

Jo Spaans

UNITY AND DIVERSITY AS A THEME IN EARLY MODERN DUTCH RELIGIOUS HISTORY: AN INTERPRETATION

(*Unity and Diversity in the Church. Studies in Church History* 32, Oxford 1996, 221-234)

The Reformation in the Low Countries fascinates both church historians and general historians. Religious change and political revolution went hand in hand. The history of the Reformation is an integral part of the history of the birth of the Dutch nation. Although well-researched, its attraction is renewed with each successive historiographical fashion.

Far less well-known is the history of Dutch religious life after the Reformation, Although a lot of detailed research has been done in this field, it is very difficult to give a synthesis of Dutch church history during the early modern period. The main problem is the apparent impossibility of integrating church history into the general history of the Dutch Republic.¹ In modern works on Dutch history religion simply fades away somewhere around the middle of the seventeenth century, only to reappear around the middle of the nineteenth century.² No conceptual tools have been devised to come to grips with all that lies in between.

Church historians have mainly focused their attention on biographies of ministers and academie theologians and on the history of ideas. General historians have lost interest. I would argue that the root of the problem is twofold. Firstly: church historians only rarely overstep the boundaries set by the tradition of their own Church. Thus they fail to see the overwhelming influence of the confessionally diverse surrounding culture on each Church. Secondly: historians have undervalued the religious policy of public authorities. It is generally assumed that there was no such policy. The role of magistrates has been depicted as one of both neglect towards the legitimate demands of the Reformed Church to maintain its rights, and of an often grudging and erratic toleration of other faiths. An approach to Dutch ecclesiastical history in terms of unity and diversity is highly suggestive of the way in which the gap can be filled.

The Reformation in the Netherlands had only a partial success. Calvinist opposition to Habsburg rule had been the mainstay of the Revolt. Once the rebel provinces declared

¹ Cf. the standard overview of Dutch church history: Otto J. de Jong, *Nederlandse kerkgeschiedenis* (Nijkerk, 1972). Attempts at synopsis: J. van den Berg, "Die pluralistische Gestalt des kirchlichen Lebens in den Niederlanden, 1574-1974", in: J. van den Berg and J.P. van Dooren, eds., *Pietismus und Reveil, Kerkhistorische Bijdragen* 7 (Leiden, 1978), pp. 1-21; C. Augustijn, "Niederlande", *Theologische Realenzyklopadie* (in press).

² Cf. the new *Algemene Geschiedenis der Nederlanden*, 15 vols (Haarlem, 1978-83).

their independence, the Reformed Church was given the position of public Church. Officially the Dutch Republic was a Protestant state. The public Church was, however, no state church. Membership was voluntary, not least because its theologians wanted a pure rather than a broad Church. Consequently the Reformed Church counted only a minority of the population as its members. This minority is estimated as about twenty per cent in the first half of the seventeenth century. Those of other faiths were denied public worship and public office. According to the Union of Utrecht (1579), a treaty which functioned as the constitution of the Republic, religious persecution was prohibited. The state protected the public Church, and though it restricted non-Reformed worship to the private sphere, it did not persecute heresy. It did however maintain general Christian norms and values in public life: un-Christian behaviour, such as blasphemy, was considered a criminal offence.

Under this constitution a number of tolerated religious communities flourished. There were large minorities of Mennonites and Roman Catholics, smaller groups of Lutherans, Jews, and, from the 1620s, Arminians. Recently a number of local studies have shown that as late as the first half of the seventeenth century, two generations after the introduction of the Reformation, a large minority, sometimes half of the population, did not belong to any of the organized Churches.³ It is highly unlikely that such people were conscious atheists. Some may have been unable to choose. Some may have been afraid to commit themselves to one or another Church as long as the war with Spain was not officially ended. More important may have been a widespread dislike of the ways in which all Churches set themselves apart from Christian society as a whole. They all had to forge a new organization after the upheavals that went with the prohibition of the traditional Catholic Church and the installation of a new public Church. All of them comprised only a part of what traditionally had been an undivided Christian society. They had to knit their members together into communities with distinct religious identities. Confessional polemics were an important part of the craft of ministers of every persuasion. This culture of mutual exclusion was seen by many among the laity as incompatible with the Christian command of brotherly love.

The religious landscape of the Dutch Republic was thus characterised by diversity. As all Churches developed their own confessional identity, they tended towards doctrinal orthodoxy. This was a common European phenomenon. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries saw the development of orthodoxy in all mainline Churches. The Dutch Reformed Church, which emerged from the Revolt with considerable variety of opinion upon points of doctrine, established its orthodoxy in the violent political and confessional clashes during the Twelve Years' Truce (1609-21), culminating in the condemnation of Arminianism at the Synod of Dort. From that moment on, the Reformed Church would follow the model set by the Genevan Reformation, as realized in the French Calvinist Churches. Other Reformed ecclesiological projects were excluded, such as those of Zwingli or Bullinger, which had formerly exercised influence together with that of Calvin. Catholics and Lutherans in the Netherlands derived their orthodoxy from co-religionists elsewhere. Only among the Mennonites was con-

³ J.J. Woltjer, "De plaats van de calvinisten in de Nederlandse samenleving", *De Zeventiende Eeuw* 10 (1994), pp. 3-23.

fessional identity not so much vested in purity of doctrine, but rather in the purity of their communal life.⁴

Such orthodoxies constituted the core of the religious identities of the majority of Christian groups. They became fixed in the first half of the seventeenth century. Most Churches had internal quarrels and some even experienced schism in the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but doctrine usually was not the main issue. In all Churches a core of essential teaching and church ordinance was never called into question.

All Churches enjoined a distinctive religious practice upon their members. The religious sincerity of individuals was judged by the measure in which they lived up to the precepts of their Church. The standing of the various congregations was judged by the measure in which the conduct of their members bore out their claims to possess the sole truth. The social obligation to live up to one's religious convictions in a confessionally diverse society strongly promoted unity within the Churches.⁵ This internal unity was underpinned by church discipline.

However, opinions differed on the extent to which confessional identity should be borne out in the life of the community and the lives of its members. In social life people of diverse religious convictions mixed freely. How exactly was the relation between the community of the believers and Christian society as a whole to be imagined? And how was this imagined relation to be expressed in daily life?

In the public Church a pietistic tendency was present from very early on. It became important around the middle of the seventeenth century, when it became intermingled in the divergence of the theological schools of the Utrecht professor Voetius and his Leyden colleague Cocceius. Voetians tended to combine a Reformed scholasticism with the propagation of a Puritan-inspired piety, focusing on the sanctification of Sunday. They sought further edification in conventicles for the study of the Bible and the catechism, complementary to the church services. Members of these circles distinguished themselves from the commoner sort of church members by ostentatious godliness.

In the later decades of the seventeenth century the so-called Labadistic crisis threw suspicion on the activities of the conventicles, which initially had convened with the blessings of Voetian-inspired local ministers. Jean de Labadie, a deposed minister of the public Church, openly preached separatism. The consequent withdrawal of official support for the conventicles made some of their remaining defenders overtly criticize the Church and its ministry for the neglect of its prophetic mission. Some conventicles took a radical turn. The demands they laid on their members bordered on asceticism and only very narrowly stopped short of preaching abstention from the ministrations of the corrupted public Church. Governing bodies of the Church and secular magi-

⁴ C. Augustijn, "Niederlande".

⁵ Examples in Joke Spaans, *Haarlem na de Reformatie. Stedelijke cultuur en kerkelijk leven 1577-1620* (The Hague, 1989), pp. 195-7.

strates worked together in bridling this radicalism. Courses on the Bible and the catechism were brought under the exclusive control of the local consistory and any danger of pietistic competition with the regular church order was effectively stopped by the second half of the eighteenth century.⁶

The Cocceians underwrote the Confession of the Dutch Reformed Church, the Heidelberg Catechism and the Canons of the Synod of Dordt (the so-called Three Forms of Unity) and as such were orthodox Calvinists. They rejected the Aristotelian metaphysics and Reformed scholasticism of the Voetians. They took biblical exegesis as the basis for their theology. This made them more open to the newer developments of philosophy and biblical scholarship. They rejected the Sabbatarianism of the Voetians by declaring that this biblical precept was meant for biblical times only.

Theological discussion on the differences accruing from the diverging theological methods followed by the schools was forbidden by the Estates, thus avoiding another schism like that of the secession of the Arminians in the early seventeenth century. In the local churches it was effectively stopped by the widespread practice of calling ministers from both schools in equal numbers.⁷ As ministers, together with the usually patrician elders, were responsible for maintaining harmony within their church, dogmatic controversies were evaded. Thus the State enforced unity on the basis of the confessional documents of the public Church. What remained was difference of opinion about the Christian life. Voetians attached great value to distinguishing themselves by godly conduct, whereas Cocceians considered this unimportant: the Reformed community needed not to be set apart from Christian society.

Among Roman Catholics, Mennonites, and Lutherans similar divergencies resulting from varying confessional self-conceptions and ideas about the Christian life can be detected. The Catholics had had rigorously to reorganize their religious life. Their Church was denied any public role, their bishops had fled the country, monasteries were dissolved, and most of the priests had either left for Catholic countries or laid down their ministry. With only a handful of priests and the remnants of the cathedral chapters of the vacant sees of Utrecht and Haarlem, a new church organization, adapted to the officially Protestant environment, was created. It heavily depended on lay assistance, but it managed to rally a sizeable minority of the Dutch population to the restyled organization, especially in the provinces of Holland and Utrecht. The sometimes makeshift arrangements that made this remarkable feat possible were eyed with suspicion by Rome. The hierarchy preferred to treat the Republic as mission territory, thus denying that the efforts of the remaining canons, priests, and laypersons amounted to a legitimate continuation of the medieval Church.

⁶ F.A. van Lieburg, "Het gereformeerd conventikelwezen in de classis Dordrecht in de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw", *Holland* 23 (1991), pp. 2-21.

⁷ J. Reitsma and J. Lindeboom, *Geschiedenis van den hervorming en de hervormde kerk der Nederlanden* (The Hague, 1949), pp. 324-37. Examples of calling exponents of different schools in equal numbers in: *Contracten van Correspondentie en andere bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van het ambtsbejag in de Republiek der Verenigde Nederlanden*, ed. with an introduction by J. de Witte van Citters (The Hague, 1873), 310-26.

In the second half of the seventeenth century, some of the indigenous clergy, notably secular priests of patrician stock, fiercely defended the continuity of the Dutch Catholic Church against the Roman view of its total ruin. They formed into a party under the name of Old Episcopal Cleresy, thereby stating their claim to continuity, and embraced a somewhat rigorous and ascetic devotion. They thus distinguished themselves from the missionaries sent by Rome, often regulars, whom they accused of moral laxity. At the same time they bent the prescriptions of Catholic canon law in order to allow Dutch Catholics to take part in the social life of their religiously diverse environment. The indigenous clergy thus converged towards the religious mentality of the surrounding Protestants. This was taken by Rome as a sign of contamination with Jansenist errors, but earned them the sympathy of the ruling elites, who distrusted the foreign missionaries as possible agents of the Catholic enemies of the Republic. At the beginning of the eighteenth century these existing differences flared into open schism. The Vicar Apostolic of the Seven Provinces, one of the heads of the Cleresy, was called to Rome to face charges of Jansenism. The Estates of Holland demanded and obtained his return to the Republic on the grounds that one of their citizens could not be cited before a foreign court of justice. The man died before the allegations of heresy had been either proved or disproved. Given the rejection of its claims by the hierarchy and the sympathy of the Dutch government, the Cleresy elected a bishop of its own and had him ordained by a sympathetic French bishop of Jansenist convictions, who happened to be passing through Amsterdam. However, the majority of both priests and laity did not recognize his authority.⁸

The existence of two competing Catholic Churches offered Estates and local magistrates the opportunity to strengthen their control over the Catholic community. Locally magistrates could arbitrate in conflicts between the two parties. On the level of the sovereign provinces the Estates could command the loyalty of both Catholic clerics by playing one against the other. This game had not been concluded when the Batavian Revolution of 1787 and the French invasion of 1795 decisively changed the rules.⁹

The Mennonites recognized very little in the way of confessions or church ordinances outside the Bible. They distinguished themselves from the bulk of Christianity by their rejection of infant baptism, and their refusal to take oaths and bear arms — measures to ensure that they would remain unpolluted by the wickedness of the world. From the beginning they were organized along more or less 'national' lines, according to their places of origin. The largest of these 'nations' were the Flemish, the Frisians, the Germans, and those from the Waterland north of Amsterdam. Already at the end of the sixteenth century these names came to designate parties rather than 'nations'. As the Golden Age brought wealth to the Dutch, and perhaps even especially to the sober and thrifty Mennonites, their communities were riddled with conflicts about the extent to which the rather attractive world of Dutch society should be shunned.

⁸ Standard overviews: L.J. Rogier, *Geschiedenis van het katholicisme in Noord-Nederland in de 16^e en 17^e eeuw*, 3 vols (Amsterdam, 1945-7); P. Polman, *Katholiek Nederland in de achttiende eeuw*, 3 vols (Hilversum, 1968).

⁹ Joke Spaans, "Katholieken onder curatele. Katholieke armenzorg als ingang voor overheidsbemoeienis in Haarlem in de achttiende eeuw, *Trajecta* 3 (1994), pp. 110-30.

As the Mennonites recognized no central authority among themselves, this resulted in an endless series of splits and partial reunions. Those who clung to the old ways of radical rejection of the world rapidly dwindled into insignificance. Roughly speaking, two large groups remained, allowing for considerable local variation. There are no useful general terms to designate them. It is best to call them by their contemporary names, derived from the names of two Mennonite church buildings in Amsterdam: 'those of the Sun' and 'those of the Lamb'. The rivalry between them is known as The War of the Lambs. 'Those of the Sun' wanted the disparate Mennonite community consolidated and united by binding it to a number of so-called confessions. These were originally peace treaties, drafted on the occasion of the reunion of parties. One of them was actually called the Olive Branch. 'Those of the Sun' wanted to accord these documents the authority of confessions of faith, whereas 'those of the Lamb' held that such authority as they might have had at first automatically lapsed once they had served their purpose.¹⁰ For them Mennonite identity centred on sole reliance on the Bible and freedom from all binding confessions. They recognized true Christianity also outside their own community.

As with the Cleresy among the Catholics, 'those of the Sun', assimilating more closely to the model of the public Church, seem to have enjoyed the sympathy of governing bodies. However, as the Mennonites lost their typical character, their membership declined dramatically. Consequently it was hardly worth a magistrate's while to capitalize on the Mennonite division, as it was in the case of the Catholic community.

The Lutherans were centred on Amsterdam. Compared with the large congregation there the other Lutheran communities, spread over the country, were small and poor. For most of the period of the Republic the Dutch Lutherans were effectively ruled from Amsterdam. As no recognized Lutheran Church order warranted such a domination of one church over all others, this resulted in a number of conflicts. Apart from some radical pietistic influence, which may have been rather incidental, there was virtually no dogmatic controversy. This may be related to the absence of professional Lutheran theologians within the Republic. Whenever a problem arose, advice was sought from orthodox Lutheran theological faculties in the Holy Roman Empire.

The Dutch Lutherans depended on these German theological faculties also for the education of ministers. This may have seemed only natural, as a large proportion of the Lutheran communities was of German extraction. Hence the bulk and powerful position of the Amsterdam community, peopled by immigrants attracted by the commercial metropolis. Garrison towns also had Lutheran churches for the many German officers of the Republican army and their German troops. In the second half of the seventeenth century Dutch Lutherans developed two wings, taking their inspiration respectively from the strictly orthodox German university of Wittenberg and the more latitudinarian Helmstedt. Those following the direction of Helmstedt were called the Dutch wing, presumably because its followers were mainly Dutch born, whereas the Wittenbergers were made up of more recent immigrants. The Dutch wing was supported by the city magistrates. It was only after the suppression of the Batavian Re-

¹⁰ N. van der Zijpp, *Geschiedenis der doopsgezinden in Nederland* (Arnhem, 1952).

volution that the orthodox party, who then enjoyed government support, found the opportunity to secede.¹¹

In this way, there arose in all Churches a division, not on points of doctrine, but on differences of opinion on whether and how the confessional heritage (of which the dogmatic core was acknowledged by all) ought to be expressed in the daily life of their members. Where originally all had developed characteristic forms of religious behaviour to uphold their claims to true Christianity in a multi-confessional society, the latter half of the seventeenth century showed everywhere a marked divergence between those who wanted to stress the distinction from the common culture and those who did not. The latter were content to live according to the common Christian morality upheld by public authority. In the Reformed Church the state did not take sides. By prohibiting further discussions it forced both parties to remain united. In the tolerated Churches however, the state did show partiality. It played upon the differences in order to further its own religious policies.

Two exceptions prove this rule in very different ways: the Sephardic Jews and the Arminians. Both refrained from building a separate moral community apart from society as a whole. Instead they chose forms that allowed them maximal adaptation to Dutch society. From the beginning the Sephardic Jews seem to have been highly assimilated to the style of religious life they found in the Republic. Of course their own sense of religious identity was assured. But they went very far in their assimilation: the organization of synagogue services, and the intellectual formation and social standing of rabbis, formed close parallels to what was common practice in the Dutch Reformed Church.¹²

The Arminians, from the moment they appeared as a separate religious community, advocated a broad church model, in line with the Anglican Church, more fitting to a state church than to the Brotherhood they actually were. But although they were small, they always considered themselves an alternative public Church. After initial fierce persecution by the government, they eventually gained toleration around the middle of the seventeenth century. Both the Sephardim and the Arminians had good cause to reject distinctive religious behaviour: the first because they were not Christians, the second because they were by their very nature in opposition to the public Church.

Any sovereign in the early modern period knew that religion was to be taken seriously. It could be extremely divisive both politically and socially. All Protestant Churches were held under the the firm control of their princes, and Catholic rulers showed

¹¹ J. Loosjes, *Geschiedenis der Luthersche kerk in de Nederlanden* (The Hague, 1921).

¹² R.-G. Fuks-Mansfeld, *De Sefardim in Amsterdam tot 1795. Aspecten van een joodse minderheid in een Hollandse stad* (Hilversum, 1999), pp. 132-8. Ms. Fuks explains this from the strong Iberian cultural identity of the Sephardic Jews. The wishes of the Amsterdam magistrate may have had some influence too.

the same ambition. At first sight the Dutch Republic seems to be an exception. At the Synod of Dordt the Reformed Church had gained sole authority in doctrinal matters. With the condemnation of the Arminians it had narrowed down its originally much broader Reformed character to a Genevan-style Calvinism. On this same occasion it had, however, decisively lost its claim to determine its own church order. This now belonged to the secular power: local congregations had to defer to their magistrates, provincial synods to the provincial Estates, who were sovereign in matters of religion. No ecclesiastical authority higher than a provincial synod was recognized. The same practical Erastianism took place with regard to the other Churches. The much-praised toleration enjoyed by other faiths did not mean that governing bodies left them to themselves.

The public authorities exercised considerable control over all Churches, most markedly in Holland, which was confessionally most diverse. They could not interfere openly in the affairs of religious bodies they did not officially recognize. Off the record, however, from the late sixteenth century they kept a close watch over the non-Reformed clergy to ensure their loyalty to the Republic. They allowed them to organize congregations and exercise church discipline over their members, but banned those who preached against the existing political and religious constellation.

Around the middle of the seventeenth century, the division of the great majority of Churches into two wings, as described above, allowed public authority a far stronger grip on the various religious communities. This division enabled it to favour in each Church the variety that was closest to its own ideal of the place of religious communities within society as a whole. It wanted Churches first of all to behave wholeheartedly as parts of Dutch society. Further it preferred Churches that had an organization more or less parallel to the decentralized Dutch structure of government, to ensure effective control. A Catholic Church with a national hierarchy was to be preferred over one that had to be approached via foreign prelates through the offices of residing diplomats of Catholic countries. Lutherans with a Dutch national identity were to be preferred over Lutherans with stronger ties to the Empire, who could always invoke the support of German princes. Mennonites who adhered to written confessions could be treated as a Church, whereas Mennonites who allowed each local community to work out its own principles were hard to grasp. In this way public authority in fact defined the relation between religious communities and society as a whole.

Religious policy, however, did not stop at this. The fact that Churches now contained a wing that rejected distinctive piety, made them less exclusive than they had been originally. Church discipline flagged. Becoming a full member seems to have become a sign of respectability.¹³ As the eighteenth century progressed public authority sought, with success, neatly to divide the entire population among the various Churches. Under the Dutch constitution there was no way to force people into any Church. But it is apparent from the facts that, gradually, the large category of people not belonging to any Church disappeared.

¹³ Herman Roodenburg, *Onder censuur. De kerkelijke tucht in de gerformeerde gemeente van Amsterdam, 1578-1700* (Hilversum, 1990), pp. 135-41.

A powerful tool in achieving this seems to have been the Dutch system of poor relief. Each locality had general welfare officers for the local poor, in addition to which all Churches had some funds for their needy members, although these were not always adequate for all. In the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Mennonites and Lutherans gained some form of recognition. From that moment on they had to care for all their own poor. Even Catholic poor were rejected by the public welfare officers and directed to their parishes. Very detailed rules were devised to determine who belonged to which Church, and so the boundaries of religious communities were defined. All those not attached to any other Church were assumed to be Reformed.¹⁴ Religion thus had become an organizing principle for the ordering of society.¹⁵ And as the Churches were expected to instill at least into the recipients of their charity the fear of God and of the powers that be, this was a tool in the hands of the authorities to maintain public order.

There was an inherent contradiction in this religious policy. By favouring the more adaptive, more indigenous wings of the various Churches, over those attached to a distinguishing orthodoxy, the actual differences between them became more fluid. From the very beginning of the Republic scattered instances can be found of proposals to set aside doctrinal differences and to form a further union of all Protestant Churches. In the first half of the seventeenth century these had foundered on the high value set on orthodoxy. From the middle of the century they gained new force among those who rejected distinctive forms of Christian life, and for whom the moral community was no longer identical with their particular religious community, but extended to Christian society as a whole. The search for unity led people to meet in inter-confessional circles like the Rijnsburg Collegiants or the Moravians, to discuss religious topics with kindred spirits.¹⁶ Those who frequented these circles explicitly remained members of their Churches of origin.

The idea that all Christians in essence held the same beliefs was only one step further. There were, however, political overtones in the supposition that the confessional divisions were artificial. After all, this division into confessional communities, that each had a special relation towards public authority, had been nurtured and was upheld by this same public authority. Calling this division into question amounted to criticism of the political establishment and its religious policy. It is therefore not surprising to find these ideas appear with greater frequency from about the middle of the eighteenth century, when opposition to the ruling oligarchies gained force.

The standard answer of the establishment to veiled criticism of this nature was to accuse those advocating further unity among at least Protestant Christians of Socinianism, which put a much stronger accent on the Christian life than on points of doctri-

¹⁴ Spaans, "Katholieken onder curatele".

¹⁵ Peter van Rooden, "Dissenters en bededagen. Civil Religion ten tijde van de Republiek", *BMGN* 107 (1992), 703-12.

¹⁶ J.C. van Slee, *De Rijnsburger collegianten: een geschiedkundig onderzoek* (Haarlem, 1895); W. Lütjeharms, *Het philadelphisch-oecumenisch streven der Herrnhutters in de Nederlanden in de achttiende eeuw* (Zeist, 1935).

ne.¹⁷ As Socinianism was considered blasphemous, and thus counted as a crime, this accusation enabled magistrates to depose ministers, both in the public Church and in the tolerated Churches. Although there may have been people who privately adhered to the doctrines of Socinus, it seems that these accusations of Socinianism were in many cases a tool to silence criticism of the political elite and its use of the religious diversity within the Dutch Republic.¹⁸

The confessional diversity in the Dutch Republic and the religious policy of the state regarding this diversity can be used as an organizing principle for Dutch church history in the eady modern period. Much more than the traditional approach from the history of ideas, it allows a reconstruction of the dynamism in religion and society before the separation of church and state. It offers the framework to take account of the incisive changes that marked the period, while presenting it as a continuous development - from the formation of closely knit minority Churches, based on pure doctrine and distinctive piety, that made an end to the traditional undivided Christian society; through the loosening of these tight communities into two wings, one stressing particular confessional identity, the other assimilating to the general Christianity that pervaded public life; to the eventual success of the authorities in using religious diversity as a means to organize society and to assist in maintaining political unity. It also goes some way into explaining the way in which the Dutch Revolutionary governments following the French invasion of 1795, instead of rejecting religion, took great pains to redefine the place of the various Churches in the revolutionary society that marked the beginning of the modern period.

¹⁷ The history of Socinianism in the Netherlands is usually seen exclusively as part of the history of ideas, cf. W.J. Kühler, *Het socinianisme in Nederland* (Leiden, 1912).

¹⁸ Socinianism may well have functioned for Protestant rulers in a way not unlike Jansenism for their Catholic counterparts.