnet, 'Textures', 355–6; Mevorah, 'Wertheimer as Diplomatic Mediator', 186–99.
 - 26 Slauter, 'Le paragraphe mobile', 374.
 - 27 See Baruch Mevorah, 'De Interventionsbestrebungen in Europa zur Verhinderung der Vertreibung der Juden aus Böhmen und Mähren, 1744-1745', *Jahrbuch des Instituts für deutsche Geschichte* ix (1980): 22, 39 and 67–8.
 - 28 In Frankfurt-am-Main, the news journal, *Nouvelles amusantes, ou histoire de l'Europe* published two news items on the expulsion. *Nouvelles amusantes ou Histoire de l'Europe*, 4 vols (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1745), i and ii, 74–6 and 165–6. In The Hague, two monthly news journals published news items on the expulsion. *Journal Universel, ou Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Civile, Politique, Ecclesiastique, & Littéraire du XVIIIe Siècle*, vol. vi (The Hague, 1745), 70–4, 546–8, 567–72; *Mercure historique et politique, contenant l'Etat présent de l'Europe*, vol. cxviii (The Hague, 1745), 148–52, 362–4. In Amsterdam, the *Amsterdam Gazette* and two news journal, *Nouvelles lettres historiques (et politiques)* and the *Mémoires historiques pour le siècle courant* covered the expulsion. *Mémoires historiques pour le siècle courant* (Amsterdam, 1745), 58–61, 274–9; *Nouvelles lettres historiques et politiques*, vol. iii (Amsterdam, 1745), 65–8, 341–2. In Leiden, the *Gazette de Leyde*, published news of the expulsion. See, for example, *Gazette de Leyde*, 2 March 1745 (NS). In Avignon, the *Courrier d'Avignon* printed news items about the expulsion. See for example, *Courrier d'Avignon*, 12 January 1745 (NS). In Paris, the *Gazette de France* also published reports of the expulsion. See, for

- example, *Gazette de France*, 23 January 1745 (NS). In Luxembourg, the *Clef du cabinet des princes de l'Europe* also published news about the expulsion. See, for example, *Clef du cabinet des princes de l'Europe*, 1 March 1745 (NS).
- 29 For one instance in which a Dutch news item about the expulsion was re-copied in London, see *Gazette de Leyde*, 22 February/5 March 1745; *General Evening Post*, 28 February–2 March 1745 (OS); *Daily Advertiser*, 2 March 1745 (OS); *Penny London Post or The Morning Advertiser*, 1–4 March 1745 (OS); *General Advertiser (1744)*, 2 March 1745 (OS); *London Evening Post*, 28 February–2 March 1745 (OS); *Universal Spectator and Weekly Journal*, 2 March 1745 (OS).
- Twelve London newspapers reported on the expulsion. See, for example, *General Evening Post*, 5–8 January 1745 (OS); *Daily Advertiser*, 7 January 1745 (OS); *Daily Gazetteer*, 9 January 1745 (OS); *Penny London Post or The Morning Advertiser*, 9 January 1745 (OS); *General Advertiser*, 16 January 1745 (OS); *Old England or the Constitutional Journal*, 9 February 1745 (OS); *Westminster Journal or New Weekly Miscellany*, 16 February 1745 (OS); *London Evening Post*, 28 February–2 March 1745 (OS); *Universal Spectator and Weekly Journal*, 2 March 1745 (OS); *London Gazette*, 5–9 March 1745 (OS); *Daily Post*, 11 April 1745 (OS); *St. James's Evening Post*, 18–20 April 1745 (OS).
- 30 See *Salisbury Journal or Weekly Advertiser*, 12 March 1745 (OS); *The Dublin Journal*, 25–9 June 1745 (OS); *New York Weekly Post Boy*, 22 April 1745 (OS); *New York Weekly Post Boy*, 29 April 1745 (OS); *Pennsylvania Gazette*, 25 April 1745 (OS). With thanks to the American Jewish Historical Society for giving me access to the Samuel Oppenheim collection, where I found the references for the *Pennsylvania Gazette* and *New York Weekly Post Boy*. See American Jewish Historical Society, New York City, Samuel Oppenheim collection, Box 24, folder 36, 'The Expulsion of the Jews from Bohemia, 1744-1745'.
- 31 See Rétat, *Miroir de l'Europe*, esp. 39–44; Popkin, *News and Politics*, esp. 36–9; Joynes, 'Opposition Press and French Politics', in Censer and Popkin, *Press and Politics*; Gibbs, 'Dutch Republic', esp. 332–5.
- 32 See René Moulinas, 'Le Courrier d'Avignon 1 (1733-1768)', *Dictionnaire des journaux* online database, published with permission of the Voltaire Foundation, <http://dictionnaire-journaux.gazettes18e.fr/journal/0261-le-courrier-davignon-1> (accessed 15 April 2018).
- 33 See Bob Harris, *Politics and the Rise of the Press: Britain and France, 1620-1800* (London: Routledge, 1996), 14–23; Michael Harris, *London Newspapers in the Age of Walpole: A Study of the Origins of the Modern English Press* (London: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1987), 134–54.
- 34 For instance, the *Augsburger Zeitung* circulated in Vienna. See, for example, Samuel Wertheimer to Wolf Wertheimer, 25 January 1745: Salomon Hugo Lieben, 'Briefe von 1744-1748 über die Austreibung der Juden aus Prag', *Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für Geschichte der Juden in der Cechoslovakischen Republik* 4 (1932): 427–8 (with thanks to Annelies Andries for this translation).
- 35 'Excerpt from a letter, arrived [in Augsburg] from Fürth', 4 December 1744 (NS): Lieben, 'Briefe', 369 (with thanks to Annelies Andries for this translation).
- 36 Samuel Wertheimer to Wolf Wertheimer, 25 January 1745 (NS): Lieben, 'Briefe', 427–8 (with thanks to Annelies Andries for this translation).
- 37 Samuel Wertheimer to Wolf Wertheimer, 3 February 1745 (NS): Franz Kobler, *A Treasury of Jewish Letters: Letters from the Famous and the Humble*, vol. II (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1953), 604–6.

- 38 Ibid.
- 39 See *Gazette de Leyde*, 2 March 1745 (NS); *Gazette d'Amsterdam*, 2 March 1745 (NS).
- 40 *Gazette d'Amsterdam*, 2 March 1745 (NS). The *Gazette de Leyde* announced, "The Leaders of the Jewish Nation received yesterday evening the pleasing News, that [...] the Queen of Hungary finally resolved to revoke the severe decrees, which Her Majesty had published against the Jews established in Bohemia," *Gazette de Leyde*, 2 March 1745 (NS) (my translation).
- 41 *Gazette de Leyde*, 2 March 1745 (NS) (my translation); *Gazette d'Amsterdam*, 2 March 1745 (NS) (my translation).
- 42 Ibid.
- 43 *Gazette de Leyde*, 2 March 1745 (NS); *Gazette d'Amsterdam*, 2 March 1745 (NS).
- 44 The leaders of the Ashkenazi communities of Amsterdam, Josele Elkana, Nathan Scheier, Susskind Emden, Gerson Binga, Elia Gompertz to the holy community of Vienna, 12 March 1745 (NS): Lieben, 'Briefe', 447–8 (with thanks to Annelies Andries for this translation).
- 45 Ibid. See *Gazette de Leyde*, 2 March 1745 (NS).
- 46 Harrington to Robinson, 22 February/5 March 1745. BL, Add MS 23819, fos. 304–5.
- 47 Ibid.
- 48 *Gazette d'Amsterdam*, 19 March 1745 (NS).
- 49 See *Gazette de Leyde*, 2 March 1745 (NS); *Gazette d'Amsterdam*, 2 March 1745 (NS).
- 50 Mevorah, 'Interventionsbestrebungen', 65.
- 51 *Daily Gazetteer (London edition)*, 11–13 March 1745 (OS).
- 52 *Penny London Post or The Morning Advertiser*, 15–18 March 1745 (OS); *Old England or The Constitutional Journal*, 16 March 1745 (OS); *Westminster Journal or New Weekly Miscellany*, 16 March 1745 (OS).
- 53 *General Evening Post*, 14–16 March 1745 (OS). *Daily Advertiser*, 16 March 1745 (OS).
- 54 *Penny London Post or The Morning Advertiser*, 15–18 March 1745 (OS).
- 55 *Mercure historique et politique*, vol. cxviii, 362–4. *Mémoires historiques pour le siècle courant*, 274–9. *Journal Universel*, vol. iv, 569–70. *Nouvelles lettres historiques et politiques*, vol. iii, 341–2.
- 56 See Slauter, 'Le paragraphe mobile', 369–70.
- 57 On the seventeenth century, see Jason Peacey, "My Friend the Gazetier": Diplomacy and News in Seventeenth-Century Europe, in *News Networks in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Joad Raymond and Noah Moxham (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 420–42; Jason Peacey, 'Managing Dutch Advices: Abraham Casteleyn and the English Government, 1660–1681', *Media History* xxii (2016): 1–17. See Helmer Helmers, 'Public Diplomacy in Early Modern Europe: Towards a New History of News', *Media History* xxii (2016). On the eighteenth century, see Popkin, *News and Politics*, 36–8; Harris, *London Newspapers*, 134–54.
- 58 John Chetwynd to William Legge, first earl of Dartmouth. TNA, SP 92/28. 13 June 1711 (NS).
- 59 Count Maffei to Victor Amadeus II. 24 July 1711. AST, Lettere ministri, Gran Bretagna, Mazzo 17.
- 60 Marquis del Borgo and Pierre Mellarède, count de Bettonet to Victor Amadeus II. 9 February 1712. AST, Lettere ministri, Olanda, Mazzo 17. Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke to John Robinson, bishop of Bristol and Thomas Wentworth, first earl of Strafford. 8 April 1712 (OS). TNA, SP 84/245/83–90. Marquis del Borgo, Count Maffei, and Pierre Mellarède, count de Bettonet to Victor Amadeus II. 19 April 1712.

- AST, Lettere ministri, Olanda, Mazzo 17. John Robinson, bishop of Bristol to Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke. 31 May 1712. TNA, SP 84/244/276-277.
- 61 Marquis de Trivié to Victor Amadeus II. 5 April 1714. AST, Lettere ministri, Gran Bretagna, Mazzo 20.
- 62 Victor Amadeus, prince of Piedmont to Marquis de Trivié. 19 April 1714. Lettere ministri, Gran Bretagna, Mazzo 21.
- 63 Victor Amadeus, prince of Piedmont to Marquis de Trivié, 3 May 1714. Lettere ministri, Gran Bretagna, Mazzo 19, 'Lettere del Marchese Vuicardel de Trivié', 1713. My translation.
- 64 Marquis de Trivié to Lord Bolingbroke. 10 May 1714. TNA, SP 96/15.
- 65 Ibid.
- 66 Ibid.
- 67 *Post Boy* (1695), 18–20 May 1714. Issue 2969. BCN.
- 68 The *Post Boy* was edited by Abel Roper, a Tory bookseller, and published by the Tory ministry's trade publisher, John Morphew. See G. A. Aitkin, 'Roper, Abel (*ibp.* 1665, *d.* 1726)'; rev. M. E. Clayton, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, May 2011, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24070> (accessed 24 March 2016), <http://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/24070>.
- 69 *Mercure historique et politique*, June 1714 (Google Books, <http://gazetier-universel.gazettes18e.fr/periodique/mercure-historique-et-politique-1-1686-1782>).
- 70 *Post Boy* (1695), 18–20 May 1714. Issue 2969. BCN.
- 71 Marquis de Trivié to Victor Amadeus, prince of Piedmont. 26 April 1714 (NS). Archivio di Stato, Turin (hereafter AST), Lettere ministri, Gran Bretagna, Mazzo 20. My translation.
- 72 Vaudois pastors to unknown. Copy sent to John Chetwynd. 22 March 1715. TNA, SP 92/27. My translation.
- 73 Ibid.
- 74 Sir Thomas Robinson to Edward Weston, Under-Secretary of State for the Northern Department. 16 January 1745 (NS). BL, Add MS 23870. See also Guesnet, 'Textures', 357.
- 75 Philip Dormer Stanhope, fourth earl of Chesterfield to Sir Thomas Robinson, 24 February 1745 (NS). BL, Add MS 23819, fos. 243–4. 'Order of the States General', 23 February 1745 (NS), enclosed in Chesterfield to Robinson, 24 February 1745 (NS). BL, Add MS 23819, fos. 245–6. My translation. The leaders of the Ashkenazi communities of Amsterdam, Josele Elkana, Nathan Scheier, Susskind Emden, Gerson Binga, Elia Gompertz to the holy community of Vienna, 12 March 1745 (NS). Lieben, 'Briefe', 447–8 (with thanks to Annelies Andries for this translation). Edward Weston to Sir Thomas Robinson, 15 February 1745 (OS). BL, Add MS 23819, fo. 253.
- 76 William Stanhope, first earl of Harrington to Sir Thomas Robinson, 28 December/8 January 1745 (NS). BL, Add MS 23819.
- 77 Sir Thomas Robinson to Edward Weston, 3 April 1745 (NS): BL, Add MS 23870, fo. 235.
- 78 Sir Robert Trevor to Sir Thomas Robinson, 9 April 1745 (NS). BL, Add MS 23820, fo. 32. Barthold Douma de Burmania to the Griffier of the States General, 14 April 1745. In David Kaufman, 'Barthold Dowe Burmania und die Vertreibung der Juden aus Böhmen und Mähren', *Jubelschrift zum siebzigsten geburststage des Prof. Dr. H. Graetz* (S. Schottlaender: Breslau, 1887), 299–300 (with thanks to Annelies Andries for this translation).

- 79 Letters of intercession were often sent after peace treaties had been signed. See 'Intercession on Behalf of French Protestants at Ryswick', 1697. BL, Add MS 72573. My translation. Thomas Herbert, earl of Pembroke to Gilbert Burnet, 20 September 1697 (NS). Bodleian Library, Oxford, MSS. Add. D. 15-24, fos. 111-12. Pierre Jurieu, 'Raisons pour obtenir de Leurs Excellences les ambassadeurs et plenipotentiaires des princes protestants des deux communions d'intervenir dans notre affaire, par voye de negociation, et non par une simple intercession', 7 August 1697 (NS). TNA, SP 103/96, unfoliated. My translation.
- 80 See, for example, Britain's letter of intercession on behalf of Protestants in the duchy of Savoy in 1708. 'Such an Indulgence for the Protestants of these Valleys will be pleasing to our Protestant allies; And for me [Queen Anne] I will be much obliged to you,' Queen Anne to Victor Amadeus II, duke of Savoy, 28 December 1708 (OS), enclosed in Victor Amadeus II to Ignazio Solaro di Moretta, marchese del Borgo, 13 March 1709 (NS). AST, Lettere Ministri, Olanda, Mazzo 13. My translation.
- 81 Sir Thomas Robinson to William Stanhope, first earl of Harrington, 27 March 1745 (NS): TNA, SP 80/168, unfoliated.
- 82 Barthold Douma de Burmania to the Griffier of the States General, 14 April 1745. Kaufman, 'Barthold Dowe Burmania', 299-300. With thanks to Annelies Andries for this translation.
- 83 *Nouvelles amusantes, ou histoire de l'Europe*, vols. i and ii, 165-6.
- 84 *London Evening Post*, 18-21 May 1745 (OS); *General Advertiser*, 21 May 1745 (OS). For another news item, which actually assumed that the queen must have given in to her allies' demands that she end the expulsion, see *Courrier d'Avignon*, 19 March 1745 (NS).
- 85 Guesnet, 'Textures', 358. Sir Thomas Robinson to William Stanhope, first earl of Harrington. 12 May 1745 (NS). TNA, SP 80/169.
- 86 As Stefan Plaggenborg has shown, local and regional protest, rather than international pressure eventually resulted in a settlement. The refugees were allowed to re-enter the city in 1747, when the Bohemian nobility, local representatives of the Habsburg monarchy, the commission appointed to implement the original expulsion order, and merchant guilds in Leipzig, Hamburg, and Amsterdam began to protest the expulsion of Jews from Prague. Stefan Plaggenborg, 'Maria Theresia Und Die Böhmischen Juden', *Bohemia. Zeitschrift Fur Geschichte Und Kultur Der Bohmischen Lander* 39 (1998): 1-16 (with thanks to Annelies Andries for her translation). See also Guesnet, 'Textures', 358. Wolf Wertheimer to Moses Hart. 18 December 1747 (NS): Kobler, *Treasury*, vol. II, 609-10.
- 87 In the same letter, Robinson reported that another Austrian official had repeated this observation to him. Count Stahremberg warned Robinson that, 'knowing as he did the Character of the Queen, he could answer for the ill effect of the rest of the Representation, were it only on Account of its being too true', Sir Thomas Robinson to William Stanhope, first earl of Harrington, 27 March 1745 (NS). TNA, SP 80/168, unfoliated.
- 88 See Didier Boisson, *Consciences en liberté? Itinéraires d'ecclésiastiques convertis au protestantisme (1631-1760)* (Paris: Champion, 2009), esp. 150-1; Steve Pincus, 1688 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 121-5; Annabel Brett, *Changes of State: Nature and the Limits of the City in Early Modern Natural Law* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011), 149-51; Kaplan, *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Religious Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2010).

- 89 I draw here on constructivist theories of how norms develop and operate in IR. See Nicholas Wheeler, 'The Humanitarian Responsibilities of Sovereignty: Explaining the Development of a New Norm of Military Intervention for Humanitarian Purposes in International Society', in *Humanitarian Intervention and International Relations*, ed. Jennifer Welsh (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 38; Thomas Risse and Stephen C. Ropp, 'International Human Rights Norms and Domestic Change: Conclusions', in *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change*, ed. Thomas Risse, Stephen C. Ropp and Kathryn Sikkink (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 246; Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998).
- 90 Jurgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989); Reinhart Koselleck, *Critique and Crisis: Enlightenment and the Pathogenesis of Modern Society* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press 1988); Anthony La Vopa, 'Conceiving a Public: Ideas and Society in Eighteenth-Century Europe', *Journal of Modern History* lxiv (1992): 79–116; Keith Baker, 'Defining the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century France: Variations on a Theme by Habermas', in *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, ed. Craig Calhoun (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992); Dena Goodman, *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994); Tabettha Ewing, 'Invasion of Lorient: Rumor, Public Opinion, and Foreign Politics in 1740s Paris', in *Into Print: Limits and Legacies of the Enlightenment, Essays in Honor of Robert Darnton*, ed. Charles Walton (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2011); Peter Lake and Steve Pincus, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England', *Journal of British Studies* xlv (2006): 270–92; Jason Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
- 91 See Fabian Klose, 'Enforcing Abolition: The Entanglement of Civil Society Action, Humanitarian Norm-setting, and Military Intervention', in *The Emergence of Humanitarian Intervention: Ideas and Practices from the Nineteenth Century to the Present*, ed. Fabian Klose (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), esp. 93; Caroline Shaw, *Britannia's Embrace: Modern Humanitarianism and the Imperial Origins of Refugee Relief* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), esp. 66, 59, 67–9, and 126–30; Caroline Shaw, 'The Power of Shame: Public Intervention and Nineteenth-Century Refugee Relief', *Refugee History Blog*, University of East Anglia, 30 January 2017. <http://refugeehistory.org/blog/2017/1/30/the-power-of-shame-public-intervention-and-nineteenth-century-refugee-relief> (accessed 1 December 2017); Abigail Green, 'The Limits of Intervention: Coercive Diplomacy and the Jewish Question in the Nineteenth Century', *International History Review* xxxvi (2014): esp. 478–9; Abigail Green, 'The British Empire and the Jews: An Imperialism of Human Rights?', *Past & Present* cxcix (2008); Abigail Green, 'From Protection to Humanitarian Intervention? Enforcing Jewish Rights in Romania and Morocco around 1880', in Klose, *Emergence*, 142–62; Davide Rodogno, *Against Massacre: Humanitarian Intervention in the Ottoman Empire, 1815-1914* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), esp. 9, 15, 73–8 and 97–116.

Part III

Migration management and
imperialism

Plague, war and the politics of refuge in early modern Prussia

Kat Hill

For early modern European Mennonites, the lands of the Vistula Delta in Polish Prussia, were imagined as a refuge, a haven from persecution, filled with the promise of toleration and security.¹ From the mid-sixteenth century onwards, men and women fled Western Europe to head for this place of relative safety. Today you can still stand at the water's edge in the small Dutch town of Franeker and imagine the experience of the first Mennonite families who journeyed along the canals and waterways, out to the Baltic, and made their way to Polish Prussia. Mennonites were a non-conformist Protestant community that emerged from the Anabaptist movement of the early reformation, groups who disavowed infant baptism, repudiated the swearing of oaths and the sword, and rejected worldly practices. Mennonites, named after the Dutch preacher Menno Simons, were a distinct strand of Anabaptism that evolved in the Netherlands from the mid-1530s onwards. Many Mennonite communities travelled to Polish Prussia to escape intolerance, although the Vistula Delta was not the only place to which they fled following the brutal persecution of sixteenth-century Anabaptists.² Anabaptists were hated by Protestants and Catholics alike, and were never included in the various religious peace settlements which drew confessional boundaries in early modern Europe.³ The narratives of martyrdom, of persecuted exile, and of migration in search for a place of refuge have remained a powerful dynamic in Anabaptist communities and in accounts of Mennonite history.⁴ Prussian Mennonites feature only briefly, however, in many accounts of refugee history and migration in the early modern world, including Terpstra's groundbreaking history of the reformation.⁵ Yet the experience of Mennonites, who were neither Catholic nor Protestant, offers important perspectives on the dynamics of refugee politics in this period, in a region where migration shaped and was shaped by the rise of new states.

This chapter focuses on Prussian Mennonites and the politics of refuge and migration that evolved amidst the complex dynamics of state and imperial power in this part of Europe. Over a period of 200 years, these Mennonite communities successfully negotiated a place of relative freedom and security in early modern Polish Prussia. But by the end of the eighteenth century, the way of life which they had carved out was under pressure. With the threats to their way of life posed by the unification of

these lands under the rule of the Kingdom of Prussia, many Mennonites became exiles and migrants once more, travelling to the Russian empire.⁶ Their status as migrants was entangled with the vagaries of political and social change in early modern Prussia and later, imperial Russia. Specific points of crisis affected the Mennonites' position, such as the tragedies of the early decades of the eighteenth century, when plague and war struck this region of Europe. The devastating impact of these events refocused attention on Mennonites as refugees and outsiders, but these moments were flash points in an ongoing narrative of the political negotiation surrounding migration. The management of migrants was inextricably linked with the realities of state building by Prussian and Russian authorities, and this moulded the perception and treatment of Mennonites.

As scholars such as Benjamin Kaplan and Alexander Schunka have shown, refuge, exile and migration were processes that fundamentally shaped the political and social geography of early modern Europe and beyond.⁷ Mirroring the practices of other states, Prussia issued invitations to communities as part of a process of consolidating power, authority and territorial control, welcoming the artisanal, economic and cultural contributions of migrants and refugees. Following the Edict of Potsdam in 1685, Mennonites joined French Huguenots and Austrian Protestants in repopulating regions devastated by the Thirty Years' War and subsequently making significant contributions to Prussian culture and politics.⁸ In the nineteenth century, the Russian empire followed suit and the invitations proffered to Mennonites were part of a grand plan to settle 'uncultivated' regions and to stimulate industry, an invite issued to all foreigners but targeted particularly at German populations.⁹

The Mennonites of early modern Prussia are one strand in the broader story, their history as refugees implicated in these larger processes. But they also present a unique case. Caught between Protestant and Catholic camps, migrant descendants of Anabaptism occupied an ambiguous place in the confessional map of Christian politics, still tainted with the legacy of heresy and social rebellion.¹⁰ Image and reputation mattered, and the Mennonites' notoriety as farmers and land managers was fundamental to the settlements that they were able to negotiate in Prussia and beyond. This image was embedded in the earliest agreements made in Polish Prussia and recurred repeatedly in subsequent discussions, used by Mennonites themselves and by the authorities with whom they bargained for position. It is a revealing aspect of the way in which the long *durée* politics of managing migration shaped political decisions but also community identity. Both internal and external perceptions mattered. An internal dynamic of the experience of martyrdom, exile and refugeedom is a thread running through Mennonite communities, but Mennonites were also conscious of the way in which states perceived them, categorized them, and the role that they could play as migrants. If they were to succeed as refugee settlers, they had to demonstrate they were peaceable subjects who could make a useful contribution. The place they occupied in the interplay of refugee politics shaped their identity, but this did not mean that Mennonites were simply agents of state settlement programmes. Rather, this chapter examines the broader context in which the meaning of refugee and refuge was constructed in response to specific needs, in the politics of the moment and by pragmatic decisions made by states, rulers and the Mennonite communities themselves.

Being a Mennonite refugee in early modern Prussia

In the sixteenth century, Dutch Mennonites fled from increasing religious intolerance to settle in the marshy lands of modern-day northern Poland. The Kingdom of Poland offered a rare place of refuge. Following war between the Teutonic Knights and the King of Poland, the relative independence of cities like Danzig and of local rulers resulted in a political patchwork that offered space for Mennonite settlers.¹¹ The bishops of Kulm, for example, who had extensive rights over the land in their vicinity, valued the Mennonites as settlers and protected their freedoms.¹² By the eighteenth century, these refugees in west or Polish Prussia had become a well-established presence around cities such as Danzig, Marienburg and Elbing, and along the Vistula river, and were an integral, successful part of the regional economy.¹³ The memories of sixteenth-century martyrdom remained but the Mennonites status as refugees, as opposed to settled outsiders, became ambiguous as they stayed and took up roots. While Mennonites were different, they were largely tolerated. The story in east ducal Prussia was much rockier. Officially a Lutheran state from 1525, Protestant refugees came to east Prussia from the Netherlands and with them Mennonites, but the latter were generally unwelcome. Although some tried to stay, expulsions and hostile attitudes in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries prevented Mennonite settlements.¹⁴ This changed in the eighteenth century when new congregations emerged around Königsberg and other areas such as Tilsit, but toleration was unstable. Royal decrees in 1724 and 1732 that expelled Mennonites (the latter to be reversed in 1740) exemplify the instability of the lives of east Prussian Mennonites. Only Königsberg Mennonites generally escaped these disruptions, as they were too important to the local economy to be exiled.¹⁵ This uneven pattern of toleration was replicated in many places where Mennonites settled.¹⁶ The reasons for spikes of intolerance were mixed: confessional hostility and ongoing suspicion of the loyalties of Mennonites mingling with concern over their economic success. The threat of the renewed possibility of exile and refugeedom remained present, but despite these uneven fortunes in many areas of Europe, settlement was possible for Mennonites.

If Mennonites had in some ways achieved the status of settled migrants by the late eighteenth century in west royal Prussia and some parts of east ducal Prussia, circumstances changed with the rise of the Kingdom of Prussia. In 1772, with the Partition of Poland, the Mennonites of the Vistula Delta became subjects of Frederick II. Various privileges and exemptions which had guaranteed toleration were now void and had to be renegotiated, but new laws demanded high sums for military exemptions and stopped Mennonites from buying more land. From 1786, rules were tightened further under Frederick William II.¹⁷ No longer guaranteed the decision to opt out of the demands of the military Prussian state, an issue of civil obedience but also a confessional principle, and worried about the freedom to practice their faith, many Mennonites chose to leave. It was again lands to the east, in the Russian empire, that seemed to hold the promise of a place of toleration and peaceful existence. Catharine the Great needed settlers to populate lands round the Black Sea, the Volga and in Siberia and alongside other migrants, Mennonites were invited by Tsarist agents with the promise of land and money. Congregations moved to the new Chortitza and Molotschna settlements on the Dnieper and Molochnaya Rivers.¹⁸

The narrative of Mennonite settlement in Prussia is complex and does not follow any linear patterns, nor provide easy definitions of what contemporaries understood by the term 'refugee'. Mennonites fled persecution yet were also welcomed as migrant settlers by empires and states looking for people and skills, and they were granted specific privileges, although their confessional position was often viewed with suspicion. Mennonite experiences parallel histories of other early modern refugees who negotiated their positions amidst concerns about religious non-conformity.¹⁹ The intellectual and structural frameworks that shaped ideas about these migrant communities were based on social economic and political contingencies. Never really accepted as a confessional minority, the status of Mennonite refugees was ambiguous, and the boundaries of inclusion and exclusion were subject to constant negotiation amidst the power struggles of the great events that shaped Northern Europe and beyond: the Great Northern Wars, the unification of Prussia under Frederick the Great and the rise of Catharine the Great's Russian empire. These political and economic realities, rather than any concept of confessional tolerance, shaped the experience of the Vistula Delta Mennonites.

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, many communities became implicated in pragmatic negotiations about what authorities needed, and they often moved not as the result of formal exile proclamations nor because their lives were under threat, but because the balanced details of a pragmatic, sometimes grudging toleration had changed. Threat of expulsion remained real for some, but the dynamics of migration were shaped by complex political forces. As scholars have observed, the confessional conflicts of the sixteenth century did not give way to happy co-existence, and the number of exiles and migrants increased in the seventeenth century.²⁰ The Mennonites push the boundaries of this narrative even further and offer a counterpoint to the idea that the eighteenth century was an age of toleration. Indeed, for Mennonites in particular, whose way of life depended on co-opting out of the bonds which tied together new nation states, problems reoccurred with urgency at the end of the eighteenth century. Amidst the push for political dominance, military service became a crucial testing ground for the limits of toleration, even in the promised land of the American colonies. The world of colonial America in some ways differed from Europe since the settlements in Germantown and elsewhere were founded on principles of freedom of faith and toleration. Yet despite the promise of the Atlantic world, some of the same issues remerged in the eighteenth century as Mennonites resisted calls to swear oaths or serve as soldiers to defend the new regime.²¹ Acceptable compromises were sometimes found, but rather than accept the new conditions imposed by rulers, many Mennonites in Europe chose to become migrants once more.

The willingness to keep moving, to keep searching for a place to be the 'quiet in the land' is a feature of Mennonite communities. It also underscores the legacy of their refugee status. Despite often generous settlement agreements, the reality of being an outsider continued to shape the lived experience of Mennonite communities as they renegotiated their position in times of crisis or with political change. Toleration might be extended, but at what price? What happened when toleration broke down? And what change in conditions might spur a new wave of exile or migration? Even when Prussian Mennonites were relatively settled, the idea of being an exile or migrant

community was important to Mennonite identity from both internal and external perspectives. From the point of view of authorities, Mennonites were still different, a population who could be moved on or in some cases swapped for other, more useful migrants. For communities themselves, memories of sixteenth-century persecution as well their contact with Mennonites elsewhere, who experienced exile and intolerance, perpetuated an exile mentality and was a key driver in stimulating further waves of movement when agreements in Prussia broke down.

The refugee politics which shaped the experience of early modern Prussian Mennonites involved force, violence, exile, persecution and intolerance, but also negotiated acceptance, difficult choices, accommodations and decisions to leave. The Mennonite experience highlights with particular clarity some of the questions raised by existing scholarship about the dynamics of what it might mean to be a refugee and exile in early modern Europe.²² Early modern Mennonites themselves did not often use the notion of refugeedom, sometimes preferring the language of exile, possibly because they saw themselves as communities who had been expelled and forced out rather than a people seeking shelter, and they also relied heavily on the models of apostolic wandering.²³ Yet Mennonites were often seen as refugees, and it was an idea they increasingly came to use in the modern world. Refugee was a notion which was constructed in the politics of pragmatic settlement, in the lived experience and amidst the interplay of imperial ambitions, and this shaped both internal and external views of Mennonites as refugees and migrants over the long *durée*.

Negotiated status

As they sought out land in the Vistula Delta, Mennonites relied on a series of privileges, charters, and exemptions issued by various political actors, from the King of Poland to local lords and bishops. These charters guaranteed their status as accepted outsiders.²⁴ However, these privileges were not based on ideas about religious or humanitarian protection, human rights or principled toleration. The language of refuge and refugees seemed to feature rarely in rhetoric used by external actors about Mennonites. Rather, they were recognized as outsiders who might be useful. The underlying reason given for allowing Mennonites to settle was economic. Indeed, the issue of whether to carry refugees across the Baltic often seemed to come down to prioritizing ease of trade rather than enforcing religious policies.²⁵ The Hanseatic League warned that if member cities tolerated 'the error and heretical Anabaptists' they would be excluded from Hansa privileges, but merchants and ships seemed to have paid little heed to these warnings and preferred to accept refugees rather than disrupt the flow of trading.²⁶

Similar pragmatic considerations governed the question of Mennonite refugee settlement. The complex politics of western Royal Prussia allowed Mennonites to remain through a variety of locally negotiated agreements, and particularly where this settlement was profitable to landlords. One of the most famous founding legends among Vistula Delta Mennonites is that connected to the settlement in Tiegenhof (Nowy Dwór Gdański in the Gross-Werder) and the banking family of Van Loysen. Hans, Simon and Steffen van Loysen held this land as security for a loan made to the

Polish King.²⁷ The Mennonites were granted the land on emphyteutic leases, which lasted for an extended period of time and were inheritable. In their eighteenth-century chronicle, the Mennonite ministers of Orloffelfelde, Heinrich and his son Johann repeated the narrative that the Mennonites were welcome because they were useful. The van Loysens could not farm this swampy, unfruitful land that was overgrown, and so called the Mennonites who were skilled in building dams and mills to make the land useable.²⁸ This, then, was a contractual agreement based on economic utility rather than the need of refugees.

Sometimes charters recognized the pitiable position of Mennonites. In 1623 Sigismund II issued a confirmation to the Mennonites in the villages of Gross and Klein Lubin, Dragass, Kommerau, Brattwin, Gross and Klein Westfahlen that they would be free of financial contributions for military efforts and quartering of soldiers, in recognition of 'their bitterest poverty'.²⁹ However, for the most part, the privileges stressed the economic benefit of Mennonite settlers.³⁰ There is no copy of the first agreements summoning the Mennonites – the 'Berufungs Privilegium' was probably lost in the Polish unrest according to the Donners³¹ – but one of the first official royal affirmations of privileges that survives was issued by King Wladislaw IV in 1642. It justified a tit for tat exchange of rights for farming and land management skills, as Mennonites had taken 'deserted, boggy, and useless places' and transformed them with 'much work and cost' into fertile, farmable land. By digging ditches, building mills and draining bogs they had earned their place.³² This pattern was not unusual in the history of migration and the toleration of early modern refugees. Like many other migrant refugee communities, Mennonites profoundly shaped the economic and social life of the region. Huguenots in Brandenburg brought cultural and scientific contributions, Jewish settlers in Polish Prussia played a crucial role in the grain trade and crafts, and Mennonites were valued for their skill with land management. Decisions about accepting refugees were often made based on assessments of their potential impact on growth and development.³³

Similar priorities governed Catharine the Great's decision to invite Mennonites to settle land along the Dnieper River: to develop the territories and increase the population.³⁴ The Tsarist representative, George von Trappe, dealt with Mennonite agents Johannes Bartsch and Jacob Hoepfner.³⁵ The agreements made for separate colonies with rights and guarantees were not dissimilar to the framework which structured refugee cities analyzed by Benjamin Kaplan. Many refugee communities were given the right effectively to form their own nations.³⁶ The settlements served the political agendas of rulers, but there were significant benefits accorded to refugees like Mennonites. As Kaplan argues, the agreements had to be attractive enough to draw in settlers.³⁷

From the very beginning of Prussian settlement, the Mennonite reputation for being reliable farmers and workers of the land shaped both internal and external perceptions, as they drained marshes and built dykes.³⁸ Despite the past taint of heresy and social rebellion, this seems to have helped rehabilitate them as possible migrants. Unlike Huguenots, who might be welcome as coreligionists by other reformed communities, the Mennonites did not enjoy a parallel position in Europe. Nowhere could a Mennonite nation give them protection, and their place in any notion of a Protestant international

was ambiguous at best. They certainly were not missionaries of an accepted brand of global Protestantism. Although as Mennonites joined Quakers in crossing the Atlantic in the late seventeenth century, they helped push the borders of the British empire west.³⁹ Consequently, their reputation as useful refugees was crucial. William Penn himself described the Mennonite as 'sober people', farmers who 'will neither swear nor fight'.⁴⁰ Confidence in the positive value they would add to the land was a feature of the decisions that surrounded migration management, and this persisted into the twentieth century. As Royden Loewen has remarked, the Mennonites have been long connected with the land and 'quite agrarian worlds'.⁴¹ Like other migrants, this reputation also gave them a degree of agency to negotiate particular conditions, though this often remained limited, subject to conditions imposed by powerful political actors.⁴² In Russia, von Trappe promised Bartsch and Hoepfner fertile land close to the city of Kherson, along with the guarantee of freedom of faith and funds. The conditions remained in place but in the end the Mennonites were offered land on Prince Potemkin's estates, near Chortitza, which was not as promising or as fertile as the area they had been offered.⁴³

Many limitations also reminded the Prussian Mennonites that, despite their success, they were still outsiders – they were not allowed to own property within the city walls of Danzig nor build their own official churches since they were not a recognized denomination, and citizenship was denied until 1800.⁴⁴ Individual Mennonites in Danzig bought land on which the Flemish and Frisian congregations built churches, disguised as normal houses,⁴⁵ and in rural areas congregations worshipped in barns.⁴⁶ Mennonites in Danzig had to pay protection fees as they did not share in and so did not benefit from the defence of the city, a practice also used elsewhere.⁴⁷ The Mennonites' stance on not swearing oaths, serving in political office or supporting military endeavours meant they could not be fully integrated into the communities where they settled, although workarounds might well be found when needed – in place of an oath a simple promise was often deemed sufficient for Mennonites in Danzig or Elbing.⁴⁸ But as Urry has pointed out, the legal position of Mennonites remained unclear, and privileges were not backed up in laws passed by the Polish royal parliament.⁴⁹

Discontentment, crisis and change

Privileges that were granted to Mennonites linked the notion of being a refugee and the protection of Mennonite refugees to particular ties with rulers and the state. The bonds with external authority could work to the Mennonites' advantage, as many local rulers saw them as a group worth favouring or deserving of protection at times of need or in local disputes. The economic success of the Mennonites meant that there was always room for discontentment from non-Mennonite neighbours, who were often unhappy at the accommodations made for these congregations and the competition they faced for trade and business. The guilds in Danzig and elsewhere often grumbled at the economic benefits wealthy Mennonites seemed to enjoy and the money they made from products such as clocks and *Goldwasser*. But in many instances, despite bad feeling from fellow tradesmen, the authorities defended the rights of the Mennonites and resisted calls for

expulsion. Debates about profits made from lacemaking in 1646–9, for example, led to some restrictions on Mennonites. Regulations stated that they should buy materials and sell through local merchants, but they were not prevented from manufacture and trade.⁵⁰

Because of the crucial role they played in the regional economy, Mennonites might also receive assistance when crisis struck. These were times when the marginality of those who had come to places as refugees became particularly apparent. Life was often difficult and fraught in the Vistula Delta region. A community and family record kept by members of the Old Flemish Danzig congregation, known as the Lehn Diary, devotes a whole section to the disasters which hit the region such as plague and war. Similarly, the Donners' chronicle describes the ups and downs of life, such as the suffering caused in 1674 when five floods ruined the land where the Mennonite congregations lived.⁵¹ Although the conventions of the chronicle genre often sought to imitate a biblical narrative of suffering and perseverance, these disasters were real enough. Devastating plague swept through the Baltic region in the early eighteenth century and there were some 150 dangerous floods from the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries.⁵² The collateral damage of military conflict also often hit Mennonites hard, since they lived beyond the protection of cities such as Danzig. The destruction rained on the region by the 'Swedish Deluge' during the Thirty Years' War proved devastating and many buildings and farms were destroyed. There followed soon after the First Northern War (1655–60), and troops also lived off the land during the Great Northern War (1700–32). The miseries of the early eighteenth century were compounded by the wave of plague which hit Danzig in 1709, part of a wider major epidemic in Europe. This was devastating for the city of Danzig and for the Mennonites who lost 409 souls.⁵³ Royal authorities often recognized the vulnerable status of Mennonites at these moments. From 1660 a restoration project was initiated to rebuild rural communities around Danzig, in which the Mennonites participated. And in the early eighteenth century following the traumas of disease and war, Mennonites were invited into the city for protection and recovery.⁵⁴ The Mennonites' position on the margins of urban life meant they benefitted from these measures though these were not designed specifically with refugee rights in mind.

Times of crisis also presented opportunity for mobile migrant populations. The ravages of the same plague which had decimated west Prussia forced King Frederick I in east Prussia to search for settlers for the Duchy. Poorer Mennonites who had been expelled from Switzerland, and who chose not to opt for the Palatinate or Pennsylvania took up his offer.⁵⁵ As Lachenicht has noted, refugees often served to further processes of internal colonization in this way.⁵⁶ Toleration and acceptance was never a linear process. These changes that occurred at times of crises did not signal permanent shifts nor a particular recognition of the rights of Mennonite communities. However, these moments reveal the way in which the perception and treatment of such communities shifted with circumstance and were based on pragmatic judgements about political and socio-economic realities.

But the status of Mennonites also came under threat at times of change and crisis. Pragmatic arrangements and privileges granted could easily be revoked depending on what the authorities and the state needed from its subjects. For example, economic pressures in Danzig in the eighteenth century led to much harsher restrictions on

Mennonite trade as the king needed the guilds onside. For Mennonites, who would not swear oaths and refused to contribute to military efforts, this pressure was particularly acute in the era of eighteenth-century state building. The warning signs that preceded the later large-scale migrations were already clear in the early part of the century. Raids occurred on Mennonite villages attempting to press them into service, and in 1724 in east Prussia King Frederick William I declared that 'I cannot abide such useless worms that refuse to become soldiers'. Mennonite families were expelled and although some returned with permission, protection was again removed in 1732 when a transactional expulsion took place. Mennonites who had refused military service were removed for Lutherans who were coming from Salzburg, where the Catholic Prince Bishop had expelled his 20,000 Lutheran subjects.⁵⁷ King Frederick William I need settlers, soldiers and labour, and underpinning this switch was a consideration about which group of migrants was a better prospect. The incoming Lutherans would likely not only be easier to recruit in the service of the state but were an easier confessional fit for Protestant Prussia. Mennonites traditionally were not part of a larger transnational Protestant identity, although Mennonites started to make use of this discourse in their claims for inclusion and toleration, as the work of Jessica Lowe on Rheydt has begun to explore.⁵⁸ In his order of expulsion Frederick William declared that the Mennonites would be replaced by 'good Christians who do not think it forbidden to be a soldier'.⁵⁹

A few decades later these ongoing frictions came to a head with the unification of Prussia and the militarization of the Prussian kingdom. The balance between toleration and economic utility tipped under Frederick the Great and his successor Frederick William II. Frederick the Great had granted the Mennonites religious liberty and freedom from military service if taxes were paid, issuing the *Gnaden Privilegium* of 1780. Yet he still restricted Mennonites from buying land from non-Mennonites, except with special exemption by the war ministry, and by 1786 under Frederick William II only Mennonites who accepted military service could acquire more land.⁶⁰ The Mennonites were not the only ones to see their position threatened under the new regime. Frederick the Great brought in oppressive measures against Jewish communities, although he was also ready to alter his position if he thought he could exploit their wealth and economic networks to his advantage.⁶¹ What was common to the Jewish and Mennonite experience was the way in which both were assessed based on their potential utility to the new state and treated accordingly.⁶² As Thomas Dahms argues, religion was not the main consideration for Frederick but rather where his subjects slotted into his political and economic vision.⁶³ Some Mennonites chose to accept this vision, others left.⁶⁴ For those who stayed, Prussian migration politics still shaped the dynamics of these communities. The work of Mark Janzten has underlined how power in these Mennonite congregations was intimately connected to the external power of the state, and initially at least, Mennonite leaders were given powers to police and tax their congregations by the Prussian government. By the 1860s, however, any military exemption was revoked.⁶⁵ Mennonite refugee populations who came into Prussia could be useful organs in the socio-economic evolution of states, but they were equally problematic, not simply because they did not fit into religious categories that governed state politics, but because they did not act like other subjects.

Mennonite perceptions

For the authorities who dealt with Mennonites in Prussia, these communities, who were at once refugees and confessionally suspect, but also useful, occupied an ambiguous position. But how did Prussian Mennonites see themselves? Their role in imperial politics meant that they became attuned to the idea of being good farmers and reliable migrants, and they internalized these perceptions, but the roles that enabled them to negotiate toleration also sat alongside other ideas about their own identity. The experience of being refugees and exiles in the sixteenth century fundamentally shaped Mennonite narratives. This was not unusual among migrant groups. Several scholars have argued that many communities adopted the status of exile as a central pillar of their identity.⁶⁶ Later generations of Huguenots, for example, wrote histories of exile into their family histories, and martyr narratives became a form of argument in religious debates about identity and community.⁶⁷ The power of the exile narrative and the idea of seeking a place of refuge remained a powerful force shaping Mennonite identity, even in more settled times. Mennonites did not have a key origin story around one event like the Revocation of Nantes, but persecution was woven into their culture. Menno Simons's life had been one of exile and this profoundly shaped his theology. The Dordrecht confession of faith embedded the idea of refugee status in Mennonite theology if necessity require it, flee for the Lord's sake from one city or country into another, and suffer the spoiling of our goods.⁶⁸ Mennonites in the Vistula Delta, in west Prussia, enjoyed relative stability in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and it seems they rarely used the term 'refugee', but their own remembered pasts recalled times of persecution and martyrdom. The *Martyrs Mirror* was a central part of Mennonite culture, and Vistula Delta Mennonites recounted martyr stories elsewhere. The *Lehn Diary* transcribed a letter received from the Swiss communities which recounted the first martyrdoms of the 1520s and the true origin of their faith.⁶⁹

One of the key questions on which the issue of toleration often rested was Mennonite attitudes to military service and their willingness to support the military interests of the state. It was often for this reason that rulers renegotiated terms of settlement, but also why Mennonites took it into their hands to become exiles and move. In this way, the notion of being a refugee or an outsider was intimately related to ideas about violence, the state and non-resistance. In Mennonite narratives their stance on non-resistance was inextricably linked with the martyrdom of their past. For those actively persecuted the unwillingness to engage in violence was a refusal to enact revenge and to inflict harm; for more settled communities, pacifist tendencies meant not supporting military endeavours. These ideas were powerfully connected, both non-resistance and anti-militarism, and the notion of being exiles and refugees who held to the true faith. Heinrich Donner related a remarkable incident of a preacher who stood up to the King of Sweden in 1709 and preached the virtue of non-resistance.⁷⁰ Donner looked back to Funk as a hero with a knowledge of truth which was now lacking. Many of his fellow Mennonites agreed to military service for the sake of land and so betrayed their faith and their origins.⁷¹ Within the changed context of the eighteenth century, the persecution and pacifism of past centuries still mattered, and within the context framed by the demands of Prussian politics,

Mennonite communities shaped their own sense of belonging as outsiders, refugees and migrants.

Mennonite communities were also linked to refugee identities through local and international networks, which allowed them to mobilize support for migrant groups across the various states. For west Prussian Mennonites, the notion of belonging to a community of diasporic refugees was reinforced by the history of east Prussian Mennonites, whose experience was a constant reminder of the dangers of exile. When communities were expelled in 1724, following short-lived toleration in the early eighteenth century, many went to west Prussia. When more expulsions followed, according to Jantzen, the 'trauma' of this double exile inspired fear among Mennonites about the dangers of living in Prussia.⁷² Bonds much further afield also connected Prussian Mennonites to brothers and sisters in need elsewhere. Swiss Anabaptists and many in northern Germany were still subject to exile and persecution, and Dutch Mennonites established a financial and humanitarian network which supported fellow Mennonites. The Fonds voor Buitenlandsche Nooden (Dutch Relief Fund for Foreign Needs) organized substantial relief efforts for communities suffering from persecution, starvation and intolerance. Collections were coordinated throughout Europe at various points of crisis, with some of the most notable collections made for Mennonites in the Palatinate in the 1690s and Bern in 1710, when refugees fled to the Netherlands and other more tolerant places such as Krefeld. The Prussian Mennonites themselves were the recipients of aid in 1714 as the crises of war and plague hit.⁷³

These networks of international support were not unique to Mennonites. Geert Janssen has argued that the basis of transnational humanitarian bonds lay in the activities of these exile networks, not the efforts of states and rulers.⁷⁴ The powerful webs of international aid may have been particularly important for Mennonites, as nowhere were they dominant or in power. They remind us that migration management was not a top-down process directed by states, but that the treatment and negotiations around refugees were shaped by these networks of migrants themselves. The network of connected communities moulded the Mennonite imagination in particular ways by reinforcing the idea of being part of a refugee diaspora and of creating the possibility of continued migration. Mennonites were distinct in this respect, for their idea of exile did not generally hold out the possibility of return, of the hope of a nation to recover. Mennonite communities lobbied for their position amidst the dynamics of state and imperial politics and supported fellow brethren in need. The *privilegium* that Russian Mennonites negotiated with Tsar Paul in 1800, for example, extended the promise of exemption from military service and guaranteed certain customary inheritance rights.⁷⁵ As migrants valued for their economic contributions, these settlement agreements occurred elsewhere, such as the toleration afforded skilled Mennonites in the Rhineland in the seventeenth century.⁷⁶ But despite such agreements, Mennonites were also always prepared to move elsewhere in the search for somewhere they could live out lives in the way they desired.

Conclusion

The pragmatic considerations that shaped attitudes to Prussian Mennonite refugees, the uneven rhythms of toleration and expulsion, and the role of these communities

in economic networks, state building and processes of internal colonization mirror many refugee experiences elsewhere in early modern Europe. But there are distinctive elements of the Mennonite story. Mennonites, neither Protestant nor Catholic, yet not confessional outsiders in the same way as Jewish populations were, held a distinct place in European imaginations. Rarely were they talked about as religious refugees, perhaps because they could not share in this sense of Protestant identity, but as the taint of heresy associated with Münster dissipated, they were able to negotiate a place in areas such as early modern Prussia. Crucial to the ability to settlement agreements was the way in which they built themselves a lasting reputation as good farmers, not troublemakers. Their credentials for working the land and making it fertile were established early on in Prussia, and they stuck. Being good farmers was a label which authorities applied to them but one on which they also relied, and which allowed them to jostle for position. Despite their unwillingness to partake in many of the social practices common to other subjects, such as swearing oaths or fighting, they made themselves useful in other ways – predominantly through economic success. Mennonites reveal dramatically how malleable could be the status of those once classed as refugees and how perceptions shifted. They were sometimes useful, sometimes problematic, and authorities adjusted their treatment accordingly.

However, Mennonites too had their own agency in the process of refugee politics, not only in negotiating their position but also shaping their narrative, their reputation and their communities. Always underpinning Mennonite communities was the power of the refugee and martyr narrative. Stories of persecution, refuge and exile were passed on in congregations and have helped propel migration, as they sought for other places of refuge in the event of persecution or changing fortunes.⁷⁷ Just as those in power came to see Mennonites in different ways in a shifting world of refugee and migration management, so too many Mennonites adjusted to new circumstances, as they were forced to move or contemplate altered conditions of settlement. And Mennonites who no longer felt welcome in a place they had once called home might prove welcome recruits elsewhere, as was the case for Prussian Mennonites who left for the southern Russian empire. These politics of refuge allow us to understand the way in which these experiences of migration have shaped not just states and empires, but also communities and individuals as they grappled with the process of settlement and migration.

Notes

- 1 Hermann Mannhardt, *Die Danziger Mennonitengemeinde: ihre Entstehung und ihre Geschichte von 1569-1919: Denkschrift zur Erinnerung an das 350 jährige Bestehen der Gemeinde und an die Jahrhundertfeier unseres Kirchenbaus am 14* (Danzig: Danziger Mennonitengemeinde, 1919). English translation: *The Danzig Mennonite Church: Its Origin and History from 1569-1919*, ed. and trans. Mark Jantzen and John D. Thiesen (North Newton: Bethel College; Kitchener: Pandora Press, 2007), 37; Peter J. Klassen, *Mennonites in Early Modern Poland and Prussia* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2009), 21–5. See the text of the play *Gysbreght van Aemstel* by Joost van den

Vondel which talks of a people in trouble and tells them to seek lands in Prussia to the east to build a New Holland.

Zijn wil is, dat gy treckt naer 't vette lant van Pruissen,
 Daer uit het Poolsch gebergt de Wijsseelstroom komt ruisschen,
 Die d'oevers rijck van vrucht genoeghelijck bespoelt.
 Verhou u daer, en wacht tot dat de wraeck verkoelt.
 Gy zult in dit gewest een stadt, Nieuw Hollant, bouwen . . . ?

Taken from the 1659 edition, p. 63. Online at https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/vond001gysb04_01/vond001gysb04_01_0010.php.

- 2 For an outline see Hans-Jürgen Goertz, *The Anabaptists*, trans. Trevor Johnson (London and New York: Routledge, 1996).
- 3 Neither the Peace of Augsburg (1555) nor the Peace of Westphalia (1648), for example, recognised Anabaptists/Mennonites as a legal entity. See James Urry, *Mennonites, Politics and Peoplehood: Europe – Russia – Canada 1525-1980* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2006), 59–61.
- 4 The continued importance of the martyr stories was reflected in the *Martyrs Mirror*. See for example John D. Roth, 'The Complex Legacy of the Martyrs Mirror among Mennonites in North America', *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 87, no. 3 (2013): 277–316.
- 5 Nicholas Terpstra, *Religious Refugees in the Early Modern World: An Alternative History of the Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015). Mennonites feature, for example, in studies by Susanna Lachenicht, 'Refugee "Nations" and Empire-Building in the Early Modern Period', *Journal of Early Modern Christianity* 6, no. 2 (2019): 99–109; Benjamin Kaplan, *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), and Alexander Schunka, 'Konfession, Staat und Migration in der Frühen Neuzeit', in *Handbuch Staat und Migration in Deutschland seit dem 17. Jahrhundert*, ed. Joachim Olmer (Oldenbourg: De Gruyter, 2015), 117–70. Michael Driedger's excellent work covers the Mennonite communities who fled to Hamburg and Altona. Michael D. Driedger, *Obedient Heretics: Mennonite Identities in Lutheran Hamburg and Altona During the Confessional Age* (London and New York: Routledge, 2002).
- 6 For accounts of Prussian and Russian Mennonite history see Klassen, *Mennonites in Early Modern Poland* and Urry, *Mennonites, Politics and Peoplehood*.
- 7 For example, Benjamin Kaplan, 'The Legal Rights of Religious Refugees in the "Refugee-Cities" of Early Modern Europe', *Journal of Refugee Studies* 32, no. 1 (2018): 86–105; Geert Janssen, 'The Republic of the Refugees: Early Modern Migrations and the Dutch Experience', *The Historical Journal* 60, no. 1 (2017): 233–52; Jesse Spohnholz and Gary K. Waite, eds, *Exile and Religious Identity, 1500–1800* (London and New York: Routledge, 2018); Alexander Schunka, *Gäste, die bleiben: Zuwanderer in Kursachsen und der Oberlausitz im 17. und frühen 18. Jahrhundert* (Münster: LIT, 2006); Owen Stanwood, *The Global Refuge: Huguenots in an Age of Empire* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2019).
- 8 Frédéric Hartweg, 'Influence culturelle et intégration linguistique du refuge huguenot à Berlin au XVIII^e siècle', in *Le Refuge Hugenout in Allemagne* (Paris: CNRS, 1981); Thomas Klingebiel, 'Huguenot Settlements in Central Europe', and Mack Walker, 'The Salzburger Migration to Prussia', in *In Search of Peace and Prosperity: New German Settlements in Eighteenth-Century Europe and America*, ed. Hartmut Lehmann and

- Hermann Wellenreuther (University Park: Penn State Press, 2000), 39–76; Jason Coy, Jared Poley and Alexander Schunka, eds, *Migrations in the German Lands, 1500–2000* (New York: Bergbahn Books, 2018); Helmut Schnitter, ‘The Refugees in the Army of Brandenburg-Prussia: “Those Unfortunate Banished People from France”’, in *War, Religion and Service: Huguenot Soldiering, 1685–1713*, ed. Matthew Glozier and David Onnekink (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007) 145–59.
- 9 Richard D. Scheuerman and Clifford E. Trafzer, *Hardship to Homeland: Pacific Northwest Volga Germans* (Pullmann: Washington State University Press, 2018).
 - 10 On this problematic legacy see Jessica Carol Lowe, ‘The Price of Belonging: Negotiating Anabaptist Inclusion and Exclusion in the Northwestern Holy Roman Empire, 1535–1744’ (PhD diss., Vanderbilt University, Nashville, 2021).
 - 11 The various patterns of settlement were complicated. A good overview can be found in: Eric Lohrey, ‘Übersicht der Mennonitengemeinde in Westpreußen, Ostpreußen, Brandenburg (Neumark) und Polan (zwischen Plock und Warschau)’, https://mla.bethelks.edu/information/mpsa/lohrey_uebersicht.pdf (accessed 2 February 2022). On the political background see Klassen, *Mennonites in Early Modern Poland*, 23–8.
 - 12 Wilhelm Mannhardt, *Die Wehrfreiheit der altpreussischen Mennoniten: Eine geschichtliche Erörterung* (Marienburg: Im Selbstverlage der Altpreussischen Mennonitengemeinden: in Commission bei B. Hermann Hemmpels Wwe., 1863), 92–5; Klassen, *Mennonites in Early Modern Poland*, 47–95.
 - 13 Naming regions is not always straightforward, for Prussia itself was not unified. West or Polish Prussia was the lands around the lower Vistula, and it became part of Royal Prussia under the Polish crown. East Prussia, that was Ducal Prussia, constituted the former lands of the Teutonic Knights which became a hereditary Duchy. From 1773 both were incorporated as provinces of the new Kingdom of Prussia.
 - 14 The classic account of Mennonites in east Prussia is Eric Randt, *Die Mennoniten in Ostpreussen und Litauen bis zum Jahre 1772* (Königsberg: Randt, 1912). See also Klassen, *Mennonites in Early Modern Poland*, 88–94; Horst Penner, ‘East Prussia’, *Global Anabaptist Mennonite Encyclopedia Online* (1955), https://gameo.org/index.php?title=East_prussia&oldid=161268 (accessed 31 May 2021). There are also online resources such as Manuel Janz, ‘Die ersten 100 Jahre in Ostpreußen – oder: Der lange Weg, in der Elchniederung sesshaft zu warden’, https://chort.square7.ch/Buch/OP_100T1.htm (accessed 5 October 2021).
 - 15 Klassen, *Mennonites in Early Modern Poland*, 89.
 - 16 In the Rhineland city of Rheydt, for example, in 1694 a fire destroyed a large area of the city. Mennonites were implicated, imprisoned, fined and finally expelled, many of whom found refuge in nearby Krefeld. On the Rheydt Mennonites see Lowe, ‘The Price of Belonging’.
 - 17 For details see Mark Jantzen, ‘The Trouble with Marrying Prussian Lutheran Boys: The End of Exogamous Marriages in the Mennonite Community in the Polish Vistula Delta, 1713–1808’, in *Sisters: Myth and Reality of Anabaptist, Mennonite, and Doopsgezind Women, ca 1525–1900*, ed. Piet Visser (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 285–7; Klassen, *Mennonites in Early Modern Poland*, 93, 97, 119; Susanna Lachenicht, ‘Refugees and Refugee Protection in the Early Modern Period’, *Journal of Refugee Studies* 30, no. 2 (2017): 272; Urry, *Mennonites, Politics and Peoplehood*.
 - 18 A particularly useful primary source collection for the negotiations that occurred is the ‘Hildebrand Nachlass’, Unclassified, Mennonite Heritage Centre Archives, Winnipeg. On Mennonites in Russia see Urry, *Mennonites, Politics and Peoplehood*,

- and a recent volume edited by Leonard G. Friesen, *Minority Report: Mennonite Identities in Imperial Russia and Soviet Ukraine* (London and Toronto: UTP, 2018).
- 19 Lachenicht, 'Refugees and Refugee Protection'; Terpstra, *Religious Refugees*, particularly chapter 3.
 - 20 Terpstra, *Religious Refugees*, 241; Kaplan, *Divided by Faith*.
 - 21 John C. Wenger, 'Franconia Mennonites and Military Service, 1683-1923', *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 10, no. 4 (1936): 222-45.
 - 22 See for example Lachenicht, 'Refugees and Refugee Protection'.
 - 23 See Kat Hill, 'God's Theatre: Global Conceptions of Space in the Early Modern Mennonite Diaspora, c. 1550-1800', *Journal of Early Modern History* (forthcoming).
 - 24 On privileges and mandates see Urry, *Mennonites, Politics and Peoplehood*, 58-89. Copies of many of these relating to Prussian Mennonites can be found in the Mennonite Heritage Centre Archive, Winnipeg, West Prussian Collection 3369, 3, 'Religions-Privilegien'.
 - 25 Klassen, *Mennonites in Early Modern Poland*, 31.
 - 26 Hanserezesse, Band 4, vol. 2 (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1890), 24-5, 83.
 - 27 Klassen, *Mennonites in Early Modern Poland*, 56-8. On the van Loysens see Christian Hege and Nanne van der Zijpp, 'Loysen (Loisen, Loytzen)', *Global Anabaptist Mennonite Encyclopedia Online* (1957), [https://gameo.org/index.php?title=Loysen_\(Loisen,_Loytzen\)&oldid=144284](https://gameo.org/index.php?title=Loysen_(Loisen,_Loytzen)&oldid=144284) (accessed 3 June 2021).
 - 28 'mehrentheils eine sumpfige, unbrauchbare, mit Rohr und Strauch bewachsene Gegend', *Die Chronik begann Heinrich Donner (1735-1805), der 1772 zum Ältesten gewählt wurde. Sein Sohn Johann Donner (geb. 1771), Ältester von 1804-1830, führte diese weiter* (hereafter *Orlofferfelde Chronik*), 1. For the chronicle see Kirchenbuch der Orlofferfelde Mennonitengemeinde: Geburten, Taufen, Trauungen, Todesfälle 1727-1857, Mennonitische Forschungstelle Weierhof (hereafter MFS, KB.OR.01) and also available online at <https://mla.bethelks.edu/Prussian%20Polish%20Mennonite%20sources/orlofferfeldechronik.html>.
 - 29 *Geschichte des Schwetzer Kreises 1466-1873 von Hans Maercker*. Band II. *Eine polnische Starostei und ein preussischer Landrathskreis*. *Zeitschrift des Westpreussischen Geschichtsvereins*, Heft 17-19 (Danzig: Th. Bertling, 1886-8), 54.
 - 30 Urry, *Mennonites, Politics and Peoplehood*, 61-2.
 - 31 'Das Berufungs Privil. ist nicht mehr vohanden', *Orlofferfelde Chronik*, 1.
 - 32 For the text of this see Mannhardt, *Die Wehrfreiheit der altpreussischen Mennoniten*, LX-LXI (1, Lat.) and 80 ff for the German. See also Urry, *Mennonites, Politics and Peoplehood*, 64-6.
 - 33 Terpstra, *Religious Refugees*, 182.
 - 34 Lachenicht, 'Refugees and Refugee Protection', 266-9.
 - 35 On the negotiations with Bartsch and Hoepfner see Adolf Ens, 'The Tie That Binds: and Russian Mennonites 1788-1794', *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 8 (1990): 34-51; Lawrence Klippenstein, 'Four Letters to Susanna from Johann Bartsch, A Danzig Mennonite Land Scout, 1786-87', *The Polish Review* 54, no. 1 (2009): 31-59.
 - 36 Kaplan, 'The Legal Rights of Religious Refugees'; Lachenicht, 'Refugees and Refugee Protection'.
 - 37 Kaplan, 'The Legal Rights of Religious Refugees', 99.
 - 38 See for example Cory Davis, "'Their Hands Made the Case. . .': Pragmatic Toleration of Anabaptists in the Electoral Palatinate, 1650-1664", in *Thinking Outside the Cages: New Directions in the Reformation*, ed. Geoffrey Dipple and Kat Hill (forthcoming).

- 39 On the role of Huguenots in the project of empire see Lachenicht, 'Refugees and Refugee Protection'; Owen Stanwood, 'Between Eden and Empire: Huguenot Refugees and the Promise of New Worlds', *American Historical Review* 118, no. 5 (2013): 1319–44.
- 40 John C. Wenger, *History of the Mennonites of the Franconia Conference* (Telford: Franconia Mennonite Historical Society, 1937), 14.
- 41 Royden Loewen, 'The Quiet on the Land: The Environment in Mennonite Historiography', *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 23 (2005): 151–64, here 161.
- 42 Kaplan, 'The Legal Rights of Religious Refugees', 99.
- 43 See Urry, *Mennonites, Politics and Peoplehood*, 123–8; Helmut Huebert, *Hierschau: An Example of Russian Mennonite Life* (Winnipeg: Springfield Publishers, 1986), 15–16.
- 44 Klassen, *Mennonites in Early Modern Poland*, 134–5.
- 45 *Ibid.*, 135.
- 46 Abraham Hartwich, *Geographisch-Historische Landes-Beschreibung derer dreyen im Pohlischen Preussen liegenden Werdern, als des Dantziger-Elbing- und Marienburgischen* (Koenigsberg: Johann David Zancker, 1722), 290.
- 47 Klassen, *Mennonites in Early Modern Poland*, 188. On *Schutzgeld* see Jessica Carol Lowe, 'Considering Seventeenth-Century *Schutzgeld*', *Anabaptist Historians*, 28 May 2020, <https://anabaptisthistorians.org/2020/05/28/considering-seventeenth-century-schutzgeld/> (accessed 21 October 2021).
- 48 Klassen, *Mennonites in Early Modern Poland*, 85, 93.
- 49 Urry, *Mennonites, Politics and Peoplehood*, 61, 67.
- 50 Klassen, *Mennonites in Early Modern Poland*, 35, 73–7.
- 51 'Transcription from the Gothic script and translation of the Lehn Diary', ed. Waldemar Henry Lehn (2010). Photocopy taken from MHCA, Winnipeg: *Orloffelfelde Chronik*, 3.
- 52 Karl-Erik Frandsen, *The Last Plague in the Baltic Region 1709-1713* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 2010); Edmund Kizik, ed., *Dżuma, ospa, cholera. W trzechsetną rocznicę wielkiej epidemii w Gdańsku i na ziemiach Rzeczypospolitej w latach 1708–1711. Materiały z konferencji naukowej zorganizowanej przez Muzeum Historyczne Miasta Gdańska i Instytut Historii PAN w dniach 21–22 maja 2009* (Gdańsk: Muzeum Historyczne Miasta Gdańska, 2012); Jerzt Cyberski et al., 'History of Floods on the River Vistula', *Hydrological Sciences Journal* 51, no. 5 (2006): 813.
- 53 See Kirchenbuch der Mennoniten-Gemeinde Danzig, Preussen 1638-1809. Geburten, Taufen, Trauungen, Todesfälle, Predigerliste, Mennonitische Forschungsstelle Weierhof, Ker 2 Da 01, 214.
- 54 Klassen, *Mennonites in Early Modern Poland*, 75.
- 55 Jantzen, 'The Trouble with Marrying Prussian Lutheran Boys', 286.
- 56 Lachenicht, 'Refugees and Refugee Protection.'
- 57 Jantzen, 'The Trouble with Marrying Prussian Lutheran Boys', 284–7; Mack Walker, *The Salzburg Transaction: Expulsion and Redemption in Eighteenth-Century Germany* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992), 86–7.
- 58 Lowe, 'The Price of Belonging.'
- 59 Walker, *Salzburg Transaction*, 82.
- 60 Klassen, *Mennonites in Early Modern Poland*, 190–4.
- 61 Thomas Dahms, 'Diligent Bureaucrats and the Expulsion of Jews from West Prussia, 1772–1786', *German History* 39, no. 3 (2021): 335–57.
- 62 On taxation of Mennonites see Mark Jantzen, 'Creating Proper Citizens: Prussian Taxation Policies Toward Mennonites, 1773-1927', in *Taxation, State and Civil Society*

- in *Germany and the United States from the 18th to the 20th Century*, ed. Alexander Nützenadel and Christoph Strupp (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2007), 97–113.
- 63 Dahms, ‘Diligent Bureaucrats’, 342.
- 64 On Mennonites who stayed see Mark Jantzen, *Mennonite German Soldiers Nation, Religion and Family in the Prussian East, 1772–1880* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010).
- 65 Mark Jantzen, ‘Wealth and Power in the Vistula River Mennonite Community, 1772–1914’, *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 27 (2009): 93–4.
- 66 Terpstra, *Religious Refugees*, 4. See Johannes Müller, *Exile Memories and the Dutch Revolt: The Narrated Diaspora, 1550–1750* (Leiden: Brill, 2016).
- 67 Johannes Müller, ‘From Diaspora to “Imagined Minority”: Memories of Persecution and the Cross-generational Transformation of Protestant Migrant Networks in Early Modern Europe’, *Diasporas* 31 (2018): 21–34.
- 68 ‘Dordrecht Confession of Faith (Mennonite, 1632)’, Global Anabaptist Mennonite Encyclopedia Online, [https://gameo.org/index.php?title=Dordrecht_Confession_of_Faith_\(Mennonite,_1632\)&oldid=14640](https://gameo.org/index.php?title=Dordrecht_Confession_of_Faith_(Mennonite,_1632)&oldid=14640) (accessed 28 September 2021).
- 69 ‘Lehn Diary’, 44–5.
- 70 <https://mla.bethelks.edu/Prussian%20Polish%20Mennonite%20sources/orloffferfeldechronik.html>, 5.
- 71 Klassen, *Mennonites in Early Modern Poland*, 188.
- 72 Jantzen, ‘The Trouble with Marrying Prussian Lutheran Boys’, 288.
- 73 For material relating to this aid see *Documents of Brotherly Love. Dutch Mennonite Aid to Swiss Anabaptists*, introduced, transcribed, translated, and annotated by James W. Lowry; edited by David J. Rempel Smucker and John L. Ruth, *vol 1: 1635-1709* (Millersburg: Ohio Amish Library, 2007), *vol 2: 1710-1711* (Millersburg: Ohio Amish Library, 2015). Also W. J. Kühhler, ‘Dutch Mennonite Relief Work in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries’, *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 17 (1943): 87–94; Jeremy Bangs, *New Light on the Old Colony Plymouth, the Dutch Context of Toleration, and Patterns of Pilgrim Commemoration* (Leiden: Brill, 2019), especially chapter 10: ‘Dutch Aid to Persecuted Swiss and Palatine Mennonites, 1615–1699’, 267–336.
- 74 Janssen, ‘The Legacy of Exile and the Rise of Humanitarianism’, in *Remembering the Reformation*, ed. Brian Cummings, Ceri Law, Karis Riley and Alexandra Walsham (London: Routledge, 2020), 226–42.
- 75 Urry, *Mennonites, Politics and Peoplehood*, 124–6.
- 76 Davis, ‘Pragmatic Toleration of Anabaptists’.
- 77 See for example John P. R. Eichner, *Exiled Among Nations: German and Mennonite Mythologies in a Transnational Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019).

Engineering the Refuge

Switzerland, England and the Huguenots, 1685–1700

Owen Stanwood

In 1689 Sir Thomas Coxe made his way from The Hague to Switzerland. The ‘envoy extraordinary’ of the English monarchs William and Mary, who had recently come to power following the Glorious Revolution, Coxe concerned himself mainly with defending his king and queen’s interests in a remote but critical part of Europe, an odd collection of Protestant and Catholic cantons perched at the door of France. With the recent start of the War of the League of Augsburg, a conflict that placed William III as the nominal leader of a coalition of European powers against Louis XIV, Switzerland took on new importance. Coxe intended at least to keep the neutral Swiss from aiding the French, and his great ambition was to enlist the cantons in what he referred to as ‘the good cause’, the transnational union to beat back the Catholic imperial ambitions of the Sun King.¹

As he travelled, however, Coxe came to harbour another goal. Crossing Europe, he found Huguenot refugees everywhere. From 1685 onwards, tens of thousands of Protestants surreptitiously escaped France, where Louis XIV had banned their religion, settling as refugees throughout Protestant Europe. These newcomers tugged at the heartstrings of charitable Protestants, even as they taxed the resources of local authorities. As a good godly man, Coxe shared the desire of many of his coreligionists to help the Huguenots. This was not surprising, as Coxe had lived in France and had many Huguenot friends, including perhaps the most famous of them all, the Rotterdam minister Pierre Jurieu, who confidently predicted in 1686 that the persecution of his people marked a sign of the coming apocalypse. Nonetheless, Coxe’s outreach to the refugees represented more than charity. As he crossed Europe, he realized that the French Protestants could help him to accomplish his larger goals. Everywhere he went the refugees waited on him with respect, considering Coxe as the prime representative of Europe’s Protestant hero. They pledged their service to William and Mary, though not without expecting some charity in return. Coxe came to see that the refugees could be important tools in the Protestant cause. Working with other Protestant leaders, he championed or collaborated on a variety of schemes, which over the subsequent decade moved, or tried to move, thousands of Huguenots from Central Europe to the

far reaches of the empire, particularly to Ireland, but later to more distant colonies in the Gulf of Mexico and Virginia.²

These Huguenot communities have never lacked historians, but they have rarely been studied as a coherent unit. After all, when the refugees scattered, they became embroiled in a variety of national stories. Individual countries welcomed the Huguenots for distinct reasons: the Dutch and English wanted to use the newcomers to jumpstart certain trades and industries, for instance, while German princes aimed to overcome recent population losses and develop the agricultural sector. Once in their new homes, moreover, the refugees tended to assimilate quickly, at least by the second generation in most places. While these local stories are important and interesting, they have tended to obscure the larger networks that held them together.³ This chapter aims to illuminate these networks, showing the larger diplomatic, religious and economic processes that propelled the Huguenots around Europe, and occasionally beyond.

There are two key lessons to this story. The first concerns the power of informal, transnational networks in early modern Europe. The refugees had dispersed around the continent and possessed no durable institutions, but they quickly attained enormous political influence during the 1680s, to the extent that the envoy of a powerful state sought them out as allies. Their strength came out of conviction and connections. To begin, the Huguenots managed to promote themselves as emblems of the Protestant cause. They fashioned a discourse about their own role in sacred history that inspired many Protestant leaders to support them. Beyond that, they offered practical advantages as potential allies or subjects of Protestant rulers. The Huguenots had recently defected from France and possessed intelligence about life in that country. The refugees also had certain skills – for instance, the ability to produce valuable commodities like silk and wine, or to grow flax or make furniture – that could benefit any country that granted them refuge. Moreover, the very fact of their dispersion proved a political advantage, since they could lobby numerous rulers and use contacts around the continent to send goods, money and intelligence from one side of Europe to the other. The Huguenots thus became perfect exemplars of what scholars have labelled the ‘Protestant International’, a transnational union that combined religious and economic motives and worked beyond the boundaries of any one state.⁴

Nonetheless, as important as the Protestant International might have been, states mattered as well. The ambassador may have wanted to cultivate the Huguenots, but the refugees needed him more. Stateless people in a continent at war, the refugees were in constant peril. In France itself they faced persecution, prison or worse, while as refugees they often suffered discrimination and material hardship. The only people who could help them, they found, were those who ran large institutions: churches, chartered companies and especially governments. After 1689, William and Mary’s England proved the most fertile ground for support. To get aid, however, the Huguenots had to make themselves useful to their new masters, and that meant volunteering to go places where most people were unwilling to go. Thus, thousands of Huguenots in Switzerland found themselves heading to unusual places, from Ireland to North America and even occasionally to South America, the East Indies or Africa. States (and empires) mattered; the transnational Huguenots eventually learned to temper their own ambitions and blend in as useful national and imperial subjects. The story of these

refugees demonstrates how states depended on informal networks, and how networks often became subsumed within expanding state structures. In the end, though, as we will see, state actors rarely lived up to their end of the bargain, often leaving the refugees flailing as they tried to find a place in an unpredictable, changing world.⁵

Transnational Huguenots

The origins of the Huguenot diaspora lay in the tumultuous politics of the 1680s. Throughout the decade the nation's Protestants felt besieged, as Louis XIV chipped away at the protections in the Edict of Nantes, a guarantee of limited rights that the king's grandfather had signed to end France's religious wars in 1598. By October 1685, Louis declared the old edict to be null and void, forcing the conversion of the kingdom's approximately 750,000 Protestants. Most Huguenots acquiesced to the king's demands and abjured their faiths, but a sizable minority of close to 150,000–200,000 souls chose flight to conversion, sneaking over the borders in every direction, intending to find refuge in Protestant states. This massive exodus created what historians have called *le Refuge*, a global diaspora that scattered the Huguenots around Europe and, eventually, to places as far afield as North America and southern Africa.⁶

The small, landlocked realm of Switzerland played a critical role in the development of the Refuge. Part of its importance lay in its location. Many of France's Protestants lived in the southern swath of the kingdom stretching from Lyon to Montpellier, and the easiest retreat involved an overland journey to Geneva, an independent city-state poised between France and Switzerland. While Geneva remained the intellectual and emotional centre of Francophone Protestantism, most refugees did not stay. Genevan leaders depended on Louis XIV for grain supplies, and while the refugees were popular heroes to many Genevans, authorities encouraged them to move on to the adjacent Pays de Vaud, and from there to the German-speaking Protestant centres of Bern and Zurich. During the mid-1680s all of these regions experienced what can only be called a refugee crisis. Staggering numbers of Huguenots crossed the border, many of them destitute. Geneva's 'bourse française', founded a century earlier to accommodate a previous stream of refugees, spent nearly 80 *ecus* each day during the fall of 1685, and ran out of money in early November.⁷ Hospitals in the Pays de Vaud refashioned themselves to help ailing refugees, and most towns dedicated a share of alms-collection to their cause. But the numbers kept increasing. In Schaffhausen, for instance, a Protestant city on the German border, 530 refugees passed through in 1685, over 5,000 the following year and 9,006 in 1687, as some of the disgruntled refugees in Switzerland joined newcomers from France in seeking new retreats.⁸

In the face of these great challenges, refugee leaders waged an astute propaganda war. They lobbied Protestant leaders to grant them refuge, mainly by calling on their own status as persecuted people of God, perhaps with a special role in sacred history. The best intellectual argument came from Pierre Jurieu, whose 1686 bestseller *L'Accomplissement des prophéties* (translated as *The Accomplishment of the Scripture Prophecies*) identified the Huguenots as the 'two witnesses in sackcloth' in the book of Revelation. In the prophecy, the forces of Antichrist slayed the witnesses, who lay

dead in the 'Great City' for three and half days before coming back to life, at which time Antichrist began to decline. Jurieu interpreted days as years and the Great City as France, meaning that the Huguenots would rise again sometime in 1689. Until that time, Protestant leaders had a responsibility to preserve the witnesses, he wrote, by offering 'asylum and aid' to the refugees, and especially to 'Pastors, who God preserves to relight the torch of pure doctrine'. In addition, Jurieu believed that the Bible prophesied a political union, described in scripture as the 'people and kindred and tongues and nations' who were in truth 'the chosen, the elect among the people, the faithful scattered around all the nations of Europe', whose task was to prevent 'the total destruction of the Reformation in France'. Jurieu's militancy bothered some elite Huguenots – especially those who believed rapprochement with Louis XIV was still possible – but proved very popular with ordinary refugees, and soon became a central plank in Huguenot politics even for those who otherwise distrusted the Rotterdam minister. It also proved popular in England, where a steady stream of Jurieu's translated works appeared during the 1680s and 1690s.⁹

Jurieu and other refugee leaders believed that the Huguenots would play a distinct role in the creation of this anti-French political coalition. The refugees would disperse around the continent and become ambassadors for the Protestant cause in whatever places they could be useful. At the same time, they needed to maintain enough autonomy to preserve their language and liturgy. They meant to do something quite novel: create a transnational state composed of hundreds of 'colonies' around Europe. An internal memorandum, written by a minister in Switzerland, outlined how refugee leaders could form these colonies. The first step was to identify prospective homelands, places with sympathetic rulers and plenty of available land. Next, representatives of the Swiss Huguenot communities would visit these places and make sure the land 'would be good enough to live up to the work and hope of the refugees'. The next step was to convince leaders to grant the newcomers enough advantages that the establishment would succeed. The *mémoire* suggested a secular argument: the newcomers would 'augment the number of subjects' and bring in new tax revenues. They would also 'be obliged to a much greater fidelity, obedience, and service by the recognition of the graces that had been granted to them'. The Huguenots would be perfect subjects, while the 'colonies will become eternal monuments to the charity that they [the princes] had shown toward the poor people'. In short, it was in the interests of all rulers to assent to the creation of refugee colonies in their territories – not just as an act of charity but to strengthen their states.¹⁰ If they could find no refuge, claimed another *mémoire*, the Huguenots would be forced to leave Switzerland and return to France, and those persecuted people who remained in that kingdom would not be able to leave. All of this would be a great blow not just for the French Protestants themselves, but for the whole Protestant interest.¹¹

Ministers and gentlemen fanned out from Switzerland in several directions to look for patrons. The first and greatest was Friedrich Wilhelm I, elector of Brandenburg, who welcomed thousands of refugees, granting them land, tax relief and political autonomy.¹² By 1687, however, these lands had mostly filled up, so a committee of Huguenots meeting in Berlin's French Church divided Europe into five departments and sent representatives to look for new retreats. Perhaps the most important route

went to the lawyer Henri de Mirmand and the minister Claude Brousson, who headed to the Netherlands by way of Hamburg and other northern German cities. The two men found good wishes and vague promises of assistance wherever they went, whether in Hamburg, Emden or the towns and cities of Frisia, and they even acquired an audience with one of the most important men of all, Pensionary Gaspard Fagel, in The Hague. Nonetheless, Mirmand admitted that the mission had been a technical failure. Good wishes were not sufficient to provide land or food to refugees experiencing 'extreme necessity' in Switzerland, many of whom did not have the financial resources to undertake even the relatively short journey to Germany or the Netherlands.¹³

Soon after Mirmand's mission, however, a miracle occurred. The key patron of the Huguenots, after Friedrich Wilhelm's death, was the Dutch stadholder William of Orange. The prince had many ties to French Protestantism; his ancestral principality was a French Calvinist centre, and he had already established himself as the leader of the continental movement against Louis XIV. After 1685 he surrounded himself with refugees, many of whom entered his service as soldiers. In November 1688 William led an invasion force against his father-in-law James II, and in the series of events later known as the Glorious Revolution, he and his wife Mary wrested the English crown from its Catholic king. While it happened far away from Switzerland, the Revolution changed the fate of the refugees. Almost overnight, they spoke of nothing but going to England, which now had become the new promised land. In Lausanne, for instance, the local committee of refugees lauded the 'wonders that just arrived in England', noting that William's 'royal beneficence' was the only thing between them and extreme poverty or a return to persecution in France. Two Huguenot ministers quickly began lobbying in the new court of William and Mary, trying to obtain 'retreats to place people who can and will go farther', along with aid for the difficult journey across Europe.¹⁴ From Rotterdam, meanwhile, Pierre Jurieu noted that the Glorious Revolution had been ordained by God, and predicted in prophecy, as one of the signal events that would bring about the end of the Anti-Christian empire.¹⁵

The Irish Refuge

It was soon after this time that Thomas Coxe began his trek to Switzerland. Even before he got very far on his journey, he entered the thick of refugee politics. In The Hague he received an urgent dispatch from Pierre Jurieu, and he 'was loth to refuse a man of so much zeale and good intentions to his Matys Service'. Coxe was reluctant to reveal the contents of their conversation in writing, but they probably discussed using refugees to spy in and invade France, a favourite plan of the Rotterdam minister. In a letter to the king the ambassador relayed Jurieu's bold prediction that with a little English military support, 100,000 French Protestant soldiers could mobilize for service 'in a fournight'.¹⁶ About the same time he heard of the increasing numbers of French and Savoyard refugees in Switzerland, and of their good feelings about his master William III. According to reports, the refugees marched under English flags, chanting 'Vive le Roy Guillaume'.¹⁷ Along with promises of loyalty, meanwhile, came pleas for help. Henri de Mirmand sent a typical appeal through his friend, François de Gaultier,

urging Coxe to ask William to write a letter in the refugees' behalf to authorities in Bern. The men understood that their continued presence in Switzerland was taxing the resources and patience of their hosts, but they urged the English king to encourage Bernese officials to 'make a final effort of charity in our favor, during this next winter'. Mirmand believed that the English king's influence would inspire Bern's leaders to increase their efforts.¹⁸

In short, Coxe and the Huguenots needed each other. The ambassador's main task was to turn the Swiss against France and, if possible, to launch attacks against the enemy from within its borders, and the beleaguered refugees served as both a potent symbol of why the League of Augsburg fought, and a practical tool to use in the fight. As his meeting with Jurieu had undoubtedly underscored, the refugees had strategic value during a time of war. The Huguenots, meanwhile, were desperate. Many of them did legitimately espouse William and Mary's cause, but for Mirmand and Gaultier the practical tasks of feeding and housing their people mattered more than geopolitics. Mirmand called on the ambassador as soon as he arrived in Zurich, along with a refugee minister who 'made [Coxe] an Eloquent & patheticall discourse, turning chiefly upon ye late deorable condition of ye Prot: Rell: & ye great revivall of their hopes since ye happy accession of K. William to ye throne wth many zealous Expressions & Wishes for their Majtys'.¹⁹

Coxe realized in short order that the Huguenots were among his best friends in Zurich and Bern. While the leaders of the Protestant cantons continued to equivocate, refusing to join the war in earnest, ministers thundered from their pulpits about the fight against Antichrist, and some Huguenots privately promised the ambassador that they were arming themselves 'in a private and secret way' to take the fight to France at the first opportunity.²⁰ A constant stream of refugee visitors sought audiences with the ambassador, their names diligently recorded by his secretary, Élie Bouhéreau, who was a French refugee himself. On 21 December 1689, for instance, Coxe issued passports to twenty-nine men along with several women and children, 'who wished to travel to England, the men in order to bear arms'.²¹ Many of these would-be soldiers, who included noblemen, joined a large French regiment that helped William's forces in Ireland, where he faced off against the armies of the deposed James II and his Irish Catholic allies. According to Bouhéreau, the Bernese celebrated news of William's victory on the Boyne in July 1690 with 'fires of joy, fireworks, cannon volleys, lights in the windows, fountains of wine, [and] dancing'.²² François Gaultier believed the victory in Ireland cleared the way for his long-awaited invasion of France, in which an English-led refugee army would retake Languedoc by way of Switzerland. Once again, such a bold plan proved too ambitious for English military planners who were already fighting on several fronts. As much as Coxe and his Huguenot friends wanted to use the cantons as a base to push forward Jurieu's prophecies, they were not able to get the support and resources they needed.²³

Instead of an invasion, soon the refugees faced a heightened crisis. In the wake of several bad harvests, authorities in Bern decided to be rid of the refugees for good. All those that were able to march, they said, would have to leave in the spring. The Swiss made these resolutions with heavy hearts, they claimed, but could no longer support the Huguenots. There was not enough grain to go around, especially with

the war interfering with imports from France, and ordinary Swiss people had turned against the refugees in some instances, seeing them as competitors for food and work. The native Swiss were close to ‘mutiny and rebellion’, Coxe warned, while the refugees stood on the brink of starvation.²⁴ Both Swiss and Huguenot leaders came to Coxe to solve the problem. William, after all, was now Protestant Europe’s most powerful man, and he had depended on Huguenots for his military success in Ireland. Surely he could find some charity to help them in this moment of crisis.

Coxe took two tacks in his campaign for the refugees. First, he urged authorities in Bern and Zurich to grant the refugees more time, claiming that it was too difficult to find retreats for them during wartime. He chided his hosts for pushing the refugees into despair even as the ‘common enemy’ threatened to overrun Europe, and asked at least that they wait until they ‘find them a retreat close to some other Protestant power that has the will to receive them.’²⁵ Second, he made a vague promise of one such possible place of refuge, in Ireland itself, where the years of war were beginning to subside and many Protestant landlords had a lot of land and too few tenants. Settling Ireland with good Protestants had been an English obsession for decades, and several small groups of Huguenots had already settled there, especially during the early 1680s. Coxe must have realized that he could use one problem, the unwanted Huguenots in Switzerland, to solve another, the lack of Protestants in Ireland. It marked the first, but not last time that English authorities imagined they could harness the power of a transnational network to develop a neglected corner of the empire. This diplomatic strategy quickly proved effective. Leaders of Bern and Zurich were sufficiently chastened that they gave the refugees a reprieve, but they did so almost exclusively with the expectation that most of the poor Huguenots would soon leave for Ireland. Without that resolution, Coxe warned his English overlords that Switzerland could face a ‘generall-rebellion’ that expelled the refugees by force.²⁶

Various influential people around the Refuge mobilized to make the Irish colony a reality. One of the key players was Henri de Ruvigny. Previously the deputy general of the French Protestant churches, Ruvigny served William in Ireland and received lands and a title as the earl of Galway in return. Ruvigny laid out the possibilities of the programme in a late 1691 letter to Henri de Mirmand. While he resisted the overblown language of a ‘land of milk and honey’ that had characterized previous Irish colonization tracts, he lauded the possibilities of settlement there. There was plenty of cleared land that was vacant of people, and Protestant landlords saw the Huguenots as ‘the only means to reestablish their country, depopulated for a long time and even more so since the late war’. Ruvigny admitted the voyage to Ireland was ‘long and hard’, but insisted that those who formed ‘colonies’ there could ‘enrich themselves in a short time with little effort’. What was more, English officials fully supported the plan, as it would withdraw more people from France and ‘contribute very much to a raising security of the peace of that kingdom’.²⁷

The Huguenots sought to capitalize on the situation. In one representative petition, they aimed for the same advantages they had in German colonies, while promoting their own value to the realm. The potential migrants began with a political economic argument, noting that ‘the multitude of peoples is the happiness of kingdoms’, and that the most fertile lands would present ‘only horrors to our eyes’ without ‘the industry

of men' to cultivate the countryside, build great cities and encourage 'the sciences and arts' that distinguished Europeans from 'the barbarous nations of the world'. Moving to the case at hand, the petitioners noted that Ireland was a land with many natural advantages that remained nearly in a state of nature, largely because its native inhabitants, lazy and bigoted by Catholicism, refused to civilize the land. 'The most certain way to remedy all these disorders', the Huguenots added, 'and to make Ireland useful to you is to plant good colonies of new inhabitants with the opposite religion and morals to those of the Irish, and who can by their numbers and their diligence smother the spirit of revolt that is in them'. The French were the best potential colonists: they were good, industrious Protestants, who suffered for the faith, and helping them would serve 'Christian charity' and the interests of the state. Finally, the petitioners added that many other European princes, including the elector of Brandenburg, had made similar offers – a subtle call for the kinds of offers of land and autonomy that were common in Germany.²⁸

For the next few years Mirmand, Ruvigny and others worked hard to make the Irish colonial vision a reality. The general strategy remained the same for much of the decade: the earl of Galway suggested that William III grant a portion of confiscated land to a group of Huguenot lords and worthies, who would populate it with their industrious coreligionists. Galway looked especially to the province of Connaught in western Ireland, where he promised to set up linen and hemp manufacturing, while avoiding wool, since that would compete with the domestic English market. Nonetheless, similar schemes appeared in virtually every corner of the kingdom, as local officials and Protestant nobles learned of the new possible source of settlers. In one characteristic scheme, a group of Huguenot noblemen proposed that confiscated land and wealth in Connaught be used to fund refugee settlement. The newcomers would receive leases on land for three lifetimes, and in return 'they would be obliged to plant flax and hemp on a certain number of acres, proportionate to the extent of their lands, and obliged to plant a certain quantity of trees'.²⁹

For their part, Irish Protestant lords jumped at the opportunity to attract industrious Protestant settlers to lands that remained largely vacant after the war. One was Richard Coote, earl of Bellomont, an ally of William and Mary who received lands in Ireland for his troubles but little means to make them profitable. In 1691 the earl embarked on a campaign to tempt Huguenots to settle on his holdings in the western province of Connaught and County Sligo, sending a description of his lands and terms to ministers in Switzerland. The lands were 'proper for all sorts of agriculture', Bellomont wrote, 'and very well situated for trade, being only two miles from the sea and five miles to Sligo which is a seaport'. The earl offered to receive 100 French families and provide them materials to build houses, with no taxes for the first year and very reasonable ones after that, with settlers able to take out long leases on their plots of land. Finally, he offered to bring in a French minister and build a church. While the terms made no mention of French political autonomy, they drew heavily from the 'colonial' plans common in Germany the previous decade.³⁰

Leaders of the Swiss Refuge insisted on completing their research before committing to sending their people to such an uncertain refuge. In one unsigned *mémoire*, refugee leaders insisted on exact reports on 'the situation of these places' where land was

available, the numbers of families they could support and the kinds of people who could best prosper there. Beyond that, they called for more care on how exactly people could transport themselves from Switzerland to Ireland, especially during a time of war. Despite dwindling options in Switzerland itself, Huguenot leaders were wary of schemes that sounded too good to be true, and they decided to send a deputy who could report back on all these potential colonial settlements and make initial plans to jumpstart the migration.³¹ The person who answered the call was Charles de Sailly, a Burgundian gentleman who had already researched several schemes involving refugee colonies, most notably the plan to settle Huguenots on a deserted island in the Indian Ocean. In March 1693 Sailly headed to Ireland to judge the feasibility of moving large numbers of refugees to the kingdom.³²

Sailly kept a journal as he travelled from Dublin through much of the southern part of the kingdom. Everywhere he went he saw a land scarred by warfare. Many of the places he visited were like the village of Goldenbridge, 'which is a very good and beautiful place, on the river and the great road, but ruined and in need of rebuilding. In this country there are not cows, or sheep, or people, however rich or good the land'. The war had depopulated much of the kingdom, leaving what Sailly saw as a blank slate for new settlers. Aside from ruined houses, Sailly also encountered dozens of Protestant nobles eager to find Huguenot settlers for their land. In each town he found local landowners willing to take ten, twenty or a hundred families, and others who had travelled from miles away to offer terms to the French gentleman. One particularly optimistic lord said that 'if things go well, he could receive and place more than a thousand families, and that there was no Protestant gentleman who would do so with as much pleasure'. Sailly dutifully recorded all these offers, and noted the advantages of the lands he traversed. He was especially taken with the seaside ports of Ireland's south coast, which he thought would be appropriate for merchants and artisans, and the 'ruined and burned' cathedral town of Macroom, which he declared 'the Montpellier of Ireland due to its healthy air'. Sailly believed 600 families could settle the area, where 'One could make a good establishment and all sorts of manufactures'.³³

Despite Sailly's positive report, the settlement of Ireland provided logistical problems that were difficult to overcome. For one thing, getting thousands of refugees from Bern and Zurich to Dublin involved a harrowing journey through dozens of small states at a time when travel was notoriously difficult and the costs of transport, even just food and lodging, were more than any single refugee family could afford. Most travellers went up the Rhine to the Netherlands and then across the Channel to London, but the exact itinerary varied from traveller to traveller. English diplomats worked to make sure not only that Swiss authorities gave the Huguenots means to travel, but that the various leaders of the 'lieux de passage' provided housing and food to the often penniless refugees. Lands controlled by the Holy Roman Emperor were particularly problematic; William's ambassador in Vienna, George Stepney, worked to ease their passage through imperial territories, only to learn at a late date in the summer of 1693 that 'this matter is not so ripe as first imagined', and had been delayed to the following spring.³⁴ In the meantime, Henri de Mirmand directly lobbied King William, then on campaign in the Low Countries, to drum up financial support from

Dutch town councils, even as he worried about dangers on the route and the possibility that proper lands would not even be ready by the time the refugees reached Ireland.³⁵

The next year, very little had changed. The money still had not come, even though Swiss authorities expected the refugees to leave for Ireland promptly on 1 April. If there was no money to take them to Ireland, they would have to go elsewhere, and the choices were not appealing. Some would probably choose to retire to France, one Huguenot noted, or take the extreme step of travelling to the Cape of Good Hope, where the Dutch East India Company gave good terms to Huguenots willing to take the harrowing journey.³⁶ Meanwhile, in Ireland itself, other obstacles emerged. Some had to do with English mercantile interests, who feared that the introduction of thousands of Huguenot artisans and merchants in Ireland would cut into their profits. In addition, the circumstances of settlement on the island were not always the most generous to the newcomers. As Galway expressed to Mirmand, 'there is not an inch of land in Ireland that does not belong to someone, whether a lord or tenant'. While the lords wanted new people, they could rarely support very many on any one tract of land, and when they did, they had little desire to offer the settlers the kind of terms they could expect in other places – most especially, the right to own and pass on their own property. By the end of the decade, Galway had largely given up, suggesting that various German states could provide safer retreats for the luckless refugees.³⁷

In the end, the story of Huguenot Ireland did not match the big dreams of Galway and Saily. A few thousand refugees did settle in the kingdom, though most of them travelled from England or the Netherlands rather than Switzerland. A group of army veterans founded a town in Portarlinton, to the southwest of the capital, while others settled in Dublin, Cork, Lisburn and a few other locations. Nonetheless, the dreams of an Ireland dominated by French refugees never came to pass, though they would reappear periodically during the eighteenth century. The Irish Refuge was important, however, in that it moved the Huguenots more explicitly into the world of imperial politics. Since Elizabethan times English leaders had attempted to 'make Ireland British' by importing Protestant settlers, whether English Puritans or Scots Presbyterians, to form what they usually called 'plantations'. The plan championed by Ruvigny and Mirmand represented a French variant of the same scheme. The Huguenots offered to become agents of the English empire in Ireland, as long as they could receive aid and some degree of autonomy. Of course, this scheme was just about as successful as most other plans to remake Ireland. In the absence of significant investment, the plan never lived up to expectations, and the island kingdom remained mostly Catholic.³⁸

Travelling to the end of the world

By 1693 Coxe had left Switzerland. His replacement, Philibert d'Hervart, was a Huguenot, and dedicated himself to the same programme as his predecessor, attempting to solidify the alliance between England and the Protestant cantons while attending to the needs of the refugees. Matters showed no signs of great improvement. The war prevented large-scale resettlement of the Huguenots who remained in Switzerland, but the cantons were reluctant to keep them either. In one letter, Hervart

claimed to be 'between fear and hope' when thinking of the refugees' fate, noting that most Swiss leaders still wanted them to leave, even as the promised funding to take them to Ireland never appeared. Correspondence from Switzerland to England during the mid-1690s had a repetitive quality. The English continued, with only moderate success, to keep the Protestant Swiss on their side, while the Huguenots languished in the shadows, and grand plans for refugee colonization were constantly deferred. In the meantime, more English attention gravitated towards the neighbouring Duchy of Savoy, which had become central to military planning, and had its own population of vulnerable Protestants.³⁹

The refugees' best chance was in a good settlement at the end of the war. The Huguenots hoped that their allies would speak for them in treaty negotiations, ensuring that toleration was a condition for any peace, and that the French Protestants scattered around Europe could return home. When the allies met Louis's representatives to negotiate peace in the Dutch city of Ryswick in 1697, however, they thoroughly abandoned the refugees. The Sun King was in no mood to compromise on the issue, and representatives for England and the Dutch Republic proved unwilling to sacrifice the hope for peace to help refugees who were no longer the *causes célèbres* they had been a decade earlier. This disappointment led some Huguenots to rethink their role in the world. Perhaps Pierre Jurieu's confident prediction that the Huguenots would return triumphant to a newly converted France and welcome Christ's return was not true after all. Indeed, the actual lives of Huguenots were far from glamorous. Many found themselves in the same position as one Monsieur Sondreville, who told authorities in Zurich that he had 'wandered through all of Europe in search of bread' but 'could no longer find help in any place'.⁴⁰ In the meantime, Zurich and Bern renewed their longstanding goals of ridding themselves of the refugees who continued to drain local charities and inspire unrest in the native population. In 1698, for instance, the Bernese declared 'with regret' that their canton could no longer serve as a 'place of establishment'. They did not want the refugees to fall into destitution, so they wrote circular letters to other 'Protestant princes who have large states thinly inhabited in certain spots [who] could receive them as their subjects and give them land'.⁴¹

It was in this uncertain moment that a new scheme came into being. The mastermind was also an Englishman named Coxe, but not it seems a relation to Thomas. Daniel Coxe had served as royal physician to Charles II and as an absentee governor of New Jersey, and in the 1690s he inherited an old patent for a realm called Carolana (distinct from the later patent for the smaller colony of Carolina), a vast territory that covered much of the North American Southeast. Coxe and his allies saw it as a geopolitical necessity for England, a source of profit and also an opportunity to do good. In particular, Coxe aimed to use French refugees as the primary settlers in the new colony, which would be both a boon for the empire and relief for the Huguenots, who languished around Europe. Coxe specifically noted that in the late 1690s 'Protestants Refugees' had become 'a charge and a burthen to those Princes and States, under whose protection and government they live'. Once they were established in North America, however, these refugees would become productive and useful subjects, providing 'a due value for the Nation'.⁴² Coxe's argument represented an interesting gloss on previous political economic understandings of the refugees' importance. He noted that the old theories

that new populations would strengthen England itself were mistaken – the newcomers were burdens rather than boons. By going to the empire, however, they would help England, at least according to the current dictates of mercantilist thought. Here, Coxe followed the theories of writers like Josiah Child, who had called for sending otherwise distressed and persecuted people to the colonies where they could finally become productive.⁴³

Like Ireland, America had long occupied a place in the Huguenot imagination. During the 1680s hundreds of refugees had settled in South Carolina, New York, New England and Pennsylvania, drawn by promotional literature that presented the colonies as new Edens waiting for productive settlers. Many of those designs had aimed specifically at refugees who could produce certain valuable goods – most notably silk, wine and naval stores – and thus realize longstanding imperial ambitions.⁴⁴ Coxe drew on these previous plans but repackaged them for the interior portions of the continent, which he had envisioned settling since his time as New Jersey's governor. The vast American interior, Coxe maintained, was among the most fruitful lands in the world. For one thing, it abounded with 'Vines of divers sorts' that would yield good wine, and the climate was appropriate for silk as well. From an initial settlement on the Espiritu Santo River (now the Apalachicola), Coxe aimed to occupy the whole interior, starting on the Gulf Coast but then expanding to the Ohio River Valley and beyond, to the semi-mythical 'great western lake' which he believed to be a short distance from the Pacific Ocean. He believed that from the lake one could easily reach 'the great gulph of Nova Albion' and the 'better half of the Island of Calefornia', places claimed for England by Sir Francis Drake in the sixteenth century, and close to 'the Seas of Tartary and Japan'.⁴⁵

Coxe and his partners gathered funds and support for what one writer labelled the 'New Empire'. The designers of 'Carolana Florida', as the colony often appeared, used almost every method in the colonial booster's toolbox. Coxe began by lauding the productive capacity of the land in question, not only in producing those old standbys of silk, wine and olive oil, but also naval stores, fruits of all kinds, furs and precious metals from mines.⁴⁶ Coxe also appealed to the charitable intentions of officials in both the Church of England and dissenting congregations, promoting his colony as a peaceful retreat for the poor, debtors and orphans as well as refugees. He also envisioned his colony as a centre for evangelizing Native Americans, and indeed he worked closely with several men also active in the old New England Company, a venerable organization that had funded missionary efforts in that region for decades. In short, he viewed his colony as a virtual panacea: an effort that would increase England's glory even as it solved a number of the continent's social problems.⁴⁷

Not surprisingly, Coxe looked to Switzerland as the source for many of his settlers. In 1698 a committee formed to manage the transportation of Swiss refugees to the colony. It contained many noteworthy names from the Swiss and Irish Refuges – one M. Reboulet, probably Zurich's French minister, was one of the chief agents, and other signatories included Thomas Coxe's former aide Élie Bouhéreau, by this time the earl of Galway's secretary and the Irish minister Jacques Fontaine. The leader, however, was undoubtedly Charles de Saily, who found seventy-two refugees in Bern willing to go to Carolana. The Huguenots made the difficult trek through the Rhine Valley

to Rotterdam, where Sailly was supposed to meet them and accompany them to the colony, only to find that their benefactor had already left the port. Alarmed by yet another betrayal, representatives of the families petitioned the Dutch States General, complaining that they had been 'deceived by the beautiful hopes they had been given,' and now languished 'in such a deplorable state, that they would all perish of misery and hunger without the aid of some charitable persons.' The States collected some money to send the unfortunate people to lands in Germany and Ireland.⁴⁸

In the meantime, more bad news came from across the Atlantic. A scouting expedition in the Gulf had come upon agents of the French king, who were busy establishing their claim to what eventually became Louisiana. French officials were alarmed by English claims in the region – especially those involving Huguenots – and instructed their agent, Pierre Lemoyne d'Iberville, to form a post at Biloxi. The English Board of Trade, meanwhile, had no stomach for confrontation. In a report the Board advised the king that 'the settling of a Colony in that part of the world, as proposed, does not appear to be a strengthening of Your Majesty's other plantations.' They worried that the settlement might also anger the Spanish at Pensacola, and besides, 'the multiplying of distant Plantations tends to the encouragement of illegal Trade; and affords a greater opportunity for the reception of Pirates'. If the Board thought Carolana was a bad idea at any rate, the involvement of Huguenots in the scheme seemed to make it even more precarious. The Board had learned 'that a considerable part of the persons designing to engage in this Undertaking are French Refugees,' and they believed that 'without a constant military force' they 'will be lyable to be molested or attack'd by them of a different Religion, who bear no good will to them.'⁴⁹ Over previous decades the Huguenots had often seemed to be valuable partners in imperial projects, but now the Board considered them liabilities, even on the far reaches of the empire.

With his Florida plans in disarray, Daniel Coxe settled on another solution. Along with the patent for Carolana he had also received title to a smaller tract of land in Lower Norfolk County, Virginia, on the border with North Carolina. This new plan was far less ambitious than a design to claim the interior of a continent and remake the global economy, but it still found a retreat for the refugees and provided Coxe settlers for some of his holdings. In 1699 and 1700 champions of the colony, led by Sailly and a nobleman, the marquis de La Muce, tapped into the charitable networks of the Church of England to find aid for individual refugees, 'French and Vaudois,' who hoped to go to Virginia.⁵⁰ The chief agent in this endeavour was Sir William Ashurst, a Whig member of the Corporation of London who had longstanding family connections to both overseas colonization and the dissenting interest. Ashurst was able to open up the coffers of the Corporation's collections for refugees. During the spring and summer of 1700 the Archbishop of Canterbury coordinated with Ashurst and the Corporation to distribute several thousand pounds from the old Royal Bounty to refugees heading to Virginia, at the rate of £6 per person, as well as a special fund for 'a Church & Ministers maintenance,' which went to a man named Benjamin de Joux.⁵¹ During the summer the first colonists, a contingent of 170 men, women and children, left London in the *Peter and Anthony*, reaching Jamestown in September, where they met a small advance party, including La Muce and Sailly, who were already in the colony.⁵²

When the refugees reached Virginia, however, they found another surprise. The governor, a military man named Francis Nicholson, had decided that the land set out for the colonists in Lower Norfolk County was not suitable. As early as 1698 Nicholson's ally William Byrd II, then in London, had lambasted the plan, arguing that their proposed retreat was 'low Swampy ground, unfit for planting and improvement, and the air of it very moist and unhealthy, so that to send Frenchmen thither that came from a dry and Serene Clymate were to send 'em to their Graves'. Byrd suggested instead that the refugees settle on the upper part of the James River, a more salubrious climate that also happened to be an exposed frontier region whose leading settler was none other than Byrd's father, William Byrd I.⁵³ When the colony's leaders Nicholson greeted them and instructed them not to go to the 'unhealthfull place' they had expected, but to a location called Manakin town, an abandoned native village. In a letter justifying himself, Nicholson cited 'Strengthening of the Frontiers' as the main reason to send the newcomers to the site.⁵⁴ Nicholson himself had made military preparations against the French one of his main projects, and Byrd had long tried to attract more settlers to his neighbourhood. Beyond that, Byrd was not unfamiliar with the refugees' story. While not a particularly religious man, he had requested a copy of Pierre Jurieu's *Accomplishment of the Scripture Prophecies* some years earlier. The story of the Huguenots had travelled to the place that Byrd referred to as 'the end of the world'; and soon the refugees themselves would be there as well.⁵⁵

Conclusion

With the establishment of Manakintown the story of the Huguenots came full circle. The Refuge had begun with a prophecy that transformed into a political vision. It propelled people out into the vast expanses of Protestant Europe, and soon beyond, as small cadres of refugees found homes in Germany and England, Ireland and America, Suriname and South Africa. As they scattered, however, the purpose of these Huguenot 'colonies' changed. They gradually lost their identity as independent bastions of French Protestantism, poised to return the faith to the homeland, and became constituent parts of the states and empires that hosted them. Nowhere was this more apparent in the far reaches of the British empire, and particularly in Manakintown. In 1700 the Virginia Council chastised the French because in petitions they 'frequently call themselves the French colony', implying that 'their said Settlem[en]t is to be under a distinct Governmt'. The governor ordered that they 'not hereafter use the title of a Colony' and present their petitions in English.⁵⁶

Of course, this was not the end of the Huguenots' story. They remained in Virginia, Ireland and dozens of other places around the Atlantic world. Their networks were still important, even if they were more economic than political in nature, like those of the Huguenot merchant families that continued to dominate Atlantic trade.⁵⁷ The political arguments pioneered by the refugees also appeared again. When German-speaking Protestants fled the Palatinate for England in 1708, for instance, they recycled many of the old strategies of the Huguenots, promoting themselves both as persecuted Protestants but, even more importantly, as productive migrants who could develop

neglected regions of the British empire and jumpstart critical industries. Of course, the Palatines' story contained just as much drama and dislocation as the Huguenots' earlier peregrinations, but it demonstrated the continuing relevance of the earlier refugees' strategies.⁵⁸

In the end, though, it is hard to see the Huguenots' drama as much less than a failure. Motivated by apocalyptic speculation combined with early Enlightenment theories of population and political economy, both the refugees and their patrons thought that Huguenots could remake Europe and the world. That belief turned out to be mistaken. If theorists of 'political arithmetic' were confident that states could harness the power of populations to shape the future of states and empires, these plans almost never worked out like central planners intended, partly because states were not as powerful as they thought, and partly because they were simply unwilling to provide the resources. Despite all the rhetoric, population schemes were expensive, and the British were unwilling to pay. The Huguenots were largely left on their own, waiting for an apocalypse that never came.⁵⁹

Notes

- 1 Coxe has attracted little attention from historians, but see L. A. Robertson, 'The Relations of William III with the Swiss Protestants, 1689-1697', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 12 (1929): 137-62; and Christopher Storrs, 'British Diplomacy in Switzerland (1689-1789) and Eighteenth-Century Diplomatic Culture', *Études des Lettres* 3 (2010): 181-216. I have reconstructed his mission from original letters and memoirs collection in SP 96/7-8, The National Archives, Kew (hereafter TNA), and Add. Mss. 38013, British Library.
- 2 The dispersion of Huguenots in Europe has attracted much attention from scholars, but they have rarely attempted works that move beyond borders. For some preliminary attempts see the work of Susanne Lachenicht, especially *Hugenotten in Europa und Nordamerika: Migration und Integration in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2010); and the collected essays in Eckart Birnstiel and Chrystel Bernat, *La Diaspora des Huguenots: Les réfugiés de France et leur dispersion dans le monde (XVIe-XVIIIe siècles)* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2001); Michelle Magdelaine and Rudolf van Thadden, eds, *Le Refuge Huguenot* (Paris: Colin, 1985); and Bertrand Van Ruymbeke and Randy J. Sparks, eds, *Memory and Identity: The Huguenots in France and the Atlantic Diaspora* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006).
- 3 David Van der Linden, *Experiencing Exile: Huguenot Refugees in the Dutch Republic, 1680-1700* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015); François David, 'Les colonies des réfugiés protestants français en Brandebourg-Prusse: Institutions, géographie, et évolution de leur peuplement', *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français* 140 (1994): 111-42; Robin Gwynn, *Huguenot Heritage: The History and Contribution of the Huguenots in Britain* (London: Routledge, 1985).
- 4 The idea of a 'Protestant International' comes from Herbert Lüthy, *La Banque Protestante en France de la Révocation de l'Édit de Nantes à la Revolution* (Paris: S.E.V.P.E.N., 1959). For some recent uses of the term see J. F. Boshier, 'Huguenot Merchants and the Protestant International in the Seventeenth Century', *William and*

- Mary Quarterly* 3rd ser., 52 (1995): 77–102; David Ormrod, ‘The Atlantic Economy and the “Protestant Capitalist International”’, *Historical Research* 66 (1993): 197–208; Mark Peterson, ‘Theopolis Americana: The City-State of Boston, the Republic of Letters, and the Protestant International, 1689-1739’, in *Soundings in Atlantic History: Latent Structures and Intellectual Currents, 1500-1825*, ed. Bernard Bailyn and Patricia Denault (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009).
- 5 For an expanded version of this argument see Owen Stanwood, *The Global Refuge: Huguenots in an Age of Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020).
 - 6 The term ‘le Refuge’ comes from Charles Weiss, *Histoire des réfugiés protestants de France depuis la révocation de l’Édit de Nantes jusqu’à nos jours*, 2 vols (Paris: Charpentier, 1853). The most recent treatment of the Revocation and its context is Philippe Joutard, *La Révocation de l’édit de Nantes ou les faiblesses d’un état* (Paris: Gallimard, 2018).
 - 7 Jacques Flournoy, *Journal, 1675-1692*, ed. Olivier Fatio (Geneva: Droz, 1994), 125; Registres de Conseil, R.C. 185, fol. 152, Archives d’État de Genève. On the history of the bourse française see Cécile Holtz, ‘La Bourse française de Genève et le refuge de 1684 à 1686’, in *Genève au temps de la Révocation de l’Édit de Nantes, 1680-1705*, ed. Olivier Fatio (Geneva: Droz, 1985), 439–500.
 - 8 Rémy Scheurer, ‘Passage, accueil, et intégration des réfugiés huguenots en Suisse’, in *Le Refuge huguenot*, ed. Magdelaine and von Thadden, 49.
 - 9 Pierre Jurieu, *Accomplissement des prophéties*, ed. Jean Delumeau (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1994), 151–2, 154–5, interpreting Rev. 5:9. Jurieu wrote another work that laid out the rationale for this union, shorn of much of its apocalyptic rhetoric; see *Avis aux Protestants de l’Europe, tant de la Confession d’Augsbourg que de celle de Suisses* (1685), translated as *Seasonable Advice to all Protestants of Europe of what Persuasion soever, for defending themselves against Popish Tyranny* (London, 1689).
 - 10 ‘Mémoire pour le dessein des colonies’, Collection Court, vol. 17L, ff. 105–7, Bibliothèque de Genève [BGE].
 - 11 ‘Memoire touchant les françois Refugiez en Suisse pour la Religion’, [1690?], Blathwayt Papers, Box 4, Folder 78, Beinecke Library, Yale University.
 - 12 Jürgen Wilke, ‘Statut et pratiques judiciaires des huguenots en Brandebourg-Prusse (1685-1809)’, in *La Refuge huguenot*, ed. Magdelaine and von Thadden, 124–5.
 - 13 ‘Mémoires de Henri de Mirmand’, in Marie de Chambrier, *Henri de Mirmand et les réfugiés de la révocation de l’édit de Nantes, 1650-1721* (Neuchâtel: Attinger, 1910), appendice, 9; Mirmand au comité de Lausanne, 30/20 septembre 1688, Collection Court, vol. 15, ff. 15–22, BGE.
 - 14 La Direction de Lausanne à de Jossaud et Mesnard, 12 mars 1689, Collection Court, vol. 15, ff. 42–3, BGE; Mémoires pour joindre à la lettre écrite à M.M. de Jonaud et Meynard, pasteurs, Collection Court, vol. 15, f. 48.
 - 15 Jurieu laid out his beliefs in IX. *Lettre Pastorale: Examen de la question s’il est permis de defendre sa religion par les armes. Reflexions sur les affaires d’Angleterre. Suite de la refutation du Livre des variations* (Rotterdam, 1689).
 - 16 Coxe to William III, 30/20 September 1689, SP 96/7, TNA.
 - 17 Coxe to Shrewsbury, 24 September 1689, SP 96/7, TNA.
 - 18 Gaultier to Coxe, 3 octobre 1689, SP 96/7, TNA.
 - 19 Coxe to Shrewsbury, 25 November 1689, SP 96/7, TNA.
 - 20 Coxe to Shrewsbury, 16/26 January 1690, SP 96/7, TNA.
 - 21 Marie Léoutre, Jane McKee, Jean-Paul Pittion and Amy Prendergast, eds, *The Diary (1689-1719) and Accounts (1704-1717) of Élie Bouhéreau: Marsh’s Library, MS Z2.2.2* (Dublin: Irish Manuscripts Commission, 2019), 35.

- 22 Elie Bouhereau to [Nottingham?], 26 July 1690, SP 96/7, TNA.
- 23 Copy of Monsr Gaultier's Project, n.d. [c. July 1690], SP 96/7, TNA.
- 24 Coxe to Nottingham, 13 and 27 January 1692, SP 96/8, TNA.
- 25 Requête de Messrs les Réfugiés aux Seigneurs de Berne; Copie de mon Mémoire aux Seignrs de Berne, en faveur des Francois-Refugiés, 8 fevr. 1692, SP 96/8, TNA.
- 26 Coxe to Nottingham, 23/13 February 1692, SP 96/8, TNA. For background on the Huguenot settlements in Ireland see especially Raymond Hylton, *Ireland's Huguenots and their Refuge, 1662-1745: An Uncertain Refuge* (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2005); and C. E. J. Caldicott, Hugh Gough and Jean-Paul Pittion, eds, *The Huguenots and Ireland: Anatomy of an Emigration* (Dublin: Glendale Press, 1987).
- 27 Ruvigny à Mirmand (extrait), decembre 1691, Collection Court, vol. 15, ff. 78–9, BGE; Considerations concerning Ireland, 1691, *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, William and Mary* (London, 1918), 2:67. On previous promotional literature on Ireland see Ruth Whelan, 'Promised Land: Selling Ireland to French Protestants', *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 29 (2008): 37–50; and on Ruvigny's life more generally, Marie M. Léoutre, *Serving France, Ireland, and England: Ruvigny, Earl of Galway, 1648-1720* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2018).
- 28 Copie of the Remonstrance of the Protestants in France to remove into Ireland, Rawlinson Mss. A 478, f. 30, Bodleian Library.
- 29 Mémoire Sur l'établissement des François Réfugiés en Irlande, 1697, Portland Papers, PwA2375, Nottingham University Library. While this particular plan did not go anywhere, some Huguenots did eventually jumpstart Ireland's flax industry, especially in Ulster.
- 30 Propositions de Monsr le Comte de Bellomont por letablissement d'une Colonie Françoise en Irlande, Collection Court, vol. 17S, fols. 135–6, BGE.
- 31 Memoires, E 1 25.14: Franz. Angelegenheiten, amtliche Akten, 1693 Juli-1694, Staatsarchiv Zürich. See also Collection Court, vol. 15, fols. 160–5, BGE.
- 32 For background on the mission see Michelle Magdelaine, 'Conditions et préparation de l'intégration: le voyage de Charles de Sailly en Irlande (1693) et le projet d'Edit d'accueil', in *From Strangers to Citizens: The Integration of Immigrant Communities in Britain, Ireland, and Colonial America, 1550-1750*, ed. Randolph Vigne and Charles Littleton (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2001), 435–41.
- 33 Sailly's original journal is in the Collection Court; it is reproduced in 'L'émigration en Irlande: Journal de voyage d'un réfugié français, 1693', *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du Protestantisme français XVII* (1868): 591–602. For the specific references see pp. 594, 596, 597–8.
- 34 Memoriall relating to the Refugies in Switzerland, SP 105/58, f. 165, TNA; George Stepney to William Blathwayt, 15/25 July 1693, SP 105/59, f. 85.
- 35 Mirmand à d'Arselliers, 11/1 juin 1693, E 1 25.13: Franz. Angelegenheiten, amtliche Akten, 1688-1693 juni, Staatsarchiv Zürich. Mirmand did not reveal the arguments he used to convince the Dutch councils to give him aid. Many of them had themselves courted refugees the previous decade, but had fewer opportunities for newcomers in the early-1690s.
- 36 Memoire envoyés a mylord Portland, 26 fevrier 1694, Collection Court, vol. 170, f. 216, BGE.
- 37 Galway à Mirmand, 5/15 decembre 1698, Collection Court, vol. 18, ff. 133–4, BGE.
- 38 On the larger history of Irish settlement schemes see Nicholas Canny, *Making Ireland British, 1580-1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001). On the eighteenth-century plans see Susanne Lachenicht, 'New Colonies in Ireland?'

- Antoine Court and the Settlement of French Refugees in the Eighteenth Century', *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 29 (2009): 227–37. It is unclear what happened to the refugees who intended to move to Ireland. Many must have stayed in Switzerland, while others moved to Berlin and other German states.
- 39 D'Hervart to John Trenchard, 5/15 December 1694, SP 96/8, TNA. Coxe himself was preoccupied with Savoy before his recall; see Christopher Storrs, 'Thomas Coxe and the Lindau Project', in *Dall'Europa alle Valle Valdesi: Atti del XXIX Convegno storico internazionale: 'il Glorioso Rimpatrio (1689-1989). Contesto – Significato – Immagine'*, ed. Albert de Lande (Turin: Claudiana, 1990), 199–214.
- 40 M. Sondreville to Zurich comité, n.d., E 1 25.18: Franz. Angelegenheiten, 1699 Dez.-1703, Staatsarchiv Zürich.
- 41 Extrait des brevets des Seigneurs de la Chambre d'inspection de Berne, 12 juillet 1698, Collection Court, vol. 15, f. 321, BGE.
- 42 [Daniel Coxe], *Proposals for Settling a Colony in Florida* (London, 1698), 1–2.
- 43 Josiah Child, *A New Discourse of Trade* (London, 1693). On mercantilism see Philip J. Stern and Carl Wennerlind, eds, *Mercantilism Reimagined: Political Economy in Early Modern Britain and its Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).
- 44 On the Huguenots in British America see Stanwood, *The Global Refuge*; as well as Jon Butler, *The Huguenots in America: A Refugee People in New World Society* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983); Bertrand Van Ruymbeke, *From New Babylon to Eden: The Huguenots and their Migration to Colonial South Carolina* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006); Neil Kamil, *Fortress of the Soul: Violence, Metaphysics, and Material Life in the Huguenots' New World, 1517-1751* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005); and Paula Wheeler Carlo, *Huguenot Refugees in Colonial America: Becoming American in the Hudson Valley* (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2005). On Coxe's colony itself see David E. Lambert, *The Protestant International and the Huguenot Migration to Virginia* (New York: Peter Lang, 2009).
- 45 Daniel Coxe, *A Description Of the English Province of Carolana, By the Spaniards call'd Florida, And by the French La Louisiane* (London, 1722), 62, 74, 90; 'A Demonstration of the Just Pretensions of his Majesty The King of England unto the Province of Carolana alias Florida and of the present Proprietary under his Majesty', CO 5/1259, no. 23, TNA.
- 46 'An Account of the Commodities of the growth and Production of the Province of Carolana alias Florida', CO 5/1259, no. 24, TNA.
- 47 'Draught of the Scheme I drew for Dr Daniel Cox many years since for the settlemt of New which wee called the New Empire written by Mr Spooner', Rawlinson Mss. A305, ff. 2–6, Bodleian Library.
- 48 Nathaniel Weiss, 'Le Mirage de la Floride (1698-1699)', *Bulletin de la Societe de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Francais* 39 (1890): 142–5, 329.
- 49 Opinion of the Board of Trade, 21 December 1699, CO 5/1288, pp. 139–43, TNA. On the confrontation on the Gulf see Bertrand Van Ruymbeke, 'A Dominion of True Believers not a Republic for Heretics: French Colonial Religious Policy and the Settlement of Early Louisiana, 1695-1730', in *French Colonial Louisiana and the Atlantic World*, ed. Bradley G. Bond (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005), 83–94.
- 50 Original Papers Relating to the Vaudois & French Refugièes From 12 May 1699 to 1 April 1703, MS. 1028, Lambeth Palace Library, London.

- 51 See Warrants (COL/CHD/PR/006/004), nos. 17, 20, 35, 37, 38, 41, 42, London Metropolitan Archives.
- 52 'List of all ye Passingers from London to James River, in Virginia, being French Refugees imbarqued in the ship ye Peter and Anthony, Galley of London, Daniel Perreau Commander', in *Documents, Chiefly Unpublished, Relating to the Huguenot Emigration to Virginia and to the Settlement at Manakin-Town*, ed. R. A. Brock (Richmond: Virginia Historical Society, 1886), 14–16.
- 53 Proposals humbly submitted to the Lds of ye Councill of Trade and Plantations for sending ye French Protestants to Virginia, 1698, in Brock, *Documents*, 6–7.
- 54 Nicholson to the Board of Trade, 1 August 1700, CO 5/1312, no. 1, TNA.
- 55 William Byrd to Perry and Lane, 8 August 1690, in *The Correspondence of the Three William Byrds of Westover, 1684-1776*, ed. Marion Tinling (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1977), 1:135.
- 56 A Collection of several matters relating to the French Refugees from the 12 March 1701/2, CO 5/1312, no. 40.lxi, TNA.
- 57 On these networks see Boshier, 'Huguenot Merchants and the Protestant International'; Stanwood, *The Global Refuge*, 191–6.
- 58 On the Palatines and the comparison to Huguenots see Philip Otterness, *Becoming German: The 1709 Palatine Migration to New York* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004); Alison G. Olsen, 'Huguenots and Palatines', *The Historian* 63 (2001): 269–85.
- 59 On the concept of 'political arithmetic' see Ted McCormick, *William Petty and the Ambitions of Political Arithmetic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Exile between revolution and counter-revolution, c. 1800¹

Jan C. Jansen

At first glance, William Augustus Bowles (c. 1763–1803) and Louis-Marie Turreau de Garambouville (1756–1816) seem to have little in common: on the one hand, a fiery military officer and adventurer from Maryland who fought against the American Revolution, refashioned himself as a leader of Native Americans and, later, led an effort to establish a Native American nation-state under British protection in North America's imperial borderlands; on the other, an ennobled French general who led the revolutionary army's brutal repression of the monarchist uprising in the Vendée and, later, while French ambassador to the United States, developed a plan to reconquer newly independent Haiti.² At closer inspection, however, certain commonalities emerge. Both Bowles and Turreau sought to seize opportunities resulting from the violence accompanying the respective American and French revolutions to build military careers for themselves. Once these careers were halted due to the vicissitudes of revolutionary politics and military events, each continued to make use of their military expertise to carve out roles for themselves in a world in turmoil. Each engaged in ambitious projects designed to change the course of a revolutionary period – and both men failed, now mere footnotes at best in the historiographies of the revolutions in North and South America, across Europe and in the Caribbean.

Hailing from different backgrounds, Bowles and Turreau became involved in a dynamic and sprawling sphere of political activity and planning that took shape as political upheavals unfolded during the half-century between the 1770s and the 1820s. Each of the major revolutions and the violent conflicts that accompanied them put tens or even hundreds of thousands of people on the move. The American Revolution had pitted champions of independence against those who remained loyal to the British Crown, and the aftermath of the American War of Independence saw the 1782–3 emigration of at least 60,000 'Loyalists'.³ Roughly 150,000 individuals who opposed the French Revolution left France in the early 1790s and were scattered across Europe and the Americas.⁴ Some 20,000 to 30,000 people left the struggling French colony of Saint-Domingue during the Haitian revolution between 1791 and 1804, and thousands more escaped a number of smaller revolutions (successful or failed) across Europe and the Caribbean.⁵ A few years later, tens of thousands of people fled violence-

ridden Spanish America to the Caribbean, the United States and Europe.⁶ Acts of state repression following failed insurrections or constitutional movements across Europe and the Caribbean were further drivers of involuntary political mobility during this period.⁷ In total, more than a quarter-million people left or were forced to leave their homes as a result of political conflicts and civil wars. In many places throughout the American continent, the Caribbean and Europe, contemporaries had no doubt that political modernity, brought about by the great revolutions and often identified with new concepts of citizenship, sovereignty and participation, was inextricably connected with the mass phenomenon of political refugees.

This chapter uses the cases of William Augustus Bowles and Louis-Marie Turreau de Garambouvillle – and the connections between them – to examine some of the main features of exile as an arena of political action during the revolutionary era. It argues that exile took shape out of unexpected and shifting alliances across multiple boundaries, including the boundaries between different revolutionary and imperial contexts, between various groups of refugees, migrants and non-mobile people, between a variety of interests, and even between revolutionary and counter-revolutionary politics. Rather than the breeding ground of vanguard ideas, exile during this period was a space where a variety of actors sought to carve out agency for themselves and imagined alternatives – be they liberal or anti-liberal, or, in many cases, murky and ambiguous – to the actual historical path taken.

Exile politics in an age of revolutions, wars and refugees

Over the past five decades, historians have emphasized the multiple entanglements between revolutionary actors and ideas across the Atlantic basin in the decades around 1800.⁸ But for a long time they have been reluctant to apply the same methodological rigor to those who opposed and fled these revolutions. As a result, refugees have still not been properly integrated into their respective revolutionary histories, and only in recent years have scholars begun to retrace the contours of a shared, connected history of revolutionary-era refugee movements.⁹ American Loyalists, French émigrés, refugees from Saint-Domingue, Spanish American exiles and others not only formed transnational exile diasporas across various states and colonial territories. They also interacted with one another, crossing paths at the same places of refuge, making connections and comparisons to each other, or finding themselves put in the same categories or being affected by the same alien laws or forms of institutional assistance. Such connections were not only made by the refugees themselves. State authorities across Europe and the Americas considered arriving refugees to be part of a broader phenomenon, and they responded to these newcomers with their own mix of restrictions and targeted assistance for particular refugee subgroups.

In doing so, the interactions between host countries and refugees followed well-established practices of refugee reception and mobility control dating from previous centuries. And yet at least two momentous shifts were introduced. On the one hand, many host countries fundamentally altered their concepts and categories regarding fugitives and asylum seekers. They began to ‘universalize’ these categories

by dissociating them from the historical references of ancient exile and early modern religious refugees (especially the Huguenots) and applying them to the refugees and exiles of their own time.¹⁰ This does not mean that the authorities were operating with a clear-cut vocabulary – not to speak of a legal status – surrounding the ‘refugee’. While they were coming to be considered, and coped with, as a distinct type of mobile person, revolutionary-era refugees remained inextricably connected to other forms and categories of coerced and free mobility. Local authorities and refugees alike relied on ill-defined systems of ad hoc classification as ‘emigrants’, ‘loyalists’, ‘refugees’, ‘exiles’ or ‘fugitives’, and combined these designations with other legal categories such as enslavement, military captivity, etc.¹¹ On the whole, however, it was a rather comprehensive category that arguably became the main legal tool serving to shape the status of refugees during this period: aliens. Governments’ responses to the arrival of refugees led to a proliferation of the so-called alien laws across the Americas and Europe that sought to curb and regulate the movement of refugees, and foreigners in general, across borders. The legal and bureaucratic ramifications of host territories’ refugee policies were thus a crucial (yet largely overlooked) element in what should be considered a dual process reconfiguring political belonging during this period.¹² While many states redefined the terms of membership and the status of those whom they regarded as belonging to the state (often under the umbrella of ‘citizenship’), they likewise made no less of an effort to regulate the status of those they considered non-members.

On the other hand, refugees and states increasingly mapped exile and reception policies onto a binary system of political division consisting of ‘revolution’ and ‘counter-revolution’. While religious notions of sanctuary continued to colour the reception policies in some instances, political loyalties, rather than religious beliefs, came to be considered the paramount driving force. To be sure, the political refugee as such had much older precedents. Yet the age of revolutions stands out as the moment when people escaping political change and revolutionary violence became a recognizable mass phenomenon. Along with the motives, the radii of movements changed dramatically. The refugees did not disperse, as in the preceding centuries, following a religious logic, but fanned out across a dynamic political map that shifted with the moving front lines of revolutionary and civil wars.¹³ Already in the early 1790s, for instance, both the representatives of the revolutionary French Republic and its enemies agreed on the importance of exile as an integral site of a domestic revolutionary struggle turned into a universal civil war. The revolutionary Committee of Public Safety even considered using the legal tools against *émigrés*, the enemies in exile, against domestic critics and opponents.¹⁴ The politicization of exile starting during this period has seeped into the influential, although only partial, image of exile as a space of marginalized progressive forces, of the ‘vanguards of their people’, as Hannah Arendt, herself in exile, famously put it.¹⁵ Recent scholarship on multinational exile communities also reflects this lopsided idea of exile as a space of revolutionary politics, as it tends to focus on groups of liberal exiles and their struggle against post-Napoleonic restoration governments.¹⁶ Yet, the largest pre-1814 revolutions – the American, French and Haitian revolutions – defy this image. Exile in all these cases was primarily an experience of those who

stood on the side of monarchies, colonial domination and slavery, and became part of what would, with the French Revolution, be often subsumed under the neologism of 'counter-revolution'. To complicate things further, recent forays into the history of concepts have shown that the dichotomy of 'revolution' and 'counter-revolution' was characterized by semantic fuzziness and porosity.¹⁷ 'Counter-revolution' both as self-designation and, more often, as a polemical label applied to others, stood for many things at the same time. In mid-1790s Saint-Domingue, nearly every group of actors – monarchist governors, plantation owners, enslaved insurgents, free people of colour, Jacobin commissioners – would face accusations of being 'counter-revolutionary', or they would proudly embrace the label, as most of the Black insurgent leaders initially did.¹⁸ 'Revolution' and 'counter-revolution', though they suggest a fundamental and inflexible antagonism of two homogenous camps and sets of ideas, instead reveal multiple dynamic, shifting divisions and alliances among activists on all sides.

Exile as a transnational, or rather: trans-imperial, political space during this period took shape at the intersection of these two tendencies – the reconfiguration of political belonging and the dichotomy of revolution and counter-revolution – and strongly reflected the messiness of each. Exile understood in this way can be described on three levels. First, it continued a longstanding practice by state authorities of granting temporary or permanent asylum and relief to refugee groups. While certain parameters – such as the movement along political rather than confessional lines – tended to shift in the decades around 1800, the processes of negotiating the terms of refuge engaged in by authorities of host territories, consuls of third countries and representatives of refugee communities resembled longstanding patterns of refugee politics and relief. Resettlement schemes towards American Loyalists, Saint-Domingue refugees and Spanish American exiles within the British and the Spanish empires, respectively, along with colonization projects in the Americas and Russia among French émigrés, stood in the tradition of imperial refugee settlements as a means to populate uninhabited territories and, in particular, imperial 'buffer zones'.¹⁹ Continuous inter-imperial warfare during the revolutionary era constituted yet another important area of employment – and action – for refugees.

Second, exile was a crucial site of political – and military – action aimed not only at the terms of admission or settlement in a host territory but at the course of events in the territory of origin – intended to actively change or even undo the causes of exile or to seize new opportunities. In this respect, too, refugees of the revolutionary era continued and escalated early modern public campaigns often mounted through the international press. French émigrés and Saint-Domingue refugees in Great Britain and in the United States, for example, set up their own newspapers as a means to shape both internal and transnational public opinion about hotly debated political events and issues in France, Saint-Domingue and beyond.²⁰ Political action out of exile gained its particular dynamic from a high degree of geopolitical uncertainty resulting from political upheavals and imperial breakdowns. Uncertainty propelled certain exile groups and other freewheeling actors to the centre of messy international struggles.²¹ They forged alliances with foreign state and non-state actors, set up risky military endeavours or obscure intrigues.

And third, exile was a generator of alternative imaginations, plans and expectations in a period of heightened uncertainty, a treasure box of 'futures past' that never came to fruition.²² Refugees of the revolutionary era took political action, but to an even greater extent they worked on ideas and plans – countless plans addressing how to alter the way the era unfolded, to stop or even undo the downfall of a monarchy, the independence of a colony or the abolition of slavery. While communication across different locales strengthened the cohesion of exile communities, it also laid bare the many fault lines running through these groups. In their alternative visions to the actual paths taken, exiles sought to stake out agency and put their struggles into broader geopolitical contexts, often involving and connecting to a variety of other state and non-state actors. Even more so than specific results or political facts, these intellectual activities are probably the most important legacy of revolutionary-era exile.

William Augustus Bowles and Louis-Marie Turreau de Garambouville certainly did not reflect much on these theoretical issues. Like most of their contemporaries, they engaged in the political space of exile as self-proclaimed men of action. And by doing so, they illustrate some of the main characteristics of revolutionary-era exile as it was transformed into an important sphere of cross-border political action.

William Augustus Bowles and the struggle for 'Muskogee'

Maryland-born William Augustus Bowles was barely a teenager when he enlisted in a Loyalist regiment to fight for the British during the American War of Independence. While stationed in Florida, he left his regiment in 1778 and joined, initially as a captive, the Creeks, an Indian confederacy of some 20,000 to 40,000 ethnically diverse people, allied with the Seminoles in Florida and dominating much of the territory west and south of Georgia into northern Florida and the eastern Mississippi.²³ While Bowles married into an influential family and began to build a power base among the Creeks, he remained a loyal subject to the British king and rejoined his Loyalist regiment. After the war's end, Bowles settled in the British Bahamas and began working closely with exiled former Virginia governor Lord Dunmore, now governor of the Bahamas. From this new home base, Bowles lobbied for British re-expansion in North America and for the renewal of the Creeks' older commercial and military ties with Great Britain. Starting in the late 1780s, Bowles embarked on an ambitious nation-building project. Having been recognized by a council of Creek, Seminole and Cherokee representatives as their self-styled *Estajoca* ('Director General'), Bowles directly challenged the authority of mestizo Creek leader Alexander McGillivray, and, after Gillivray's death in 1793, he joined the competition for leadership among the Creeks. Shuttling between the Bahamas and Creek country, Bowles launched his longest incursion into Spanish Florida in 1799. By mobilizing warriors largely recruited from Lower Creek and Seminole villages against Spanish forts and Bahamian privateers against Spanish merchant vessels, he claimed to have laid the foundations for a new state.

He envisioned this state – 'Muskogee' – to be an independent pan-Indian state of Creeks, Seminoles, Cherokees, supplemented by European settlers and fugitive enslaved people, centred in the American Southeast but potentially extending into

Louisiana and large swaths of the American hinterland. In contrast to other Creek leaders, Bowles promoted a close alliance with British Loyalism and Great Britain. The shared experience of betrayal during the negotiations following the American War of Independence was a rallying point he could use to connect defeated Loyalists and Native Americans. Despite his quest for legitimacy among the Creeks, Bowles largely ignored longstanding native notions of independent nationhood. Instead, Muskogee was built on European and US models. It was to have a constitution, a flag, citizenship regulations, a navy and institutions of higher education. Although he mustered cautious support from the British government and various American territories of the British empire, his plan met growing resistance from the US government and Spanish authorities. While he found steadfast supporters among some Creek and Seminole leaders, most Creeks rejected Bowles as an impostor and a facilitator of foreign speculation on their lands. Upper Creeks, in particular, considered Muskogee to be a threat to their economic interests. Bowles's relationship to Florida's Black population was also complex and contradictory. Muskogee both held slaving interests and served as a harbour for emancipated Blacks. Georges Biassou, one of the Spanish-allied leaders of the slave uprising in Saint-Domingue, exiled to St. Augustin, led the city's militia of free Blacks against Bowles. In 1803, Creek allies of the Spanish lured Bowles into Upper Creek country, captured him with the assistance of US agents, and turned him over to the Spanish. Two years later, he died in captivity in Havana.

The Muskogee project emerged out of the confluence of several histories. It is one chapter in the Creeks' wide-ranging attempts to maintain its position as an autonomous power among competing European empires and amidst increasing US encroachment onto their lands.²⁴ By tying in with the longstanding Spanish practice of granting asylum and freedom to enslaved fugitives from Protestant territories and for military service – and Great Britain's more recent variation of this policy in the midst of the American War of Independence – (while also engaging in the slave trade), Muskogee was also enmeshed in the struggles around the expansion of plantation slavery and Anglo-American racial hierarchies in the Southeast.²⁵ Muskogee is also a textbook example illustrating the crucial role of freewheeling actors, 'adventurers' and go-betweens in broader geopolitical struggles among European imperial powers, Native American nations and settler communities that had endured in the Louisiana-Florida borderlands since the end of the Seven Years' War.²⁶ Finally, Bowles's project shows how the revolutionary-era model of nation-building was picked up at the margins, and it offers a picture of the challenges facing the exercise of political sovereignty in a hierarchical postcolonial state system taking shape in the Americas.²⁷

Yet Muskogee was also largely born out of exile. Bowles and some of his most important allies were American Loyalists who considered Muskogee to be one way to make the resettlement of Loyalists a tool of an expanding British empire, as well as a project that would put a dent in Spain's American territories. It also reflected widespread expectations among Loyalist circles that the fragile union of the former colonies would not last and that they could play a crucial role as beneficiaries of the young nation's demise.²⁸ In addition, Bowles sought recruits well beyond the community of British American exiles. Seeking to mobilize support for an expedition to Florida in 1799, Bowles travelled across the British West Indies. In Jamaica, he established close

contacts within the considerable community of refugees from Saint-Domingue who had left the struggling French colony at a moment when British authorities wanted desperately to rid the island of the thousands of refugees of all colours stranded there. As his secretary, Hugh Ferguson, later recalled, Bowles was 'preceded by the reputation of a very learned man, which added to the singularity of the Indian dress he wore made him much researched by every class of people [. . .] and more particularly so by the French emigrants from St. Domingo of whom Kingston was then full'.²⁹ During his time in Kingston, Bowles sought to win over the refugees as settlers for Muskogee. Negotiations had already reached an advanced stage by the end of his two-month stay in Jamaica. Bowles had agreed to grant each refugee family considerable tracts of land, and he assured exiled priests that a religiously tolerant constitution would allow them to minister to the refugee community. In the end, however, Bowles was captured in May 1803, and plans for Muskogee and for a resettlement of pro-British Saint-Domingue refugees went nowhere.

Turreau de Garambouville and the struggle against Haiti

In purely chronological terms, the case of Turreau de Garambouville almost seamlessly follows the failure of Muskogee. In December 1803, roughly half a year after Bowles's capture, Napoleon appointed Turreau to be the new French ambassador to the United States, a move closely related to the larger geopolitical shifts in which Bowles and his motley band of Native Americans and exiles had sought to play a role.³⁰ French troops had just suffered a decisive defeat in their attempt to retake control of Saint-Domingue, and Haitian revolutionary leaders were preparing the proclamation of Haitian independence on 1 January 1804; meanwhile, French authorities in Louisiana were busy preparing the official transfer of that vast territorial expanse of land to the United States.³¹ Turreau came to his new office as France's most important representative in the Western Hemisphere not as a seasoned diplomat but as a controversial military leader, known for the atrocities and the exterminatory tactics that accompanied the suppression of the Vendée uprising in 1794.

Although Turreau had no previous ties to the Americas or the West Indies, he quickly began to devise an ambitious strategy to retake control of Haiti, laid out in a secret memorandum roughly a year after his arrival in the United States. Turreau's plan, largely based on intelligence he received on the ground and apparently developed unbeknownst to his own ministry, envisioned what would have been one of the largest overseas military endeavours by any European imperial power during this age of almost uninterrupted maritime warfare.³² With 30,000 regular troops plus thousands of auxiliary fighters, Turreau's expeditionary force would have been even larger than the failed expedition commanded by General Leclerc (1802–3). Like Bowles's Muskogee, Turreau's 1805 vision of conquest never materialized. Still, word of it circulated among a diverse set of people on the ground who helped shape the plan. Like Muskogee, the initiative was enmeshed in various historical developments and contexts. It throws light on concepts of 'irregular' warfare during the revolutionary era and their circulation in European and American theatres of war. It was also part of the wide-ranging efforts

and plans to re-institute France as a major imperial power in the Americas. Since its major territorial losses in the wake of the Seven Years' War, a continuous stream of memoranda and plans addressing the rebuilding of France's American empire had been amassed in French government circles; in the years preceding Turreau's diplomatic tenure, French diplomatic, military and espionage activities in the Americas, as well as all kinds of plans for the restoration of French rule over large swaths of the North American continent and above all the colony of Saint-Domingue, skyrocketed.

Like Bowles's Muskogee, Turreau's vision of an expedition against Haiti was also largely a product of (counter-)revolutionary-era exile politics. Shortly after his arrival in the United States, Turreau surrounded himself with white members of the Saint-Domingue refugee diaspora, a community of several thousand individuals who since the mid-1790s had lobbied, from their host territories across the Americas, the French state and other imperial powers in hopes of subduing the slave revolution and rebuilding the pre-revolutionary plantation system. Turreau quickly occupied the centre of Saint-Domingue refugee politicking across the Americas, including from places such as the Danish colony of Saint-Thomas and eastern Cuba, then one of the most important host territories of the Saint-Domingue diaspora.³³ Most importantly, he was embraced by the US-based branches of the refugee community, including by individuals with strong monarchist credentials who had previously allied themselves with revolutionary France's imperial adversaries.³⁴ Members of the local refugee community supplied Turreau with intelligence, contacts and their own sweeping plans for reconquering Haiti.

Turreau's interest in the refugee interlocutors' schemes to reoccupy Haiti was grounded in what he considered his specific expertise in a particular kind of warfare, in which, as he put it, 'everything is irregular and accidental'.³⁵ Long before the revolutionary era, concepts and theories had been proposed for 'irregular' warfare – characterized by ambushes and surprise raids rather than large standing battles and by the porousness of combatants and non-combatants – in Europe and for colonial wars across the globe. Ideas about irregular military violence in Europe were commonly thought to be separate from those addressing such conflict occurring elsewhere, yet Turreau saw a continuum between the two spheres. Though highlighting the particularity of warfare in Haiti, he also emphasized that his plan for reconquest was built on 'a quite long experience in a more or less similar war',³⁶ a thinly veiled reference to his activities in the Vendée. Under Turreau's command, twelve mobile columns of 2,000–3,000 men each had plowed through the Vendée in early 1794 under orders to 'pacify' the region via devastating violence and by terrorizing the largely defenceless civilian population.³⁷ This idea of unrestrained violence carried out against the Republic's enemies resonated with the sort of warfare that had convulsed revolutionary Saint-Domingue, something Turreau's refugee informers understood perfectly well. Throughout the 1790s, white refugee leaders had cast themselves as victims of Black violence, and some had espoused exterminatory ideas against the free-coloured and Black insurgents.³⁸ In their petition to Turreau, the refugee representatives in Philadelphia alluded to this idea by characterizing the 1793 Fire of Cap-Français as 'the butchery of June 20 [that gave] the signal for the general extermination of the white colonists'.³⁹ The final phase of France's attempt at military reconquest in 1802–3 ended in racial bloodshed, with French

troops, believing themselves to be engaged in a war of extermination, carrying out mass killings and other atrocities.⁴⁰ Building on this perceived similarity between the Vendée and Haiti, Turreau's 1806 memorandum returned to a military tactic that – in France, at least – was closely associated with his name: the use of unrestrained violence by mobile units. Presupposing the restoration of slavery in Haiti, Turreau anticipated the large-scale deportation and killing of Haiti's Black and mixed-race population. His tactics of unfettered racial violence in the service of counter-insurgency linked ideas circulating among refugees and former members of the Leclerc expedition to what he considered to be his own (European) expertise in irregular warfare.

Connections to the refugee community also brought about the most unorthodox element in Turreau's plan, with traces that can lead us back to Bowles's Muskogee: the involvement of a large contingent of Native American warriors from North America's southeastern borderlands. In developing his plan, Turreau explored the idea of recruiting up to several thousand men, 'all elite warriors', who had agreed to fight in Haiti for a daily wage of 26 French sous.⁴¹ Each warrior would receive a gun and a sword, and every surviving man was to be paid 550 French francs at the end of the war. This would have been one of the largest native armies ever assembled in North American history. Turreau was by no means an advocate for Native American interests – quite the contrary. His correspondence, including the memorandum, was filled with racial stereotypes of American 'savages'.⁴² Nor did he possess any kind of direct knowledge of the communities he wanted to engage with – he did not bother even to provide their names; only the Florida reference suggests he was thinking of Creeks and Seminoles. As Turreau himself admitted, the contacts at the origin of this idea had come about through channels created by exile.⁴³ A Saint-Domingue refugee and a network of French interpreters linked with native communities in Florida had approached him and initiated the negotiations in 1804.

While Turreau's memorandum and his correspondence remain mute about the exact networks that pushed for a Franco-Indian alliance aimed at reconquering Haiti, it is not unlikely that previous connections between Saint-Domingue refugees in Jamaica and Bowles, responding to one particular revolutionary context (the American Revolution), had laid the foundation for a project that sought to intervene in another (the Haitian Revolution). Bowles had created a connection that was complemented by other channels, including contact with Louis Le Clerc de Milford, another aspiring leader among the Creeks. Like Bowles, the French-born Milford had defected from military service as a young man and, sometime during the American Revolution, had migrated to America.⁴⁴ He married into Creek leader McGillivray's family and, self-fashioned as the military leader Tastanegy, he began to lobby for an alliance between the Creeks and revolutionary France in the 1790s. Turreau's bold promise of mobilizing thousands of native warriors for a Saint-Domingue expedition bore the signature of exile adventurers like Bowles and Milford. After the failure of Muskogee and other projects, allying with the French was not necessarily a farfetched idea in Creek country. While Turreau's idea of an innate hatred between Native Americans and African Americans hardly did justice to the complexities of multiracial Creek country, some Creek leaders had long engaged in slavery and the slave trade.⁴⁵ Joining the fight against Haitian emancipation thus promised to be a new arena in Native Americans'

desperate struggle to maintain their independence. Saint-Domingue refugees had considered joining the state-building project of Muskogee, and now Turreau's plan sought to recruit the disoriented supporters of this failed state for his reconquest of Haiti.

Conclusion

William Augustus Bowles and Turreau de Garambouville, and their failed projects, are usually (if at all) considered to be relatively insignificant chapters of unconnected histories. When studied alongside each other, however, larger patterns and connections emerge that shed light on exile as a sphere of political action during the age of revolutions. This particular sphere did not come out of the blue, nor did it vanish with the end (or, rather, the slowdown) of revolutionary upheaval in the Atlantic world. Rather, the decades between the 1770s and 1820s mark a crucial transitional moment in the longer history of refugees and exile politics, a moment defined by both continuity and change. In many ways, revolutionary-era exile built on long-established practices of reception and resettlement among early modern imperial states and on the public sphere carved out by certain refugee groups. Yet, in a departure from early modern practices, the revolutionary era also prefigured the nineteenth-century emergence of exile as an integral site of nearly all political change and transformation. At the same time, in contrast to the iconic images and near-professionalism of mid-nineteenth-century exiles, the age of revolutions did not produce a clearly defined type of political 'exile'; rather, it provided a set of hybrid figures of involuntary mobility, in whom the contours of the late modern category of refugee began to reveal themselves.⁴⁶ Seen in comparison and in connection with each other, the cases of Bowles and Turreau point to a number of features of, and open questions concerning, the transitional nature, still poorly understood, of revolutionary-era exile politics.

First, these two cases suggest that exile was the site of unlikely alliances that crossed national, imperial and even 'civilizational' boundaries, shaped by actors with unstable and changing loyalties and networks that 'travelled' between different (counter-) revolutionary contexts. Revolutionary-era exile politics evolved not in a vacuum but in close alliance with its broader surroundings. Exile activities by refugees thus often emerged at the intersection of multiple and often murky interests, so that exile politics (and refugee mobilities) during this era were frequently intertwined with economic ventures, military engagement, settler colonialism or geopolitical schemes. As can be seen in the two cases, complex borderland settings provided fertile ground for the convergence of interests and alliances that shaped exile politics, to such an extent that one may justifiably ask how to delineate 'genuine' exile or refugee politics and borderland politics. This also has consequences for the still-nascent field of migration and exile's conceptual history, as it pushes us to reconsider the distinction between refugee and the members of other mobile and non-mobile groups.⁴⁷

Second, the plastic, border-crossing character of exile as shown in the two case studies poses important questions about the place and role of political ideas with regard to exile politics. The deeply engrained romantic image of the white male

liberal, central to the notion of exile in nineteenth-century Europe, does not apply to the revolutionary era. The political migrations and exile politics of the revolutionary era deviate from this norm in the majority of cases. Although the exact motives and circumstances varied, most exiles did not adhere to a revolutionary or liberal cause; in fact most sought to evade or actively opposed revolutionary change and its consequences, albeit sometimes in revolutionary ways of their own. Notions of freedom, republican government and equal citizenship, usually considered the main ingredients of political activism during this period, were not central concepts in the cases studied here – instead one finds ideas of extreme violence (in Turreau's case), ideas less progressive but no less 'modern' than the aforementioned ideals. The case studies point to communities of non- or even anti-revolutionary exiles that were no less multinational and multifaceted than the better-known liberal or revolutionary International.⁴⁸ In close connection to what happened over the course of the post-1776 'revolutions', certain guiding scripts of 'counter-revolution' emerged, to a large extent written, rewritten and improvised in exile.⁴⁹ The questions raised by the two case studies, however, go beyond a mere widening or rebalancing of the ideas discussed and shaped in exile. They should prompt us to reconsider the significance ascribed to political ideas in exile politics during this period. The projects discussed in this chapter were driven by a complex array of interests, in which political goals and norms went hand in hand with economic interests, mercenarism, geostrategic considerations, among others. The close collaboration between a veteran of the revolutionary army (Turreau) and prominent monarchists with close ties to Great Britain, and the mobilization of one of the legendary Black generals of the Haitian revolution (Biassou) against the self-proclaimed troops of a multiracial Native American state in Florida: these examples necessitate a more nuanced understanding of the complexity and dynamism of the divide in 'revolutionary' and 'counter-revolutionary' politics. For Bowles and Turreau, it may not have even mattered whether they were to be classified as 'revolutionary' or 'counter-revolutionary'.

Third, the countless failed activities stemming from exile(s) raise important questions about legitimacy and power during the revolutionary era. In many ways, the means, symbols and strategies employed in anti-revolutionary schemes such as Bowles's and Turreau's, as well as the various failed revolutionary state-building projects masterfully studied by Vanessa Mongey, were not essentially different from what proved to be successful.⁵⁰ Taken together, they reveal a much broader 'contest over legitimacy',⁵¹ in which situational and shaky alliances on the ground and hierarchical external recognition on an international level, personal ambitions and larger geopolitical contexts intersected in a situation that did not automatically replace crumbling empires with fully sovereign nationstates. In the absence of globally shared mechanisms and forums (such as the post-1945 United Nations systems), the means by which claims for sovereignty and legitimacy could be asserted or recognized were in flux and up for grabs for those pursuing revolutionary state building and those contesting it. Below the level of formal recognition and state treaties, actual commercial relations, privateering commissions and the crafting of constitutions were among the proofs of legitimacy that revolutionaries and counter-revolutionaries – and, among them, many exiles – fought over. Extending our gaze beyond the tunnel vision of successful (revolutionary)

state building can help us ask more precise questions about the conditions of successful revolutionary or counter-revolutionary politics in the decade of 1800.

And fourth, the case studies raise important questions about established chronologies and teleologies by opening up a whole universe of alternative planning and ‘past futures’. Muskogee, and Turreau’s plan of a Franco-Indian reoccupation of Haiti, may appear chimerical and bizarre, and certainly neither changed the actual course of events. And yet, these episodes and the countless comparable exile activities by other actors evoke the fundamental uncertainty towards the ultimate outcome of this period and call into question the teleology of the age-of-revolutions model. Even if the newly established independent states would consolidate themselves in the long run, such a development could not realistically be taken for granted over a period of several decades. Projects such as Muskogee or Turreau’s Franco-Indian alliance did not necessarily seem more adventurous or unlikely than the idea of an independent American state system led by Creole elites and the formerly enslaved and the eventual rise of the United States to a continental (later even global) hegemon. In the eyes of their refugees, the great revolutions were much less irreversible than they may appear in hindsight.

Notes

- 1 For close reading and insightful comments on earlier versions, I would like to thank the editors, the participants in the ‘Refugee Politics’ workshop and the members of the research seminar of the Käte Hamburger College / Global Cooperation Research. Research for this article has received funding by the German Historical Institute in Washington and the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 849189).
- 2 On William Augustus Bowles and his activities, see Lyle N. McAlister, ed., ‘The Marine Forces of William Augustus Bowles and His “State of Muskogee”’: Illustrative Documents’, *Florida Historical Quarterly* 32, no. 1 (1953): 3–27; J. Leitch Wright, Jr, *William Augustus Bowles, Director General of the Creek Nation* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1967); Maya Jasanoff, *Liberty’s Exiles: American Loyalists in the Revolutionary World* (New York: Knopf, 2011), 234–42, 321–3. Turreau de Garambouville’s later career is overshadowed by his role in the Vendée suppression; see Jean-Clément Martin, *La Vendée et la France* (Paris: Seuil, 1987), 206–46; David A. Bell, *The First Total War: Napoleon’s Europe and the Birth of Warfare as We Know It* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2007), 154–85; Jacques Henri-Robert, *Dictionnaire des diplomates de Napoléon* (Paris: Veyrier, 1990), 332–3.
- 3 On the history of American Loyalists, see Jasanoff, *Liberty’s Exiles*; Cassandra Pybus, *Epic Journeys of Freedom: Runaway Slaves of the American Revolution and their Global Quest for Liberty* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2006); Mary Beth Norton, *The British Americans: The Loyalist Exiles in England, 1774–1789* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1972); Neil MacKinnon, *This Unfriendly Soil: The Loyalist Experience in Nova Scotia, 1783–1791* (Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1986); David G. Bell, *Early Loyalist Saint John: The Origin of New Brunswick Politics, 1783–1786* (Fredericton:

- New Ireland Press, 1983); on historiography, see Jane Errington, 'Loyalists and Loyalism in the American Revolution and Beyond', *Acadiensis* 41, no. 2 (2012): 164–73.
- 4 Friedemann Pestel, *Kosmopoliten wider Willen: Die 'monarchiens' als Revolutionsemigranten* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015); Juliette Reboul, *French Emigration to Great Britain in Response to the French Revolution* (Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2017); *The French émigrés in Europe and the Struggle against Revolution, 1789–1814*, ed. Kirsty Carpenter and Philip Mansel (Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, 1999); François Furstenberg, *When the United States Spoke French: Five Refugees Who Shaped a Nation* (New York: Knopf, 2014). On historiography, see Karine Rance, 'L'historiographie de l'émigration', in *Les Noblesses françaises dans l'Europe de la Révolution*, ed. Philippe Bourdin (Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2010), 355–68; Friedemann Pestel, 'The Colors of Exile in the Age of Revolutions: New Perspectives for French Émigré Studies', *Yearbook of Transnational History* 4 (2021): 27–68.
 - 5 There is no comprehensive study of the Saint-Domingue diaspora; for different localities, see Nathalie Dessens, *From Saint-Domingue to New Orleans: Migration and Influences* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2007); Rebecca J. Scott and Jean M. Hébrard, *Freedoms Papers: An Atlantic Odyssey in the Age of Emancipation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012); Gabriel Debien and Philip Wright, 'Les colons de Saint-Domingue passés à la Jamaïque (1792–1835)', *Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire de la Guadeloupe* 26, no. 4 (1975): 3–216; Ashley White, *Encountering Revolution: Haiti and the Making of the Early Republic* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010).
 - 6 The political emigrations of the Spanish American revolutions are currently the least understood. For overviews, see Edmundo A. Heredia, *Los vencidos: Un estudio sobre los realistas en la guerra de independencia hispanoamericana* (Córdoba: University Nacional, 1997), 65–92; Paul Verna, *Bolívar y los emigrados patriotas en el Caribe (Trinidad, Curacao, San Thomas, Jamaica, Haití)* (Caracas: INCE, 1983); Karen Racine, 'Imagining Independence: London's Spanish-American Community, 1790–1829' (PhD diss., Tulane University, 1996); Edward Blumenthal, *Exile and Nation-State Formation in Argentina and Chile, 1810–1862* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019); Nicolás A. González Quintero, 'Exile and Empire in the 19th Century Spanish Caribbean' (PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2020).
 - 7 Maurizio Isabella, *Risorgimento in Exile: Italian Émigrés and the Liberal International in the Post-Napoleonic Era* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Juan Luis Simal, *Emigrados: España y el exilio internacional, 1814–1834* (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales, 2012); Muiris MacGiollaibhuí, 'Sons of Exile: The United Irishmen in Transnational Perspective, 1791–1827' (PhD diss., UC Santa Cruz, 2019).
 - 8 For one succinct and one sweeping synthesis of these scholarly efforts, see David A. Bell, 'The Atlantic Revolutions', in *Revolutionary World: Global Upheaval in the Modern Age*, ed. David Motadel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021), 38–65; *The Cambridge History of the Age of the Atlantic Revolutions*, ed. Willem Klooster, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023).
 - 9 Maya Jasanoff, 'Revolutionary Exiles: The American Loyalist and French Émigré Diasporas', in *The Age of Revolutions in Global Context, c. 1760–1840*, ed. David Armitage and Sanjay Subrahmanyam (Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2010), 37–58; Jan C. Jansen, 'Flucht und Exil im Zeitalter der Revolutionen: Perspektiven einer atlantischen Flüchtlingsgeschichte (1770er–1820er Jahre)', *Geschichte und*

- Gesellschaft* 44, no. 4 (2018): 495–525; Friedemann Pestel, ‘The Age of Emigrations: French Émigrés and Global Entanglements of Political Exile’, in *French Emigrants in Revolutionised Europe: Connected Histories and Memories*, ed. Laure Philip and Juliette Rebol (Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2019), 205–31.
- 10 ‘Exiled: Identity and Identification’, *Age of Revolutions*, Roundtable, 29 May–26 June 2023. <https://ageofrevolutions.com/category/exiled-identity-and-identification>; Caroline Shaw, *Britannia’s Embrace: Modern Humanitarianism and the Imperial Origins of Refugee Relief* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 15–40; Sylvie Aprile and Delphine Diaz, ‘Les réfugiés et l’asile dans l’Europe du XIX^e siècle’, in *Définir les réfugiés*, ed. Michel Agier and Anne-Virginie Madeira (Paris: PUF, 2017), 29–45; Delphine Diaz and Alexandre Dupont, eds, ‘Les mots de l’exil dans l’Europe du XIX^e siècle’, *Hommes & migrations* 1321 (2018) 6–11; Kit Candlin, ‘The Expansion of the Idea of the Refugee in the Early-Nineteenth-Century Atlantic World’, *Slavery & Abolition* 30, no. 4 (2009): 521–44.
 - 11 Jan C. Jansen, ‘Registration and Deportation: Refugees, Regimes of Proof, and the Law in Jamaica, 1791–1828’, in *Mobility and Coercion in an Age of War and Revolution (c. 1750–1830)*, ed. Jan C. Jansen and Kirsten McKenzie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2024), 173–93.
 - 12 Jan C. Jansen, ‘Aliens in a Revolutionary World: Refugees, Migration Control and Subjecthood in the British Atlantic, 1790s–1820s’, *Past & Present* 255 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtab022>.
 - 13 Philipp Ther, *The Outsiders: Refugees in Europe since 1492* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019), 8–10, 139–43; Dirk Hoerder, *Cultures in Contact: World Migrations in the Second Millennium* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002), 303–4; Sylvie Aprile, *Le siècle des exilés: Bannis et proscrits de 1789 à la commune* (Paris: CNRS, 2010); Delphine Diaz, *En exil: Les réfugiés en Europe de la fin du xviii^e siècle à nos jours* (Paris: Gallimard, 2021), 33–76.
 - 14 ‘Représentants en mission du Département des Alpes, Antoine-François Gauthier, Edmond Dubois Crance et Antoine-Louis Albitte, au Comité du Salut Public, Grenoble (8 July 1793)’, in *Recueil des Actes du Comité du Salut Public*, ed. François-Alphonse Aulard, Suppl. vol. 1 (Paris: Impr. Nationale, 1966), 423.
 - 15 Hannah Arendt, ‘We Refugees [1943]’, in *The Jewish Writings*, ed. Jerome Kohn and Ron H. Feldman (New York: Schocken Books, 2007), 274.
 - 16 E.g. Isabella, *Risorgimento in Exile*; Simal, *Emigrados*.
 - 17 On the conceptual history of ‘counter-revolution’, see Matthias Middell, *Die Geburt der Konterrevolution in Frankreich, 1788–1792* (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2005); Friedemann Pestel, ‘On Counterrevolution: Semantic Investigations of a Counterconcept during the French Revolution’, *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 12, no. 2 (2017): 50–75; Pestel, ‘Contre-révolution’, in *Handbuch politisch-sozialer Grundbegriffe in Frankreich 1680–1820*, ed. Jörn Leonhard and Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink, vol. 22 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021), 165–230. On the much better-researched concept of ‘revolution’, see Reinhart Koselleck et al., ‘Revolution, Rebellion, Aufruhr, Bürgerkrieg’, in *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, ed. Otto Brunner et al., vol. 5 (Stuttgart: Klett Cotta, 1984), 653–788; Rolf Reichardt, ‘Révolution, révolutionnaire’, in *Handbuch politisch-sozialer Grundbegriffe*, vol. 22, 61–162.
 - 18 Jane Landers, *Atlantic Creoles in the Age of Revolutions* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010), 55–94; John K. Thornton, ‘“I am the Subject of the King of Congo”: African Political Ideology and the Haitian Revolution’, *Journal of World History* 4, no. 2 (1993): 181–214; David P. Geggus, ‘The Caribbean in the Age of

- Revolution’, in Armitage and Subrahmanyam, *The Age of Revolutions in Global Context*, 95–9; Pestel, ‘On Counterrevolution’, 71–3.
- 19 On these earlier practices, see Susanne Lachenicht, *Hugenotten in Europa und Nordamerika: Migration und Integration in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt/M: Campus, 2010); Owen Stanwood, *The Global Refuge: Huguenots in an Age of Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020); Bram M. Hoonhout and Thomas J. F. Mareite, ‘Freedom at the Fringes? Slave Flight and Empire-Building in the Early Modern Spanish Borderlands of Essequibo–Venezuela and Louisiana–Texas’, *Slavery & Abolition* 40, no. 1 (2018): 61–86; and the chapters by Kat Hill and Owen Stanwood in this volume. For the cases during the revolutionary era, see Jasanoff, *Liberty’s Exiles*; Debien and Wright, ‘Colons de Saint-Domingue’; González Quintero, ‘Exile and Empire’; Friedemann Pestel, ‘(Un)Settling Exile: Imagining Outposts of the French Emigration across the Globe’, in Jansen and McKenzie, *Mobility and Coercion*, 58–82.
 - 20 Simon Burrows, *French Exile Journalism and European Politics, 1792–1814* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000); Samuel Joseph Marino, ‘French Refugee Newspapers and Periodicals in the United States, 1789–1825’ (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1962). On the longer traditions of mounting press campaigns, see the chapter by Catherine Arnold in this volume.
 - 21 Rafe Blaufarb, *Bonapartists in the Borderlands: French Exiles and Refugees on the Gulf Coast, 1815–1835* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2005); Furstenberg, *When the United States Spoke French*; David E. Narrett, *Adventurism and Empire: The Struggle for Mastery in the Louisiana-Florida Borderlands, 1762–1803* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015).
 - 22 On ‘futures past’, see Reinhart Koselleck “Erfahrungsraum” und “Erwartungshorizont” – zwei historische Kategorien, in Reinhart Koselleck, *Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten* (Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp, 1989), 349–75; Lucian Hölscher, *Die Entdeckung der Zukunft*, 2nd edn (Frankfurt/M: Fischer, 2016).
 - 23 On Creek society and politics during this period, see *McGillivray of the Creeks*, ed. John Walton Caughey (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1938); Elena Sánchez-Fabrés Mirat, *Situación histórica de las Floridas en la segunda mitad del siglo XVIII (1783–1819): Los problemas de una región de frontera* (Madrid: Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores, 1977); J. Leitch Wright, Jr, *Creeks and Seminoles: The Destruction and Regeneration of the Muscogulge People* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986); Kathryn E. Holland Braund, *Deerskins and Duffles: Creek-Indian Trade with Anglo-America, 1685–1815* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993); Claudio Saunt, *A New Order of Things: Property, Power, and the Transformation of the Creek Indians, 1733–1816* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
 - 24 Wright, Jr, *William Augustus Bowles*; Kathleen DuVal, *Independence Lost: Lives on the Edge of the American Revolution* (New York: Random House, 2015).
 - 25 Landers, *Atlantic Creoles*, 100–10; Watson W. Jennison, *Cultivating Race: The Expansion of Slavery in Georgia, 1750–1860* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2012), 127–55.
 - 26 Gilbert C. Din, *War on the Gulf Coast: The Spanish Fight against William Augustus Bowles* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2012); Narrett, *Adventurism and Empire*, 209–32, 259–62.
 - 27 Eliga H. Gould, ‘Independence and Interdependence: The American Revolution and the Problem of Postcolonial Nationhood, circa 1802’, *William and Mary Quarterly* 74, no. 4 (2017): 729–52.

- 28 Jasanoff, *Liberty's Exiles*, 234–42, 321–3.
- 29 Havana, Archivo Nacional de Cuba (hereafter ANC), Fondos de Las Floridas, Legajo 1, Exp. 24, No. 10, 81–5, T. H. 'Issue of T.H. Ferguson's adventure to the Muskogee nation (as collector of a town not yet built on the Okelochnee)', 16 June 1800, quote at 81 [Transcripts at LC, Manuscript Division].
- 30 La Courneuve, Archives des Affaires Etrangères (hereafter AAE), Correspondance Politique (hereafter CP), Etats-Unis, vol. 56, fol. 236r, Arrêté par le Premier Consul, 16 Frimaire XII [6 December 1803]; for his arrival in the United States, see AAE, CP, Etats-Unis, vol. 57, fols. 387r–388r, Turreau au ministre des relations extérieures, 28 Brumaire XIII [18 November 1804]. This part draws on findings from Jan C. Jansen, 'American Indians for Saint-Domingue? Exile, Violence, and Imperial Geopolitics after the French and Haitian Revolutions', *French Historical Studies* 45, no. 1 (2022): 49–86.
- 31 For overviews, see Rayford W. Logan, *The Diplomatic Relations of the United States with Haiti, 1776–1891* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1941), 152–87; Thierry Lentz, *Napoléon diplomate* (Paris: CNRS Éd., 2012), 233–60; Peter P. Hill, *Napoleon's Troublesome Americans: Franco-American Relations 1804–1815* (Dulles: Potomac Books, 2005).
- 32 Kingston, National Library of Jamaica (hereafter NLJ), Manuscript Division, Ms161 and Vincennes, Service historique de l'armée de terre (hereafter SHAT), B7/1: Plan pour la conquête de Saint Domingue, 1806, par Turreau de Garambouville.
- 33 AAE, CP, Etats-Unis, Supplément, vol. 38, fols. 133r–134r, Commissaire de marine de Première Classe, agent de Saint-Domingue aux isles danoises, Somon, au Général Thurreau, 7 messidor XII [25 June 1804]; AAE, CP, Etats-Unis, vol. 59, fols. 46r–50v, Louis de Bellegard à Turreau, 1 January.
- 34 AAE, CP, Etats-Unis, Supplément, vol. 38, fols. 179r–192r, Les colons de Saint-Domingue à son Excellence le général Turreau, grand officier de la légion d'honneur et ministre plénipotentiaire de S.M. l'empereur des Français près les Etats-Unis d'Amérique, s.d. Among Turreau's closest informers were members of the Rouvray family, a well-known royalist planter family from Saint-Domingue. See AAE, CP, Etats-Unis, Supplément, vol. 38, fol. 193r–v, Rouvray à Turreau, 4 Floréal XIII [13 April 1805]; on the family, see David P. Geggus, *Slavery, War, and Revolution: The British Occupation of Saint Domingue, 1793–1798* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 270, 274; Alejandro E. Gómez, *Le spectre de la révolution noire: L'impact de la Révolution haïtienne dans le monde atlantique, 1790–1886* (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2013), 63–5.
- 35 NLJ, Ms161, *Plan pour la conquête de Saint Domingue*, 7.
- 36 *Ibid.*, 4.
- 37 Martin, *Vendée*, 206–46; Bell, *First Total War*, 154–85. On continuities and discontinuities in the longer history of warfare, see also Martin Rink, 'From Small Wars to Imperial War: Military and Tactical Transformations in the 18th and 19th Centuries', in *Insurgency and Counterinsurgency: Irregular Warfare from 1800 to the Present*, ed. Thijs Brocades Zaalberg, Piet Kamphuis and Alan Lemmers (The Hague: Nederlands Instituut voor Militaire Historie, 2011), 171–84; David Armitage, *Civil Wars: A History in Ideas* (New York: Knopf, 2017).
- 38 Marlene L. Daut, *Tropics of Haiti: Race and the Literary History of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World, 1789–1865* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015), 98–109; Laurent Dubois, 'Avenging America: The Politics of Violence in the Haitian Revolution', in *The World of the Haitian Revolution*, ed. David P. Geggus and Norman Fiering (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009), 111–24.

- 39 AAE, CP, Etats-Unis, Supplément, vol. 38, fols. 179r–192r, Les colons de Saint-Domingue . . . , quote from fol. 183r.
- 40 Claude Bonaparte Auguste and Marcel Bonaparte Auguste, *L'Expédition Leclerc, 1801–1803* (Port-au-Prince: Deschamps, 1985); Laurent Dubois, *Avengers of the New World: The Story of the Haitian Revolution* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 280–301; Philippe R. Girard, *The Slaves Who Defeated Napoleon: Toussaint Louverture and the Haitian War of Independence, 1801–1804* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2011), esp. 224–47, 318–25; Philippe R. Girard, 'French Atrocities During the Haitian War of Independence', *Journal of Genocide Research* 15, no. 2 (2013): 133–49.
- 41 NLJ, Ms161, *Plan pour la conquête de Saint Domingue*, quote at 33.
- 42 NLJ, Ms161, *Plan pour la conquête de Saint Domingue*, 31–4; AAE, CP, Etats-Unis, vol. 59, fols. 140r–151r, Turreau au ministre des relations extérieures, 10 May 1806.
- 43 NLJ, Ms161, *Plan pour la conquête de Saint Domingue*, 33.
- 44 On Tastageny, see his own account from 1802, G[énéral] Milfort, *Mémoire, ou, Coup-d'œil rapide sur mes différens voyages et mon séjour dans la nation Crèck* (Paris: Giguet et Michaud, 1802). See also E. Wilson Lyon, ed., 'Milfort's Plan for a Franco-Creek Alliance and the Retrocession of Louisiana', *Journal of Southern History* 4 (1938): 72–87; Gilbert C. Din, 'Louis LeClerc de Milford, a.k.a. General François Tastanegy: An Eighteenth-Century French Adventurer among the Creeks', in *Nexus of Empire: Negotiating Loyalty and Identity in the Revolutionary Borderlands, 1760s–1820s*, ed. Gene Allen Smith and Sylvia L. Hilton (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2010), 63–88. On the broader intersections of Native American politics and the conflicts of the revolutionary era, see Christian Ayne Crouch, 'The French Revolution in Indian Country: Reconsidering the Reach and Place of Atlantic Upheaval', in *The French Revolution as a Moment of Respatialization*, ed. Megan Maruschke and Matthias Middell (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019), 85–105.
- 45 On the complex and contradictory interracial relationships in Creek country, see Kevin Mulroy, *The Seminole Freedmen: A History* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007); Saunt, *A New Order of Things*, 111–35.
- 46 A central argument in Jansen and McKenzie, *Mobility and Coercion*.
- 47 For recent time discussed by Karen Akoka, *Lasile et l'exil: Une histoire de la distinction réfugiés/migrants* (Paris: La Découverte, 2020); Rebecca Hamlin, *Crossing: How We Label and React to People on the Move* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2021).
- 48 For early forays into these connections, see *La Contre-Révolution en Europe: XVIII^e–XIX^e siècles: Réalités politiques et sociales, résonances culturelles et idéologiques*, ed. Jean-Clément Martin (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2001); Jordi Canal, 'Internationale blanche', in *Dictionnaire de la contre-révolution*, ed. Jean-Clément Martin (Paris: Perrin, 2011), 307–11; *Cosmopolitan Conservatism: Countering Revolution in Transnational Networks, Ideas, and Movements (c. 1650–1930)*, ed. Matthijs Lok, Friedemann Pestel and Juliette Reboul (Leiden: Brill, 2021).
- 49 *Scripting Revolution: A Historical Approach to the Comparative Study of Revolutions*, ed. Keith Michael Baker and Dan Edelstein (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015).
- 50 Vanessa Mongey, *Rogue Revolutionaries: The Fight for Legitimacy in the Greater Caribbean* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2020); many relevant cases are also touched on in a broader perspective by Linda Colley, *The Gun, the Ship, and the Pen: Warfare, Constitutions, and the Making of the Modern World* (London: Profile Books, 2021).
- 51 Mongey, *Rogue Revolutionaries*, 2.

Afterword

Refugee politics in longue-durée perspectives

Fabian Klose

*'Refugees are people like anyone else, like you and me.
They led ordinary lives before becoming displaced,
and their biggest dream is to be able to live normally again.'*¹

Ban Ki-moon, UN Secretary-General, 2015

At the end of 2021 the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) calculated in its Global Trends report that 89.3 million people worldwide had been forced to flee their homes due to violence, persecution, massive human rights violations, humanitarian disasters and war.² Especially protracted conflicts in countries such as Afghanistan, Ethiopia, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Myanmar, Nigeria, Syria and Yemen caused this figure to dramatically increase. And only a few months later, this figure hit another sad record due to the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine that began in February 2022 and resulted in one of the fastest and largest displacement crises since the end of the Second World War: the tally of displaced persons worldwide now topped, for the first time, 100 million people.³ According to the UN refugee agency, global displacement over the last decade has steadily increased each year and has more than doubled, so that today '1 in every 78 people on earth has been forced to flee – a dramatic milestone that few would have expected a decade ago'.⁴

Regarding these enormous numbers and this general development, it becomes self-evident that issues of forced displacement, refugee politics and refugee protection are interconnected aspects of a global phenomenon that is one of the major challenges of our time. These themes are high on the agenda of international politics and humanitarian organizations, but they also trigger controversial political debates within societies. Furthermore, they are setting new research agendas in various academic disciplines such as political science, sociology, international law and history.⁵ Especially given the so-called European migrant crisis⁶ of 2015, when more than 1.3 million people – mostly Syrians, but also people from Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan and Eritrea – sought asylum in Europe, these topics have also drawn enhanced attention among historians. As a result, an increasing number of new studies have been published, significantly broadening the historical perspective on the history of refugees and displacement. While this narrative was hitherto mainly told as a twentieth-century history,⁷ recent

historiography extends beyond this narrow chronological boundary by including the pre-modern era in its analysis.⁸ The term ‘refugee’ has thus been shown to have emerged in this period not only as a neologism but also as a social and political category, with far-reaching consequences in the early modern world.⁹

The edited volume *Refugee Politics in Early Modern Europe* contributes significantly to this ongoing historiographical debate by providing the first comparative approach investigating the origins of the concept of refugee as well as its impact on European politics and beyond. As the volume’s editors, Geert Janssen and David de Boer, highlight in their introduction, this volume uses ‘refugee politics’ in a rather broad sense and as an umbrella term which deliberately includes all forms of political behaviour influencing and shaping the situation of displaced people. Accordingly, the book focuses on political interactions between various groups of refugees and their respective host societies as well as on various governments’ reactions in their attempts to manage forced migration movements. Spatially, the volume’s contributions cover a vast area, ranging from the British Caribbean to the Baltics and from Scandinavia to the Maghreb. In its three parts the book seeks to address three interrelated main themes: namely, to examine the origins and the development of the refugee as a social and political category in early modern Europe; to identify the agency of displaced people in forging humanitarian networks; and to analyse the impact of refugees on European state formation and empire-building.

Most of the contributors to this volume – especially in its first part, ‘Refugees and Belonging’ – reflect on the historical emergence of the concept of refugee, covering the period from the Reformation to the Age of the Atlantic Revolutions. They examine the semantic origins of various refugee categories, refugee discourses and related identity formations from a comparative and cross-confessional perspective, including case studies of Protestant, Catholic and Jewish refugees as well as Iberian Moriscos. The religious dimension dominates here, as members of all these groups, in their discourses, refer to their specific confessional allegiance. An exception broadening this religious scope is Sari Nauman’s case study on Swedish refugees during the Great Northern War (1700–1721).¹⁰ This refugee group did not flee from religious persecution but was escaping the miseries caused by the war; furthermore, they were not fleeing a state’s territory but were moving within one. Accordingly, she introduces an early case of an internally displaced people and their strategies to obtain help from their compatriots and their own ruler.

Investigating the emergence of the concept of refugee is, as these case studies illuminate, extends far beyond semantics. The question of belonging to a special group of displaced people and being able to adequately present this allegiance – mainly regarding confessional groups – was essential for early modern refugees: it was indispensable to their obtaining aid and protection, to their acceptance in host societies and to their achieving the status of political and social subjects. Refugees’ belonging was fundamental to issues of selectivity, hierarchy and the related protection of displaced people. This holds true not only for early modern times but also for refugee politics in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. When, after the First World War, the first international refugee regime emerged in the realm of the League of Nations, it was highly selective and depended on national belonging. The Nansen passport

system, providing stateless refugees some kind of legal status and protection, was at first reserved only for Russians fleeing civil war, and it was only slowly extended to others such as Armenian, Assyrian and Turkish refugee groups over the course of the 1920s.¹¹ The 1951 UN Refugee Convention, legally defining for the first time the term 'refugee', outlining the rights of refugees and the legal obligations of states to protect them, was selective with regard to time and geography, referring exclusively to the protection of European refugees from before 1 January 1951.¹² The UN Protocol of 1967 eliminated these temporal and spatial limitations, but nevertheless modern international refugee politics has remained highly selective and has been driven by questions of belonging.¹³ Even in our own era, former UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon had to remind the world, in an urgent appeal addressing the appalling humanitarian crisis in 2015 and the deaths of thousands of refugees, that protection was not a question of belonging, but a fundamental human duty: 'International law has stipulated – and states have long recognized – the right of refugees to protection and asylum. When considering asylum requests, States cannot make distinctions based on religion or other identity – nor can they force people to return to places from which they have fled if there is a well-founded fear of persecution or attack. This is not a matter of international law; it is also our duty as human beings.'¹⁴

Most importantly, all the contributions in this volume offer evidence of the strong political agency of these various refugee groups. These groups, as demonstrated especially by Sari Nauman, Alexander Schunka and Gerard Wiegers, raised their voices via petitioning, thus actively claiming their political agency and appealing directly to rulers' responsibility to protect.¹⁵ Furthermore, they became important actors in local, regional and transnational politics. In his study comparing Italian Protestant refugees in Jacobean London to English Catholic refugees in Counter-Reformation Rome, Diego Pirillo vividly shows that these exile groups were able to assume the mantle of 'political subjects'.¹⁶ They not only successfully managed their exile but played an active role in transforming their new residences into important sites for religious and political debate, forums where various ideas were articulated and discussed, and polyphonic factions within the exiled competed for leadership. In this context exile communities – as Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin highlights in the case of Irish Catholic exiles – significantly influenced political discourses across Europe and, at the same time, played a vital role in the invention of national identities.¹⁷ From this perspective, exile presented itself as an opportunity to reshape and advance identity formation. According to Jesse Spohnholz's insights concerning Reformed refugees from the Habsburg Netherlands in the Holy Roman Empire,¹⁸ these communities built up lasting 'transnational refugee networks', which not only connected various exile havens but also helped shape regional and transnational politics in a significant fashion.¹⁹

These findings convincingly remind us that refugees were not (and are not) marginalized and stigmatized victims fully dependent on aid from others. Far from being helpless objects unable to speak for themselves and to demand protection, they were instead actors who successfully managed their exile and, furthermore, significantly shaped politics in early modern Europe. This assessment offers an important historical insight that should change our perspective regarding the modern history of refugee politics, given the predominance, even today, of interpretations that

cast refugees merely as aid recipients, deprived of all political agency. The refugees themselves have rejected this narrow notion, which was refuted most prominently by Hannah Arendt in her January 1943 essay 'We Refugees'. As a German Jew forced to flee Nazi persecution, she rejects – in the essay's very first lines – being called a refugee and stigmatized as such. Instead she asserts her agency to rebuild her life in exile as 'newcomer' or 'immigrant', becoming an integrated part of the host society. After describing the hardship of fleeing, she presents exiles in her conclusion not as passive victims but, on the contrary, the 'vanguard of their people'.²⁰

In the second part of the volume, the focus shifts to emerging refugee networks. Under the heading of 'humanitarianism' both editors raise the question of the role of displaced minority groups in creating early transnational humanitarian networks. By examining relief efforts, long-distance solidarity and media coverage concerning the situation of persecuted groups, their aim is to uncover the significance of early modern refugees in promoting a culture of charity and empathy as well as in influencing general domestic and foreign policies affecting these issues. In his chapter on Protestant minorities in Central Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Alexander Schunka demonstrates vividly that support for refugees was heavily dependent on confessional belonging, mobility and the ability to successfully fundraise among distant co-religious communities.²¹ Fundraising trips based on elements of pre-modern poor relief thus became a common strategic feature when exiled communities were mobilizing vital support for its members. As a consequence, these journeys contributed significantly to the evolution of confessional solidarity networks across Europe, strengthening the ties among diaspora communities and their co-religious supporters.

Adam Teller underlines the importance of these solidarity networks in his study on Jewish communities fleeing the Swedish and Russian invasion of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 1650s.²² Focusing on these refugees, who were facing xenophobia and open hostility on the part of the non-Jewish majority societies, he gives a detailed picture of the relief strategies of local Jewish communities as well as trans-regional cooperation among Jewish communities in providing support. According to Teller, these refugees could rely on Jewish solidarity and a support network that, in its size and sophistication, was quite unique in early modern Europe.

Solidarity and advocacy concerning displaced people, however, could also be practised and expressed beyond narrow religious relief networks. As Catherine Arnold shows in her contribution, various refugee groups during the first half of the eighteenth century used the rapidly growing medium of printed news intensively so that it became a powerful tool for transnational advocacy.²³ By publishing and disseminating atrocity stories via newspapers, they sought to appeal directly to a broader transnational audience in order to put pressure on the governments responsible for the persecution. Naming and shaming thus became an important part of the strategy employed within refugee networks to mobilize support and to put their concerns prominently on the international agenda.

All these chapters highlight the crucial importance of transnational network building for early modern refugee groups to elicit solidarity, to gain support, and to raise awareness of their precarious situations. However, there still remains some desiderata as to the direct impact these discussed cases exerted on the emergence of the concept

of humanitarianism. Most authors refrain from referring to this analytical framework – actually, the term ‘humanitarian’ is used only rarely²⁴ – and emphasize instead the co-religious dimension. Providing relief was still firmly motivated by confessional solidarity with endangered coreligionists in nearby European countries and not by a broader discourse of helping suffering fellow human beings regarded as an undeniable part of universal humanity.²⁵ The notion of ‘humanity’, even though its definition varied over time and in different linguistic contexts, implies, however, certain core meanings.²⁶ Beyond denoting the natural characteristics of individual human beings and serving as the collective noun for the whole human species, ‘humanity’ included also the practice of ‘Benevolence’.²⁷ In this context ‘humanity’ even found its way into seminal texts of international law such as *The Law of Nations: or, Principles of the Law of Nature* (1758) by the Swiss legal scholar and philosopher Emer de Vattel. In his Book II de Vattel defined the duties of a nation towards others as the ‘Offices of Humanity’²⁸:

The offices of humanity are those succours, those duties, to which men are reciprocally obliged as men, that is, as social beings which necessarily stand in need of a mutual assistance for their preservation, for their happiness and for living in a manner conformable to their nature. Now the law of nature being no less obligatory to nations than individuals [. . .] what a man owes to other men, a nation, in its manner, owes to other nations [. . .]. Such is the foundation of the common duties of those offices of humanity to which nations are reciprocally bound one to another.²⁹

Thus implying a guiding norm for societal behaviour among fellow human beings as well as nations, the term ‘humanity’ was essential for the emergence of the concept of ‘humanitarianism’.

Catherine Arnold touches on this issue slightly when she points out that in the newspaper campaigns at the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century there can be found the argument ‘that rulers should treat all their subjects with “humanity”’.³⁰ Even though this is only briefly discussed, it can indeed be interpreted in the sense of the rise of a ‘humanitarian sensibility’ and the prominent emergence of a ‘humanitarian narrative’ over the course of the eighteenth century. Humanitarian reform movements such as abolitionism relied intensively on pamphlets, newspaper articles and images to mobilize domestic as well as transnational public opinion in support of their cause.³¹ Early modern refugee aid was still firmly dominated by confessional belonging, but certain related practices might be seen as part of a ‘proto-humanitarian culture’³² as Sari Nauman puts it or, in other words, as humanitarianism *avant la lettre*.³³

The role of media in particular as a tool of transnational advocacy for refugees is now greater than ever before. In 2015, when hundreds of thousands of refugees were trying to escape from disaster, war and persecution – many of them drowning on dangerous journeys to the perceived safe haven of Europe – voices in the media made loud appeals to our common humanity. For instance, in one of his articles in the British newspaper *The Guardian*, the journalist Owen Jones powerfully reminded the public of the simple, fundamental, but seemingly forgotten fact that ‘Refugees are human.’³⁴

As right-wing politicians across Europe began describing refugees merely as statistical figures stripped of human attributes or, even worse, as an unwanted, anonymous flood threatening Fortress Europe, Owen vehemently argued for a strategy of humanizing faceless refugees and showing their true human nature:

It is only when we strip the humanity from people – when we stop imagining them as being quite human like us – that our empathic nature is eroded. That allows us either to accept the misery of others, or even to inflict it on them. [. . .] [W]e need to show the reality of refugees: their names, their faces, their ambitions and their fears, their loves, what they fled.³⁵

In its final section, 'Migration Management and Imperialism', the volume sheds new light on the impact of refugees on processes of state and empire-building. Here questions are raised about how people who were forced to flee their lands of origin due to religious and political persecution became important agents for modernizing the states they found refuge in. In other words, as the editors trenchantly point out in their introduction: 'States made refugees, but refugees also made early modern states.'³⁶ Associated with special skills regarding trade, craftsmanship and land cultivation, displaced people were welcomed by foreign rulers, and in their exile states they began to shape the economic and cultural life of whole regions.

Nevertheless, the status given to refugees remained ambiguous and even precarious, especially in times of crisis and changing political environments. The Mennonites in early modern Prussia are an illuminating case study in this respect, as Kathrine Hill demonstrates.³⁷ Neither Catholic nor Protestant they constitute a very special group of exiled people, who successfully negotiated a relatively secure position in early modern Polish Prussia for over 200 years due to their strong reputation for land management. Hill highlights that their status was based not on ideas of religious and humanitarian protection but primarily on economic considerations by the Prussian state regarding developing eastern regions. As the changing political situation in the Prussian Kingdom at the end of the eighteenth century put pressure on Mennonite communities, many opted for exile and accepted the Russian invitation to become settlers in provinces of the Tsarist Empire. To obtain land and support by promoting themselves as people with particular talents is something the Huguenots also did when they fled France after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. Owen Stanwood highlights this aspect in his chapter investigating plans to settle French refugees in Ireland and in British colonies in North America.³⁸ Relying on their transnational networks, Huguenots successfully presented themselves as useful settlers for various parts of the emerging British empire as well as agents who played a crucial role in creating an anti-French coalition.

Exile could indeed become a highly politicized space, which people from different backgrounds used as a sphere of trans-imperial influence and action. Discussing two cases of failed military intervention by exiles around 1800 – namely a project to create an anti-American native nation-state, and a planned counter-strike against the Haitian Revolution – Jan Jansen ultimately shows how exile could be transformed into an amorphous space, where refugees from manifold revolutionary contexts

met, interacted and formed unexpected coalitions in the service of a political vision hovering between revolution and counter-revolution.³⁹ In this sense exile became a transnational laboratory for manifold political visions in the Age of the Atlantic Revolutions.

Looking at migration management through an imperial lens significantly changes the view on refugees: they are presented not so much as individuals in urgent need of relief but rather as people advancing and modernizing their states and empires of exile. Instead of being a social burden for their host societies, they become useful imperial subjects, fostering economic development and strengthening state power, and thus extending the imperial frontiers.⁴⁰ Furthermore, this new perspective leads away from a narrow Europe-centred approach, shedding light on empire as a crucial arena for refugee history and politics.⁴¹ If we include, in a *longue-durée* perspective, the twentieth-century history in this picture, we can even argue that refugees made empires, but empires also made refugees. The end of empires such as the Russian and Ottoman during and after the First World War was what made hundreds of thousands of people leave their homes, triggering the emergence of the first international refugee regime under the aegis of the League of Nations.⁴² After the Second World War, the decolonization of European colonial empires resulted in millions of refugees. In this regard, the partition of India in 1947 was the most dramatic example, leading to the displacement of at least fourteen million people across India and Pakistan. Finally, it was the situation of some 250,000 Algerians fleeing the ruthless French war of decolonization (1954–62) to Morocco and Tunisia, which truly internationalized a refugee politics that had been Europe-centred and led to the elimination of the temporal and spatial selectivity of the 1951 UN Refugee Convention through the UN Protocol of 1967.⁴³ In other words, refugees in an imperial context absolutely matter: they should be placed not at the margins but, as this volume does, at the centre of the study of refugee politics.

Taken together, the volume sketches out a highly diverse and intriguing picture of refugee politics over the course of more than three centuries, spanning from the Reformation to the Age of the Atlantic Revolutions. Moreover, with its *longue-durée* approach, it enriches our understanding of refugee history and of the role of displaced people, thereby sharpening our view of refugee politics in modern times regarding issues such as refugees' belonging and agency as well as of relief networks and protective strategies within Europe and beyond. Above all this multifaceted picture of early modern refugee politics reminds us that refugees have been a common phenomenon throughout history. Accordingly, they have to be written into historical narratives in ways that extend far beyond the simplistic notion that they were helpless, marginalized victims. Rather, they should also be seen as influential actors, significantly shaping both national and international politics in various centuries.

Notes

- 1 Ban Ki-moon, *Secretary-General's Message, World Refugee Day*, 20 June 2015, <https://press.un.org/en/2015/sgsm16858.doc.htm> (accessed 28 February 2023).

- 2 United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, ed., *Global Trends. Forced Displacement in 2021* (Copenhagen, 2022), 2, <https://www.unhcr.org/62a9d1494/global-trends-report-2021> (accessed 28 February 2023).
- 3 Press Release, UNHCR: *Ukraine, Other Conflicts Push Forcibly Displaced Total over 100 Million for First Time*, 23 May 2022, <https://www.unhcr.org/news/press/2022/5/628a389e4/unhcr-ukraine-other-conflicts-push-forcibly-displaced-total-100-million.html> (accessed 28 February 2023).
- 4 Press Release, UNHCR: *Global Displacement Hits another Record, Capping Decade-Long Rising Trend*, 16 June 2022, <https://www.unhcr.org/news/press/2022/6/62a9d2b04/unhcr-global-displacement-hits-record-capping-decade-long-rising-trend.html> (accessed 28 February 2023); UNHCR, *Global Trends*, 7.
- 5 Philip Marfleet in particular underlines the importance of and the need for history regarding Refugee Studies. See Philip Marfleet, 'Refugees and History: Why We Must Address the Past', *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 3 (2007): 136–48.
- 6 The terms 'migrant crisis' and 'refugee crisis' are highly problematic: both suggest a misleading picture of the situation in 2015. It was caused not by migrants and refugees but by political, economic, and environmental crises which made people seek refuge. Accordingly, the '2015 crisis' was far more a crisis of Europe's humanity and its ability to take appropriate humanitarian action.
- 7 See, for instance, such studies as United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, ed., *The State of the World's Refugees. Fifty Year of Humanitarian Action* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Peter Gatrell, *The Making of the Modern Refugee* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); Jakob Schönhausen, *Geschichte der internationalen Flüchtlingspolitik. 1945–1975* (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2023), which exclusively focus on the period after 1945.
- 8 See, for instance, new surveys of and approaches towards the history of refugees such as Caroline Shaw, *Britannia's Embrace: Modern Humanitarianism and the Imperial Origins of Refugee Relief* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); Philipp Ther, *The Outsiders. Refugees in Europe since 1492* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019); Andreas Kossert, *Flucht. Eine Menschheitsgeschichte* (Munich: Siedler Verlag, 2020).
- 9 On the early modern period see, for instance: Susanne Lachenicht, 'Refugees and Refugee Protection in the Early Modern Period', *Journal of Refugee Studies* 30, no. 2 (2017): 261–81; Nicholas Terpstra, *Religious Refugees in the Early Modern World: An Alternative History of the Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015); Owen Stanwood, *The Global Refuge: Huguenots in an Age of Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019); Robert Chazan, *Refugees or Migrants: Pre-Modern Jewish Population Movement* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2019); Adam Teller, *Rescue the Surviving Souls: The Great Jewish Refugee Crisis of the Seventeenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020).
- 10 See Chapter 5 by Sari Nauman in this volume.
- 11 On the League of Nations' refugee regime and the Nansen passport see for instance: Barbara Metzger, 'The League of Nations, Refugees and Individual Rights', in *Refugees in Europe 1919-1959. A Forty Years' Crisis?*, ed. Matthew Frank and Jessica Reinisch (London and Oxford: Bloomsbury, 2017), 101–19; Claudena M. Skran, *Refugees in Inter-War Europe. The Emergence of a Regime* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995); Kathrin Kollmeier, 'Das Nansen-Zertifikat. Ein ambivalentes Schlüsseldokument des ersten internationalen Flüchtlingsregimes', *Zeithistorische Forschungen/Studies in Contemporary History* 16, no. 2 (2019): 354–62, <http://www.zeithistorische-forschungen.de/2-2019/5733> (accessed 28 February 2023).

- 12 UNHCR, *State of the World's Refugees*, 18–26; Gatrell, *Making of the Modern Refugee*, 107–9; United Nations, *Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees*, Geneva, 28 July 1951, https://treaties.un.org/doc/Treaties/1954/04/19540422%2000-23%20AM/Ch_V_2p.pdf (accessed 28 February 2023).
- 13 UNHCR, *State of the World's Refugees*, 52–7; United Nations, *Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees*, New York, 31 January 1967, https://treaties.un.org/doc/Treaties/1967/10/19671004%2007-06%20AM/Ch_V_5p.pdf (accessed 28 February 2023).
- 14 Ban Ki-Moon, *Statement Attributable to the Secretary-General on Recent Refugee/Migrant Tragedies*, 28 August 2015, <http://www.un.org/sg/statements/index.asp?nid=8938> (accessed 28 February 2023).
- 15 See Chapter 5 by Sari Nauman, Chapter 6 by Alexander Schunka, and Chapter 4 by Gerard Wiegers in this volume. On agency of early modern refugees and petitioning see also: Lachenicht, 'Refugees and Refugee Protection', 270–2.
- 16 See Chapter 1 by Diego Pirillo in this volume.
- 17 See Chapter 3 by Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin in this volume.
- 18 See Chapter 2 by Jesse Spohnholz in this volume.
- 19 With regard to Huguenot networks and their enormous political influence in the 1680s see also Chapter 10 by Owen Standwood in this volume.
- 20 Hannah Arendt, 'We Refugees', in *The Jewish Writings*, ed. Jerome Kohn and Ron H. Feldman (New York: Schocken Books, [1943] 2007), 264–74.
- 21 See Chapter 6 by Alexander Schunka in this volume.
- 22 See Chapter 7 by Adam Teller in this volume.
- 23 See Chapter 8 by Catherine Arnold in this volume.
- 24 The term 'humanitarian' appears briefly but not as broader conceptual framework in the chapters by Sari Nauman, Gerard Wiegers, and Catherine Arnold.
- 25 Accordingly, in my own work, I distinguish between military interventions to help coreligionists in early modern times and interventions made 'in the cause of humanity' since the nineteenth century. See Fabian Klose, *In the Cause of Humanity. A History of Humanitarian Intervention in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022), 37–8.
- 26 On the significance of the term 'humanity' in a longue-durée perspective see: Fabian Klose and Miriam Thulin, eds, *Humanity. A History of European Concepts in Practice from the Sixteenth Century to the Present* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016).
- 27 See for instance the entry 'Humanity' in Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language: In Which the Words are Deduced from Their Originals, and Illustrated in Their Different Significations by Examples Form the Best Writers*, Vol. 1 (London, 1755).
- 28 The book was first published in French in 1758 as *Le droit des gens ou principes de la loi naturelle: appliqués à la conduite et aux affaires des nations et des souverains*. For an English translation see: Emer de Vattel, *The Laws of Nations; or Principles of the Law of Nature: Applied to the Conduct and Affairs of Nations and Sovereigns* (Dublin, 1792), Book II, Chap. I, 211.
- 29 *Ibid.*, § 2, 213.
- 30 See Chapter 8 by Catherine Arnold in this volume.
- 31 Thomas Laqueur, 'Bodies, Details, and the Humanitarian Narrative', in *The New Cultural History*, ed. Lynn Hunt (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 176–204; Lynn Festa, 'Humanity without Feathers', *Humanity* 1/1 (2010): 3–27; Thomas L. Haskell, 'Capitalism and the Origins of Humanitarian Sensibility', part 1, *American*

- Historical Review* 90, no. 2 (April 1985): 339–61, and ‘Capitalism and the Origins of Humanitarian Sensibility’, part 2, *American Historical Review* 90, no. 3 (June 1985): 547–66; Klose, *In the Cause of Humanity*, 39–45.
- 32 See Chapter 5 by Sari Nauman in this volume.
- 33 Geert H. Janssen, for example, identifies a ‘proto-humanitarian spirit’ in early modern charity campaigns for refugees: Geert H. Janssen, ‘The Legacy of Exile and the Rise of Humanitarianism’, in *Remembering the Reformation*, ed. Brian Cummings et al. (London: Routledge, 2020), 226–42, here 233. For a similar interpretation see also: David de Boer, *The Early Modern Dutch Press in an Age of Religious Persecution: The Making of Humanitarianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2023).
- 34 Owen Jones, ‘Refugees Are Human. This Simple Fact Seems to have been Forgotten’, *The Guardian*, 28 August 2015, <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/aug/28/migrants-humans-drowning-suffocating-safety-statistics> (accessed 28 February 2023).
- 35 Ibid.
- 36 De Boer and Janssen, Introduction to this volume.
- 37 See Chapter 9 by Katherine Hill in this volume.
- 38 See Chapter 10 by Owen Stanwood in this volume.
- 39 See Chapter 11 by Jan Jansen in this volume.
- 40 On refugees as colonial settlers see: Lachenicht, ‘Refugees and Refugee Protection’, 267–8.
- 41 For the long nineteenth century see especially: Shaw, *Britannia’s Embrace*.
- 42 Metzger, ‘The League of Nations, Refugees and Individual Rights’; Skran, *Refugees in Inter-War Europe*.
- 43 UNHCR, *State of the World’s Refugees*, 37–57; Gatrell, *Making of the Modern Refugee*, 223–52.

Index

- Abbot, George 18, 21
Abī 'l-Āṣī, Muḥammad ibn 74
Accomplishment of the Scripture Prophecies
(Jurieu) 172, 183
Alarcos, Battle of (1195) 72
al-Biṣṭāmī, Abd al-Raḥmān 73
al-Ḥajarī, Aḥmad Ibn Qāsim 74
Allen, William 22–4, 26, 31 n.60
Almançor, Miramolin Yacob 70
Alpujarras, Revolt of the (1568–71) 67,
69, 72
al-Qashshāsh, Abu 'l-Ghayth 73
American Revolution 16, 189, 193–4,
197
Aminoff-Winberg, Johanna 86, 88
Anabaptists 33, 36, 153, 157, 163
agents of state settlement
programmes 154
attitudes to military service 162
being refugee 155–7, 166 n.14
farmers and land managers 154
memories of sixteenth-century
martyrdom 155
military service 156, 162
negotiation of place of relative freedom
and security 153–4
non-conformist Protestant
community 153
plague 154, 160
politics of pragmatic settlement 157
privilegium negotiated with Tsar Paul
in 1800 163
protections fees in Danzig 159
role in imperial politics 162–3
settlement in Tiegenhof 157
skill with land management 158
socio-economic evolution of
states 161
stability in Vistula Delta 153, 162
status of settled migrants 155
threat of expulsion 156–7
trade 161
tragedies of plague and war 154
trauma of double exile 163
unification and militarization 161
van Loysens 157–8
Analecta Sacra Nova et Mira, de rebus
Catholicorum in Hibernia
(Rothe) 60
Andalus/Andalusians 66, 74
Andersdotter, Catharina 92
anti-Catholic statutes in England 61
Apology for the Oath of Allegiance (James
I) 18
Arendt, Hannah 191, 209
Arminians 18, 20–1, 26
Ashkenazim 130 n.24, 132, 135, 136,
138, 140, 142, 147 n.44, 148 n.75
Atlantic Revolutions 201 n.8, 207, 212
Bacon, Francis 19
Badius, Johannes 38–9
Balbani, Niccolò 15–16, 20
Beare, Philip O'Sullivan 53, 60
Bell, Thomas 26
Bentivoglio, Guido 20
Berufungs Privilegium 158
Biassou, Georges 194
Bill, John 18–19
Binga, Gerson 132, 136–7, 140
Bohemian emigrant community 108
Bohemian Protestants 57, 108
Bowles, William Augustus 189, 190,
193–199, 200 n.2
Burlamacchi family 20
Butler, James 50
Byrd I, William 183
Byrd II, William 183
Calandrini, Cesar 18, 20–1
Calvinism 3, 9 n.9, 26, 33, 34, 38, 41–3,
96, 109, 110, 142, 174, 183

- Campion, Edmund 22, 24
 Carleton, Dudley 18, 20–1
 Carstenius, Petrus 91
 Castelli, Giovanni Battista 22
 Castillo, Alonso del 74
 Catharine the Great 155–6, 158
 Catholic (secular) exiles in Europe 96
 Morisco population 54, 69
 Cecil, Sir William 23, 27
 charity 40–2, 59, 177
 cross-border fundraising 108, 111
 Dutch Reformed fundraising 133
 initiatives by Church of England
 clergymen 111
 intra-European fundraising 108
 liberation of Protestants, fundraising
 for 111
 material support for galley
 slaves 110, 111
 schemes of inter-state solidarity
 110–11
 organized financial solicitation 109
 trip 108, 110, 209
 Charles XII 86, 90, 94, 96
 Chetwynd, John 138
 Christianus, Johannes 36–7, 39
 church councils (consistories) and
 congregations 33
 classis 36–7, 45 n.23–7
 of Cleves 36
 Cologne 37, 38, 40
 Clynogg, Morys 24–5
communis patria 16
 Como, Cardinal 25
 Coote, Richard 177
 Council of Trent 16
 Coxe, Daniel 180, 182
 Coxe, Sir Thomas 170, 174, 181
 Creagh, Richard 55
 Cromwellian conquest of 1649–53 61

 Dahms, Thomas 161
 Dathenus, Petrus 42
*De Antiquitate Christianae Religionis apud
 Scotos* (Thompson) 59
 Dédieu, Joseph 133
 de Dominis, Marco Antonio 18–21
*De Regno Hiberniae Sanctorum Insula
 Commentarius* in 1600–1
 (Lombard) 58

De republica ecclesiastica (De
 Dominis) 19–20, 27
 de Valdés, Juan 15
 Dey, Yūsuf 71, 73
 d'Hervart, Philibert 179
Di bashraybung fun Ashkenaz un Polak
 (The Description of a German
 and a Polish Jew) 124–5
 Diderot, Denis 1
 Diodati, Giovanni 20
 Donner, Heinrich 158, 160, 162
 Dursteler, Eric 17
 Dutch East India Company 179
 Dutch Reformed Church 34, 36–8, 42–3
 Dutch Republic
 congregations, Dutch- and German-
 speaking 36
 Flemish churches 37
 ‘national’ synod 37–8
 Walloon congregation 36

 Edict of expulsion of the Moriscos
 (1609) 75, 141
 Edict of Nantes 1, 162, 172, 211
 Edict of Potsdam in 1685 5, 154
 Edward VI 17, 55
 egodocuments 106–7
elches 72
 Eleonora, Ulrika 85–6
 Elizabeth I 22–3, 25, 50
 Elkana, Josele 132, 136–7, 140
 Emden, Susskind 132, 136–7, 140
 English Catholic Community 27, 97
 English Catholic refugees
 clergy and Jesuits, relations between 24
 in Counter-Reformation Rome 22–6,
 208
 English College in Rome 24
 English mission, international
 controversy 22–3
 royal proclamations 22–3
 Society of Jesus 25–6
The English Romayne Lyfe (Munday) 25
 Enlightenment 1–2, 5, 184
Essays (Bacon) 19
 Eustace, James 51
 Eustace, Oliver 55
 exile(s)
 anti-revolutionary 199
 British American 194

- Catholic 52–5, 96 (*see also* Catholic (secular) exiles in Europe)
 clerical 57
 Irish 54, 60, 208 (*see also* Irish clerical migrants)
 Protestant 8, 113
 Spanish American 190, 192
 Waldensian 133
- Falk, Annika Johansdotter 85, 91
 Ferdinand III 123
 Ferguson, Hugh 195
 First World War 207, 212
 FitzGerald, Gerald 51
 Floyd, John 18
flykting 89–92
 Franciscans, Louvain 58–9
 Francke, August Hermann 113
 Francophone Protestantism 172
 Frederick I 110–11, 160
 Frederick II 110, 155
 Frederick III 110
 Frederick William of Brandenburg 119, 173
 Frederick William II 155, 161
 French war of decolonization (1954–62) 212
 Friedrich III, Palatine 34, 39
 Frijhoff, Willem 33–4
- Gaelic and Gaelicized rebels 50–2, 57, 61
 Gaultier, François de 174–5
Gazette d'Amsterdam 132, 136–7, 143 n.5, 147 n.40
Gazette de Leyde 132, 136–7, 143 n.5, 145 n.28
gens catholica 61
 Glikl of Hameln 120
 Glorious Revolution 170, 174
 Gompertz, Elia 132, 136–7, 140
 Gonzague, Charles de 57
 Granadan Moriscos 66–7, 69, 71–3, 75–6
 Granatino, Ibraim 73
 Granvelle, Antoine Perrenot de (1517–86) 1
 Great Northern War (1700–21) 85–6, 89, 99 n.25, 156, 160, 207
 Gregory XIII 16, 22, 24, 30 n.50
 Gregory XV 21
 Grodzisk community 122–3
 Grotius, Hugo 19–20, 27, 87
- Guesnet, François 135
 Güntzer, Augustin 107
 Gyllenstierna, Nils 89
- Habsburg 7, 33, 34, 39, 42, 51–4, 57, 70, 87, 105, 123, 132, 135, 142, 149 n.86, 208
 Haitian Revolution 189, 191, 195, 197, 199, 202 n.18, 204 n.30, 204 n.38, 211
 Hamburg 37, 40, 41, 119–2, 125, 126, 135, 149 n.86, 174
Hamburger Reichs-Postillion 137
 Hanseatic League 157
 Helmichius, Werner 39
 Henry VIII 24, 51
 Heyden, Gaspar van der 34, 37
 Hijra 66–7
Historia del concilio tridentino (Sarpi) 19, 27
Historiae Catholicae Iberniae compendium (O'Sullivan Beare) 53
Historia Verdadera del Rey don Rodrigo (Luna) 72
 Hohenlohe-Neuenstein, Philip of 42
 Hollis, Thomas 16
 Holyk, Georg 108
 Holy Roman Empire 33–5, 112–13, 117–18, 124, 134, 136, 140, 208
 Huguenots 5, 7, 8, 43, 88, 105, 108–112, 133, 154, 158, 162, 168 n.39, 170–184, 184 n.2, 187 n.44, 211
 humanity 6, 133, 142, 210–12, 214 n.26
 human rights 1–2, 5, 157, 206
 Huygens, Constantine 20
- IDPs, *see* internally displaced persons (IDPs)
- Ignatius of Loyola 22, 24
 Index of Prohibited books 16
 Inquisition 21, 76
 Roman 15–16
 Venetian 20
 internally displaced persons (IDPs) 86–97
 International Calvinism 17, 21, 109
 Irish Catholicism 50, 52, 54, 57–8
 Irish clerical migrants
 cash donation 57
 education of secular clergy 55
 Irish petitions at Salamanca 55–6
 success of Irish colleges 56

- Irish identity
 education of pastors 60
 expatriate clerical network 57
 fidelity to Catholicism 58
 Irish as 'Scoti' 59
- Italian Protestant church of London
 17–21, 26–7
- Italian Protestant refugees
 Calandrini (*see* Calandrini, Cesar)
 de Dominis (*see* de Dominis, Marco Antonio)
 Gunpowder Plot 18
 in Jacobean London 17–21, 208
 oath of allegiance 18
 protection to anti-Roman Italian writers 18
 reconciliation among churches 19
 reconstruction of the Italian Protestant community 19
 sermons 19–20
- Italian Reformation 16
- Italy 15, 16, 18–21, 25, 27, 67, 68, 126
- James II 142, 174–5
- Jews 7, 16, 33, 69, 87, 117–128, 132, 135, 136, 137, 140–142
- Joux, Benjamin de 182
- Jurieu, Pierre 170, 172, 174, 180, 183
- Kant, Immanuel 87
- Khmelnysky Revolt 117–19
- Ki-Moon, Ban 208
- Konigsberg Mennonites 155
- La Coruña community 52
- League of Augsburg 175
- Letter concerning Toleration* (Locke) 16
- Lewis, Owen 24, 25
- Lombard, Peter 54, 57–60
- Louis XIV 6, 111, 142, 170, 172–4
- Luna, Alonso de 74
- Luna, Miguel de 72, 74, 76
- Lund, Sigrid 91
- MacAingil, Aodh 57
- Maria Theresa 132, 135–7, 140–2
- Mary Tudor 24, 51
- Mather, Cotton 16
- memorial*, 1612 70–76
- Mennonites, *see* Anabaptists
- Messingham, Thomas 60
- Mevorah, Baruch 135, 140
- Milford, Louis Le Clerc de 197
- Mirmand, Henri de 174, 176
- Montaigne, Michel de 22
- Moriscos 4, 7–8, 16, 207
almalafa, wearing of 69
 concept of exile 73
 contacts with Ottomans in Istanbul 74
 crypto-Muslims 67
 expulsion of 1609–14 66
 Iberian 7–8, 68, 207
memorial (*see memorial*, 1612)
 petitioning 69–70
- Morone, Giovanni 24–5
- Mudejars 67–8, 72, 75
- Muldrew, Craig 94
- Muley, Francisco Núñez 69, 75
- Munday, Anthony 25
- Mush, John 25
- Musrif, Hamete 69, 72, 75
- Nansen passport system 207–8, 213 n.11
- newspapers
 Ashkenazi communities 136
 diplomats, contact with 138
 letters of intercession 140–1, 149 n.79
 Savoy's treatment of Protestants 139
 tool for transnational advocacy 133–4, 140
- Nicholson, Francis 183
- Nicodemism 15
- Nilsdotter, Elizabeth 89–91
- Nine Years' War 51, 54
- Ochino, Bernardino 15–16
- O'Donnell, Ruairi 54
- O'Hurley, Dermot 55
- Ó Maolchonaire, Flaithrí 56–7
- O'Neill, Hugh 51–2, 54–5, 58
- Orangeois 105, 108, 110–12
- Palatine immigrants to Britain in 1709 113
- Pantratus, Nicolaus 40
- papacy 16–19, 21, 56, 58
 protection of refugees 17
 role in managing refugee flows 16

- papal nuncio 55, 61
 Paul III 15
 Pauli-Stravius, Richard 56
 Peace of Westphalia 54
 Pelagianism 59
 Penn, William 159
Penny London Post 137, 146 n.29,
 147 n.52
 Persons, Robert 22
 Peter the Great 89
 philanthropy in Protestant Europe, *see*
 charity
 Philip II 7, 42, 51
 Philip III 53, 56, 69, 75
 philo-Protestants 15, 21, 27
 Pius V 23
 Platter, Thomas 106
 Pole, Reginald 15, 24, 51
 Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth 88,
 117, 124, 127, 209
 Polish-Lithuanian Jewish refugees
 coordinated flight 123
 fundraising 118, 120
 to the Holy Roman Empire 118
 interaction with German Jews 124
 local relief 124–5
 Royal privilege of 1657 119
 Polish Prussia 153–5, 158, 211
 Pomara, Bruno 17, 68
 Pons, Luis Bernabé 69, 72
 Prendergast, Thomas 55
 Presbyterianism 50
 protection of refugees 2, 5, 67, 206
 Papacy's role in 16
 in the Swedish Empire 87–8
 Protestant International 109, 115 n.23,
 158, 171, 184 n.4
 Protestants
 displaced from German Palatinate 7
 galley slaves 111
 heresy 15
 non-conformity 50
 orthodoxies 16
 Pufendorf, Samuel von 87
 Puritans 16, 21, 33, 179
 Reformation 1, 3–4, 16–17, 20–1, 24, 27,
 33, 51, 173, 207–8, 212
 Reformed, *see* Calvinism
 Reformed refugees 33–4, 42, 208
 Refugee Commission (1712–22) 86,
 89–92
 republicanism 16
 Republic of Letters 17, 19, 21, 27
 Rinuccini, GianBattista 61
 Robinson, Thomas 137, 140–1
 Rohegude, Marquis de 111
 Roman Catholicism 16–18, 25, 26, 55–6,
 58–62, 111, 177
 English 22, 24, 27
 Habsburg sympathies 54
 identity of Spanish brotherhood 52
 Irish 50, 52, 54, 57–8
 Irish in Habsburg dominions 52–3
 La Coruòa community 52
 Morisco population 54, 69
 post-Tridentine 62
 refugees 3, 16, 22–3, 25, 27, 208
 Roman Inquisition 15–16
 Rome 8, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22–26, 51, 54–60,
 208
 Rothe, David 57, 60
 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques 5
 'Royal Bounty' in England 110–11,
 182
 Ruvigny, Henri de 176–7, 179
 Saily, Charles de 178–9, 181–2
 Salzburger Emigrants 105, 112–13
 Sarpi, Paolo 18–19, 27
 Saverino, Bruno Pomara 17
 Saxon immigrant petitions 96
 Scheier, Nathan 132, 136–7, 140
 Second World War 206, 212
 Sephardim community 4, 7, 16, 122
 settlements
 of Chortitz and Molotschna
 155
 of Frankenthal 36
 Huguenots 110, 179, 186 n.26
 of Jews 119, 121, 123–4, 126–7
 Mennonites 154–7
 Moriscos 67
 Seven Years' War 80, 194, 196
 Shepard, Thomas 16
shtadlanut, tradition of 135
 Sigismund II 157
 Simmel, Georg 87, 95

- Simon, Menno 153, 157, 162
- Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK) 110–11
- Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge in London 138
- Society of Jesus 18, 20, 25–6
- Spanish American revolutions, political emigrations of 201 n.6
- Spiritual Exercises* (Ignatius of Loyola) 22
- Stepney, George 178
- Sweden, IDPs in (1700–21)
- Baltic and Finnish refugees 86
 - female IDPs and use of '*främling*' 93
 - flykting*, religious connotations 89–90
 - IDP petitions to King Charles XII 86
 - landsflykting* or *landsflyktighet* 91
 - narrative accounts 89–92, 96
 - protection of refugees 87–8
 - Refugee Commission (1712–22) 86, 91
- Swedish Deluge 160
- Swedish occupation, 1655–60 117
- Sweet, John 18
- Switzerland 8, 18, 20, 108, 134, 160, 162, 163, 170–81, 210
- Teutonic Knights 155, 166 n.13
- Thirty Years' War 124, 127, 132–3, 154, 160
- Thompson, George 59
- Tiegenhof 157
- Trevor, Sir Robert 141
- Trivié, marquis de 132, 134, 139–41
- Tudor Reformation 59
- Turreau de Garambouville, Louis-Marie 189–90, 193
- 1806 memorandum 197
 - deportation and killing 197
- Fire of Cap-Français (1793) 196–7
- Franco-Indian alliance 197
- suppression of Vendée uprising in 1794 195
- Turretini family 20
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) 206
- UN Protocol of 1967 208, 212
- UN Refugee Convention, 1951 207–8, 212
- Utrecht peace negotiations in 1713 111
- van Loysen, Steffen 157–8
- van Marnix, Philip 34
- Vattel, Emer de 210
- Vendée uprising (1794) 195
- Venetian Interdict of 1606/07 18
- Verdadera Historia* (Luna) 72–3, 76
- Vermigli, Pietro Martire 15, 20
- Victor Amadeus 134, 139, 140, 142
- Victor Amadeus II 132, 134, 138, 141–2
- Vienna
- expulsion 136
 - Jews of Vienna 126, 136
- von Trappe, George 158–9
- Wadding, Luke 57
- Waldensians 6, 7, 105, 108, 112, 132, 134–42, 144 n.11, 144 n.12, 182
- Walraven, Cornelis 36, 38, 40
- War of the League of Augsburg 170
- War of the Spanish Succession 139
- Wertheimer, Samuel 136
- Wertheimer, Wolf 135–6, 140
- William III 111, 170
- William of Orange 34, 42
- Wood, Anthony 21
- Zapata, Luis de 74
- Zaydān (1608–27) 68

