A Swarm of ‘Locusts’

Pro/Persecution and Toleration of Catholic Priests in Utrecht, 1620–1672

Genji Yasuhira

Musashi University

genji.yasuhira@u.musashi.ac.jp

Abstract

In the Protestant Dutch Republic, Catholic priests were represented as one of the deadliest “enemies” in view of both their confessional doctrines and political inclination. Under pressure from the Reformed Church, numerous anti-Catholic edicts were issued for the prosecution of priests streaming like a swarm of “locusts” to the Utrecht city, the stronghold for Reformed and Catholic Churches alike in the Northern Netherlands. In theory, the policy of the political authorities barred priests from their pastoral duties to Catholics living in the city. In practice, however, the Utrecht magistracy publicly recognised, and non-publicly connived at, the presence of priests. Political practices of pro/persecution and toleration served to manage and regulate the precarious environment of confessional coexistence. In defying persecution and seeking toleration, Catholic priests tactically and discursively mobilised their civic status based on their and/or their families’ close relationship with, and contribution to, the civic community of Utrecht.

Keywords

persecution – toleration – coexistence – confessionalisation – Dutch Republic – early modern Catholicism – priest

In 1655–1656 the Reformed synod of Utrecht demanded of the Provincial States of Utrecht that it immediately deny the “tolerance and connivance” (*tolerantie ende conniventien*) being shown to Catholic priests. According to the official policy in place, any priests wishing to stay in Protestant Utrecht were to observe the existing anti-Catholic edicts prohibiting “conventicles or assem-

blies" (*conventiculen ofte vergaderin[gen]*) and the exercise of Roman "superstitions" (*superstitien*). The synod claimed that

[t]his condition, which has been accepted by Catholic Priests, is now being disregarded a thousand times over [...] as if they were given privilege to enter here in the land in [large] numbers without fear, if only they give their names [...], [streaming to cities and villages] like locusts [...] [to] exercise their Roman idolatry.¹

For that reason, it petitioned the Provincial States to deprive Catholic priests of their "free and public residence and stay in the Province of Utrecht" (*vrije ende publycke wooninghe ende verblijf inde Provincie van Utrecht*).

Catholic priests were theoretically denied the right to perform their duties as ecclesiastics in the Protestant Dutch Republic. Although it has long been known that non-public connivance was exercised, allowing priests to stay on Dutch soil, no systematic analysis has yet been conducted on the way such pro/persecution² and toleration of individual priests functioned in practice. The existing historiography, including the canonical—albeit strongly clericalist—work on Dutch Catholic church history from Lodewijk J. Rogier,³ as well as recent cultural-historical studies on Dutch Catholic laity which rejected Rogier's top-down view,⁴ fails to pay sufficient attention to the way individ-

1 Het Utrechts Archief (hereafter, HUA), Verzameling van Buchel-Booth (hereafter, VBB), 139, probably 1655 or 1656: "Dat nu dese conditie die vande Papen wort aengenomen duysentmael is verbroken [...] als off haer een privilegie ware gegeven, om sonder eenige vreesse met meenichten hier int lant te come, alse maer slechts hare namen bekend maken [...] als sprinckhanen [...] haeren Roomschen Afgoden-dienst plegen." I would like to express my gratitude to the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science for its generous funding, to the anonymous referees for their valuable comments on an earlier version of this article, and to Albert Gootjes for correcting the English.

2 The Dutch word *vervolging* had and still has the sense of both 'prosecution' and 'persecution.' When public authorities spoke of the *vervolging* of Catholics, they referred to the 'legal prosecution' of these 'criminals.' When Catholics referred to their own *vervolging*, they meant their 'persecution' as innocent people. In this study, this double meaning of the term *vervolging* is exploited with a view to different representations of the same phenomenon by various stakeholders among contemporaries as well as modern historians.

3 Lodewijk J. Rogier, *Geschiedenis van het katholicisme in Noord-Nederland in de 16e en de 17e eeuw*, 3 vols. (Amsterdam, 1945–1947).

4 Willem Frijhoff, *Embodied Belief: Ten Essays on Religious Culture in Dutch History* (Hilversum, 2002); Jaap Geraerts, *Patrons of the Old Faith: The Catholic Nobility in Utrecht and Guelders, c. 1580–1702* (Leiden, 2018); Geert H. Janssen, *The Dutch Revolt and Catholic Exile in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge, 2014); Carolina Lenarduzzi, *Katholiek in de Republiek. Subcultuur en tegencultuur in Nederland, 1570–1750* (Ph.D. dissertation, Leiden University

ual Catholic priests in practice resisted persecution and won toleration at the local and social level.⁵ This also holds true for scholarship on the city of Utrecht,⁶ which by the 1620s and 1630s had become the stronghold for Reformed and Catholic Churches alike in the Dutch Republic. As the present study will show, in Utrecht one could find numerous ordinary and highly placed Catholic priests, as well as a small number of hard-line Reformed ministers influenced by Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676), professor of theology at Utrecht University and a fervent critic of the Catholic faith.⁷

Against this historiographical backdrop, the present study will attempt to shed light socio-historically on the way the swarm of “locusts” – i.e., Catholic priests—managed to survive the Reformed regime in Utrecht so as to stay for short periods in the city or even to reside there continuously. It will focus on the period from 1620 to 1672, that is, from shortly before the resumption of the Eighty Years’ War with Spain until the beginning of the French occupation of Utrecht.

In the present study, ‘pro/persecution’ and ‘toleration’ are understood as political practices for managing and regulating the precarious environment of coexistence between people of different confessions sharing the same physical urban space.⁸ Historians should always offer a clear definition of the term ‘toleration,’ a core concept of modern liberalism; otherwise they run the risk of

2018); Caroline Jacomine Mudde, *Rouwen in de marge. De materiële rouwcultuur van de katholieke geloofsgemeenschap in vroegmodern Nederland* (Ph.D. dissertation, Utrecht University 2018); Charles H. Parker, *Faith on the Margins: Catholics and Catholicism in the Dutch Golden Age* (Cambridge, 2008); Judith Pollmann, *Catholic Identity and the Revolt of the Netherlands, 1520–1635* (Oxford, 2011); Joke Spaans, *De Levens der Maechden. Het verhaal van een religieuze vrouwengemeenschap in de eerste helft van de zeventiende eeuw* (Hilversum, 2012).

5 With regard to the social history of individual priests, a notable exception is the prosopographical work of Gian Ackermans on Catholic secular priests working in the Dutch Republic during the second half of the seventeenth century. Gian Ackermans, *Herders en huurlingen. Bisschoppen en priesters in de Republiek (1663–1705)* (Amsterdam, 2003).

6 For such studies on Utrecht Catholics, see Niek Boukema, *Geloven in het geloof. Een onderzoek naar de positie van de katholieken en de katholieke seculiere zielzorg binnen de stad Utrecht gedurende de periode 1580–1672, met accent op de eerste helft van de 17e eeuw* (Ph.D. thesis, Utrecht University 1982); Bertrand Forclaz, *Catholiques au défi de la Réforme. La coexistence confessionnelle à Utrecht au XVIIe siècle* (Paris, 2014).

7 On Voetius and his followers, see, e.g., Arnoldus Duker, *Gisbertus Voetius*, 4 vols. (Leiden, 1897–1914); Fred van Lieburg, *De Nadere Reformatie in Utrecht ten tijde van Voetius. Sporen in de gereformeerde kerkeradsacta* (Rotterdam, 1989).

8 In this regard, I agree with Christine Kooi who maintains that “toleration and persecution are not so much political or social values as two possible tactical responses to this society’s prevailing fact of life—its multiconfessionalism.” Christine Kooi, *Calvinists and Catholics during Holland’s Golden Age: Heretics and Idolaters* (Cambridge, 2012), 93.

unwittingly but easily reinforcing the teleological narrative of modernisation as the ‘rise of toleration,’ based as it is on the ideology and utopia of modern liberalism.⁹ For the present study, we define ‘toleration’ as a political art of ‘social engineering’¹⁰ with two forms: ‘limited recognition,’ which was publicly bestowed; and ‘connivance,’ which was non-publicly exercised. In previous studies, only the latter—i.e., connivance—has been analysed as the form toleration assumed in practice in early modern Dutch religious history.¹¹ This form of toleration can only be detected at the hand of primary sources attesting to the illegal presence or actions of—in our case—Catholic priests who had no official permit, but were nevertheless immune from legal prosecution. It is the very absence of official documentation of recognition which has allowed historians to speculate that political authorities in practice connived at their presence or behaviour, illegal as it was on the level of theory with a view to the existing policies. If such practices of connivance alone are taken into consideration and no room is left for quantitative analyses or for the perspective of the tolerated party, the most scholars can offer is a simple impression of tolerance, and in the end—either unconsciously or consciously—they only contribute to the mythologisation of ‘Dutch’ toleration.¹² This study, in contrast, argues that another form of toleration—i.e., limited recognition—can be traced in official government documents, enabling historians to assess the frequency of and trends in the political practice of toleration as well as agency of the tolerated party. Through its analysis of toleration as limited recognition, it attempts to shed light on two aspects of confessional coexistence that have been neglected

9 On this point, see also Benjamin J. Kaplan, *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflicts and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2007), 6–7; idem, “‘Dutch’ Religious Tolerance: Celebration and Revision,” in *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, ed. Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia & Henk van Nierop (Cambridge, 2002), 25.

10 I have taken the term ‘social engineering’ from Joke Spaans, “De katholieken in de Republiek na de Vrede van Munster,” *De zeventiende eeuw* 13 (1997), 259. On active religious policies coping with *de facto* confessional coexistence in the Dutch Republic, see also Spaans, “Religious Policies in the Seventeenth-Century Dutch Republic,” in *Calvinism and Religious Toleration*, ed. Hsia & Van Nierop (see above, n. 9).

11 For such an understanding of ‘Dutch’ toleration as a passive practice of connivance, see, e.g., Frijhoff, *Embodied Belief* (see above, n. 4), 40.

12 For critical surveys of the historiography of ‘Dutch’ toleration, which has tended to construct a myth of Dutch liberal-national identity, see Marijke Gijswijt-Hofstra, “Een schijn van verdraagzaamheid. Proeven uit vijf eeuwen Nederlands verleden,” in *Een schijn van verdraagzaamheid: Afwijking en tolerantie in Nederland van de zestiende eeuw tot heden*, ed. Marijke Gijswijt-Hofstra (Hilversum, 1989); Kaplan, “‘Dutch’ Religious Tolerance” (see above, n. 9).

to date in the historiography of toleration due to its nearly exclusive focus on connivance: quantitative data of pro/persecution and toleration as limited recognition, and the discourses mobilised by those who were pro/persecuted and tolerated.

A first section in this article traces the restoration of the Catholic pastoral infrastructure as well as the enactment of anti-priest legislation in Utrecht up to 1630, in order to demonstrate how anti-Catholicism was 'legalised' on the theoretical level of official policy. Secondly, this article will explore how the pro/persecution and toleration of Catholic priests functioned in practice from 1630 to 1672 on the basis of a systematic analysis of the minutes of the city council and other legal documents. As such, quantitative data of pro/persecution and toleration will be offered in this second section. To avoid a one-sided description of confessional coexistence, it will be necessary to listen to the voices of those who were pro/persecuted and tolerated, that is, the Catholic priests. For this reason, the third and final section will propose a discourse analysis of the way Catholic priests defied persecution and sought toleration in the petitions they submitted to the political authorities.¹³ Here special attention will be paid to the priests from three prominent families (Pelt, Van Vianen, and Van Honthorst).¹⁴

1 The Theoretical 'Legalisation' of Anti-Catholicism in Utrecht Policy, 1620–1630

The prohibition on Catholic worship, together with the death of the Archbishop of Utrecht, Frederik Schenck van Toutenburg (in office 1559–1580), which both took place in 1580, meant the disintegration of the official Catholic hierarchy in Utrecht. Led by the Apostolic Vicar (i.e., a substitute for the Archbishop of Utrecht), the Holland Mission (*Missio Hollandica*, *Hollandse Zending*) launched a campaign for the re-Catholicisation of the northern provinces

13 For an analysis of the legal discourses mobilised by Catholic defendants summoned before the Utrecht city court, see Genji Yasuhira, *Civic Agency in the Public Sphere: Catholics' Survival Tactics in Utrecht, 1620s–1670s* (Ph.D. dissertation, Tilburg University 2019), 381–410; idem, "Delimitation of the 'Public' and Freedom of Conscience: Catholics' Survival Tactics in Legal Discourses in Utrecht, 1630–1659," *Early Modern Low Countries* 3:1 (2019).

14 I would like to thank Marten Jan Bok, who kindly shared a number of his (unpublished) findings and materials concerning the genealogy of early modern Utrechters (especially the families of Van Vianen and Van Honthorst) with me.

in 1592, regarding the city of Utrecht as a centre for its activities.¹⁵ One of the urgent problems it faced was the chronic lack of pastors. In tackling this issue, the Apostolic Vicars preferred quality over quantity, establishing the Alticolense seminary in Cologne in 1602 and the Pulcheria seminary in Louvain in 1617, and urging budding theologians to attend universities in such Catholic territories as Cologne, Louvain, and Douai.¹⁶ By the 1620s the pastoral infrastructure had largely been restored, albeit illegally under Dutch civil law. According to Mathieu G. Spiertz, the number of Catholic priests (both secular and regular) in the Dutch Republic grew from seventy in 1602, to 235 in 1622, 421 in 1635, 500 in 1642, and 508 in 1668.¹⁷ Furthermore, Gian Ackermans has demonstrated that more than half (169) of his sample of 298 secular priests working in the Dutch Republic came from patrician or noble families; many of them thus hailed from elite families that could afford to send their sons abroad to study.¹⁸ The Apostolic Vicars preferred to send secular priests to areas with dense Catholic populations, such as Utrecht.¹⁹ Although congregations in other areas of the Dutch Republic, such as the eastern provinces, experienced discontinuity in pastoral care, Utrecht Catholics always had the religious service of clerics available to them.²⁰ In the second half of the seventeenth century, there were 12.7 priests per 1000 Catholics in Utrecht, while for Haarlem this ratio was 5.2 and for Amsterdam 3.7, notwithstanding the fact that the latter two cities likewise had large Catholic populations.²¹ According to Benjamin Kaplan, more than half of the secular priests working in Utrecht in 1622 had university degrees, and this ratio rose to three-quarters by 1638.²² In short, Utrecht Catholics had many priests available to them, most of whom were also highly qualified and came from well-to-do families.

15 Anthonius van Lommel (ed.), "Verslag van den toestand der Hollandsche Missie ten jare 1616," *Archief voor de geschiedenis van het aartsbisdom Utrecht* (hereafter, *A.A.U.*) 1 (1875), 214.

16 Ackermans, *Herdens* (see above, n. 5), 67–120; Carolina Lenarduzzi, "De religieuze spagaat van katholieke studenten in de Republiek rond 1600," *De zeventiende eeuw* 31:2 (2015); Parker, *Faith on the Margins* (see above, n. 4), 77–100.

17 Mathieu G. Spiertz, "De katholieke geestelijke leiders en de wereldlijke overheid in de Republiek der Zeven Provinciën," *Trajecta* 2 (1993), 20.

18 Ackermans, *Herdens* (see above, n. 5), 54–55.

19 *Ibid.*, 101.

20 Rogier, *Geschiedenis* (see above, n. 3), 2: 386–395.

21 Ackermans, *Herdens* (see above, n. 5), 48.

22 Benjamin J. Kaplan, "Confessionalism and Its Limits: Religion in Utrecht, 1600–1650," in *Masters of Light: Dutch Painters in Utrecht during the Golden Age*, ed. Joaneath A. Spicer & Lynn Federle Orr (New Haven, 1997), 65.

Although the local Calvinist-Libertine conflict and the Remonstrant controversy in Utrecht initially prevented political authorities from devising effective solutions to cope with the reviving Catholic community,²³ they did begin forming plans against the priests following the National Synod of Dordrecht (1618–1619) and the end of the Twelve Years' Truce (1609–1621). From Maurice's purge of Remonstrant magistrates in 1618 until the 1650s, power within the Utrecht city council was in the hands of the orthodox Calvinists, who under the influence of Voetius also managed to hold control over the Reformed consistory throughout the entire period under study.²⁴

In 1622 the States General promulgated a harsh anti-Catholic edict which was soon adopted by the province of Utrecht. It was made in the context of "the expiration of the Truce, by which these Lands were again thrown into public war against the King of Spain." The main target of the edict were the Catholic priests, which it represented as politico-religious agitators. It charged that the priests were seducing people to rebellion against the "lawful Government" of the Dutch Republic, and inciting them to loyalty to the Pope and the King of Spain. Since such priests threatened to disturb the "public tranquillity," a prohibition was announced on all priests coming to Utrecht from outside the city. As for the priests who had long been living in Utrecht, they were required to register with the local magistrate. The edict also prescribed that no one was to go abroad to study in the Habsburg territories or at Jesuit colleges.²⁵

Two weeks after the edict of the States General was issued in 1622, the Utrecht city council declared that all the priests who had long been living in Utrecht had eight days to register with magistrates in compliance with the edict.²⁶ On 11, 12, and 13 March, thirty priests including Johannes Wachteleaer (1583–1652), the serving Vicar General (i.e., a substitute for the bishop)

23 E.g. Frits Broeyer, *Het verleden van Utrecht als remonstrantse stad, 1610–1618. Maurits' zwaard* (Utrecht, 2018); Benjamin J. Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines: Confessions and Community in Utrecht, 1578–1620* (Oxford, 1995).

24 On the politico-religious history of Utrecht during this period, see Forclaz, *Catholiques* (see above, n. 6), 70–75, 107–119; Yasuhira, Civic Agency (see above, n. 13), 56, 65–76, 83–89.

25 Johan van de Water, *Groot Placaat-Boek vervattende all de placaten ... der Staten's lands van Utrecht* (hereafter *G.P.U.*), 3 vols. (Utrecht 1729), 1: 397–400 (26 February 1622): "de expiratie van den Treves, daar door dese Landen weder gevallen zyn in openbare oorloge tegen den Koninck van Hispanien," "wettige Overheyd," and "gemeene ruste." The 1603 edict of the city of Utrecht, which required new incoming Catholic priests to register with the municipality, had probably become a dead letter. HUA, Stadsarchief II (hereafter, SAII), 121–4, 2 May 1603.

26 HUA, SAII, 121–9, 11 March 1622; Van de Water, *G.P.U.* (see above, n. 25), 1: 397–400.

⟨26⟩, registered with the municipality, giving their name, age, and address (appendix 1).²⁷ The thirty registered priests also included Jan Alexander Axilius ⟨1⟩ and Jacob Bool ⟨3⟩, who in 1620 both had received an ultimatum for ceasing their illegal pastoral work.²⁸ According to the mission report that the Apostolic Vicar Philippus Rovenius (1573–1651) sent to Rome in 1622, at the time there were around forty priests living in Utrecht, including a Jesuit and a Dominican.²⁹ The number of priests in the city is striking when it is compared to the number of Reformed ministers in Utrecht at that point in time, since the public church only had four ministers.³⁰ In later sessions, the city council frequently noted the high number of priests in Utrecht, as well as the influx of Catholic priests coming from outside the city, especially from “enemy places” (*vyanden plaetsen*).³¹ Magistrates then consulted the list of registered priests to devise further measures against these as well as future incoming priests.³²

Around 1630 the city council found it necessary to take more rigorous action against the priests who were still coming to Utrecht ‘daily’ from the outside, in spite of the prohibition. Its response came in the form of a provincial edict issued in 1630 (and reissued in 1636) prescribing that even the priests who were “tolerated” (*getolereert*) in other cities or places in the United Provinces could not come to Utrecht without the prior consent of the burgomasters.³³ Soon thereafter the Catholic priest Rombout van Medenblick ⟨31⟩ submitted a petition to the city council requesting permission to reside in Utrecht. He wrote that he had already registered with magistrates in Leiden in 1622. On 15 September the city council publicly recognised his right to live in his hometown Utrecht. On that same day, the city’s magistrates also approved a decision allowing the return of priests who were sons of citizens upon the completion of their university studies in “enemy Lands” after 1622.³⁴ On 20 September 1630 the city council received another petition in the name of all the priests who

27 HUA, Verzamelde stukken van de oud-katholieke kerk in Nederland (hereafter, *VSOKN*), 112, 11, 12, 13 March 1622. The names of the registered priests are marked ⟨number⟩ in appendix 1.

28 HUA, *SAII*, 121–8, 7 September 1620; HUA, *SAII*, 121–9, 11 March 1622.

29 Rogier, *Geschiedenis* (see above, n. 3), 2: 388.

30 Duker, *Voetius* (see above, n. 7), 3: 108–109; Van Lieburg, *De Nadere Reformatie* (see above, n. 7), 151.

31 E.g. HUA, *SAII*, 121–10, 29 October 1622, 21 June 1624, 9 August 1624.

32 E.g. *Ibidem*, 12 April, 24 May 1624; 16 August 1624; HUA, *SAII*, 121–13, 7 April 1628.

33 Van de Water, *G.P.U.* (see above, n. 25), 3: 468.

34 HUA, *SAII*, 121–14, 15 September 1630. According to Kooi, the Leiden city court collected the names of eleven Catholic priests residing there in 1622, including Van Medenblick. Christine Kooi, *Liberty and Religion: Church and State in Leiden's Reformation, 1572–1620* (Leiden, 2000), 192. On Van Medenblick, who published a book of Catholic religious songs

had been living in Utrecht before 1622 and left the city after that date to study in "France, Germany, and other Neutral Lands" (*Vranckrijck, Duytslandt and andere Neutrale Landen*), but had since returned to Utrecht. As detailed in the last section of this article, they pleaded with the city council for permission to reside in Utrecht. The city council approved this request, albeit on the condition that they observe the edict issued in 1630.³⁵

Therefore, by 1630 anti-Catholicism was 'legalised' on the theoretical level of official policy in Utrecht. That does not mean, however, that magistrates admitted no exceptions. But how did the two political measures of pro/persecution and toleration function in practice?

2 Pro/Persecution and Toleration in Practice, 1630–1672

2.1 Numerical Overview

Political authorities never overcame their anxieties about the influx of priests from the outside or the potential threat of their activities. On the other hand, from 1630 onwards magistrates did begin to bestow public recognition on some—if not all—Catholic priests, allowing them to stay or take residence in the city of Utrecht. A survey of the minutes of the city council, which to date has not been undertaken systematically in this regard,³⁶ reveals that sixty-four priests were officially tolerated to stay or reside in Utrecht from 1630 to 1672 (appendix 1).³⁷ This statistic is remarkable in view of the low number of legal proceedings undertaken against Catholic priests; from 1630 to 1672 there were fifteen cases (appendix 2).³⁸

Only two cases have been identified in which priests were refused a permit to stay or reside in Utrecht. In 1650, when Henrick Hoeffslach, a priest working in Huissen, requested permission from the magistrates to stay in Utrecht for a month, the sheriff (*schout*) and burgomasters denied his request.³⁹ In 1656,

in Dutch under the pseudonym Rumoldus Batavus, see also Charles van Leeuwen, *Hemelse voorbeelden. De heiligenliederen van Johannes Stalpart van der Wiele, 1579–1630* (Nijmegen, 2001), 46–47, 134, 139, 162; Lenarduzzi, *Katholiek* (see above, n. 4), 102, 264–265.

35 HUA, SAII, 121–14, 20 September 1630; HUA, VSOKN, 112, 20 September 1630.

36 A list of recognised priests for the years 1657 to 1658 can be found in Samuel Muller (ed.), "Lijst van Roomsche-Katholieke priesters, wien door de vroedschap der stad Utrecht in 1657 en 1658 verlof ("geleyde") gegeven is om in de stad te komen. Afschrift Rijksarchieven van Utrecht," in *A.A.U.* 14 (1886), 245–246. Bertrand Forclaz deals with the recognised priests from 1648 to 1659 alone. Forclaz, *Catholiques* (see above, n. 6), 117–118.

37 The names of the recognised priests are marked {number} in appendix 1.

38 Each legal proceeding is marked {number} in appendix 2.

39 HUA, SAII, 121–23, 17 June 1650.

however, magistrates did allow him a three-week stay ⟨61⟩.⁴⁰ In 1651 an heir of the late Willem van Pylsweert requested the city council to allow Wachtelaer, who had been sentenced to banishment from the city in 1640 {5}, to return to Utrecht to divide the property of the deceased, but in vain.⁴¹ There are also priests who were given a permit on multiple occasions; most notable in this regard are Balthasar van de Kemp from Emmerich ⟨38⟩ and Willem (de) Munter from Dordrecht ⟨59⟩, who both received permission to stay in Utrecht no less than six times.⁴² Others managed to extend their permit prior to expiration; for example, although Henrick van Domselaer was initially permitted to stay in Utrecht for only twelve days, in the end he was granted three extensions allowing him to stay there for no less than 145 days ⟨37⟩.⁴³ In four other cases, the city council explicitly noted that the permit could not be extended, even though three of the four priests in question did manage to obtain a new residence permit at a later time.⁴⁴ The length of stay for those priests ranged from 3 days for Cornelis van der Hout ⟨53⟩—he obtained four three-day permits in two years⁴⁵—to an indefinite stay. Seven priests received such permission for an indefinite stay in Utrecht (until cancellation of the permit),⁴⁶ while Willem van Cruysbergen, a priest in IJsselstein, was given permission to visit Utrecht whenever he needed to ⟨88⟩.⁴⁷

2.2 *Chronological Developments*

Anti-Catholicism in Utrecht oscillated between periods of stricter and laxer legislation and prosecution. The intensity corresponded to the (inter)national and local politico-religious circumstances, such as open warfare with the Catholic powers of Spain and elsewhere, eliciting suspicions concerning the political loyalty of Catholics, as well as rivalry between Voetian and Republican factions in the city council. From 1618 to the 1650s, the Utrecht magistracy was dominated by 'strict' Voetians, although, as we will see, power later fell into the hands of the 'moderate' Republicans. Power within the consistory of the Reformed church, however, remained always in the hands of the hard-line Voetians.

40 ⟨61⟩ in appendix 1.

41 HUA, SAIL, 121–23, 20 March 1651. See also {5} in appendix 2.

42 ⟨38⟩ ⟨59⟩ in appendix 1. For genealogical details on Willem (de) Munter, see also Ackermans, *Herders* (see above, n. 5), 404.

43 ⟨37⟩ in appendix 1.

44 ⟨33a⟩ ⟨36⟩ ⟨38a⟩ ⟨63b⟩ in appendix 1.

45 ⟨53abcd⟩ in appendix 1.

46 ⟨31⟩ ⟨33b⟩ ⟨38f⟩ ⟨64⟩ ⟨89⟩ ⟨91⟩ ⟨94⟩ in appendix 1.

47 HUA, SAIL, 121–27, 15 December 1662.

In the context of the last phase of the Eighty Years' War against the Habsburg monarchy, Catholic priests were represented by public authorities as 'enemies' who only brought harm to the soil of the Protestant Republic. Indeed, the registered priest Paulus van Geresteijn (16) was accused of presiding over a Catholic assembly in St Job Hospice on Christmas Day in 1634 {2}.⁴⁸ It is worth noting, however, that even after this event he was non-publicly connived as a trustee to St Anthony Hospice (in office at least 1631–1633, 1635–1636), notwithstanding the existing prohibition on the appointment of Catholic trustees in all Utrecht hospices.⁴⁹ In 1636 the city council drew up a list of priests who had contravened the edicts, which appears no longer to be extant.⁵⁰ A provincial edict issued in April 1639 prescribed that the Catholic priests who had come to Utrecht after 1622 were to leave, regardless of whether they had been born in Utrecht, and that the priests who had been living there from before 1622 were once again to register their name and address with the magistrates. Those who were "tolerated" had to live in observance of the edicts.⁵¹ Furthermore, in 1639 the city council decided to offer a premium to anyone who caught Catholic priests (f. 150 per person).⁵² These events formed the context in which five Catholic priests, including the Apostolic Vicar Rovenius and the Vicar General Wachtelaer, were severely prosecuted in 1640.⁵³

Despite these trials, priests kept coming from neighbouring Catholic areas.⁵⁴ As the end of the war approached, the Reformed Church pushed the political authorities to buckle down in their oppression of Catholic priests. The petition from the consistory complained about the "public residences" (*publicque inwoning*) of priests, Jesuits, and *kloppes* (i.e., semi-religious Catholic women), to the "detriment of the church of God and the annoyance

48 {16} in appendix 1. {2} in appendix 2.

49 HUA, Bewaarde archieven II (hereafter, BAI), 1987–1, passim (1631–1633, 1635–1636). For more details of Catholic trustees in hospices, see Yasuhira, Civic Agency (see above, n. 13), especially 139–140, 221–223.

50 HUA, SAI, 121–17, 7 January, 1 February 1636.

51 Van de Water, *G.P.U.* (see above, n. 25), 1: 395–396 (9 April 1639).

52 HUA, SAI, 121–18, 6 May 1639.

53 {4} {5} {6} {7} {8} in appendix 2. On the lawsuits against these Catholic priests, see also Jan Hallebeek, "Godsdienst(on)vrijheid in de Gouden Eeuw? Het proces tegen Johan Wachtelaer (1583–1652)," *Trajecta* 23 (2014); Margaret Hewett & Jan Hallebeek, "The Prelate, the Praetor and the Professor: Antonius Matthaeus II and the *Crimen Laesae Majestatis*, Utrecht 1639–1640," *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis* 66:1 (1998); Yasuhira, Civic Agency (see above, n. 13), passim; idem, "Delimitation of the 'Public'" (see above, n. 13), passim.

54 E.g. HUA, KR, 5, 29 June 1646; HUA, SAI, 121–20, 14 November 1643.

of the [Reformed] Community.”⁵⁵ A long petition drawn up by the consistory in 1648 stated that “the popish priests and those who are papists are enemies of our city.” It argued that the more “enemies” were residing in the city, the greater the threat the magistrates and their subjects faced. Here the petition reminded the city council of the legal case against Rovenius {4}. As concrete anti-Catholic countermeasures, the consistory proposed fixing bounties for information not only on priests, but also on participants in Catholic assemblies as well as supporters who concealed the names of suspected priests and laypeople. Because Catholic priests were known to be “boldly” presiding over “conventicles,” the consistory requested the city council to repeal the stay or residence permits that had been given to them.⁵⁶

Political authorities did not fully adopt this proposal, based as it was on a confessionalised notion of the Reformation. According to the mission report that the Apostolic Vicar Jacobus de la Torre (1608–1661) sent to Rome in 1638, the city of Utrecht had twenty-six secular priests including Wachtelaer, three Jesuits, two Dominicans, and one Augustinian, in addition to seven priests working in the surrounding villages.⁵⁷ Again, the estimated number of Catholic priests was far higher than that of the Reformed ministers, of whom there were only seven at the time.⁵⁸ The presence of Catholic priests was not only unofficially connived at, but also officially recognised. From 1630 to 1648, fourteen priests publicly obtained limited recognition for permanent or temporary residence in Utrecht (appendix 1), even though this same period saw the most (twelve) legal procedures launched against priests among the fifteen total cases against them between 1630 and 1672 (appendix 2). From 1630 to 1648, three priests were given permanent residence in Utrecht: Van Medenblick in 1630 {31}, Herman van Honthorst in 1637 {33b}, and Servaes van der Nypoort (c. 1608–1677) in 1648 {41c}.⁵⁹ After receiving their permit, however, the first two were sentenced to banishment from the city in consequence of lawsuits filed against them: Van Medenblick in 1631 {1}, and Van Honthorst in 1641 {10}.⁶⁰

55 Ibidem, 18 May 1646; HUA, SAIL, 121–21, 19 May 1646: “nadeel van Godes kercke ende erger-nisse vande Gemeente.”

56 HUA, KR, 5, 28 February 1648: “de papen en diegeene die paeps sijn vyanden sijn van onsen stadt.” See also, HUA, SAIL, 121–22, 6 March 1648.

57 Rogier, *Geschiedenis* (see above, n. 3), 2: 389.

58 Duker, *Gisbertus Voetius* (see above, n. 7), 3: 108–110; Van Lieburg, *De Nadere Reformatie* (see above, n. 7), 151.

59 {31} {33b} {41c} in appendix 1.

60 {1} {10} in appendix 2. Together with other priests called “Aegid[ius] de Ridder [van Groenesteyn], unknown Duyck,” Herman van Honthorst had been banished in 1638 by the city council. HUA, SAIL 121–18, 6 August 1638.

Nevertheless, it still seems remarkable that Catholic priests were even publicly tolerated to stay or reside in Utrecht during the last phase of the Eighty Years' War, also after the aforementioned trials against the five priests in 1640 {4} {5} {6} {7} {8}.

Following the Peace of Munster (1648) and the Great Assembly (1651), the public church urged political authorities to take more effective action against Catholics. According to the Reformed consistory, the growing "boldness of Papists" resulted from the "free and rather public residence" of priests in the city.⁶¹ Indeed, the city council was informed about a priest called Hattem who was said to be living in a house on the Nieuwstraat without a residence permit.⁶² The magistrates and city court therefore decided to be more diligent in watching the Jesuits flowing into Utrecht from the Habsburg Netherlands, which no more represented official 'enemy territory.'⁶³ In several petitions, the Reformed consistory requested the city council to observe the anti-Catholic edicts concerning priests.⁶⁴ As noted above, the petition that the synod of Utrecht submitted to the Provincial States in 1655–1656 justified the refusal of "free and public residence and stay in the province of Utrecht" to all priests and *klopjes*. They were considered harmful because of their confessional doctrines and political (dis)loyalties. In particular, they placed "the Monarchy and power of the Pope [...] above all churches and governments, above all Kings and Princes." Hence, so the petition claimed, Catholic priests insisted that they were "free and exempt" from "obedience to their lawful Governments." The petition also noted the toleration which the political authorities had been bestowing upon priests who "from ancient times have been living in these lands only under the express condition [...] that they act and order themselves" after the anti-Catholic edicts. Since tolerated priests were violating their oaths and contravening the edicts, so the synod of Utrecht continued, they ought to be "irrevocably" deprived of "the toleration and connivances that had been bestowed [on them]."⁶⁵

61 HUA, KR, 5, 15 October 1649: "vrij ende genoch openbaer wonen."

62 HUA, SAII, 121–23, 20 November 1648.

63 HUA, SAII, 121–25, 31 October 1653.

64 HUA, KR, 5, 2 December 1650; HUA, KR, 6, 3 April 1654, 23 March 1657; HUA, KR, 8, 26 January 1663, 4 September 1665; HUA, SAII, 121–25, 10 April 1654; HUA, SAII, 121–26, 23 March 1657.

65 HUA, VBB, 139, probably in 1655 or 1656: "vrije ende publijcke wooninghe ende verblijf inde Provincie van Utrecht," "de Monarchie ende macht des Paus," "boven alle kercken en politien, boven alle Coningen en Princen," "vrij ende exempt," "gehoorsaemhey aen haer wetten Overicheden," "van outs binnen dese landen woonachtich sijn geweest alleen

The political authorities seemed to be unwilling, however, to realise the confessionalising agenda of the Reformed Church for abolishing toleration as a political practice. According to De la Torre's 1656 mission report, there were around thirty secular priests inside the Utrecht city walls, four secular priests in the suburbs, as well as two Jesuits, two Dominicans, two Augustinians, one Franciscan, and one Carmelite within the city walls.⁶⁶ Judging from this report at least, the number of priests working in Utrecht seems still to have been growing in the second half of the seventeenth century. In 1665 the Reformed consistory lamented that the ratio of Catholic priests to Reformed ministers was no less than three or four to one.⁶⁷ This hardly seems an exaggeration, since there were only thirteen ministers working in the city at the time.⁶⁸ Moreover, between 1649 and 1672, a total of fifty-two priests were publicly tolerated, allowing them to stay in Utrecht (appendix 1). Five priests were given permission to stay in Utrecht indefinitely, and they seem never to have been deprived of this right.⁶⁹ Van Cruysbergen {88} was given permission to visit Utrecht whenever he needed to.⁷⁰ And even though the Reformed consistory suspected that Josephus van der Steen, a Carmelite in Brabant, would cause "considerable harm,"⁷¹ he still received permission to stay with a nobleman named Wttenhove in Neerlangbroek for a year and a half {79}.⁷² So too a priest who had already been prosecuted was allowed to return to Utrecht after he had served his punishment. This was Cornelis van der Hout, incarcerated and then freed on bail (f. 750) in 1641 {9}, who on four different occasions in 1653 and 1654 was given a three-day residence permit {53}.⁷³ Between the Peace of Munster and the start of the French occupation of Utrecht, only three legal procedures were initiated against priests, namely Robert Redinge in 1653 {13}, Anthonis de Rhode (Rode) in 1655 {14}, and Cornelis Duck {15} in 1663, whose permit for staying in the city had already expired {43}. De Rhode would be given permission to stay in Utrecht a month after his lawsuit {58}.⁷⁴

onder de expresse conditien [...] dat se haer sullen gedragen ende reguleren," "onweder-sprekelick," and "hare gepretendeerde tolerantie ende conniventien."

66 Rogier, *Geschiedenis* (see above, n. 3), 2: 392.

67 HUA, KR, 8, 30 June 1665.

68 Duker, *Gisbertus Voetius* (see above, n. 7), 3: 108–122; Van Lieburg, *De Nadere Reformatie* (see above, n. 7), 151.

69 {38f} {64} {89} {91} {94} in appendix 1.

70 {88} in appendix 1.

71 HUA, KR, 7, 24 October 1659.

72 {79} in appendix 1.

73 {53} in appendix 1. {9} in appendix 2.

74 {43} {58} in appendix 1. {13} {14} {15} in appendix 2. On Cornelis Duck, see also Ackermans, *Herders* (see above, n. 5), 353.

The laxity in the prosecution of priests which can be discerned especially in the 1660s may well have resulted from the overwhelmingly Republican composition of the Utrecht city council or its antagonistic relationship with the Voetian consistory. Around 1660 the Utrecht city council, which had been dominated by the 'strict' Voetians and Orangists since 1618, now came into the hands of the 'moderate' Republicans, represented by the renowned Cartesian philosopher and medical doctor Lambert van Velthuysen (in office as city councillor 1667–1674).⁷⁵ Illustrative of this change in the balance of power within the city council is the response it gave in 1663 to several requests from the Reformed Church appealing for enforcement of the existing anti-Catholic edicts.⁷⁶ The burgomaster Nicolaas Hamel (in office 1656–1658, 1662–1664, 1666–1668), a leading member of the Republican faction in Utrecht, responded to the Voetian consistory that magistrates had found no violations of the edicts. If anyone were to be found violating the edicts, Hamel continued, they would certainly be prosecuted. Although he added that the city council would discuss this matter further, the clear undertone of his message to the public church was for it to mind its own business.⁷⁷

Catholic ecclesiastics showed themselves to be well aware that the politico-religious milieu in Utrecht had changed. In 1668 the Apostolic Vicar Johannes van Neercassel (1626–1686) reported to Rome on the situation of the Catholics in the Northern Netherlands, stating that there was no 'Persecution' (*Persecutio*) in the city of Utrecht.⁷⁸ In another letter to Rome dating from 1669, Van Neercassel similarly identified a magistrate who had studied the "heretical theology" in Geneva—no doubt Van Velthuysen—as one "reason for our tranquillity" (*nostrae tranquillitatis causa*). Using Scripture, this 'heretical' magistrate had demonstrated "most painstakingly" (*operosissime*) that Catholics ought not to be subjected to "persecution" (*persecutione*).⁷⁹ Furthermore, the sheriff

75 On the politico-religious history of Utrecht during this period, see Forclaz, *Catholiques* (see above, n. 6), 75–76, 119–126; Yasuhira, Civic Agency (see above, n. 13), 76–80, 89–90. On Van Velthuysen and fellow members of the 'college of savants' in Utrecht, see Albert Gootjes, "The *Collegie der Sçavanten*: A Seventeenth-Century Cartesian Scholarly Society in Utrecht," in *Enlightened Religion: From Confessional Churches to Polite Piety in the Dutch Republic*, ed. Joke Spaans & Jetze Touber (Leiden, 2019).

76 HUA, KR, 8, 9 June 1662, 28 September, 5 October, 16 November 1663.

77 Ibidem, 30 November 1663.

78 Brom, Gisbert (ed.), "Neerkassels bestuur van 1662 tot 1676," *A.A.U.* (1890), XVIII, 232 (28 February 1668).

79 Johannes Cornelissen et al. (eds.), *Romeinsche bronnen voor den kerkelijken toestand der Nederlanden onder de apostolisch vicarissen, 1592–1727*, 4 vols. (The Hague, 1932–1952), 2: 500 (18 October 1669).

at the time, Frederik Ruysch (in office 1659–1677), who had earlier also served as burgomaster (in office 1639–1643 and 1650–1652), built up friendships with a number of Catholic priests. In a letter written to his Vicar General Abraham van Brien en (1605–1683, alias Abraham van der Matt) in Utrecht in 1674, Van Neercassel revealed that he had been informed by a monk called Evert about the “affection” (*affectie*) which the sheriffs active in Utrecht and Amersfoort at the time, thus including Ruysch, had shown for him (i.e., Van Neercassel). He asked Van Brien en to “thank from the bottom of his heart” (*hartelyck bedancken*) both Evert and the sheriffs.⁸⁰

This does not mean, however, that the Republican magistrates stopped watching the Catholic priests in the 1660s. In 1665 they compiled a list of nineteen priests “who live and hold fixed residence here” (appendix 3).⁸¹ The list included an Utrecht native, Servaes van der Nypoort (002), who in 1648 was given permission to stay in Utrecht indefinitely (41c), with the note that he was “free” (*vrij*) in Utrecht. This serves to confirm that among the nineteen total priests living in Utrecht at the time, Van der Nypoort was the only one to have publicly gained limited recognition as a tolerated citizen.⁸² Although the city council submitted a list of priests—probably the same one—to the sheriff in July 1665,⁸³ the Vicar General Van Brien en (001) and a Jesuit named Lambert van Dilsen (1619–1679) (009) are the only priests on the list whose names are also mentioned in the legal records only after the end of the French occupation in 1673.⁸⁴ Hence, the list of priests drawn up in 1665 shows that the other seventeen priests benefited from non-public connivance allowing them to live in Utrecht, even though the public authorities knew of their existence and in some cases were even aware of their place of residence.

80 HUA, Apostolische vicarissen van de Hollandse Zending, 246, 14 August 1674.

81 HUA, SAII, 616, probably in 1665 (these reports were transcribed in J.H. Hofman (ed.), “Allerlei, betreffende de stad Utrecht,” *A.A.U.* 5 (1878), 183–189, here especially 187–189): “die alhier wonen en vaste domicilie houden.” The names of the connived priests are marked (number) in appendix 3.

82 (41c) in appendix 1. (002) in appendix 3. On Van der Nypoort, see also Ackermans, *Herders* (see above, n. 5), 407–408; Anique C. de Kruijf, *Miraculeus bewaard. Middeleeuwse Utrechtse relieken op reis: de schat van de Oud-Katholieke Gertrudiskathedraal* (Zutphen, 2011), 148–152, 198, 261, 270, 272–273; Lenarduzzi, *Katholiek* (see above, n. 4), 198, 246.

83 HUA, SAII, 121–27, 24 July 1665. See also *ibidem*, 28 August 1665.

84 (001) (009) in appendix 3. For the legal case concerning Van Brien en, see HUA, SAII, 616, 6 January 1675 (Hofman (ed.), “Allerlei,” 192–195). For the Van Dilsen case, see HUA, SAII, 2236–5, 5 January 1676; HUA, SAII, 2244–135, 1, 3, 4, 8, 15, 17, 21 December 1675. On Van Brien en (001), see also Ackermans, *Herders* (see above, n. 5), *passim*, especially 331. On Van Dilsen, see also P.C. Molhuysen et al (eds.), *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, 10 vols. (Leiden, 1911–1937), 3: 288.

Catholic priests represented a clear politico-religious danger to the public order of Protestant Utrecht: their number was always much higher than that of the Reformed ministers, and they were steadily pouring into the city like a swarm of "locusts." Under the influence of Voetius, the public church therefore always pushed the magistracy, whose composition had shifted from a 'strict' Voetian majority to a 'moderate' Republican majority, to prosecute Catholic ecclesiastics more severely. Although at times some Catholic priests were indeed prosecuted, in practice they also gained toleration. Utrecht's magistrates adopted two measures—i.e., prosecution and toleration—to regulate the precarious environment of confessional coexistence. The nature of the pro/persecution or toleration coincided with politico-religious circumstances in and around Utrecht, although it should also be emphasised that even 'strict' Voetian magistrates adopted toleration from 1618 to the 1650s, and that conversely even 'moderate' Republican magistrates resorted to prosecution from the 1660s to 1672. Furthermore, since scholars have tended to focus exclusively on passive practices of connivance in early modern Dutch religious history, it is also important to note that political authorities not only unofficially connived at, but also—on a surprisingly large scale—officially recognised the presence of Catholic ecclesiastics in Utrecht.

3 Discourses for Resisting Persecution and Winning Toleration

How did the individual Catholic priests discursively manage to resist persecution and request toleration in their petitions to political authorities? Toleration as connivance was, by its very definition, practised without official documentation. Hence, it is impossible to detect how the connived priests sought toleration. Since previous studies have focused exclusively on non-public connivance as the form of toleration practised in the Dutch Republic, they failed to assess how Catholics also actively won toleration for themselves through their petitioning activities. Shedding light on another type of toleration (i.e., public recognition), this section will offer a detailed analysis of discourses appearing in the petitions which recognised Catholic priests submitted to the magistracy in order to assess agency the priests possessed. The contents of their requests were recorded in the minutes of the city council, although in most cases they are rather fragmentary.

It is unknown whether the reasons advanced in the petitions for stay or residence permits were fake or 'genuine.' A unique case is that of Henrick van Domselaer (37) who, after three extensions, was in the end given permission to stay in Utrecht for a total of some 145 days. He maintained that he had not been

FIGURE 1 Recognised priests in Utrecht, 1630–1672, reasons

working for long as a Catholic priest; whether or not this was actually true, is not known.⁸⁵ A number of other priests seem more clearly to have been attempting to deceive political authorities to obtain permission to stay in Utrecht. Servaes van der Nypoort, a son of the patrician Joost Willemsz, explained in 1645 and 1646 that he wanted to stay in Utrecht due to his health and the medical care he needed (41ab); on both occasions, he was granted permission to stay in his hometown for six months. His argument might well have been fabricated, since he had been serving the secular clandestine church of St Gertrudis in Utrecht since 1643. Then, in 1648, he publicly obtained a permit for residence in the city until cancellation (41c).⁸⁶ Although magistrates noted that all the recognised priests were required to observe the anti-Catholic edicts—and thus forbidden to exercise the Catholic faith—, Van der Nypoort hardly seems to have been the only one who on paper concealed the real purpose for his stay or residence in Utrecht, namely to serve the Catholics living in the city. A surprising argument was offered by a Carthusian from Cologne named Arnoldus Rade(n). On two occasions he publicly obtained a permit to stay in Utrecht to visit and rent out the immovable property of a Carthusian monastery in the Dutch Republic—the precise location of its estate is unknown—, and to see to its 'affairs' (*affaires*) (60ab).⁸⁷ These cases involving Rade(n) are remarkable

85 (37) in appendix 1.

86 (41abc) in appendix 1.

87 (60ab) in appendix 1.

because this regular priest appears to have been too honest to disguise the religious purpose of stay, while the Reformed magistrates for their part seem to have been too idle to prevent this regular priest from further infractions of the edicts. After all, in the Dutch Republic every kind of revenue by and for Catholic ecclesiastical institutions had long been outlawed.

Various arguments were mobilised to justify the request for stay or residence permits by priests in Utrecht. Nevertheless, a noticeable trend can still be observed among the many petitions, since a growing number appealed to the civic status of the Catholic ecclesiastics. 'Civic status' is understood here as the priests' social profile entailing public rights within the civic community, irrespective of their known or unknown legal status of citizenship.⁸⁸ An illustrative example of such an appeal can be found in the aforementioned collective petition which the priests submitted to the city magistracy in 1630. It noted how in the past many Catholic notables and citizens had been expelled from the city for political reasons during the war, which had been fought against the "rigorous edicts of the King of Spain" and for the "liberty of the lands and of Religion." "The union [of Utrecht] and [the] religious peace" now prescribed that "everyone in these lands, whether ecclesiastical or secular, should live in the religion by which he thinks he will be blessed." Upon this official principle of the Dutch Republic at large, the petition argued that people should be able to leave their hometown freely to study at universities, irrespective of the subject of study, whether theology, law, or medicine. It furthermore argued that the above edict of the States General promulgated in 1622 should be applied only to those who boldly stayed in "enemy Lands." In contrast, "obedient citizens"—including the petitioners—who had lived in Utrecht since before 1622 and then returned to Utrecht ought to be allowed to live in their "paternal City." As noted, the city council acceded to this request, provided that the returning priests observe the edicts.⁸⁹ Appealing to the freedom of conscience prescribed by the Union

88 Due to the absence of records, the precise legal status of some of the studied priests unfortunately could not be determined. On the importance of the civic status of Catholic defendants for their survival, see Yasuhira, *Civic Agency* (see above, n. 13), *passim*; *idem*, "Delimitation of the 'Public'" (see above, n. 13). On the policy excluding Catholic newcomers from Utrecht citizenship, first stipulated in 1655, see Maarten Prak, "The Policies of Intolerance: Citizenship and Religion in the Dutch Republic (Seventeenth to Eighteenth Centuries)," in *Calvinism and Religious Toleration*, ed. Hsia & Van Nierop (see above, n. 9), *passim*; Ronald Rommes, *Oost, west, Utrecht best? Driehonderd jaar migratie en migranten in de stad Utrecht (begin 16e–begin 19e eeuw)* (Amsterdam, 1998), especially 41–44; Yasuhira, *Civic Agency* (see above, n. 13), especially 144–147; *idem*, "Confessional Coexistence and Perceptions of the 'Public': Catholics' Agency in Negotiations on Poverty and Charity in Utrecht, 1620s–1670s," *BMGN—Low Countries Historical Review* 132:4 (2017), 10, 21.

89 HUA, VSOKN, 112, 20 September 1630: "rigereuse placaten vande Coninck van Spaengien,"

of Utrecht, the priests thus used civic terms to justify their freedom to study abroad and to return to their hometown thereafter, rejecting their representation by the Reformed Church as “public enemies” and counter-representing themselves as “obedient citizens.”

Although prosecuted native priests with citizenship and an elevated social standing, such as Van Medenblick <31> {1}, Wachtelaer <26> {5}, Gerrit Pelt <5> {8}, and Van Honthorst <33> {10}, lost the right to stay or reside in their hometown in consequence of legal proceedings against them,⁹⁰ the relationships which the recognised priests had with the Utrecht civic community seem to have played a role in persuading the political authorities to tolerate them to stay or reside in Utrecht in spite of the existing prohibition. After all, for thirty-five of the sixty-four recognised priests there is no doubt that they had some connection or other with Utrecht.⁹¹ In six cases, recognised priests maintained that they intended to visit Utrecht for the purpose of dividing someone's property in the city (fig. 1).⁹² The secular priest Jacob Pieck <32>, for instance, was tolerated to visit Utrecht as executor to the testament of the late Jacob Bool, a registered secular priest <3>.⁹³ In seventeen cases, recognised priests alleged family visits as the reason for their stay (fig. 1).⁹⁴ The secular priest Nicolaes Prins was tolerated to return to his hometown to grieve with his family following the death of his brothers <51a> and to rescue their properties <51b>. On another, similar occasion <51c>, permission was requested on his behalf by Eva van Amerongen, the widow of his brother Gerard Prins, an advocate of the provincial court of Utrecht.⁹⁵ In eleven cases, recognised priests justified their stay in Utrecht by declaring that they required medical care in Utrecht (fig. 1).⁹⁶ The Emmerich canon Balthasar van de Kemp, for instance, was first tolerated to stay in Utrecht in 1641 to divide his deceased father's property <38a>, and later

“liberteyt vande landen, ende vande Religie,” “bij den unie ende religions vrede,” “een yder 'tzij geestelick ofte weerlick in dese landen in sulcke religie soude mogen leven, daer mede hij meenden salich te worden,” “vijanden Landen,” “gehoorsame borgers,” and “vaderlicke Stadt.” Catholic notables and citizens were purged in 1585, when the Habsburg troops were on the offensive, and in 1586, when the Earl of Leicester collaborated with Calvinists and militias in Utrecht. Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines* (see above, n. 23), 166, 175–176.

90 <5> <26> <31> <33> in appendix 1. {1} {5} {8} {10} in appendix 2.

91 <31> <32> <33> <34> <38> <39> <41> <43> <44> <45> <46> <50> <51> <52> <56> <59> <64> <69> <71> <72> <74> <75> <77> <79> <83> <84> <85> <87> <88> <89> <90> <91> <92> <93> <94> in appendix 1.

92 <32> <38a> <51b> <59bc> <74b> in appendix 1.

93 <3> <32> in appendix 1.

94 <33a> <34> <38ae> <44> <51a> <52b> <59a> <69a> <72d> <77c> <85ab> <88> <89> <92> <93> in appendix 1.

95 <51abc> in appendix 1.

96 <38f> <41ab> <44> <50b> <51d> <80> <86> <87abc> in appendix 1.

in 1658 to assist his elderly mother (38e). Finally, in 1659 he requested permission to stay in his hometown because of his own physical condition, receiving permission to reside in Utrecht indefinitely in recognition of his advanced age and visual impairment (38f).⁹⁷

The total of ninety-four recognised priests included many sons from elite Utrecht families. Here we will focus on clerics from the Pelt, Van Vianen, and Van Honthorst families to show the important role their elevated civic status played in defying persecution and winning toleration.

The patrician Pelt family produced many Catholic ecclesiastics.⁹⁸ Although a branch of the family converted to Protestantism and moved to the Generality Lands to attain public offices,⁹⁹ others remained firm in their Catholic faith and stayed in Utrecht. Despite the existing prohibition on the appointment of Catholic trustees to hospices, Steven Pelt (c. 1565–1642), a solicitor of the city court, was non-publicly connived as a trustee of St Anthony Hospice (in office at least 1625–1627, 1638, 1640–1642).¹⁰⁰ Three of Steven's six children chose to become clerics.¹⁰¹ Among them, his oldest child Gerrit (before 1592–1642) was ordained as a secular priest working in the former parish of the Buur Church in Utrecht. In compliance with the edict, he registered with the magistrates in 1622 (5).¹⁰² Then, in 1640, he together with other priests was sentenced to the confiscation of his properties and banishment from the Dutch Republic (8).¹⁰³ One of Steven's other sons, Anthoni (1604–1661), a medical doctor, was an important member not only of the Utrecht Catholic community but also of the civic community. Like his father, he was non-publicly connived as a trustee of St Anthony Hospice (in office at least 1636–1642, 1644–1649).¹⁰⁴ Four

⁹⁷ (38aef) in appendix 1.

⁹⁸ On the Pelt family in general, see also Boukema, Geloven (see above, n. 6), 45–51; Forclaz, *Catholiques* (see above, n. 6), 54–56, 121–122, 138, 152–154, 161, 171, 207, 249; Adrianus J. van de Ven, "Een Utrechtse familie uit de 17e eeuw," *Jaarboek Oud-Utrecht* (1960); Yasuhira, Civic Agency (see above, n. 13), 263–265.

⁹⁹ Forclaz, *Catholiques* (see above, n. 6), 153–154.

¹⁰⁰ HUA, BAI, 1987–1, passim (1625–1627, 1638, 1640–1642). For Steven Pelt, see also Boukema, Geloven (see above, n. 6), 45; Forclaz, *Catholiques* (see above, n. 6), 54, 152–153; Van de Ven, "Een Utrechtse familie" (see above, n. 98), 120–121, 123–124.

¹⁰¹ Ackermans, *Herders* (see above, n. 5), 414; Boukema, Geloven (see above, n. 6), 45, 48, 51; Forclaz, *Catholiques* (see above, n. 6), 54; Van de Ven, "Een Utrechtse familie" (see above, n. 98), 120, 125.

¹⁰² HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12 March 1622.

¹⁰³ HUA, SAI, 2086; HUA, SAI, 2244–86, passim.

¹⁰⁴ HUA, BAI, 1987–1, passim (1636–1642, 1644–1649). For Anthoni, see also Van de Ven, "Een Utrechtse familie" (see above, n. 98), 125–126.

of Anthoni's sons chose a Catholic religious vocation.¹⁰⁵ Among them, Joannes (c. 1639–1704), a secular priest trained at the Oratory in France, was publicly recognised to come back to Utrecht in 1668 in order to see to his and his minor brother's 'affair' (92).¹⁰⁶

For Godefroy van Vianen (c. 1642–1708), the elevated civic status of his family in Utrecht played an indispensable role in obtaining a residence permit (91). Through their familial relations, the Van Vianens were well connected to many members of the Catholic social elite in Utrecht. Godefroy's grandfather Cornelis van Vianen (1568–1649), an advocate of the provincial court and Lord of Drakesteyn (in office 1630–1639), first married Hadewich van Haeften (–1611), and later Mechteld van der Burch (–1638) in a Catholic clandestine church in The Hague.¹⁰⁷ Despite the prohibition on the appointment of Catholics, Cornelis was non-publicly connived as a trustee of St Anthony Hospice (in office at least 1621–1644).¹⁰⁸ In his house resided a registered priest named Niclaes van der Burch (12).¹⁰⁹ Born as the son of Valentijn van Vianen (–1654), advocate to the provincial court and secretary of the Teutonic Order, Godefroy had regularly worked in Mons in the Southern Netherlands.¹¹⁰ In 1668 his mother Antonetta van der Eem (–before 1682) pleaded with magistrates to permit her son to reside in Utrecht, stating that he wanted to avoid the ongoing war—i.e. the War of Devolution from 1667 to 1668, in which France invaded the Hapsburg Netherlands—and the resulting inflation that followed in Mons. Away from the battlefield, he needed to live in quiet in his hometown. The city council acceded to this request, and he was officially given permission to reside in Utrecht indefinitely until the cancellation of his permit.¹¹¹ Here the elevated civic status of his family in Utrecht seems to have been necessary to win public recognition; had he been a social outsider of the civic community, magistrates may not have tolerated a Catholic priest to escape the war between Catholic forces and to take refuge in their officially Protestant city.

105 Ackermans, *Herders* (see above, n. 5), 414–415; Willem Frijhoff, "The Oratory in the Seventeenth-Century Low Countries," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 107:1 (2012) 212; Van de Ven, "Een Utrechtse familie" (see above, n. 98), 126–133, 135, 138–141.

106 HUA, SAII, 121–28, 30 March 1668.

107 Marcel Roethlisberger & Marten Jan Bok, *Abraham Bloemaert and His Sons: Paintings and Prints*, 2 vols. (Doornspijk, 1993) 1: 659–660.

108 HUA, BAIL, 1987–1, passim (1621–1644).

109 HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12 March 1622.

110 On the Van Vianen family in general, see also Ackermans, *Herders* (see above, n. 5), 462–463; Roethlisberger & Bok, *Abraham Bloemaert* (see above, n. 107), 1: 658–660; Yasuhira, *Civic Agency* (see above, n. 13), 265–266.

111 (91) in appendix 1.

Like the Pelt and Van Vianen families, the Honthorst family too can be counted among the leading Catholic families of Utrecht.¹¹² This patrician family played an important role for the city's Catholic community as well as the civic community at large, and was connected to the Protestant (ruling) elite.¹¹³ The son of the famous Catholic painter Gerrit Hermansz van Honthorst (1592–1656), Anthoni van Honthorst (c. 1638–1718) was—despite the prohibition on the appointment of Catholic trustees—non-publicly connived as a trustee of the municipal *Aalmoezenierskamer* (chamber of charity) (in office 1658–1660), and later assumed the post of trustee to the Catholic *Aalmoezenierskamer* (in office 1681–1683).¹¹⁴ Another one of Gerrit's sons, Gerardus van Honthorst (–1681), followed a Catholic ecclesiastical vocation. In June 1658 he was given public permission to return to Utrecht to visit his aging and invalid mother, Sophia Coopmans, who would pass away later that same month (69a).¹¹⁵ Remarkably, from 1660 to 1661 (thus, after his ordination) Gerardus joined a Dutch diplomatic missionary to Spain—the first such endeavour after the Peace of Munster—together with Lodewijk Huygens (1631–1699), the third son of the famous poet Constantijn Huygens (1596–1687), with whom Gerardus's father Gerrit Hermansz had cultivated a close friendship.¹¹⁶

The most extraordinary and best documented case involving petitions for a stay or residence permit for clerics was the one submitted by the painter Gerrit Hermansz van Honthorst for his brother Herman, a secular priest. Gerrit had Prince Frederik Hendrik as his artistic patron (fig. 2),¹¹⁷ and thus in 1631 he pleaded with the Prince to tolerate his brother to reside in their hometown

112 The Pelt family was connected to the Van Honthorst family via marriage through the aforementioned medical doctor Anthoni Pelt and his wife Maria van Honthorst (–1653). Van de Ven, "Een Utrechtse familie" (see above, n. 98), 126.

113 On the Van Honthorst family, see also Marten Jan Bok, "Gerard Hermansz. van Honthorst, 1592–1656," in *Nieuw licht op de Gouden Eeuw. Hendrick ter Brugghen en tijdgenoten*, ed. Albert Blankert & Leonard J. Slatkes (Utrecht, 1986); Forclaz, *Catholiques* (see above, n. 6), 44, 109, 152, 155, 159, 276; J. Richard Judson & Rudolf E.O. Ekkart, *Gerrit van Honthorst, 1592–1656* (Ghent, 1999); Yasuhira, Civic Agency (see above, n. 13), 261–263.

114 HUA, SAIL, 1825–3, 1 September 1658, 31 August 1659; HUA, Oude rooms-katholieke aalmoezenierskamer te Utrecht, 23, 1 September 1681, 1 September 1682. For the municipal and Catholic *Aalmoezenierskamers* in Utrecht, see Yasuhira, Civic Agency (see above, n. 13), 275–306; idem, "Confessional Coexistence" (see above, n. 88).

115 Bok, "Gerard Hermansz. van Honthorst" (see above, n. 113), 278–279.

116 Maurits Ebben, *Lodewijk Huygens' Spaans journaal. Reis naar het hof van de koning van Spanje, 1660–1661* (Zutphen, 2005), 19, 71–72, 362–363.

117 Judson & Ekkart, *Gerrit van Honthorst* (see above, n. 113), 19–20, 23, 30–33, 35–39, 42, 44–45.

FIGURE 2 Gerrit van Honthorst, double portrait of Frederik Hendrik (1584–1647) and Amalia van Solms-Braunfels (1602–1675), c. 1637–1638, canvas, 213.2 × 201.7 cm., The Hague, Mauritshuis

of Utrecht. According to Gerrit, Herman had been ordained in 1628 when he was staying in Antwerp with his parents to study sculpture, and came back to Utrecht in 1630. In his petition Gerrit represented the Van Honthorst family as obedient citizens of the city of Utrecht. The petition noted that Gerrit together with his ancestors had always been “trustful subjects and good patriots of Your Princely Excellency and these lands.” Based on their family’s elevated civic status, Gerrit insisted that Herman be given permission to stay with his aging parents in Utrecht. He argued that if Herman were required to leave, his elderly parents would become depressed. Herman was ready, he added, to live “silently and modestly” alongside citizens and “many other Religious persons.”

A copy of this petition in the minutes of the city council for 5 March 1632 bears the signature of Frederik Hendrik dated 1631.¹¹⁸

On 5 March 1632 the city council delegated the ex-burgomaster Johan van Weede (in office 1626–1629) to the Prince of Orange. The Utrecht magistracy was afraid that if Herman were allowed to stay, it would be hard to refuse entry to other priests who were “noble and held more titles.”¹¹⁹ Here magistrates clearly felt the threat of Catholics with high civic status, who were claiming special privileges for priests in their families. Several days later the city council received a report from Van Weede. According to the decision made back in 1631, Frederik Hendrik had declared that Herman van Honthorst was to be given permission to stay in Utrecht for six months. The Prince also thought that no further problems would arise if the length of Herman’s stay were restricted to these six months (33a).¹²⁰

However, in contravention of the conditions for his stay, Herman began working as a secular priest under the supervision of pastor Gerrit Pelt in 1636, although it is unclear whether he stayed in Utrecht continuously from 1632 onwards.¹²¹ While the precise details of the negotiations are unknown, in 1637 Herman once again managed to obtain a special residence permit from the Prince of Orange to reside in Utrecht through the mediation of his brother Gerrit (33b).¹²² Although Herman was banished by the city council in 1638 without trial before the city court,¹²³ he later returned to the city, probably relying on the weight of the special permit granted him by the Prince in 1637. When Herman was found presiding at a Catholic assembly and was arrested in 1641, the incumbent burgomaster Frederik Ruysch (in office 1639–1643 and 1650–1652) together with the former burgomaster Gijsbert van der Hoolck (in office 1634–1639) visited Frederik Hendrik at Gennep to inform him of Herman’s illegal activities, in an effort to prevent Herman and his friends—and, probably, his brother Gerrit—from once more asking a favour of the Prince. During the meeting, they noted the “harm” that had been caused “to this city and the Reformed religion” (*nadeel van dese stadt ende Gereformeerde religie*). After securing the

118 HUA, SAI, 121–15, 5 March 1632: “getrouwe onderdanen ende goede patriotten van U Pr[inc]e Ex[celen]tie ende dese landen,” “stil ende modest,” and “veele andere Geestel[ijcke] personen.”

119 HUA, SAI, 121–15, 5 March 1632: “adelicke ende meer gequalificeerde.”

120 Ibidem, 19 March 1632.

121 J.H. Hofman, “De Witte Vrouwen te Utrecht,” *A.A. U.* 32 (1907), 147–149.

122 HUA, SAI, 121–19, 10 August 1641 (the minutes of the city council concerning Herman van Honthorst have been transcribed in J.H. Hofman, “Het Kerspel buiten de Wittevrouwenpoort te Utrecht bij zijn ontkiemen,” *A.A. U.* 36 (1900), 95).

123 HUA, SAI, 121–18, 6 August 1638.

cancellation of Herman's special residence permit from the Prince, the city court sentenced him definitively to banishment from the city {10}.¹²⁴

Catholic priests mobilised various discourses in an attempt to resist persecution and to win toleration publicly in the form of limited recognition. Their civic status in Utrecht played an indispensable role in their discourses for survival. Relying on the freedom of conscience advocated by the Union of Utrecht, the recognised priests in 1630 claimed the right for everyone to "live in a religion by which he thinks he will be blessed," representing themselves as "obedient citizens." Between 1630 and 1672 the other recognised priests including many sons of prominent families in Utrecht discursively justified their stay or residence in the city by noting the need to divide property, to visit their family or friends, to receive medical care, and the like. These appeals testify that connections between the priests and the Utrecht civic community implicitly—but still certainly—influenced the political authorities' decision to bestow public recognition on the priests. In that regard, the cases involving the Pelt and Van Vianen families are particularly illustrative. Furthermore, Gerrit Hermansz van Honthorst's discourse on behalf of his brother Herman explicitly exploited his family's elevated civic status as "trustful subjects" and "good patriots" to persuade the Prince of Orange to tolerate Herman's stay in Utrecht. In defying persecution and seeking toleration, Catholic priests tactically and discursively mobilised their civic status, which entailed public rights including the freedom of conscience, on the basis of their and/or their families' close relationships with and contribution to the multiconfessional civic community of Utrecht.

4 Conclusion

From the perspective of the Reformed confessionalisation strategy, Catholic priests undoubtedly represented the deadliest "enemies" due not only to their confessional doctrines, but also their political inclination. The Voetian consistory continued to urge the political authorities to prosecute Catholic priests, representing them as the fifth column dispatched by the Pope or the Habsburg monarchy. The public church's fears were not groundless: Catholic priests always far outnumbered Reformed ministers in Utrecht, and they steadily streamed to the city like a swarm of "locusts." As the episcopal city turned centre of the Holland Mission, Utrecht attracted many Catholic ecclesiastics.

124 HUA, SAII, 121–19, 5, 26 June 1641, 5, 10, 16 August 1641 (Hofman, "Het Kerspel buiten de Wittevrouwenpoort" (see above, n. 122), 94–96); HUA, SAII, 2236–4, 5, 7 May 1641, 11 August 1641.

The level of pro/persecution and toleration was at least in part determined by (inter)national and local politico-religious circumstances, among which the balance of power between 'strict' Voetians and 'moderate' Republicans in the composition of the city council. According to the official policy, Catholic ecclesiastics were theoretically prohibited from performing their pastoral duties to the city's Catholic population. Nevertheless, in practice a significant number of priests were tolerated by the political authorities, allowing them to stay in the city, even though in some cases the authorities knew both their name and address. Nor did the tolerated priests duly refrain from serving the Catholic community in Utrecht; indeed, some were prosecuted for the illegal clerical activities they went on to perform. However, it could also be argued that the pastoral activities of the tolerated priests during their stay or residence were in practice to a degree non-publicly connived at; political authorities seem tacitly to have recognised the need of pastoral care for their city's Catholic inhabitants. Moreover, it should be emphasised that many Catholic priests even managed publicly to gain limited recognition as residents (temporarily or indefinitely) or citizens of Utrecht, although to date this form of toleration has not received sufficient attention from scholars.

While toleration as non-public connivance by definition cannot be subjected to quantitative analysis, it is quite likely that the presence of a number of priests—that is, apart from those identified in the present study—was unofficially connived at in Utrecht. Presumably, they refrained from submitting official requests out of the fear that persecution would follow once they supplied the Protestant magistrates with their personal information. This raises the question why, in spite of the risk of arrest, such large numbers of priests—thirty priests in 1622, and sixty-four from 1630 to 1672—were so bold as to submit official requests to the Utrecht magistracy for permission to stay or reside in the city. A key to the solution was found in the discourses mobilised by the recognised priests, many of whom hailed from prominent families in Utrecht. In their requests they insisted that they be treated as legitimate residents or citizens, notwithstanding their Catholic religious vocation. By appealing to their civic status based on the ties they and/or their families had with the civic community, as well as the civil services they performed for it, the recognised priests questioned the legitimacy of what in their eyes was a confessionally driven persecution (which the magistrates for their part regarded as lawful prosecution), and justified toleration in the form of limited recognition of their presence in Utrecht. One may therefore assume that for the Catholic priests with elevated civic status, it may well have been safer openly to submit official requests for stay or residence permits than secretly to visit the city in the hope of connivance from the magistrates. Appealing to their civic status, they claimed the

rights that were legitimately theirs in the public sphere, reversing—whether openly or tacitly—their representation as “public enemies” by the Reformed Church, and counter-representing themselves as “obedient citizens,” “trustful subjects,” and “good patriots.” This observation finds support in the discourses studied in this article, especially the collective petition in 1630 and those delivered on behalf of Godefroy van Vianen and Herman van Honthorst.

In order to manage and regulate the environment of confessional coexistence, the Utrecht magistracy not only prosecuted Catholic clerics, but also both publicly recognised and non-publicly connived at their presence in the city. At the same time, the ‘social engineering’ of religious diversity through political practices of pro/persecution and toleration reproduced the asymmetrical politico-religious power-relationship between the Reformed (who pro/persecuted and tolerated) and the Catholics (who were pro/persecuted and tolerated), and perpetuated discrimination of the latter. Alongside pro/persecution, early modern toleration should be understood as an active and disciplinary political strategy to cope with diversity—thus, not as an indifference to differences, nor a passive policy of refraining from oppression.¹²⁵ Although more empirical case studies are needed for the purposes of further comparison, this article has nevertheless demonstrated that civic status played an indispensable role for the survival of Catholic priests in Protestant states, and that their survival tactics should be analysed socio-historically with a local, bottom-up perspective. Together with the cultural history of the Catholic laity, which has set a historiographical trend in the past decade,¹²⁶ a social history of pro/persecution and toleration of the Catholic priests may well prove effective in enabling historians to avoid building on the myth of ‘Dutch’ toleration, and rather to shed greater light on the agency of politico-religious minorities.

125 In this regard, early modernists should also take account of Wendy Brown's argument on toleration as a political practice of ‘governmentality’ and ‘biopower’ (cf. Michel Foucault). Wendy Brown, *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire* (Princeton, 2006).

126 For such recent studies, see footnote 4 above.

Appendix 1: Recognised Priests in Utrecht, 1620–1672, Details

	Year of permit	Name of the priest	Position in the Catholic Church	Period of stay/residence
⟨1⟩	1622	Jan Alexander Axilius	priest	indefinite
⟨2⟩	1622	Joost de Voocht van Rijn-evelt	priest and canon of St Jan in Utrecht	indefinite
⟨3⟩	1622	Jacob Bool	secular priest	indefinite
⟨4⟩	1622	Anthonis Vossius	priest	indefinite
⟨5⟩	1622	Gerrit Stevensz Pelt	secular priest	indefinite
⟨6⟩	1622	Hendrick van der Steen	secular priest	indefinite
⟨7⟩	1622	Jan Jansz van Becum	priest	indefinite
⟨8⟩	1622	Herman Strick	priest	indefinite
⟨9⟩	1622	Jan van Hom	priest	indefinite
⟨10⟩	1622	Jacobus de Gouda	Jesuit and canon of St Pieter in Utrecht	indefinite
⟨11⟩	1622	Bruno Foeck	priest and canon of St Marie in Utrecht	indefinite
⟨12⟩	1622	Niclaes van der Burch	priest	indefinite
⟨13⟩	1622	Folphert Claesz	priest	indefinite
⟨14⟩	1622	Willem Acrijnsz	priest	indefinite
⟨15⟩	1622	Evert van Alphen	priest	indefinite
⟨16⟩	1622	Pauwels van Geresteyn	secular priest	indefinite
⟨17⟩	1622	Henrick van Sijll	priest	indefinite
⟨18⟩	1622	Thomas Otto Haeffacker	priest	indefinite
⟨19⟩	1622	Jan Willemsz van Abcauw	priest	indefinite
⟨20⟩	1622	Adriaen van Oirschot	priest	indefinite
⟨21⟩	1622	Johan van Cuyck	priest	indefinite

Relationship between the priest and the city of Utrecht or its citizen	Reason	Source
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 11-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 11-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 11-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 11-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622

(cont.)

	Year of permit	Name of the priest	Position in the Catholic Church	Period of stay/residence
<22>	1622	Joost van Haeften	priest	indefinite
<23>	1622	Dirck van der Houve	priest	indefinite
<24>	1622	Lubbert Cornelisz Cuylman	priest	indefinite
<25>	1622	Peter Cammaker	priest	indefinite
<26>	1622	Johan Wachtelaer	Vicar General and canon of St Marie in Utrecht	indefinite
<27>	1622	Dirck de With	priest	indefinite
<28>	1622	Goidschalck Augustijn de Wolff	priest	indefinite
<29>	1622	Wouter Dircxz Keyt	priest	indefinite
<30>	1622	Philips Jolijs	priest and canon of St Pieter in Utrecht	indefinite
<31>	1630	Rombout van Medenblick	secular priest	indefinite
<32>	1631	Jacob Pieck	secular priest	4 weeks
<33>	(a) 1632; (b) 1637	Herman van Honthorst	secular priest	(a) 6 months (inextensible); (b) indefinite
<34>	1632	Benedictus (Jacobus) van Haeften	abbot of the Affligem Abbey (the Order of St Benedictine) in Brabant	1 month
<35>	1640	Nicolaes Collaert	secular priest in Emmerich	unknown (might be short stay)
<36>	1641	Gijsbert van Emmelaer	regular priest	14 days (inextensible)
<37>	1641	Henrick van Domselaer	(ex-)priest	145 days (after three times of extension)
<38>	(a) 1641; (b) 1645; (c) 1646; (d) 1654; (e) 1658; (f) 1659	Balthasar van de Kemp	secular priest and canon in Emmerich	(a) 1 month (from the day when he notified the secretary of the city / inextensible); (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 months; (d) 1 month; (e) 2 months; (f) until cancellation

Relationship between the priest and the city of Utrecht or its citizen	Reason	Source
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 12-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 13-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 13-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 13-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 13-Mar-1622
living properly and staying constantly in the city at least in 1622	registration required by the edict issued by the States General in 1622	HUA, VSOKN, 112, 13-Mar-1622
son of a citizen	registration after coming back to the city from Leiden	HUA, SAII, 121–14, 15-Sep-1630
probably son of a noble family	as an executor of Jacob Bool's testament to divide his property	HUA, SAII, 121–15, 12-Sep-1631
brother of the painter Gerrit van Honthorst	(a) to stay with his aged parents; (b) -	(a) HUA, SAII, 121–15, 5, 7, 19-Mar-1632; (b) A.A.U. 26 (1900) 91–97; A.A.U. 32 (1907) 147–149; HUA, SAII, 121–19, 5, 26 June 1641, 5, 10, 16 August 1641; HUA, SAII, 2236–4, 5, 7 May 1641, 11 August 1641
son of the citizen Anthonis van Haeften	to visit his father Anthonis van Haeften	HUA, SAII, 121–15, 28-May-1632
-	to get a passport to Holland	HUA, SAII, 121–19, 20-Mar-1640
-	-	HUA, SAII, 121–19, 22-Feb-1641
-	-	HUA, SAII, 121–19, 3-May, 7-Jun, 10, 15-Oct-1641
son of a citizen	(a) to visit his mother; to care for children of his brother; to divide his deceased father's property; (b) –; (c) –; (d) –; (e) to visit and assist his aged mother; (f) for his advanced age and visual impairment	(a) HUA, SAII, 121–19, 12-Jul-1641; (b) HUA, SAII, 121–21, 22-Sep-1645; (c) HUA, SAII, 121–21, 15-Jun-1646; (d) HUA, SAII, 121–25, 28-Aug-1654; (e) HUA, SAII, 121–26, 30-Aug-1658; (f) HUA, SAII, 121–26, 11-Apr-1659

(cont.)

	Year of permit	Name of the priest	Position in the Catholic Church	Period of stay/residence
<39>	(a) 1644; (b) 1646	Georgius Oom	secular priest in Dordrecht	(a) 14 days; (b) 14 days
<40>	1645	N (unknown) Duyck	priest	6 days
<41>	(a) 1645; (b) 1646; (c) 1648	Servaes van der Nypoort	secular priest in Utrecht	(a) 6 months (after an extension); (b) 6 months; (c) until cancellation
<42>	1646	Jacob Olye	priest in Amsterdam	14 days
<43>	(a) 1647; (b) 1649	Cornelis Duck	secular priest in Leiden (Ackermans 2003, 353)	(a) 14 days; (b) 1 month
<44>	1648	Jacobus Heer(e)man(s)	secular priest in Amsterdam	6 months (from the day when he came to the city)
<45>	1649	Henrick van der Kerckhoff	monk of a monastery in Cleves	1 month (from the day when he came to the city)
<46>	(a) 1650; (b) 1651; (c) 1656; (d) 1659	Steven (Stephano) Canter(t)	(a) (b) regular priest in Maaseik; (c) regular priest in Heyen in Cleves; (d) priest in Asperen in Cleves	(a) 14 days; (b) 14 days; (c) 1 month; (d) 1 month (from 10-Jan-1659) + 6 weeks (from 14-Feb-1659) + 6 weeks (from 28-Mar-1659)
<47>	1650	Dirck Reyniersz	regular priest in Maaseik	14 days
<48>	1650	N (unknown) Butgens	regular priest in Antwerp	8 or 10 days
<49>	1651	Johan (Johannes Hortensius) van Wevelinckhoven	secular priest in Gorinchem	14 days
<50>	(a) 1652; (b) 1658	Floris (Florentius) van Vianen	secular priest in Laren	1 month
<51>	(a) 1653; (b) 1655; (c) 1659; (d) 1668	Nicolaes Prins	(a) (b) (d) priest in Maaseik; (c) priest in Roermond	(a) 14 days; (b) 14 days; (c) 14 days; (d) 6 weeks
<52>	(a) 1653; (b) 1654	Franck van Cuyck	canon of St Donaas in Bruges	(a) 1 month; (b) sometimes (short stay)
<53>	(a) 1653; (b) 1653; (c) 1654; (d) 1654	Cornelis van der Hout	priest	(a) 3 days; (b) 3 days; (c) 3 days; (d) 3 days

Relationship between the priest and the city of Utrecht or its citizen	Reason	Source
friend of citizens/residents	(a) to visit his friends; (b) -	(a) HUA, SAII, 121-20, 11-Jul-1644; (b) HUA, SAII, 121-21, 9-Mar-1646
-	-	HUA, SAII, 121-21, 8-Apr-1645
son of a patrician family (Joost Willemsz van der Nypoort (cloth-merchant) and Maria Servaes Peters de Goude) (Ackermans 2003, 407)	(a) to receive medical care; to promote his health; (b) to promote his health; (c) -	(a) HUA, SAII, 121-21, 29-Sep-1645, 5-Jan-1646; (b) HUA, SAII, 121-21, 24-Aug-1646; (c) HUA, SAII, 121-22, 23-May-1648
nothing (Ackermans 2003, 409-410)	-	HUA, SAII, 121-21, 21-Jul-1646
son of a citizen (Jan Jansz Duck and Maria Bool) (Ackermans 2003, 353), friend of citizens/residents	-	(a) HUA, SAII, 121-22, 20-May-1647; (b) HUA, SAII, 121-23, 13-Aug-1649
brother of a citizen/resident	to promote his health; to visit his sister	HUA, SAII, 121-22, 28-Feb-1648
brother-in-law of a citizen Jacob van der Veen	-	HUA, SAII, 121-23, 15-Jun-1649
son of a citizen	-	(a) HUA, SAII, 121-23, 11-Feb-1650; (b) HUA, SAII, 121-23, 13-Aug-1649; (c) HUA, SAII, 121-26, 4-Aug-1656; (d) HUA, SAII, 121-26, 10-Jan-1659
-	-	HUA, SAII, 121-23, 11-Feb-1650
-	-	HUA, SAII, 121-23, 9-Jul-1650
nothing (Ackermans 2003, 471)	-	HUA, SAII, 121-24, 1-Nov-1651
son of a citizen/resident (Cornelis van Vianen)	(a) -; (b) to receive medical care	(a) HUA, SAII, 121-24, 21-Oct-1652; (b) HUA, SAII, 121-26, 2-Aug-1658
son of a citizen; brother of a citizen Gerard Prins (advocate of Hof)	(a) to condole on the death of his brothers who were living in the city; (b) to rescue the property of his brothers; (c) -; (d) to cure his leg	(a) HUA, SAII, 121-24, 1-Aug-1653; (b) HUA, SAII, 121-25, 19-May-1655; (c) HUA, SAII, 121-26, 27-Jun-1659; (d) HUA, SAII, 121-28, 22-Jun-1668
son of a steward of St Catharijne (the late Jan van Cuyck); brother of a widow of Peter van Sanen	(a) to visit his friends; (b) to visit his sister who was a widow of Peter van Sanen	(a) HUA, SAII, 121-24, 15-Aug-1653; (b) HUA, SAII, 121-25, 6-Mar-1654
-	(a) (b) (c) (d) to appear in the city court to answer to the juries in his suit against Aert van der Gorp	(a) HUA, SAII, 121-25, 10-Oct-1653; (b) HUA, SAII, 121-25, 5-Dec-1653; (c) HUA, SAII, 121-25, 23-Jan-1654; (d) HUA, SAII, 121-25, 16-Oct-1654

(cont.)

	Year of permit	Name of the priest	Position in the Catholic Church	Period of stay/residence
<54>	(a) 1654; (b) 1657	Peter van Millingen	regular priest of St Agatha Monastery of the Order of the Holy Cross (<i>Cruisbroeders</i>) in Emmerich	(a) 14 days; (b) 6 weeks
<55>	1654	Theodorus Mesmecker	prior of regular canons of the Gaasdonk Monastery (the Order of St Augustine) in Goch	14 days
<56>	1655	Sefker van Borcken	priest in Wesel	3 weeks
<57>	1655	Peter Vermeulen	regular priest in St Agatha Monastery (the Crutched Friars) in Cuijk	1 month
<58>	1655	Anthoni de Rode (Rhode)	priest	unknown (might be short stay)
<59>	(a) 1656; (b) 1656; (c) 1656; (d) 1657; (e) 1657; (f) 1658	Willem (de) Munter	priest in Dordrecht	(a) 1 month + 6 weeks + 6 weeks; (b) 1 month; (c) 2 months; (d) 6 weeks; (e) 14 days; (f) 14 days
<60>	(a) 1656; (b) 1657; (c) 1658; (d) 1659; (e) 1660	Arnoldus Rade(n)	regular priest and procurator of a Carthusian monastery in Cologne	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 6 weeks; (d) 1 month; (e) 3 weeks + 2 weeks
<61>	1656	Henrick Hoeffslach	priest in Huissen	3 weeks
<62>	1656	Peter van Sijpenesse	regular priest of St Bernard Abbey near Antwerp (probably in Hemiksem)	3 weeks
<63>	(a) 1656; (b) 1657; (c) 1658; (d) 1666	Dirck (Theodorus) (Boelisz) van Ba(e)r(e)n	secular priest in Amsterdam	(a) 2 months; (b) 6 weeks (inextensible); (c) 4 days; (d) 6 weeks
<64>	1657	Reynier Govertsz van Eyndhoven	priest	indefinite (residence)
<65>	1657	Johannes Snep	priest in Emmerich	14 days
<66>	1657	Andreas Vloers	Dominican friar	14 days

Relationship between the priest and the city of Utrecht or its citizen	Reason	Source
–	–	(a) HUA, SAI, 121–25, 7-Apr-1654; (b) HUA, SAI, 121–26, 28-Feb-1657
–	–	HUA, SAI, 121–25, 13-Jul-1654
uncle of a citizen (Frederick Beerninck)	–	HUA, SAI, 121–25, 9-Feb-1655
–	–	HUA, SAI, 121–25, 8-Jun-1655
–	–	HUA, SAI, 121–26, 22-Oct-1655
son of a patrician family (Johan de Munter (advocate of Hof) and Walburga Both) (Ackermans 2003, 404)	(a) to visit his sick mother; (b) (c) to divide the property of his parents; (d) (e) (f) –	(a) HUA, SAI, 121–26, 7-Jan, 25-Feb, 14-Apr-1656; (b) HUA, SAI, 121–26, 14-Jul-1656; (c) HUA, SAI, 121–26, 27-Oct-1656; (d) HUA, SAI, 121–26, 16-May-1657; (e) HUA, SAI, 121–26, 7-Sep-1657; (f) HUA, SAI, 121–26, 4-Oct-1658
–	(a) to visit and hire out the real property of a Carthusian monastery in the Dutch Republic; (b) to execute 'affairs' concerning the Carthusian monastery; (c) (d) (e) –	(a) HUA, SAI, 121–26, 17-Mar-1656; (b) HUA, SAI, 121–26, 11-May-1657; (c) HUA, SAI, 121–26, 19-Jul-1658; (d) HUA, SAI, 121–26, 25-Apr-1659; (e) HUA, SAI 121–26, 7-May, 23-Jul-1660
–	–	HUA, SAI, 121–26, 2-Jun-1656
–	–	HUA, SAI, 121–26, 14-Jul-1656
nothing (Ackermans 2003, 318)	(a) (b) (c) –; (d) to participate in his legal procedure	(a) HUA, SAI, 121–26, 4-Aug-1656; (b) HUA, SAI, 121–26, 7-Dec-1657; (c) HUA, SAI, 121–26, 2-Aug-1658; (d) HUA, SAI, 121–27, 22-Oct-1666
son of a citizen (born in Utrecht)	–	HUA, SAI, 121–26, 12-Jan-1657
–	–	HUA, SAI, 121–26, 12-Jun-1657
–	to execute his "private affairs"	HUA, SAI, 121–26, 2-Nov-1657

(cont.)

	Year of permit	Name of the priest	Position in the Catholic Church	Period of stay/residence
<67>	1658	Johan Backer	dean in Eindhoven (living in The Hague)	14 days
<68>	1658	Willem van Sevender	prior of Capuchin in Cleves	2 months
<69>	(a) 1658; (b) 1659; (c) 1660	Gerardus van Honthorst	canon in Xanten (HUA, Notarieel archief, U034a004, 213, 26 July 1658)	(a) 3 months + 4 months; (b) 3 months; (c) 1 month
<70>	(a) 1658; (b) 1667	Frederick van Cranevelt	canon of St Servaas in Maas-tricht; secular priest	(a) 1 month; (b) 6 weeks
<71>	1658	Jacob Verhaer	priest in Muiden (with resi-dence permit there)	2 months
<72>	(a) 1658; (b) 1659; (c) 1660; (d) 1663	Philips Dimmer	(a) (b) (c) priest in Cologne; (d) priest in IJsselstein	(a) 2 months; (b) 2 months; (c) 1 month; (d) whenever he needed
<73>	1658	Johan van de(r) Cloes	regular priest in Cologne	1 month
<74>	(a) 1658; (b) 1663	Dirk Ferdinand de Ridder van Groenesteyn	Jesuit in Antwerp (<i>Genealogische en heraldische bladen</i> 8 (1913) 332)	(a) 6 weeks; (b) 2 months
<75>	1658	Cornelis de Ridder van Groenesteyn	Jesuit in Flanders (<i>Genealogische en heraldische bladen</i> 8 (1913) 97, 334)	2 months
<76>	1659	Willem van Wely	priest in Culemborg	8 days
<77>	(a) 1658; (b) 1659; (c) 1668	Johan(ni) Cloeting	priest in Holland	(a) 2 months + 2 months + 3 months; (b) 6 weeks; (c) 1 month
<78>	1659	Jan van Aelst	priest	8 days
<79>	1659	Josephus van der Steen	Carmelite in Brabant (A.A. U. 18 (1890) 183)	1 year and 6 months (accord-ing to the city council) or 6 months (according to the Reformed consistory)
<80>	1660	Theodoro Duding	priest in Dinslaken	6 days
<81>	1660	Vincentio Ferdinando Kochelio	priest in Brabant	unknown (might be short stay)

Relationship between the priest and the city of Utrecht or its citizen	Reason	Source
–	–	HUA, SAII, 121–26, 22-Mar-1658
–	–	HUA, SAII, 121–26, 7-May-1658
son of the famous painter Gerrit Hermansz van Honthorst and Sophia Coopmans	(a) to visit his aged and invalid mother (Sophia Coopmans, who died in June 1658); (b) (c) –	(a) HUA, SAII, 121–26, 1-Jun, 20-Sep-1658; (b) HUA, SAII, 121–26, 21-Feb-1659; (c) HUA, SAII, 121–26, 2-Jan-1660
–	(a) –; (b) to execute his 'affairs'	(a) HUA, SAII, 121–26, 20-Jun-1658; (b) HUA, SAII, 121–27, 24-Jun-1667
son of a citizen (Steven Gisbertsz Verhaer and Geertgen Wttenbogert) (Ackermans 2003, 460)	to cure his sickness	HUA, SAII, 121–26, 5-Jul-1658
brother of a citizen/resident (his unknown sister)	(a) (b) (c) –; (d) to visit his sister	(a) HUA, SAII, 121–26, 19-Jul-1658; (b) HUA, SAII, 121–26, 30-May-1659; (c) HUA, SAII, 121–26, 2-Jan-1660; (d) HUA, SAII, 121–27, 19-Oct-1663
–	–	HUA, SAII, 121–26, 26-Jul-1658
born in Utrecht (<i>Genealogische en heraldische bladen</i> 8 (1913) 332); son of a noble family originating from Holland	(a) –; (b) to save his and his child's property in the city	(a) HUA, SAII, 121–26, 23-Aug-1658; (b) HUA, SAII, 121–27, 22-Jun-1663
born in Utrecht (<i>Genealogische en heraldische bladen</i> 8 (1913) 334) son of a noble family originating from Holland	–	HUA, SAII, 121–26, 4-Sep-1658
–	to execute his "private affairs"	HUA, SAII, 121–26, 18-Apr-1659
son of a citizen (Ackermans 2003, 337); brother of citizens	(a) –; (b) –; (c) in consideration of the sickness of his brothers	(a) HUA, SAII, 121–26, 18-Oct, 13-Dec-1658, 7-Feb-1659; (b) HUA, SAII, 121–26, 26-Sep-1659; (c) HUA, SAII, 121–28, 20-Apr-1668
–	–	HUA, SAII, 121–26, 3-Oct-1659
probably son of a patrician family	–	HUA, SAII, 121–26, 10-Oct-1659 (see also HUA, KR, 7, 24-Oct-1659)
–	to meet a "foreign doctor" (<i>uytheemse Medico</i>) and cure his illness or wound	HUA, SAII, 121–26, 24-Apr-1660
–	–	HUA, SAII, 121–26, 3-Sep-1660

(cont.)

	Year of permit	Name of the priest	Position in the Catholic Church	Period of stay/residence
⟨82⟩	1660	Cornelis Vermeulden	priest in Gennep	unknown (might be short stay)
⟨83⟩	1660	Gosuinus ter Lau	priest and canon in Cologne	several periods
⟨84⟩	1661	Johan van Wijckerslooth	priest in Weesp	14 days
⟨85⟩	(a) 1661; (b) 1663	Antoni van der Cloes	priest in Cologne	(a) 14 days; (b) 3 weeks
⟨86⟩	1661	Ernestus Rotius	priest, chief butler, and pedagogue of the petitioners	same as his masters (petitioners)
⟨87⟩	(a) 1661; (b) 1662; (c) 1663	Reynier van Wijtfelt (Wytvelt)	priest	(a) during the winter; (b) 1 year; (c) 1 year
⟨88⟩	1662	Willem van Cruysbergen	priest in IJsselstein (Ackermans 2003, 345)	whenever in need
⟨89⟩	1667	Johan van der Meer	priest	until cancellation
⟨90⟩	1667	Otto (van) Lichtenberch	priest	1 month
⟨91⟩	1668	Godefroy de (van) Vianen	secular priest in Mons	until cancellation
⟨92⟩	1668	Joannes Pelt	secular priest in Stompwijk (Ackermans 2003, 415)	short stay
⟨93⟩	1670	Jacobus van Doorn	priest	3 weeks
⟨94⟩	1671	Isidorus van (der) Veen	secular priest	indefinite

Relationship between the priest and the city of Utrecht or its citizen	Reason	Source
–	–	HUA, SAII, 121–26, 24-Sep-1660
nephew of the noblewoman Deliana van Wijckerslooth (over 90 years old)	–	HUA, SAII, 121–27, 4-Oct-1660
son of a patrician family (see also <i>Genealogische en heraldische bladen</i> 3 (1908) 187)	–	HUA, SAII, 121–27, 22-Apr-1661
son of a citizen/resident	(a) (b) to visit his aged mother	(a) HUA, SAII, 121–27, 7-Aug-1661; (b) HUA, SAII, 121–27, 3-Aug-1663
–	to stay with his masters (petitioners) whose (family?) members would like to stay in Utrecht to cure their “weakness” (<i>swakheyd</i>)	HUA, SAII, 121–27, 14-Oct-1661
son of a citizen/resident (Maria van Wijtfelt)	(a) (b) (c) because of his illness (<i>indispositie</i>)	(a) HUA, SAII, 121–27, 28-Oct-1661; (b) HUA, SAII, 121–27, 4-Aug-1662; (c) HUA, SAII, 121–27, 21-Sep-1663
son of a citizen/resident (Adriaentjen Jans van Toorn)	to visit his aged mother	HUA, SAII, 121–27, 15-Dec-1662
brother of citizens/residents (his unknown brothers and sisters)	to care for his young sister; to care for children of his deceased brothers and deceased sisters as their guardian	HUA, SAII, 121–27, 7-Jan-1667
son of a citizen (Gerrit Lichtenberch (hat-upholsterer (<i>hoedstoffeerder</i>)) and Hillegonda van Royen) (Ackermans 2003, 393–394)	to execute his “private affairs”	HUA, SAII, 121–27, 12-Aug-1667
son of a patrician family (Valentijn de Vianen (advocate of Hof and secretary of the Teutonic Order) and Antonetta van der Eem) (Ackermans 2003, 462)	in consideration of the war and the price rise in Mons; to quietly live in Utrecht	HUA, SAII, 121–28, 10-Feb-1668
son of the Catholic patrician Anthoni Pelt	to execute his and his minor-aged brother's affair	HUA, SAII, 121–28, 30-Mar-1668
son of citizen	to visit his invalid parents	HUA, SAII, 121–28, 2-May-1670
son of a patrician/noble family (son of Simon van (der) Veen (advocate of Hof and Lord of Drakensteyn and Vuursche) and Divera van der Eem) (Ackermans 2003, 456)	–	HUA, SAII, 121–28, 23-Jan-1671

Appendix 2: Prosecuted Priests in Utrecht, 1630–1672

	Year of legal records	Name of the priest	Position in the Catholic Church
{1}	1631	Rombout van Medenblick	secular priest (native)
{2}	1635	Pauwels van Geresteyn	secular priest (native)
{3}	1636	Vincent Andriesz	Dominican friar (non-native)
{4}	1640	Philippus Rovenius	Apostolic Vicar (non-native)
{5}	1640	Johannes Wachtelaer	Vicar General, canon of St Marie in Utrecht (native priest)
{6}	1640	Govert van Mooock	secretary to the Apostolic Vicar (non-native)
{7}	1640	Bernardus van Mooock	secular priest (non-native)
{8}	1640	Gerrit Pelt	secular priest (native)
{9}	1641	Cornelis van der Hout	priest
{10}	1641	Herman van Honthorst	secular priest (native)
{11}	1642	Jan Jansz van Beda	Dominican friar (non-native)
{12}	1646	Leonard Joosten Brems	priest (non-native)
{13}	1653	Robert Redinge	priest (probably)
{14}	1655	Anthonis de Rhode (Rode)	priest (non-native)
{15}	1663	Cornelis Duck	secular priest (native)

Suspicion	Sentence	Source
clerical activities	banishment from the city	HUA, SAI, 121–15, 6, 12-Feb, 21-Mar-1631
clerical activities	unknown	HUA, SAI, 121–17, 29-Dec-1634; HUA, SAI, 2244–80, 30-Jan-1635
clerical activities	f. 600 (fine) + trial cost	HUA, SAI, 2236–3, 10, 19-Nov-1636, 3-Dec-1636
clerical activities, treason, illegal transfer of properties	banishment from the Dutch Republic, confiscation of the property	HUA, SAI, 2088; HUA, SAI, 2244–86, passim
clerical activities, treason, illegal transfer of properties	banishment from the city, suspension from the canonry, f. 6000 (fine) + trial cost	HUA, SAI, 2087; HUA, SAI, 2244–87, passim
clerical activities, treason, illegal transfer of properties	banishment from the Dutch Republic, f. 2500 (fine), confiscation of the property	HUA, SAI, 2236–3, 8-May-1640; HUA, SAI, 2244–84, passim; HUA, SAI, 2244–86, passim
clerical activities, treason, illegal transfer of properties	unknown	HUA, SAI, 2244–84, passim
clerical activities, treason, illegal transfer of properties	banishment from the Dutch Republic, confiscation of the property, trial cost	HUA, SAI, 2086; HUA, SAI, 2244–86, passim
clerical activities	f. 750 (bail) + trial cost	HUA, SAI, 2236–4, 21-Jul-1641
clerical activities	banishment from the city	HUA, SAI, 121–19, 5, 26-Jun-1641, 5, 10, 16-Aug-1641; HUA, SAI, 2236–4, 11-Aug-1641 (see also <i>A.A.U.</i> 32 (1907) 147–149)
clerical activities	unknown	HUA, SAI, 2244–90, 29, 30-Apr-1642, 20, 27-May-1642
clerical activities	f. 800 (fine) + f. 140 (trial cost)	HUA, SAI, 2236–4, 20-Aug-1646
clerical activities	banishment from the province	HUA, SAI, 2236–4, 5-Mar-1653
clerical activities	f. 625 (fine) + f. 100 (trial cost)	HUA, SAI, 2236–4, 24-Sep-1655
clerical activities	'French wine' and 'Rhenish wine' + f. 10 (trial cost)	HUA, SAI, 2244–116, 5, 6, 10, 13, 18-Jun-1662, 5-Feb, 15, 21-Mar-1663

Appendix 3: Connived Priests in Utrecht, c. 1665

	Name of the priest	Birth place / former residence
<001>	Abraham van Brienem	Utrecht (son of a baker)
<002>	Servaes van der Nypoort	Utrecht (son of a patrician (cloth merchant))
<003>	Albertus Wijnen	Mechelen (dispatched to Utrecht in 1665)
<004>	Teeckelenbergh	–
<005>	Anthonius van der Plaet	Leiden (son of a carpenter)
<006>	Jacobus Vlugh	Utrecht
<007>	Reinier	–
<008>	Christophorus Flores (Floris)	Lier (at least in 1659)
<009>	Lambert van Dilsen	Nijmegen (dispatched to Utrecht in 1661)
<010>	Aloysius Ballast	–
<011>	Joan van Hoven	–
<012>	Cornelis van Velthuysen	Utrecht (son of a patrician)
<013>	Johannes Putkamer	Utrecht
<014>	Johannes Lindeborn	Utrecht
<015>	De Roy (probably Clemens de Roy)	Utrecht
<016>	Johannes Roos	Rotterdam
<017>	Dirck de Roy	–
<018>	–	–
<019>	Godefridus	–

SOURCE: HUA, SAIL, 616, PROBABLY IN 1665 (A.A.U. 5, 187–189)

Position in the Catholic Church	Living place in Utrecht	With whom living
secular priest (Vicar General in Utrecht) at the clandestine church St Gertrudis	Mariahoek	some <i>klopjes</i> and (41) (002) Van Nypoort
secular priest at the clandestine church St Gertrudis	Mariahoek	some <i>klopjes</i> and (001) Van Brien
Dominican friar at the clandestine church St Dominicus	Walsteeg	his mother
secular priest in Schalkwijk	Walsteeg	his sister
secular priest at the clandestine church Maria Minor Achter Clarenburg	Mariahoek	–
secular priest in Mijdrecht and Wilnis	Mariahoek	–
–	Mariahoek	–
Dominican friar at the clandestine church Ons Lieve Vrouw Rozenkrans	Lange Nieuwstraat / two doors away from Dorstige Hartsteeg	his mother
Jesuit at the clandestine church St Catharijne	Nieuwegracht / next to Agatha Dierhout	–
Jesuit at the clandestine church St Martinus	Herenstraat / over De Kamp	–
Augustinian friar at the clandestine church St Augustinus	Hieronymussteeg / two or three doors away from the house of the Reformed minister Arnoldus Teekmans	–
secular priest at the clandestine church St Servaas Onder de Linden	Nieuwegracht / over the Servaas Monastery	–
secular priest at the clandestine church St Nicolaas Achter de Wal	Achter de Wal bij de Lollestraat / next to the house of Van Blickenburch	Lindeborn (014) and <i>klopjes</i>
secular priest at the clandestine church St Nicolaas Achter de Wal	Achter de Wal bij de Lollestraat / next to the house of Van Blickenburch	Putkamer (013) and <i>klopjes</i>
secular priest at the clandestine church St Marie op de Kamp (alias Soli Deo Gloria)	–	–
secular priest at the clandestine church Maria Minor Achter Clarenburg	Nieuwegracht	–
–	Nieuwegracht / over "the bridge of the Pope's House" (<i>de brug van Paushuysse</i>)	–
–	next to the house of Schoonhoven	–
working for 'the new church behind' the house of Agatha Dierhout (in Nieuwegracht)	–	–