Faith, Corporate Privilege, and Democratisation: The Old Catholic Church of the Netherlands in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries

Westra, Timothy

Universiteit Leiden

Faith, Corporate Privilege, and Democratisation: The Old Catholic Church of the Netherlands in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries

Image: *Processie in de oud-katholieke kerk te Den Haag*, oil on wood, by Isaac Israëls (1880-1881). Collection of the Museum Catharijneconvent, RMCC s338, Utrecht, photo by Ruben de Heer.

MA thesis PCNI - Politics, Culture, and National Identities (1789 to present) - August 2025, Leiden University
Timothy S. Westra (s4126777)
s4126777@vuw.leidenuniv.nl
Supervisor: Prof.dr. Henk te Velde

Foreword

I would like to express my gratitude to Prof.dr. Henk te Velde for his guidance throughout the engaging and pleasurable research process that accompanied the writing of this thesis. Prof.dr te Velde's advice was always concise and insightful, and certainly gave the direction of my research an unmistakable thematic clarity. Moreover, I am also grateful for his great patience, flexibility, and understanding, as he continued to keep in contact alongside his more pressing responsibilities as the interim dean of the Humanities Faculty. Additionally, I would also like to extend my thanks to the kind staff of *Het Utrechts Archief*, the library staff of the Old Catholic Seminary in Amersfoort, and Father Marc Lindeijer S.J. for granting me access to their libraries and archives and helping me navigate through a great number of fascinating literary and archival resources. The excursions to their archives provided me with invaluable primary and secondary source material. Lastly, I sincerely thank both Prof. Jan Hallebeek and Dr. Martijn Schrama O.S.A. for their great kindness and hospitality, for their willingness to share their extensive knowledge on the history of Augustinianism, Jansenism, and the Old Catholic Church, for which I continue to have the greatest admiration. By guiding me through many intriguing and passionate discussions on the subject, they enriched my understanding of the history of Dutch Catholicism continuously, and this has certainly motivated me towards future research in these fields.

T.S. Westra

Abstract: This study examines the evolving relationship between the Old Catholic Church of the Netherlands and the state in the nineteenth century, spanning the period leading up to and following the restoration of the Roman Catholic episcopal hierarchy, as mandated by the papal bull *Ex qua die arcano* in March of 1853. The purpose of this analysis is to better understand the changing dynamics of religious toleration in Dutch society, in particular, how the Old Catholic movement, as a religious minority, adapted its religious identity from the confessionally-oriented norms of the Republican period to the nominally secular political climates of the mid-nineteenth century. Of prime importance here are the political implications behind theological belief systems, and how minority beliefs can affect the goal of establishing and maintaining toleration in democratic societies. This approach, which focuses primarily on the period 1825-1870, supports the primary argument of this thesis: that processes of secularisation can become undemocratic and intolerant when differing historical views on toleration and legitimacy emerge between church and state. In particular, if a religious minority's continued existence can be attributed to specific, time-bound political objectives, societal privileges, and cultural norms, the capacity to respond effectively to newer, constitutionally established modes of religious coexistence is significantly hindered. This argument will be explored in the context of the dialogue between the papacy, the Dutch state, and the Old Catholic communities, comparing the respective political climates of the Republican period and the first half of the nineteenth century. From a historiographical point of view, this approach attempts to steer away from the more polemical, confessional histories that emerge primarily from both Old and Roman Catholic historiographical traditions and indicate the influence of conflicting visions of church and state within an emerging secular state.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Historical Context

With the triumph of the Reformation in the Northern Netherlands from the 1580s onwards, new identity dynamics became crucial for the still substantial number of Roman Catholics that found themselves inhabiting a staunchly Calvinist republic. Societal isolation and governmental discrimination, which officially lasted until the revolutionary upheavals of 1795-1796, significantly altered the nature of Catholic self-perception and the development of religious life, doctrinal assumptions, and communal cohesion, especially in relation to the state. The so-called Schism of Utrecht (1723-1724), in which several secular Dutch clergymen independently elected their own "Archbishop of Utrecht" without papal permission, did much to disrupt the precarious tranquility of Catholic life in the United Provinces, and could be justifiably described as the dramatic apotheosis of a struggle within the remnants of Dutch Catholicism that remained unsure of both its position in Dutch society and its place within the structure of the Roman Catholic world. While not as numerous or influential as other "dissident" churches and religious minorities in the United Provinces, the bodies of refractory clergy that would come to be known as the "Old Catholic Church of the Netherlands", or the *Roomsch-Katholieke Kerk der Oud-Bisschoppelijke Cleresie*, engaged in a longstanding and multilateral dialogue with the state that reveals much about the socio-political dynamics of toleration, and how ideas about historical continuity in an ecclesiastical context can become ideological boundaries in the dialogues between church and state in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In a sense, the Old Catholic movement embodied a profound contradiction often encountered in Protestant, post-Reformation societies encumbered with a large Catholic minority; the desire to contribute to the creation of a national identity while also attempting to remain loyal to an increasingly ultramontane universal Church. This historical conundrum, the Old Catholic Church was never able to solve, experiencing both toleration and political obscurity in equal measure. Evidently, it could not claim to have shared in the old Republic's historiographically omnipresent toleration myth in the same way as other smaller faith communities.

Well into the nineteenth century, many of the issues that had led to the schism with Rome, such as Jansenism, Bull and Formulary,[1] and the creation of an independent episcopal hierarchy remained key tenets of faith for the Old Catholic world, even though these had long since passed from popular memory and were coming to symbolise the continuation of division rather than means of maintaining religious peace in the eyes of the state. Even within the ranks of the "schismatic" clergy,[2] personalities such as the pastor Martinus Glasbergen (1777-1837) had encouraged a conciliatory approach that regarded such issues as Bull and Formulary as irrelevant as early as 1807,[3] and such sentiments certainly corresponded

[1] The term "Bull and Formulary" refers to the papal bull *Unigenitus Dei Filius* promulgated by Pope Clement XI in 1713, which condemned 101 propositions found in the work of the French Jansenist Pasquier Quesnel, and the formulary of Pope Alexander VII of 1665 respectively, which required all ecclesiastics to reject the five erroneous propositions found in the work of Cornelius Jansen (d. 1638). Included as part of the bull *Regimnis Apostolici*.

[2] In this thesis, the term "clergy" refers to the Old Catholic clergy and ecclesiastical hierarchy, as separate and distinct from the majority of clerics who had remained loyal to Rome following the events of 1723-1724. The term "Old Catholic" originates from the nineteenth century, the term *cleresie* or "clergy" (alternatively, *klerezy*) being more ubiquitous in the Dutch secondary literature. For the sake of clarity, the term "Old Catholic" will be used to describe the same eighteenth-century *cleresie*. Specifically named clergymen (i.e. Martinus Glasbergen) belong to the Old Catholic clergy, unless otherwise stated.

[3] B.A. van Kleef, *Geschiedenis van de Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland* (2e herz. en Uitgebr. dr. Assen: Van Gorcum [etc.], 1953), 162.

with the enlightened policies of King William I and his government, who strongly believed in the importance of religious peace for establishing political and cultural unity within the state. Yet, having resisted attempts during the Batavian period and the subsequent Napoleonic regimes to be reunited with Rome, the Old Catholic Church also managed to retain its autonomy in the wake of the Roman Catholic episcopal restoration of 1853. Why did the Old Catholic Church resist reunification with Rome, so frequently encouraged by the state, and to what extent did this represent a conflict between governmental recognition and the principle of toleration? More importantly, why did the gradual implementation of complete religious freedom complicate the longstanding historical relationship between the Old Catholic clergy and the state? The central arguments of this thesis are, firstly, that the theological beliefs established by the Old Catholic clergy in the years leading up to and following the schism of 1723 corresponded closely with the confessional (geo)political and domestic aims of the States General and the regents of the *ancien regime*, giving both political influence and privileged form of toleration to the Church as a nominally Catholic episcopal hierarchy in the United Provinces. Aided in this process by their social connections to the oligarchic power structures of the Republic,[4] the Old Catholic movement was able to retain, if stagnantly, a monopolistic position. This argument also points to a potential desire to imitate the Anglican model of church-state relations.

Secondly, it is argued that this mode of political and cultural subsistence began to break down in the nineteenth century, as the Jansenist dispute, which had constituted the spiritual *raison d'être* for the secular clergy's resistance in 1723, began to lose both its political and cultural relevance within and outside the Old Catholic hierarchy. As a consequence of the Church's tendency to continuously define its sense of historical importance - and political usefulness - on the basis of its Jansenist beliefs and separatist identity, a process of political and cultural isolation was initiated that, somewhat ironically, made the introduction of wider religious freedoms after 1795 an arguably disastrous political development for a religious minority that had nurtured a close relationship with sympathetic state authorities in the past. This view considers the political implications of Old Catholic beliefs, which are anachronistically almost always seen in a strictly theological light in the relevant historiography. Here, theological convictions entail a reactionary attitude to democratic developments, the desire to protect a privileged social position, indeed to maintain its monopoly on "Catholicity" as the only "legitimate" form of Catholicism in the country. In other words, the failure to reunify with Rome in 1853 should be interpreted as the outcome of a confrontation between differing views on religious toleration between the state and the Old Catholic clergy, intertwined with the collapse of oligarchic political networks.

Thirdly, the Church's sudden shift towards foreign contacts, other "renegade" Catholic movements outside the Netherlands, should be viewed in the light of its undemocratic tendencies. No other minority denomination grappled as much with the effects of secularisation, and unlike any other faith community in the country viewed the Law on Church Bodies of 1853 as an outright "degradation".[5] Consequently, political coexistence could no longer rely on preventing the normalisation of Roman Catholicism in public life,[6] the historical relationship with the state that had enshrined the Church's confessional exclusivity had come to an end definitively. This argument sees the Church's growing cosmopolitanism after 1853 as a response to these new realities, as new sources of cultural legitimacy needed to be established. This shift towards internationalism, it is argued, also constituted the foundation of an Old

[4] P.W.F.M. Hamans, *Geschiedenis van de Katholieke Kerk in Nederland* (Brugge: Tabor, 1992).
[5] D.J. Schoon, *Van Bisschoppelijke Cleresie Tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk: Bijdrage Tot de Geschiedenis van Het Katholicisme in Nederland in de 19de Eeuw* (Nijmegen: Valkhof Pers, 2004), 179.
[6] Ibid, 178.

Catholic "revival", as former historical relationships with the state and the arrival of a new, more inclusive form of nationalism had created a noticeable separation between the clergy and a nascent Christian democratic political culture. These shifts, it will be argued, may also be seen as part of the clergy's response to the emergence of new forms of confessional politics and a new type of "pillarised" coexistence.

Historiography and Methodology

From a historiographical point of view, the restoration of 1853 has become well known for the virulently anti-Catholic reactions its implementation elicited from both conservative parliamentarians and the Protestant mobs of the so-called *Aprilbeweging*, or "April movement".[7] By contrast, the Old Catholic reactions, leading up to and following the restoration, have not been scrutinised as thoroughly beyond the realm of the Old Catholic historiographical tradition. Confessional histories take on a myriad of tones and attitudes towards the restoration of 1853. Early commentators, such as the Anglican cleric, historian and theologian John Mason Neale (1818-1866) take on a strongly anti-Roman stance against the perceived injustices suffered by the Old Catholic Church in works such as *A History of the So-Called Jansenist Church of Holland*, published in 1858, where anti-Jesuit and episcopalian themes abound in opposition to the perceived constitutional legitimacy of the new hierarchy.[8] Such overtly polemical histories continued well into the twentieth century, in and outside Old Catholic circles. These perspectives were very much fueled by strongly Calvinist, anti-Catholic sentiments common in the Netherlands, but also Great Britain and Germany, important reservoirs of conciliar support following the restorations of 1853, and certainly after the First Vatican Council of 1869-1870. In these nationalistic, oftentimes anticlerical political climates, the image of the Old Catholic Church as the so-called "national" church gained more traction in the confessional histories, such as B.A. van Kleef's *Geschiedenis van de Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland*, as both a cultural and political counterweight to the influence of Rome.

While the period immediately following the Second World War gave rise to various oecumenical movements in both Old and Roman Catholic circles, which tended to adopt a less polemical, strictly theological or apologetic outlook on the relationship between the Church of Utrecht and Rome, only recently has more attention been paid to the dialogue with the state. The Old Catholic historian and prelate Dick Schoon, whose magisterial work *Van Bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk* forms an extensive account of the changing positions of the Old Catholic Church throughout the nineteenth century, delves deeper into the Church's dealings with the state. Schoon describes the political outlook of the clergy in the nineteenth century as "conservative" and indeed "regalistic",[9] but does not appear to impute this stance to the specific beliefs of the Church. Additionally, Schoon also claims that the Old Catholic clergy did not desire a return to the political conditions of the Republican period, and does not believe that the Church's conservatism carried any sort of true political meaning in the nineteenth century.[10] This study, by contrast, will argue for a politicised interpretation of the Church's origins, memory culture, and theological belief systems. Based on the three main arguments of this thesis, the vulnerability of a religious minority that had functioned as a quasi "state church" in the past is explored, when enlightened ideas about religious coexistence and equality gradually experienced greater

[7] Annemarie Houkes, "Het succes van 1848: Politiek in de Aprilbeweging," in *Staf En Storm: Het herstel van de bisschoppelijke hiërarchie in Nederland in 1853 : actie en reactie*, ed. Jurjen Vis and Wim Janse (Uitgeverij Verloren, 2002), 92-99.
[8] J.M. Neale, *A History of the So-Called Jansenist Church of Holland* (Oxford: John Henry, 1858), 374-376.
[9] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke cleresie tot Oud-Katholike Kerk*, 178-179.
[10] Ibid, 713.

political normalisation. As Chapters II and III in particular will demonstrate, this did not simply pertain to the changing relationship between church and state, but also touched upon the question of national identity and the importance of constitutional religious freedoms.

The methodology used in this study revolves around three central themes that aim to clarify many of the complex political and theological threads that have defined the relationship between the Old Catholic minority and Dutch society. The first and second chapters form a comparison between the relationship between church and state in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, focusing in particular on the early years of the Church (1723-1734) and what is considered here as the period of stagnation and decline following the end of the Napoleonic period and culminating in the Roman Catholic restoration (1825-1853). A strong dichotomy between "political" and "ecclesiastical "factors can be discerned in much of the existing literature. This study, in keeping with its main argument, will define the relationship between theology, politics, and historical consciousness as a "moral relationship", described by the German historian Jörn Rüsen as part of a process where moral values are gradually converted into temporal realities.[11] In keeping with Rüsen's framework, the devotional ideals of the clergy acquire a much more pronounced political dimension than they typically achieve in the confessional histories, and this concept is particularly useful when analysing the very real political aspects of belief systems important to the clergy, such as Jansenism. This approach reinforces the central argument presented in this study, that the belief systems that helped the Old Catholic world construct a historical identity should not be considered purely theological or doctrinal points of dispute between the papacy and the schismatic clergy, but constituted potential sources of cultural and political tension that may contribute to a revised understanding of the development of religious tolerance in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It is also a method that seeks to steer away from the historiographical extremities that have come to characterise the literary corpus on the schism and its effects. A major milestone in the historiographical development came in the 1960s, especially in the aftermath of the Second Vatican Council of 1962-1965, when a new historiographical climate began to take hold of the growing post-war dialogue between Rome and the Church of Utrecht. This involved a more open, international and oecumenical approach to confessional dialogue, represented by historians such as J.A.G. Tans and M. Kok, whereby specific doctrinal issues such as Bull and Formulary, that had once served as a seemingly unalterable *sine qua non* in all previous attempts at reconciliation, no longer took precedence.[12] Rather, a new spirit of interconfessionality, that emphasised the breaking of doctrinal boundaries in historical research, in order to better define the "living faith" of a church.[13]

These latter developments contributed to a new conceptualisation of church history as the "lived" expression of doctrine and spirituality, in line with a more synodal and decentralised view of episcopal authority and practice.[14] While certainly appealing to more secular tendencies in historical research, it can at times create an artificial, and indeed anachronistic, separation between church and state in the historical narrative. The methodology used in this study, therefore, seeks to avoid a definition of religious life that is

[11] Jörn Rüsen, "Historical Consciousness: Narrative Structure, Moral Function, and Ontogenetic Development," in *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Peter C. Seixas (University of Toronto Press, 2004), 63-72.
[12] J.A.G. Tans and M. Kok, *Rome-Utrecht: Over de historische oorzaken van de breuk tussen de rooms katholieke en de oud-katholieke kerken en de huidige beoordeling van die oorzaken*, Hilversum/Antwerpen: Paul Brand, 1965), 5-6.
[13] J.Y.H.A. Jacobs, "Over oecumeniciteit en confessionaliteit : De beoefening van de kerkgeschiedenis als uitdaging," *Verzameling Bijdragen Van De Vereniging Voor Nederlandse Kerkgeschiedenis*, no. 5 (1993): 3–17, 7.
[14] Mattijs Ploeger, "De geloofsleer," in *De Oud-Katholieke Kerk Van Nederland. Een Inleiding*, ed. Peter-Ben Smit (Uitgeverij Boekencentrum, 2018), 54-56.

purely “cultural”, where political circumstances have little noticeable bearing on the structure of belief, and vice versa. The notion of a “moral relationship” as the fusion between moral, or in this case, theological, values and temporal reality, is therefore an attempt to reconcile the diverse polemical and oecumenical historiographic traditions by adopting elements of both. This method mirrors one of the most crucial arguments of this study, namely that processes of democratisation and secularisation can in themselves become instruments of cultural exclusion once conflicting notions of legitimacy and tolerance are allowed to emerge within a faith community whose identity is closely bound to state interests. It is for this reason that the primary sources used - such as pamphlets, letters, and personal chronicles - are not exclusively “Old Catholic” in their origin, but also reflect the opinions of other institutions and personalities that can be seen to contribute to this tension. Some sources, such as the chronicle of the Old Catholic pastor C.J. Rinkel, written between 1845-1894, even provide an insight into the foreign contacts of the clergy, dialogues that may nuance the traditional image of the Old Catholic Church as the aggressively “national church”, free of foreign influences. Ultimately, this method suggests that the resilience of theological values in a religiously pluralistic society depends on the shared symmetry with the political aims of a dominant confession, or inversely, the ability of a religious minority to make common cause with the cultural aims of the ruling elite.

Chapter I
Jansenism, Patronage, and the Creation of a Historical Consciousness

1.1 - Jansenism and the Origins of the National Church Ideal

The seventeenth century French theologian and philosopher Antoine Arnauld maintained that Jansenism was little more than a "phantom", claiming that "there is no one in the Church who holds any of the five condemned propositions,[15] and it is not forbidden to discuss whether or not these propositions have been taught by Jansenius".[16] From a strictly theological perspective, this may or may not have been an untruthful assessment, but for the Church of Utrecht in the eighteenth century the influence of Jansenism in shaping the historical consciousness and political activities of the Church would prove it to be a far from phantomic phenomenon. It would show itself to be far more than a purely theological dispute concerning the relationship between free will and Divine Grace, at first limited to the hermetic theological faculties of Paris and Louvain, but a new political creed in its own right, representing a new desire to return to the simplicity and purity of the early Church.[17] In the United Provinces, where the still fresh memories of a Catholic past still dominated the aspirations of many believers, it may certainly be argued that a more receptive environment for Jansenist ideas existed from the movement's outset in the 1640s. It is certainly puzzling that only in Holland did Jansenism lead to the creation of a "severed limb" of the Church,[18] while its perceptively more powerful hangers-on in France and the Spanish Netherlands were unable to maintain a stable political position, despite the strong Gallican trends in French political life that should have made this possible.[19] In this chapter, the relationship between Jansenist beliefs and the political activities of the Old Catholic clergy is of prime importance, and what kind of effects this relationship had on the wider Catholic world of the United Provinces. Additionally, the influence of the Dutch Republic's unique power structures will be assessed, to what extent the social composition of the clergy proved beneficial in transforming their theological convictions into relevant political assets in a system that sought to maintain the bond between religious orthodoxy and state offices. These political relationships will be seen as crucial to the clergy's political stance in the nineteenth century.

---

[15] The so-called "five propositions" refer to the central arguments found in Cornelius Jansen's posthumously published work *Augustinus seu doctrina Sancti Augustini de humanae naturae sanitate, aegritudine, medicina adversus Pelagianos et Massilianses* (1640) commonly referred to as the "Augustinus", which consisted primarily of a more rigorous view on the relationship between divine grace and the free will of the individual, based on Jansen's interpretation of the works of Saint Augustine of Hippo (354-430). These propositions were condemned by Pope Innocent X in the bull *Cum occasione* (1653).

[16] Antoine Arnauld, *Phantosme Du Jansénisme, Ou Justification Des Prétendus Jansénistes Par Le Livre Mesme d'un Savoiard, Docteur de Sorbonne, Leur Nouvel Accusateur, Intitulé: "Les Préjugez Légitimes Contre Le Jansénisme"* (Colonia: N. Schouten, 1686).

[17] R.A. Knox, *Enthusiasm: A Chapter in the History of Religion, With Special Reference to the XVII and XVIII Centuries* (Oxford University Press, 1950), 204-230.

[18] Ibid, 230.

[19] Gallicanism constituted a movement within the French Church that emphasised the supremacy of the native episcopate over the authority of the papacy, the importance of conciliarism and traditional liberties, and held a strong aversion to any supranational expression of papal authority. The relationship between Jansenist thought within the French clergy, and Gallican ideas, was complicated by the "inclination", as the historian Wallace K. Ferguson put it, of the Jansenist parties towards public controversy. Within the framework of King Louis XIV's (reigned 1643-1715) religious policies, directed towards complete royal control over ecclesiastical affairs and the stamping out of religious dissent, Jansenism came to represent a threat to the unity of the French Church. See, Wallace K. Ferguson, "The Place of Jansenism in French History," *The Journal of Religion* 7, no. 1 (January 1, 1927): 16–42, 33-34.

1.1.1 - Old disputes in a new political order

In the various histories written on the schism of 1723, the doctrinal and judicial disputes with the papacy and its representatives in the Dutch Mission take centre stage,[20] political aims receiving minimal attention and presented as largely isolated from questions of faith. The object of this chapter is to remedy this artificial division, to understand better what allowed the Old Catholic minority - as it would always remain - to survive as a tolerated, if not recognised, faith community. It is therefore necessary to reassess the beliefs of the first Old Catholic clergymen, who were themselves so convinced of their loyalty to Catholicity, while also acquiring a significant degree of protection from a Calvinist state and political elite. The first section of this chapter will deal with these seemingly contradictory belief systems. As stated in the introduction, the pivotal dispute that allowed for the emergence of the Old Catholic Church as a religious and political entity was the Jansenist controversy, an admittedly loose term to describe the doctrinal disputes surrounding questions of Divine Grace and predestination as found in the posthumously published works of the Dutch theologian and bishop Cornelius Jansen (1585-1638), which gained many adherents in France, the Spanish Netherlands, and the Dutch Mission. If, as Arnauld states, Jansenism was a phantom, this was at the very least attributable to the fact that it did not remain a strictly theological phenomenon for very long, but achieved very real political and cultural dimensions that disrupted many of the accepted conventions in church-state relations. In particular, significant opposition in France to the successive condemnations of Jansenist works by Rome gradually became entangled with the otherwise entirely separate issue of traditional ecclesiastical liberties, or Gallicanism, within the French Church. This development in the Jansenist controversy, which elevated doctrine to a matter of state in a manner that in many ways made the independence of the Church dependent on the ability of the state to interfere with ecclesiastical affairs,[21] would stand at the heart of the burgeoning ideal of a "national church" as found among many members of the native secular clergy in the United Provinces.

While an affinity with the "spiritual",[22] doctrinal form of Jansenism, with its rigorous Augustinian forms, had always commanded a natural appeal to certain members of the secular clergy, it would be the triumph of this "politicised" form of Jansenist thought that would lead to a new, schismatic stance. This distinction is crucial, especially in the highly theologised historiographical climate that has arisen around the events of the schism. To state that the "immediate cause" of the schism was the controversy over Divine Grace, as the Anglican historian C.B. Moss formulated it,[23] does little justice to the profound consequences that this Gallican-inspired form of Jansenism had for the Dutch Mission. Rather, it is argued here that the "immediate" cause of the schism can be located in the strong "ideological"[24] similarities between the more politicised form of Jansenism, arriving in the Republic with prominent Jansenist exiles from France,

---

[20] The Dutch Mission, or *Hollandse Zending*, received its official mandate through the *Congregratio de Propaganda Fide*, a curial body responsible for the regulation and expansion of missionary work in areas without any functioning (or extant) diocesan structures. The prelates who lead the mission were titled as "vicars apostolic", and received an episcopal title *in partibus infidelium*, that is, a titular appointment that deliberately avoided the use of the title "Archbishop of Utrecht", as this had been forbidden by the States General.

[21] B. van Bilsen O.F.M., *Het Schisma van Utrecht* (Utrecht-Brussel: Uitgeverij het Spectrum, 1949), 22.

[22] Ibid, 23-24.

[23] C. B. Moss, *The Old Catholic Movement: Its Origins and History* (Berkeley, CA: Apocryphile Press, 2005), 33.

[24] The word "ideological" is a deliberate addition, in order to emphasise the gradual merging of purely doctrinal aspects of Jansenism (concerning the nature of confession, predestination, and episcopalianism) with the socio-political tendencies of the ruling regent classes of the Dutch Republic, especially in relation to the perceived supranational influence of the papacy in affairs of state. This is a more direct characterisation, as opposed to the use of more generalising terms such as "Gallicanism", that may be misleading in the context of the Northern Netherlands.

and the notions of independence harboured by many members of the native clergy ever since the formal establishment of the mission in 1622. Consequently, these similarities would determine the unusual political relationship created by the schismatic clergy with the always fervently anti-Catholic rulers of the Republic. What were these similarities? And why did they lead to a schism within the Dutch Mission, while the rest of the Church throughout the whole of Europe remained loyal to Rome? Fundamentally, the effectiveness of what may be termed "ideological Jansenism" can be attributed to the strong desire of many secular clergymen to establish a new historical - and therefore political - framework with which to renegotiate the position of the large but politically excluded Roman Catholic minority in the Republic. In this respect we may speak of a new "moral relationship" with the past,[25] which, as I argue, was not only an expedient political strategy, but also sought to remedy the constant disputes within the Mission concerning the limits of papal jurisdiction, the influence of the Society of Jesus, and the role of the various religious orders that exercised their own form of independence.[26] The unauthorised consecration of Cornelis Steenoven as the first Old Catholic archbishop of Utrecht in 1723 should be seen as a consequence of this attempt to establish a new understanding of the Church's place in history.[27] Jansenism, as it arrived with exiled clergymen such as Pasquier Quesnel (1634-1719),[28] like many among the native secular clergy, harkened back to an earlier political state enjoyed by the Church in previous centuries. These historicised visions should not be considered as mere theological aesthetics; the exiles from France were considered *frondeurs* or "rebels" by the royal government,[29] a label that referred explicitly to the internecine religious wars that had torn the country apart only decades before. These exiles, who started to establish themselves in the Republic from the late 1680s onward,[30] carried with them an idea of the Church as it had existed in antiquity, in the days of the Early Church Fathers,

[25] Rüsen, "Historical Consciousness: Narrative Structure, Moral Function, and Ontogenetic Development," 66.
[26] The regular orders who provided the Dutch Mission with missionary priests, most notably the Society of Jesus, were not, unlike the local, Dutch-born secular clergymen, under the jurisdiction of the vicar apostolic who headed the Mission, but were under the direct authority of the *Congregatio de Propaganda Fide* or the generals of their own orders. As Paul Hamans notes, these conflicts of jurisdiction reflected the greatly disorganised state of the Mission, in which the question of jurisdiction was intimately linked with a more existential dispute as to the true character of the Dutch Church, whether or not the Northern Netherlands could truly be defined as a mission area. See, Hamans, *Geschiedenis van de Katholieke Kerk in Nederland*, 261-263.
[27] Cornelis Steenoven (1661-1725) was born into a wealthy merchant family in Amsterdam. His academic formation and ordination in Louvain likely contributed to his later Jansenist sympathies, which were solidified by his election to the (defunct) Archdiocese of Utrecht in 1723. His consecration was performed by the French prelate Dominique-Marie Varlet (1678-1742), the missionary Bishop of Babylon, who at that time had sought refuge in the Republic after his suspension from office. Varlet would consecrate three more archbishops after Steenoven's sudden death in 1725.
[28] Pasquier Quesnel (1634-1719) joined the French Oratory in 1657. His most controversial work, *Le Nouveau Testament en français avec des Réflexions morales sur chaque verset* (Paris, 1702), constituted a major contribution to Jansenist literature, of which 101 propositions were eventually condemned by the bull *Unigenitus Dei Filius* in 1713. Quesnel had been placed under arrest by the Archbishop of Mechelen (Humbert-Guillaume de Precipiano) in 1703, but managed to flee to Amsterdam where he was graciously received by the local clergy. He appears to have functioned as an adviser to those clergymen who embraced the national church ideal, and his strong Gallican tendencies contributed substantially to the strengthening of the "national" view among the secular clergy. These influences played a significant role in fomenting the final movements toward the Schism.
[29] Richard M. Golden, "The Mentality of Opposition: The Jansenism of the Parisian 'Curés' during the Religious 'Fronde.'" *The Catholic Historical Review* 64, no. 4 (1978): 565–80.
[30] Jonathan I. Israel, *De Republiek, 1477-1808: Deel II: vanaf 1647* (Uitgeverij Van Wijnen-Franeker, 1996), 1167-1168.

embracing a return to a "primitive Church discipline"[31] that emphasised the authority of individual bishops and Church councils over ultramontanism.[32] In the Dutch Mission, this spirituality found a more amenable outlet. Not simply because of the "Augustinian sympathies" of a few clerics, as the Old Catholic historian Wietse van der Velde puts it,[33] but because it corresponded with a critical political aim: the reconciliation with the state and the recovery of former ecclesiastical privileges. It is for this reason that Jansenism - as it existed in the Northern Netherlands at least - should be considered more of a political creed rather than a concrete theological stance, that gradually sought out the state as protector, and also sought to nullify papal authority by denying the historical circumstances that had led to the creation of the Mission in the first place. As in France, the Jansenists among the native clergy used the very history of the Church as a means to publicly undermine the ultramontane position, which, evidently, had the opposite political effect as experienced in France. Indeed, the historical arguments brought forth by the ideal of the "national" church relied explicitly on both denying the status of the Dutch Church as a Mission, and emphasising, in a strikingly modern, almost nationalistic way, the loyalty of Dutch Catholics to the culture and political life of the Republic. A genuine frustration with the state of the Church stood at the heart of these exhortations.

There was no officially recognised episcopal hierarchy, and since the vicars apostolic who headed the Mission could be ousted at the discretion of Rome,[34] many clergymen and ordinary faithful alike were both confused and defensive of their sense of historical independence.[35] It is this growing sense of independence that would ensure a future collaboration with state authorities, since emphasising the autonomy of the Dutch Church could be presented as a struggle against the perceived arbitrary influence of Rome. These were not only judicial disputes within the Mission, but part of a fundamental change in the position of the Church in society. In her work on the Catholic subcultures of the Northern Netherlands between 1570-1750, Carolina Lenarduzzi speaks of cultural transformation taking place in the Republic, whereby Catholics were relegated to the "periphery" of political life.[36] Arguably, the ambitions of those who adhered to the "national party"[37] not only sought to hold on to the "traditional orientations"[38] that took on the form of old privileges and rights, or utilise the Augustinian severities of the Jansenist ethos to strike a chord with reigning Calvinism, but recover the cultural and political influence lost by the Church in its banishment to the periphery. Consequently, it is clear that strictly doctrinal disputes had morphed into a far more fundamental question that would arguably dictate the destiny of the Old Catholic movement into the next century: who would be considered as the true source of legitimacy in the direction of Catholic affairs in the Northern Netherlands, the papacy or the state?

---

[31] Knox, *Enthusiasm: A Chapter in the History of Religion, With Special Reference to the XVII and XVIII Centuries*, 209.

[32] van Bilsen, *Het Schisma van Utrecht,* 18-19.

[33] Wietse van der Velde, *1723 Een Aartsbisschop Voor Utrecht: Cornelis Steenoven, "een Ijverig, werkzaam, .vroom man" Aartsbisschop van Utrecht 1723-1725* (Metropolitaan Kapittel / Stichting O.K. Uitgeverij Pascal, 2023), 29.

[34] The most divisive example of this form of papal jurisdiction would be the deposition of the Vicar Apostolic Petrus Codde (1648-1710), titular Archbishop of Sebaste, suspected of Jansenist sympathies and consequently suspended in 1702. His popularity among the secular clergy ensured that his suspension would become one of the main catalysts in the breakdown of relations between the clergy and Rome, especially since the suspension coincided with the arrival of more Jansenist exiles from France.

[35] Gian Ackermans, *Herders en Huurlingen: Bisschoppen en priesters in de Republiek (1663-1705)* (Samenwerkende Uitgeverijen Prometheus/Bert Bakker, 2003), 300-301.

[36] Carolina Lenarduzzi, *Katholiek in de Republiek: De belevingswereld van een religieuze minderheid 1570-1750* (Uitgeverij Vantilt, 2019), 333.

[37] Neale, *A History of the So-Called Jansenist Church of Holland*, 231.

[38] Rüsen, "Historical Consciousness: Narrative Structure, Moral Function, and Ontogenetic Development," 72-73.

1.1.2 - Jansenism as theological nationalism in the Dutch Republic

The national church ideal, strengthened by a new influx of Jansenist exiles after the promulgation of the bull *Unigenitus* in 1713, sought to provide an answer to this culturally and politically divisive question. Personalities such as Hugo Franciscus van Heussen (1659-1719), coadjutor to the Vicar Apostolic Johannes van Neercassel and Provicar of the Dutch Mission, whose Jansenist and Gallican sympathies were known to coincide with the ideal of a national church,[39] actively sought to establish historical narratives that would favor this shift by emphasising the independence of the Dutch Church and denying the very existence or need for the Mission itself. In his most famous work, the *Batavia Sacra* (1714), an extensive history of the Church of Holland from the time of Saints Willibrord and Boniface to his own day, van Heussen argued that "she (the Church) had by no means been degraded to the status of a Mission" and that"one could not deny her the usual privileges of a true and steadfast Church".[40] As with Jansenism in France, history had become a weapon that could question papal legitimacy, but perhaps more importantly, these views had become a vehicle through which the Jansenist-leaning faction within the Mission could escape their peripheral existence in the Republic and in the wider Catholic world. In this respect, it may be appropriate to speak of an earlier, "political" schism within the Dutch Mission prior to 1723, in which the appearance of continuity with the old medieval Church institutions became part of a struggle to acquire a new source of legitimacy outside the Catholic world.

If we revisit the older historiographical views concerning the origin of the schism, the perspective presented here differs considerably. The ambition to restore local rights and diocesan control in the face of the alleged ultramontane tendencies of the regular orders working in the Mission became a political tool in this process of emerging from a cultural and political periphery, or the "renegotiation" of political rights between Protestants and Catholics, as Lenarduzzi describes this process.[41] Yet, if the national church ideal and the popularity of Jansenist ideas - in the highly politicised form that figures such as Quesnel presented them in - had indicated anything, it is that this process of renegotiation motivated the schismatic clergy to place canon law beneath a favourable image of national loyalty and cultural continuity. Consequently, theological forms could no longer be seen to originate from Rome, and doctrines that espoused forms of episcopal independence became synonymous with an intruiging new form of spiritual xenophobia that allowed the national party to ingratiate itself with Protestant observers who were close to the States General, even before the final schism. These characterisations often permeate much of the fairly recent historiography, where groups that represented the ultramontane position - such as the Jesuits - are, especially concerning their "moral teaching and exotic piety", described as "repugnant to the Dutch" by historians such as Moss.[42] In this process, we can begin to discern not only the beginnings of two separate notions of political legitimacy in the history of Dutch Catholicism, but also the foundation of a fundamentally intolerant religious subculture that sought to exclude those Catholics who remained loyal to Rome before and after Steenoven's consecration from public life as much as possible. Oftentimes, this took on the form of anti-Jesuit rhetoric, which was not necessarily unique to the Mission, but did allow movements such as Jansenism to inspire a heightened sense of spiritual independence. This, rather than the more romantic notions of a purer, or, as the Old

[39] P.C. Molhuysen and P.J. Blok, *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, vol. I (Leiden: A.W. Sijthoffs Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1911), 1102–1103.
[40] Hugo Franciscus Van Heussen, *Batavia Sacra, of Kerkelijke Historie En Oudheden Van Batavia, Behelzende De Levens Van Onze Eerste Geloofsverkondigers, Mitsgaders Van De Utregtsche Bisschoppen* (Antwerpen: Christianus Vermey, 1715), 21-22.
[41] Lenarduzzi, *Katholiek in de Republiek*, 333.
[42] Moss, *The Old Catholic Movement*, 97.

Catholic historian M. Kok stated it, less "deformed" Catholicism than that of the Jesuits,[43] should be considered the ideological foundation of the Old Catholic political agenda in the Northern Netherlands. As a result of this orientation, the definition of true "Dutch" Catholicism, arguably became more beholden to the anti-Catholics placards of the government than the long-established traditions of the Church, in an effort to facilitate the process of cultural and political renegotiation outlined by Lenarduzzi. Practices that had been part and parcel of religious life for centuries, sacramental processions, pilgrimages, the veneration of the Virgin Mary and the Saints, and the use of indulgences, now suddenly became foreign to the history of the Dutch Church as rapidly as they had been made illegal by the placards of the 1580s.[44] Priests of the national party espoused a return to a "purer" Catholicism as it had allegedly existed before the Reformation, which incidentally coincided with a rejection of virtually all the practices forbidden by the placards, and, with more xenophobic overtones, became strange "Southern European" practices and Jesuit "excesses in the worship of the Virgin Mary and other Saints".[45]

1.1.3 - Conclusion

A symmetry between Jansenism, the national church ideal, and the spiritual prerogatives of the Calvinist regents had been created even before the final rupture of 1723. The election of Steenoven would give these sentiments a concrete political relevance that would, henceforth, transform the process of Catholic reintegration into a competition of legitimacy between opposing subcultures. This politicised interpretation of the Old Catholic movement's origins points to a more worldly universe of motivations that disputes a common confessional narrative, even presented by more contemporary historians such as Dick Schoon, that the clergy was concerned only with maintaining the age-old practices and traditions in everyday religious life.[46] Rather, a dialogue between state policy - however loosely enforced at times - and the theology of the secular clergy emerges, that questions the extent to which the schism may be defined as an internal, judicial dispute within the Dutch Mission.[47]

If we return to the central contradiction addressed at the beginning of this section, namely apparent conflict of interest between an overweening and paternalistic Calvinist state and the strong desire of secular clergymen to maintain the independence of the remnants of the Dutch Church, it seems difficult to imagine that the Jansenist predilection for historicising church traditions did not at all serve the purpose of making certain aspects of Catholic life as culturally acceptable as possible. It provided a contrast to the underground Catholic world that remained loyal to Rome, with its clandestine meetings, illegal missionaries, and foreign contacts. It is likely for this reason that, unlike in France, where the Jansenist movement gradually degenerated into fanaticism and complete political exclusion,[48] was able to remain as

[43] M. Kok, *The Old-Catholic Church of the Netherlands* (Utrecht: W. Patist & Zn., 1948), 10.

[44] In particular, the placards of 20 December 1581 and 23 June 1587, are some of the most complete. These placards not only illegalised any public professions of the Catholic faith, but also the distribution of "popish" literature of any kind. See, Nikolaas Wiltens, *Kerkelyk Plakaat-boek, Behelzende De Plakaaten, Ordonnantien, Ende Resolutien, Over De Kerkelyke Zaken, By een gebragt door Nikolaas Wiltens*, vol. I (In 's Gravenhage: By Paulus en Isaac Scheltus, 's Landts Druckers, 1722), 515-524.

[45] Kok, *The Old-Catholic Church of the Netherlands*, 10,14,19.

[46] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 29.

[47] Hamans, *Geschiedenis van de Katholieke Kerk in Nederland*, 280-281.

[48] The so-called *Convulsionnaire* movement, centered around the miracles and "convulsions" that took place around the tomb of the ascetic, Jansenist deacon François de Pâris (1690-1727) is a prime example of the gradual shift towards fanaticism within the French Jansenist movement. At this stage government of King Louis XV (reigned 1715-1774) had decreed that "the bull *Unigenitus* being a law of the Church in consequence of its having been endorsed as such, it must also be regarded as a law of the realm", driving many of the more extreme Jansenist groupings to meet and worship underground.

a distinct religious and political movement. The Old Catholics would be loyal burghers first, Catholic second. It was a politicisation of theological predilections that would not only contribute directly to the schism of 1723, but also lay the foundations for a separate Catholic memory culture that would last well into the nineteenth century.

1.2 - Patronage, Political Conflict, and Minority Intolerance: 1723-1734

In the previous section, it was shown that theology and spirituality were made subordinate to the prospect of political integration. After the schism had become a fact, a new struggle emerged which, contrary to the prevailing historiographical notions of an increasingly tolerant religious climate in the Republic after 1700,[49] constituted a seminal dispute between the state, the Dutch Mission, and the nascent Old Catholic Church that concerned a question fundamental for the maintenance of religious peace in a complex ecclesiastical landscape: the difference between toleration and (state) recognition. In this section it will be argued that the outcome of this dilemma, which, with regard to the eighteenth century, has achieved little attention in any historiographical tradition, indicate that factors such as social class, political patronage, and outright intolerance played a crucial role in determining the results of the various legal disputes that arose between the Old and Roman Catholic Churches. It will be shown that, once independence from Rome had been declared, the Old Catholic clergy were able to consciously use the state's long-standing resentment against the "supranational"[50] influence of the papacy as a tool to exercise a "soft" form of persecution against believers who remained loyal to papal authority. In a strange, almost Machiavellian way, the prelates and priests of the Old Catholic persuasion were therefore able to touch upon the latent, but raw nerve of rabid anti-Catholicism among the Republic's political establishment, to secure a form of political acceptance and protection. In any case, this argument certainly challenges the veracity of another assumption often put forward by confessional historians, namely that despite the schism, the excommunicated clergy wished to remain loyal to the central authority of Rome and remain part of the Church.[51]

1.2.1 - Securing networks of power in an unruly state

When Cornelis Steenoven was consecrated on October 15, 1724, his adopted title of "Archbishop of Utrecht" had effectively fallen into disuse after the death of the last canonically appointed archbishop in 1580, since a combination of Protestant opposition and the absence of papal ratification ensured that all diocesan structures in the Northern Netherlands effectively ceased to exist.[52] Given the historical context, it would be logical to assume that the unilateral election and consecration of an ostensibly Catholic archbishop would cause much consternation among the regents, especially since, as a letter from a Catholic observer to the grand pensionary reminded the States General, it had taken place "without their consent or connivance".[53] Yet, no placards or banishments followed, as had so often been the case when confronted with individualistic Catholic activity. On the contrary, the clergy enjoyed certain political advantages that, when it came to public and backdoor politicking, gave them a marked advantage over their missionary counterparts. These advantages, it is argued, indicate that the early eighteenth century

[49] Israel, *De Republiek, 1477-1808: Band II: Vanaf 1647*, 1151.
[50] M.G. Spiertz, "Anti-jansenisme en jansenisme in de Nederlanden in de achttiende en negentiende eeuw," *Trajecta* 1, no. 3 (1992): 233–51, 240.
[51] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 29.
[52] Hamans, *Geschiedenis van de Katholieke Kerk in Nederland*, 281.
[53] van der Velde, *1723 Een Aartsbisschop voor Utrecht*, 156.

witnessed an intensified bond between the secular clergy and the ruling institutions of the Republic on a provincial and municipal level. This argument contests the more widely accepted view that after 1700, support from provincial and municipal authorities no longer counted as a deciding factor in determining confessional discourse in society, resulting in a more tolerant cultural climate, as described by historians such as Jonathan Israel.[54] On the contrary, it illuminates another aspect in the competition for cultural renegotiation between the Mission and the secular clergy, namely the struggle to (re)acquire through political patronage a form of central, physical authority that was normally denied to Catholics and other dissenting denominations.[55] In the first half of the eighteenth century, this struggle had been won by the national party. This outcome can be attributed to the social structure of the *ancien regime*. First and foremost, as noted by the Roman Catholic historian Paul Hamans, the priests who made up the first generation of the Old Catholic clergy were drawn from the same stock of influential merchant and patrician families that dominated both provincial and municipal government,[56] and the much-coveted post of vicar apostolic of the Mission had effectively been monopolised by secular clergymen drawn from these backgrounds, many of them originating from the most prominent cities of the Republic.
Communication with civil authorities was used as a means to mobilise support for the national church ideal as early as 1719, with the appearance of pamphlets such as the *Beredeneerde waerschouwing over het tolereren der Roomschgezinde Kerkdiensten in de Vereenigde Nederlanden*, composed by Anthony Slicher, councillor at the provincial Court of Holland.[57] This work not only reaffirms the independence of the "Chapters" of Utrecht and Haarlem,[58] but, in a manner that reflects the symbiotic relationship between Jansenist belief and the state's confessionally-oriented policies, rejected the notion of the pope's universal primacy as a danger to the state.[59]
Here, the strong social connections between the regents and the national party can be observed. Slicher was closely acquainted with the future archbishop Steenoven and, in particular, Willem Frederik van Dalenoort (1658-1738),[60] later archdeacon of the Old Catholic metropolitan chapter, in whose house Steenoven would be secretly consecrated. In a different memorandum written by Slicher, titled *Mémoire sur les droits du chapitre d'Utrecht* (1722) he even assures the States General that the pastors of the

[54] Israel, *De Republiek, 1477-1808: Band II: Vanaf 1647*, 1150.
[55] A.T. van Deursen, *De last van veel geluk: De geschiedenis van Nederland, 1555-1702* (Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Bert Bakker, 2005), 347.
[56] Hamans, *Geschiedenis van de Katholieke Kerk in Nederland*, 282.
[57] Anthony Slicher (1655-1745), served for more than fifty years as a councillor for the provincial Court of Holland. He frequently published tracts concerning the limits of tolerance that could be shown to Roman Catholics, and had, prior to the schism 1723, advocated for the appointment of a bishop. It may be assumed that his unwillingness to support the installation of both a Roman Catholic and Old Catholic vicar apostolic emanated from his favorable stance towards the national party, protesting against the increased power of the Holy See in domestic Catholic affairs. See, Antonis Slicher, *Vervolg an Het ontdekte slangetje, of nader beantwoording van eenige argumenten, die voor de hofpartydige roomsgezinden gemaakt werden* ('s Gravenhage: By Johannes Kitto, Boekverkoper in de Spuystraat, 1727), 6.
[58] During the course of the Reformation, the old cathedral Chapter of Utrecht had been occupied and taken over by Protestant factions, in whose hands it would remain until the abolition of the Chapter in 1811. For this reason, the Vicar Apostolic Philippus Rovenius (1573-1651) established a so-called "Vicariate" in 1633, that would assume the former advisory functions of the Chapter as it had existed prior to onset of the Reformation. This advisory organ of the Dutch Mission, however, was in no sense founded in order to reestablish the Chapter, or reconstruct the Chapter's former jurisdiction by permitting it to elect an (arch)bishop. Many of the secular clergy sought to transform the role of the Vicariate into that enjoyed by the old Chapter, in order to emphasise the historical independence of the Dutch Church. See, Hamans, *Geschiedenis van de Katholieke Kerk in Nederland*, 250.
[59] van der Velde, *1723 Een Aartsbisschop voor Utrecht*, 102.
[60] Ibid.

national party, by seeking protection from the States, were in every way "outstanding devotees of the fatherland".[61] Here, the parallels with the chauvinistic behaviours of the clergy in the realm of doctrine outlined in the previous section are evident, and the political relationships the clergy had built up with regents such as Slicher allowed both state and clergy to use the eventual consecration of Steenoven as a weapon against ultramontane influences within and outside the Republic. Indeed, the fact that the national party actively sought state "protection" from Rome, as Slicher's 1722 memorandum states, can arguably be seen as a clandestine transfer of allegiance, aimed at prolonging, not healing the schism, since any form of division among Catholics within the Republic could be leveraged as political capital against the Catholic powers that surrounded the country. In the domestic political background of the Second Stadholderless Period of 1702-1747, during which the increased influence of the regent class coincided with the gradual loss of the Republic's reputation as an international commercial and military power,[62] this was an invaluable asset. This became especially clear with the consecration of Steenoven's successor, Cornelius Johannes Barchman Wuytiers (1692-1733) in 1725, which the papal court sought to prevent by requesting the application of diplomatic pressure on the States General from both the Venetian Republic and the Catholic electors of the Holy Roman Empire.[63]

The States' reply that it "could not admit the right of the pope to exercise unlimited authority over its subjects"[64] effectively weaponised the continuation of the schism, in which the patriotic claims made by regents such as Slicher on behalf of the national party were translated into state policies. Evidently, the chauvinistic choices in Jansenist theology had now found their political outlet through the ambitions of a regent class whose religious outlook was grounded in a top-down, geopolitically oriented perspective of religious conformity. Such obscure machinations are critical, since they require an alternative historiographical image of the tolerance and church-state relations in the Republic. Therefore, in addition to the more decentralised local forms of tolerance that may have emerged in the more Catholic provinces,[65] developments emphasised by historians such as Israel when discussing the nature of Catholic tolerance in the Republic, should the importance of these political cliques at the highest level of government be understood. The ability of a prelate such as Barchman Wuytiers, whose following remained relatively small, to influence the course of the state's diplomatic activity with neighbouring Catholic states is of the greatest importance in this regard. More importantly, the efforts of regents such as Slicher may point to more distinct Anglican tendencies - in the political sense - within the leadership of States General when attempting to establish a preferred model of church-state relations, where, as in the Church of England, prelates such as Barchman Wuytiers were permitted to embrace both spiritual *and* political responsibilities.[66] These tendencies, I argue, reinforced the role of religious orthodoxy in the various conflicts between regent families and, the "middle and lower classes", on the other hand,[67] would ensure the Old Catholic clergy's future rupture with the state in the following century, when religious

---

[61] M. van der Vorst, *Holland En De Troebelen in De Hollandse Zending, 1702-1727* (Nijmegen: Drukkerij Gebr. Janssen N.V., 1960), 223.
[62] van Deursen, *De last van veel geluk: De geschiedenis van Nederland, 1555-1702*, 163-165.
[63] Moss, *The Old Catholic Movement*, 125.
[64] Gabriel du Pac de Bellegarde, *Histoire Abrégée De L'église Metropolitaine D'Utrecht: principalement depuis la Révolution, arrivée dans les sept provinces-unies des Pays-Bas, sous Philippe II, jusqu'à l'an 1784* (Utrecht: J.A. van Woestenberg, 1852), 329-330.
[65] Israel, *De Republiek, 1477-1808: Band II: Vanaf 1647*, 1153-1155.
[66] Harry F. Snapp, "Church and State Relations in Early Eighteenth-Century England." *Journal of Church and State* 15, no. 1 (1973): 83–96, 84.
[67] E.N. Williams, *The Ancien Régime in Europe: Government and Society in the Major States, 1648-1789* (Pimlico, 1999), 31.

coexistence and constitutional secularism became the new political norm. The political influence of the Old Catholic Church was far more noticeable in provincial and municipal spheres of government, particularly during the episcopate of Barchman Wuytiers. Here, the actions of the newly independent clergy directly affected and disrupted the religious peace that local authorities allegedly sought to maintain in public life, and, much like the cultivation of oligarchic power blocs among the highest ranks of the regent classes, seriously calls into question the intriguing assertion made by historians such as Schoon that the secular clergy at all times sought to remain loyal to the central authority of Rome.[68] On the contrary, the desire for state "protection" became synonymous with a form of collaboration that could lead to the arrests, expulsions, incarcerations, and fines of those clergymen -both regular and secular- that remained loyal to Rome. Such activities can be traced to the preferential treatment received by the national party as early as 1708, when the municipal council of Amsterdam expelled the Jesuits from the city in favour of Jansenist priests.[69] However, it was only after the schism had become definitive that systematic forms of "soft" persecution could be observed. This was a gradual process, and given the fragmentary, localised nature of jurisprudence during the *ancien regime,* surprisingly systematic. In an as yet unpublished memorandum by Barchman Wuytiers to the provincial States of Holland from 1727, the archbishop begins to compromise the legality of the Mission's activities by stating clearly that the efficacy of any ecclesiastical activity depends on the enforcement of placards:

"*And in the placard of the year 1702 it is statuted that nobody will endeavour to perform the office of vicar* (apostolic) *in this province, unless delegated properly in conformity with the practices of these lands* (provinces)*, (:this sanctions the Rules of the Catholic Church outlined above:) and that he will be admitted by the noble gentlemen of the executive* (the *Gecommitteerde Raden* of the States General).[70]

In other words, the legality of any Catholic activity should, in the eyes of the Old Catholic faction, be dependent on the will of the state. They also reveal the intention of the clergy to use both old and new placards as a means to obstruct what little papal authority remained in the Republic, dispelling definitively any historiographical notion of an intention to reconcile, at least among the higher echelons of the Old Catholic clergy. The value of the national party's oligarchic connections became especially clear in this respect in 1730, when at the instigation of Barchman Wuytiers the States of Holland -followed by other provinces- issued an aggressive placard requiring all priests to swear an oath that attested to the following: (1) he had been born in the Netherlands and belonged to the secular clergy, (2) that he believed that neither the pope or any other ecclesiastical authority could release its subjects from their allegiance to the state on the basis of heretical beliefs, (3) that he accepted the government's right of *ius placiti*[71] and would not confirm the legality of any papal bull without the consent of the civil authorities.[72] Fortunately

[68] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 29.
[69] Israel, *De Republiek, 1477-1808: Band II: Vanaf 1647*, 1168.
[70] Memorie van Barchman Wuytiers aan de Staten van Holland over zijn recht, priesters te benoemen in het bisdom Haarlem, 1727, 86-1, 1.02., 37, Archieven van de aartsbisschoppen van Utrecht, 1723-1937, Het Utrechts Archief, Utrecht.
[71] Ibid.
[72] These harsher provisions were a reaction to the alleged, largely symbolic meaning of a new breviary prayer introduced by the Sacred Congregation of Rites in 1728, which honored the recently canonised Pope Gregory VII (reigned 1073-1085) for his struggle against the excommunicated and formally dethroned Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV. The ultramontane undertones that this decision carried inspired Archbishop Barchman Wuytiers to make a formal complaint to the States of Holland, claiming that this new prayer violated the sovereign authority of the civil

for those Catholics who remained loyal to Rome, these placards were not rigorously enforced;[73] bribery being a more or less accepted feature of Catholic survival strategies. Despite erratic enforcement of anti-Catholic measures, placards and oaths of loyalty to the state would be used by the Old Catholic clergy as legislative weapons of exclusion against ultramontane believers and clergy alike, laying the foundation for an independent and privileged existence throughout the eighteenth century.[74] As the next section will elucidate, regular clergymen in particular remained vulnerable to these strategies,[75] since their foreign birth and education allowed for their easier association with foreign interference and Catholic conspiracy.

1.2.2 - Seizing power through prejudice

In spite of the practical difficulties attached to the enforcement of placards, this legislation exhibited clearly the surprising minority influence wielded by the Old Catholic hierarchy, a phenomenon that may also be described as "minority terror", or a form of political survival that rested upon religious exclusion on a political and cultural level. This strategy depended in no small measure on the fierce anti-Catholic sentiments among the population at large, in virtually every province, which became even more agitated by the placard of 1730. Again, there exists an unaddressed symmetry between the adopted beliefs of the clergy and the broader cultural sentiments with which the Old Catholic world sought a harmonious relationship. The draconian measures against regular clergymen found in the placards, I argue, indicate a further symbiosis between the well-known, nearly pathological Jansenist hatred of Jesuits as conspirators, regicides, and meddlesome foreigners,[76] and, strikingly, the broader anti-Catholic sentiments that could be mobilised at times of diplomatic tension with Catholic powers abroad. Therefore, partially as a result of the influence exercised by Barchman Wuytiers and his compatriots in realising the placard of 1730, I argue that the population at large had been made more susceptible to forms of anti-Catholic hysteria that bore a strong resemblance to the Jansenist political ideals pursued by the clergy in governmental circles. The so-called "June Panic" of 1734 is a case and point. A rumour arose, likely in response to the persecution of Protestant minorities in neighbouring Catholic territories,[77] that on the Feast of Corpus Christi the Catholic populations in the Republic would rise up and massacre Protestants, alongside the

government. The placard of 1730 subsequently forbade all priests of the Dutch Mission to make use of the breviary prayer, see, Hamans, *Geschiedenis van de Katholieke Kerk in Nederland*, 309-310.

[73] Ibid, 310.

[74] These conditions allowed the schismatic clergy to subsequently expand their influence into other "dioceses", again with the support of the States General. The separate Old Catholic episcopal succession established by the suspended and excommunicated Bishop Varlet in 1723 had allowed for Archbishop Petrus Johannes Meindaerts (1684-1767) to consecrate suffragan bishops for the dioceses of Haarlem and Deventer in 1742 and 1757 respectively.

[75] Hamans, *Geschiedenis van de Katholieke Kerk in Nederland*, 315.

[76] See, as an example of the extensive anti-Jesuit mythology common in Jansenist circles, the work of the French cleric and Jansenist sympathiser Henri Philippe de Chauvelin (1714-1770), whose published work *Discours sur les constitutions des Jésuites and Compte rendu sur la doctrine des Jésuites* (1761) played a decisive role in the eventual expulsion of the Jesuits from the Kingdom of France in 1764.

[77] The "Saint Bartholomew's Night" associations made by many Protestants throughout the Republic were also aggravated by incoming accounts of the expulsion of Protestant minorities abroad. These growing anti-Catholic sentiments coincided with the clergy's general rise to power in the early 1720s, and were in some cases presented as "Jesuit" cruelties, as in the case of the persecution of Lutherans in the Polish-Lithuanian city of Thorn in 1724, following the desacration of a sacramental procession. For further details about the influence of these often inflated accounts of foreign persecutions, see, W. P. C. Knuttel, *De Toestand Der Nederlandsche Katholieken ten tijde der republiek*, vol. II ('s Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff, 1892), 123-124.

members of the municipal and provincial governments.[78] Echoes of the same anti-Jesuit xenophobia can be observed in the various pamphlets, broadsides, and rabble-rousing sermons that emerged as a result, particularly against Catholic migrant workers from Germany, Brabant, and the Austrian Netherlands, who had supposedly travelled North to assist their compatriots in the planned massacres.[79] Parallels with the English "Popish Plot" of 1678-1681 are manifest, and all across the country the regular clergymen of the Mission were harassed, arrested, banished, fined, or forced into hiding, while many of the "house churches" were raided and closed.[80] According to historian W.T.M. Frijhoff, the members of the Old Catholic Church did not play a role in these events, as they did not wish to "disrupt" their good relations with the government.[81] This assessment, in light of both the theological and political character of Dutch Jansenism, the successful accumulation of socially-engineered political alliances with the regents, and the machinations of individual prelates such as Archbishop Barchman Wuytiers, arguably requires a great deal of revision. While it would be inaccurate to state that the clergy of the national party directly instigated acts of mass hysteria, manifestations such as the June Panic were in no small measure made possible by the political weaponisation of religiously intolerant tendencies and social hierarchies that were utilised by the Old Catholic hierarchy to maintain a fundamentally undemocratic and xenophobic form of ecclesiastical independence. In any case, the political networks analysed in this chapter may also provide a more specific political context behind the emergence of the often overlooked, libellous pamphlet culture led by both Protestants and Dutch Jansenists against the alleged cruelties of the Jesuits abroad,[82] as described briefly by the historian F. van den Hoeck. Therefore, the discrimination faced by the majority of Catholics who remained loyal to Rome throughout the late 1720s and early 1730s can also be placed in a wider popular tradition of hostility towards "foreigners" as a threat to hard-won Dutch liberties,[83] in the same manner that the Jesuit order and the papacy had represented a threat to the traditional freedoms of the Dutch Church.

1.2.3 - Conclusion

This chapter has shown that the foundational beliefs of the Old Catholic Church were determined by a theological and political stance that gradually but definitively subordinated any sense of loyalty to papal authority or Catholic unity within the United Provinces to the acquisition of governmental protection and support in order to establish a form of ecclesiastical independence. This process, which originated from sincere grievances against the various judicial ambiguities between the various regular and secular components of the Dutch Mission during the seventeenth century, experienced a new radicalised trajectory with the arrival of Jansenism in the Northern Netherlands. Jansenist antiquarianism not only appealed to clergymen who sought the restitution of old, long-abolished medieval rights and privileges, but also functioned as a cultural vehicle through which clergymen could alter both the theology and political future of the Dutch Church, in a manner that sought to normalise an artificial, chauvinistic division between the allegedly ultramontane "foreign" regulars and Jesuits and the secular priests of a "purer" Dutch Catholicism.

---

[78] W.T.M. Frijhoff, "De paniek van juni 1734," *Archief Voor De Geschiedenis Van De Katholieke Kerk in Nederland* 19, no. 2 (1977): 170–233, 170.
[79] Ibid.
[80] P. Polman, *Katholiek Nederland in de achttiende eeuw*, vol. II (Paul Brand, 1968), 19.
[81] Frijhoff, "De paniek van juni 1734," 189.
[82] F. van den Hoeck S.J., *Schets van de geschiedenis der Jezuieten in Nederland* (Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt N.V., 1940), 269.
[83] Geoffrey Treasure, *The Making of Modern Europe, 1648-1780* (London & New York: Routledge, 1985), 478.

Over time, these largely ahistorical notions of ecclesiastical unicity became analogous to an aggressive, mutually beneficial, and socially-engineered political arrangement with the key institutions of the Republic's political life, the regents, the States General, and the provincial and municipal councils that effectively discarded any remaining feelings of loyalty to papal authority and its representatives. The clergy's newly acquired political weight not only allowed them to remain independent from Rome but also to become a power broker in the Republic's diplomatic interactions with neighbouring Catholic powers, a degree of influence unheard of for other dissenting confessions at the time. At the very least, this shows the need to revise the traditional view of the schism as a purely ecclesiastical dispute over lost medieval rights and privileges,[84] a view that has often compelled historians to describe the Old Catholic phenomenon as culturally insignificant and politically powerless,[85] apparently lost in its own archaisms. These conclusions may suggest a more nuanced approach to the "tolerance" phenomenon as described by historians such as Jonathan Israel, especially given the well-established image of the regent class as a more moderate, Erasmian, commerce-oriented body, disinterested in religious conflict and persecution of any kind.[86] On the contrary, it is clear that the clergy's newfound independence originated not from any sort of "growth" in tolerance towards Catholics, in contrast to the public tolerance shown to Protestant exiles from various corners of Europe,[87] but from a political strategy that made conscious use of confessional struggles within Dutch society. This last point, especially, is evidenced by the willingness of prelates such as archbishop Barchman Wuytiers to adhere strictly to the placards, whose enforcement created a historical legacy of positive state support. Most crucially for the purposes of this study, these networks provide a clear outline of the clergy's expectations of the state's role in the nineteenth century, when the advent of religious freedom and secular government made these historical ties untenable, intolerant remnants of a past regime. As the next chapter will show, the politicisation of Jansenism not only continued well into the nineteenth century, but also posed significant challenges to a new type of state that aimed to maintain the constitutional equality of all faiths.[88] This confrontation would show that, even with the arrival of religious freedom and greater democratic tendencies in state and society, cultural isolation could still determine the fate of those faith communities that were unable to separate spiritual life from a sense of political primacy.

[84] van der Velde, *1723 Een Aartsbisschop Voor Utrecht*, 23-28.
[85] A.Th. van Deursen, "De Republiek der Zeven Verenigde Nederlanden (1588-1780)," in *Geschiedenis Van De Nederlanden*, ed. J.C.H. Blom and E. Lamberts, Derde, herziene druk (Baarn: HB uitgevers, 2001), 170.
[86] Williams, *The Ancien Régime in Europe*, 32.
[87] Johannes De Jong, *Handboek Der Kerkgeschiedenis: De Nieuwere Tijd (1517-1789)*, vol. III (Utrecht-Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt N.V., 1948), 344-345.
[88] Hamans, *Geschiedenis van de Katholieke Kerk in Nederland*, 410.

Chapter II
Old Catholic Beliefs and the Political Foundations of the Nineteenth Century, 1814-1848

2.1 - The Search for Religious Unity and the Rejection of Christian Democracy

By the time of the House of Orange's restoration and elevation to the Dutch throne in 1813, the fragile and diverse religious landscape of the old Republic had been shattered by nearly three decades of revolution, secularisation, and foreign occupation. In many ways, the democratisation of religious life was experienced as an optimistic development by religious minorities across the country, (Roman) Catholics and Protestant dissenters alike were, in line with the principle of the equality of all religions before the law and the abolition of the state-controlled Reformed Church,[89] now able to participate far more actively in public life without the fear of a state-sanctioned confessional backlash. As the nineteenth century progressed, the cultural complications that shadowed the Batavian ideal of religious equality periodically arose, but the protection of all faiths remained enshrined as an inalienable constitutional right. The opening up of religious life in Dutch society, and the processes of democratisation and secularisation that made this possible, not only protected most minorities from societal isolation, but also laid the foundation for greater interconfessional dialogue within a new, centralised parliamentary state that encouraged Christian unity.[90] While this did not entail a complete end to confessional conflict or schisms within the Protestant world, it did ensure that those who chose to break free from the preferred Dutch Reformed Church could eventually count on a form of constitutional immunity and state protection.[91] There were rare exceptions to this rule among the Protestant churches of the new kingdom, but these small, peaceful and somewhat apocalyptically-oriented groups were of little consequence and did not at any time seek to threaten the constitutional foundations of religious peace.

Quite different in this respect were the remaining Old Catholic communities, who, as this chapter argues, found themselves increasingly at odds with the principle of state secularism on both a political and theological plane. This confrontation, as this chapter will show, indicates that the chauvinistic, Jansenist-inspired theology of the previous century, which actively sought and received support from state authorities, was now transformed into both a political and cultural hindrance that frustrated both the state's desire for religious peace and the Old Catholic Church's desire for recognition in a new constitutional, democratic political context. Indeed, the reaction of the Old Catholic world to these political shifts reveals that the various forms of political favoritism experienced by the Church under the *ancien regime* constituted an unresolved historical legacy that, almost uniquely among the various confessions, could not be reconciled with the gradual constitutional separation of church and state, especially after the Thorbeckian reforms of 1848. An altogether different dynamic can be observed; the

---

[89] As professed by the decree of 5 August 1795 by the National Assembly (of the Batavian Republic) following the definitive collapse of the *ancien regime*, see, *Dagverhaal der handelingen van de Nationale vergadering representeerende het volk van Nederland*, vol. II (In De Haage: Uitgegeven door Swart en Comp, 1796), 497.

[90] Albert J. Rasker, *De Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk Vanaf 1795: Haar geschiedenis en theologie in de negentiende en twintigste eeuw* (Kampen: Uitgeversmaatschappij J.H. Kok, 1974), 36-37.

[91] While the privileged position of the old *Publieke Kerk* or "Public Church" of the Reformed confession had been abolished after the revolutionary upheavals of 1795, it was not until the return of the House of Orange that an effective, state-led reorganisation of religious life was achieved. During the reign of King William I (1813-1840), all faith communities - regardless of their size - were integrated into a ministerial system of governmental support that provided stipends and salaries for churches and clergymen, as stipulated in the *reglementen* or "regulations" set aside for each confession, while separate ministries for Protestant and Catholic affairs were established in 1815.

state could not permit itself to fully tolerate the political consequences of the Old Catholic Church's historical aspirations and theology, nor was the Old Catholic hierarchy willing to adapt its highly theologised view of the role of the state as a protector of the "true" Dutch Catholic Church. In contrast to Dick Schoon, who does not believe that the theological conservatism of the Old Catholic clergy constituted any sort of political goal or agenda, or any desire to return to the conditions enjoyed in the days of the old Republic,[92] this chapter argues that the fierce rigidity of belief adhered to by the clergy until 1853 was, as in the eighteenth century, an attempt at restoring and maintaining their exclusivity as the only legitimate and state-sanctioned "Catholic" authority in the country.[93] In the new climate of state secularisation, there could be no room for a religious belief in state protection, ensuring the increased cultural marginalisation of the Old Catholic world, in spite of the growth in tolerance and religious freedom.

2.1.1 - Rejecting the new place of Christianity in a post-revolutionary state

It is certainly unusual that, given the Old Catholic Church's function as a "reliable" source of control over Catholic affairs for the state during the eighteenth century, no new political understanding could be reached with a state interested in maintaining control over culturally problematic confessions, first and foremost Catholicism. During the reign of King William I in particular (1813-1840), there were numerous situations in which the Old Catholic hierarchy, in spite of the demographic disadvantages and disputes among the clergy mentioned by Schoon,[94] could have contributed to its own advantage to policies of religious and national unity. Indeed, after a sustained period of Napoleonic hostility towards the Old Catholic clergy's aspirations to continued independence from Rome, the presence of an expanded, potentially troublesome Roman Catholic population in the newly acquired Southern provinces of the reborn Dutch state could have served as a welcome enlargement of the Church's political *raison d'être*.[95] Yet, there existed from the outset of this new relationship between church and state several strong historical and constitutional contradictions that ensured the complete nullification of these not unimportant advantages, ensuring a gradual process of political and cultural exclusion for the clergy and the wider Old Catholic community. Certainly, until the Belgian Revolution of 1830, the rupture with the state revolved around the ecclesiastical policies of William I, and his ambition to establish a form of "national Christianity".[96]

Why did this "national Christian" objective, whose anti-Roman aspect seemed to acquiesce so well to the sentiments of the clergy, not translate into an even stronger form of collaboration with the state? Fundamentally, because the artificial centralisation of religious life undermined the foundations of the Old Catholic Church's oligarchic political power, as it had been established in the previous century. All confessions, including the enlarged Roman Catholic population, had to submit to an "enlightened" and

[92] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 713.
[93] Ibid, 712.
[94] Ibid, 96-97.
[95] As noted by Adam Zamoyski, the overwhelmingly Catholic populations of the former Habsburg-ruled Austrian Netherlands (where no Old Catholic movement or tendency existed) were, by 1814, still deeply attached to a separate faith identity and the various freedoms and privileges that had been enjoyed under Habsburg rule. Their incorporation into a new United Kingdom of the Netherlands by the allies at the Congress of Vienna was met with much resentment, for fear of losing these prerogatives. For a further overview of the post-Napoleonic interaction between the Northern and Southern provinces, see, Adam Zamoyski, *Rites of Peace: The Fall of Napoleon and the Congress of Vienna* (HarperCollins UK, 2008), 206-207.
[96] J.G. Kikkert, *Geld, Macht En Eer: Willem I: Koning der Nederlanders en Belgen 1772-1843* (Uitgeverij Scheffers, 1995), 128.

universal religious ideal, whereby confessional conflict was to be subordinated to a common Christian morality.[97] While these policies not only resulted in the gradual estrangement of ultramontane believers in the Southern provinces, they also disqualified the religious monopoly established by the Old Catholic hierarchy in the previous century, a monopoly on governmental influence that had allowed the clergy to enjoy a state of privileged tolerance under the *ancien regime*. In other words, the clergy remained devoted to a form of political renegotiation and coexistence that centred around confessional conflict, and not the spirit of national unity. This attitude, I argue, which would reach its apotheosis in 1853, began with a rejection of the "oecumenical" and - ironically - "state-oriented" stance of William I's ecclesiastical policies,[98] in the realm of both ministerial politics and local expressions of faith. A telling and as yet unappreciated example of this confrontation between the Christian universalism of the state and the adherence to old privileges may be discerned from the correspondence between the Old Catholic Archbishop of Utrecht Willibrordus van Os (1744-1825) and the representatives of the newly formed *Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap* or "Dutch Bible Society", founded in 1814. This society, which, in line with William's universalist ideals, embraced an "interconfessional" stance to proselytisation,[99] had sent an appeal to van Os to collaborate with the society's activities. In another unpublished letter, dating to around 1823-1824, these overtures are rejected by the archbishop on numerous grounds, which reveal the political stance of a church still deeply entrenched in the political thinking of the Republican period. Firstly, van Os touches upon the Society's translations: "*it seems to me to be a prerequisite that both* (confessions) *deem as canonical the same books, no more or no less*".[100] Continuing, he states:

"*whereby it seems clear to me, that, considering this difference in feeling, neither confession can in good faith offer and spread one another's Bible as a real Bible*"[101]

Finally, the element of confessional conflict is broached, albeit diplomatically, amounting to a rejection of the Society's invitation, when van Os declares that "*it has occurred, that a translator grossly falsifies the text, in order to serve his own inclination*".[102] The claim forwarded by Old Catholic historians such as van Kleef that both Protestants and Old Catholics alike were, in the first half of the nineteenth century especially, victims of resurgent Jesuit "attacks" and polemics,[103] may have been true, but letters such as these certainly reinforce the notion that the Old Catholic hierarchy did not conceive of any sort of interconfessional cooperation - in line with the universalist character of state policy - that would have entailed any reduction in their confessional sovereignty. Even the development of Roman Catholic attitudes towards this new form of religious coexistence, whose aggressive ultramontanism initially posed an even greater threat to the king's ideal of Christian unity, had by the early 1820s arrived at something of

[97] Jeroen Koch, *Koning Willem I: 1772-1843* (Amsterdam: Boom, 2013), 418-419.
[98] Hamans, *Geschiedenis van de Katholieke Kerk in Nederland*, 411-412.
[99] Joris Van Eijnatten, "Religie en het Koninkrijk: Een dwars verband.," in *Een Nieuwe Staat. Het Begin van Het Koninkrijk Der Nederlanden.*, ed. Ido De Haan, Paul Den Hoed, and Henk Te Velde (Prometheus-Bert Bakker, 2013), 294.
[100] W. van Os aan de president van het Bijbelgenootschap te Amersfoort, circa 1823, 86-1, 1.07., 245, Concepten, minuten, en afschriften van uitgaande brieven, 1808-1825, Archieven van de aartsbisschoppen van Utrecht, 1723-1937, Het Utrechts Archief, Utrecht.
[101] Ibid.
[102] Ibid.
[103] van Kleef, *Geschiedenis van de Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland*, 169.

a *rapprochement* with the new climate of "bourgeois tolerance".[104] Through the successful intercessions of ultramontane churchmen such as Franciscus Antonius de Méan de Beaurieux (1756-1831), the Archbishop of Mechelen, the contradiction between loyalty to the state and Rome had been carefully navigated and ameliorated,[105] by virtue of his relationship with the king and his appointment to the upper house of the States General. Such advancements, which sought to make concessions in the face of the king's strong personal influence in ecclesiastical affairs, arguably established the foundations for the future alliance between parliamentary liberalism and Catholic emancipation.[106] While this alliance would materialise more powerfully in the aftermath of the Belgian Revolution, the efforts of de Méan underscored the differences in political flexibility between the two opposing Old and Roman Catholic camps when coming to terms with state policy. More importantly for the movement towards complete secularisation that would reach its zenith in 1848, it created within the Dutch Mission an understanding that the principle of religious freedom provided a sense of longstanding, if culturally divisive, constitutional protection. The political astuteness of the Roman party, therefore, relied not only on the often mentioned demographic advantages, which had in any case been of little consequence in the days of the Republic, but on the ability of its hierarchy to adapt quickly to new institutions of government, and, perhaps most crucially, the avoidance of the more "extreme" forms of ultramontane thought as represented by earlier bishops such Maurice de Broglie (1766-1821).[107] Undoubtedly, it was a strategy that weakened the Old Catholic clergy's longstanding monopoly on informal political alliances and privileges.

2.1.2 - Memory cultures of confessional struggle

By contrast, the Old Catholic Church's attitude towards these new political realities extended far further than the mere rejection of Christian universalism, but in many cases represented a conscious decision to harken back with even greater force to the old disputes and institutions that had once proven so politically influential. It is argued here that this entailed both a revitalisation of Old Catholic memory culture, coupled with a renewed hostility towards those elements of the Dutch Mission perceived to be "foreign" or "Jesuit" in nature, although these were now fixtures of public religious life and constitutionally protected. Culturally, as well as politically, it is argued here, the Old Catholic world came to represent the antithesis of the Roman movements towards greater liberalisation and state cooperation. The clergy's reaction to the normalisation of religious freedom and unity, as evidenced by the rich literary culture of the Old Catholic tradition, and, on a higher diplomatic and ministerial level, in the new negotiations with

[104] J. Roegiers and N.C.F. van Sas, "Revolutie in Noord en Zuid (1780-1830)," in *Geschiedenis van de Nederlanden*, ed. J.C.H. Blom and E. Lamberts, Derde, herziene druk (Baarn: HB uitgevers, 2001), 250.
[105] I.H. Gosses and N. Japikse, *Handboek tot de staatkundige geschiedenis van Nederland*, vol. VI ('s Gravenhage: M. Nijhoff, 1927), 430-431.
[106] This position coincides with the views held by J. Roegiers and N.C.F. van Sas that the true crisis experienced by the new kingdom of the United Netherlands by the late 1820s was instigated by a new wave of liberal political thought in both secular and religious circles. Essentially, that the secession of the Southern provinces was not simply due to confessional conflict - as many Roman Catholics continued to live in the reduced kingdom after 1830 - but by a more universal grievance against the authoritarian tendencies of William I and other restorationist monarchs across Europe, see, Roegiers and Van Sas, "Revolutie in Noord En Zuid (1780-1830)," 253-256.
[107] Maurice-Jean de Broglie (1766-1821) had been appointed Bishop of Ghent in 1807. He vigorously opposed the Constitution of 1815, particularly the articles that codified the equality of all religions, the king's right of *ius placiti*, and the implementation of new educational freedoms. Eventually, de Broglie was cited by court of Brussels, and, sentenced to deportation, fled to France in 1817. See, L.J. Rogier and N. De Rooy, *In vrijheid herboren: Katholiek Nederland, 1853-1953* ('s Gravenhage: N.V. Uitgeversmij Pax, 1953), 35.

the papacy encouraged by William I,[108] indicate a strong desire to maintain the old Republican contours of their cultural and political position. Several sources indicate this rejection of interconfessional discourse and coexistence, which echoes the strong anti-Roman attitudes prevalent in the previous century, and whose public expression made use of a strongly Jansenist symbology. In particular, the pastoral letters issued by the bishops to their congregations are indicative of this stance, and served to mobilise the members of the parish while also providing a public statement of faith. One written by Bishop Henricus Johannes van Buul (1795-1862) of Haarlem in 1844 presents to his flock a parallel history of the schism and its origins. It discusses the "infamous" bull *Unigenitus*,[109] while also explicitly continuing to praise personalities whose controversial relationships with Jansenism and the state had in the past contributed to the schism, such as Petrus Codde, who is not only described retrospectively as an archbishop, but also as a martyr-like figure for the Chapter of Utrecht.[110]

Another earlier work, titled *Dichtmatige levensschets van wijlen den hoog eerwaardigen doorluchtigen heer Willebrordus van Os* - a poetic eulogy composed after the death of Archbishop van Os in 1825 - by the parish priest Johannes van der Pels, is even more virulent in this regard, when it speaks of the "poison" of the Jesuits and the Bull and Formulary,[111] while quoting profusely from famous Jansenist authors such as Arnauld, Quesnel, Pascal, and Soanen. As a last example, there are the published polemic works directed against Roman Catholic clergymen, which were often centred around accusations directed against the Jesuits, rather than any attempt at reconciliation or diplomacy. One of these, titled *Drietal vragen aan den eerw. heer Wennekendonk, tot verdediging der bisschoppelijke clerezie* (1842) or "defence" of the clergy by the seminary president of Amersfoort Petrus Buys (1787-1853) extolls the same fixation with the Jesuits as hypocritical, conspiratorial, and heretical forces within the Church.[112] Despite their severely reduced influence on the Dutch Mission, especially after their suppression in 1773, Buys firmly adheres to the eighteenth century stereotypes of Jesuits as having committed numerous crimes against "church and state".[113] These publications, while appearing to be devotional in their subject matter, should be seen as a collective attempt on the part of the clergy to revive, or indeed strengthen, a longstanding cultural aversion towards papal loyalties and any sort of ultramontane thought. As in the eighteenth century, Jansenist culture should therefore be seen as a moral impetus, the cultural vehicle through which the Old Catholic world could formulate a "translation of the past into the present".[114] This analysis in itself leads to a different view on the manifestation of anti-Jesuitism in the Dutch Mission, and overall anti-Catholic sentiments as a result. The Dutch historian Joep van Gennip's conclusion that outbreaks of anti-Jesuit feeling were most widespread at times of political contention, such as in 1844-1845, 1852-1853, and 1872-1873, as part of a "broader" antipapism then,[115] requires revision. This

[108] Neale, *A History of the So-Called Jansenist Church of Holland*, 350-352.
[109] Henricus Joannes Buul, *Herderlijk Onderrigt van Henricus Joannes van Buul, Bisschop van Haarlem over de kerkscheuring onder de Katholijken dezer gewesten* (Rotterdam: H. Aewerdonk, 1844), 18, 62.
[110] Ibid, 12, 30, 45.
[111] Johannes Augustinus Van Der Pels, *Dichtmatige Levensschets Van Wijlen Den Hoog Eerwaardigen Doorluchtigen Heer Willebrordus Van Os, Aartsbisschop Van Utrecht, President En Pastoor Van Het Bisschoppelijke Seminarium Te Amersfoort, En Aldaar Den 28sten Februarij 1825 Overleden in Den Ouderdom Van Één En Tachtig Jaren En Zes En Twintig Dagen* (Amsterdam: Scholten en Gortmans, 1825), 17.
[112] Petrus Buijs, *Drietal Vragen Aan Den Eerw. Heer Wennekendonk, Tot Verdediging Der Bisschoppelijke Clerezie* (Utrecht: S. Alter, 1842), 10, 16.
[113] Buijs, *Drietal Vragen Aan Den Eerw. Heer Wennekendonk*, 26.
[114] Rüsen, "Historical Consciousness: Narrative Structure, Moral Function, and Ontogenetic Development," 67.
[115] Joep Van Gennip, "A great swarm of nocturnal raptors shrieking horribly" Negative Images of the Jesuits in the Netherlands between the Restoration of the Order and the Establishment of the Dutch Jesuit Province, 1814-1850,"

section has demonstrated that, aside from the longstanding tensions between Protestant and Catholic cultural enclaves, Jansenist polemical traditions that were specifically oriented against "Jesuit" influences in cultural and political life and the principle of religious equality, had never diminished after the secularisation of Dutch society in 1796, but represented a theological continuum that had already experienced a revival in the early 1820s. In the next section, it will be shown how these attachments to the cultural norms of the Republican period could be transformed into a political creed.

2.1.3 - Conclusion

From a cultural standpoint, it may be concluded that the Old Catholic clergy were still deeply attached to the older exclusivist form of religious coexistence, a position described as "sectarian" by more critical Roman Catholic historians such as B. van Bilsen.[116] This accusation, which had also been levelled against the clergy as early as the short reign of Louis Napoleon (1806-1810) by the minister of worship J.H. Mollerus,[117] who had indeed intended to definitively classify the "Jansenist church" as "sectarians",[118] at the very least indicates that the Old Catholic Church had garnered a reputation for ahdering strongly to politically troublesome doctrines. The passionate defence of old Jansenist dogmas and personalities by clergymen such as Buys through these polemics accentuates the strong tendency towards historical revival, an inability to culturally "renegotiate", to a new position of cultural strength that, as the previous chapter has indicated, had been successfully achieved in the eighteenth century. In the context of William I's aggressive vision of Christian universalism, this form of memory culture could not be reconciled with the new democratic reality. Above all, these modes of religious intolerance alienated the clergy, on a cultural level, from the unifying ideal of political life, the idea of the national community, a sense of nationhood that rested upon the king's vision of spiritual unity.[119] Old Catholic memory cultures would, as a result of this rupture, gradually acquire a politically problematic character.

Moreover, these aspects of the literary culture of the Old Catholic Church are, from a historiographical point of view, a confirmation of a more global cultural reality that undermined the effectiveness of the ideal of a unified, Christian nation state. This reality, described by the Dutch historian P. de Rooy as a resurgence of confessional particularisms and schisms within the realm of religious life throughout the nineteenth century,[120] suggests that the clergy's adherence to these historical symbols of resistance was part and parcel of a more commonly shared nostalgia for local, rather than centralised ecclesiastical authority among various confessions. Politically speaking, the theology of the Old Catholic Church can be said to have represented a similar kind of cultural obstacle for the enlightened ideals of religious peace and coexistence as the supposedly "dark" and "ignorant" Roman Catholic seminaries and monasteries

in *The Survival of the Jesuits in the Low Countries, 1773-1850*, ed. Leo Kenis and Marc Lindeijer S.J. (Leuven University Press, 2019), 279–301, 297.

[116] van Bilsen, *Het Schisma van Utrecht*, 146.

[117] J.H. Mollerus (1750-1834) occupied a number of ministerial offices under the Napoleonic Kingdom of Holland, including the Ministry of Worship between 1808-1809. His approach to the Old Catholic clergy corresponded with the centralising, regulating principles that characterised the Napoleonic approach to ecclesiastical affairs. Following the incorporation of the Kingdom of Holland into the French Empire, an imperial commission was established in 1812 to accelerate the unification of the various Protestant confessions in the Netherlands, and the "Jansenists" with the Roman Catholic Church. The object was to do away with old confessional disputes, in order to transform religious worship into a cultural appendage of the *raison d'état*.

[118] van Bilsen, *Het Schisma van Utrecht*, 132.

[119] M. Elisabeth Kluit, *Het protestantse réveil in Nederland en daarbuiten 1815-1865* (Amsterdam: Paris, 1970), 14.

[120] Piet de Rooy, *Republiek van Rivaliteiten: Nederland Sinds 1813* (S.l.: Park Uitgevers, 2018), 26.

heckled by Goubeau d'Hovorst,[121] the king's minister for Roman Catholic affairs. Yet, unlike the majority of Catholics who remained loyal to Rome, the clergy's strict adherence to the old disputes - and to the sense of political primacy that had emerged as its result - ensured that there could be no comparable dynamic of renegotiation with state authorities. Nor, as the next section of this chapter will argue further, should the clergy's loyalties to Jansenist symbols and theology be seen to have led to a purely "cultural" conflict with new notions of Christian universalism and tolerance. Rather, the memory culture upheld by the Old Catholic world functioned as the ideological justification for political manoeuverings that, at times, were highly unconstitutional.

2.2 - Changing Attitudes Towards the State, Collapsing Power Structures, and the Failure of Integration

In the new, post-revolutionary nation-state established by William I, the principle of unity was not merely the preserve of religious life, but, as the Dutch church historian Elizabeth Kluit notes, was a revolutionary legacy that applied itself to all facets of governmental, administrative, and economic life.[122] The nature of church politics, in both Protestant and Catholic spheres, ensured that this process was continuously accompanied by a clash between old privileges, which often revolved around a sense of local autonomy, and the unitary aspirations of the various ministries under the king's direction. This was, perhaps, an inevitable product of the historical mythology, indeed sense of nostalgia, that many church communities felt for the days of the Republic. After all, the Republic had been a "second Israel", a nation as God had intended,[123] with all the accompanying corporate privileges. The development towards a centralised nation state, therefore, entailed the breaking of many of these ecclesiastically-oriented attitudes of confessional superiority, including the accessibility of public office for those not of the Calvinist persuasion.[124] By contrast, the regulations provided to all confessions after 1816, on the basis of article 139 of the constitution of 1814, a fixed system of stipends and pensions derived from the national budget that served to remove the state from its former role as arbiter of theological orthodoxy. The king's personal ambitions for an enlightened, universal, state-run church certainly influenced the character of church politics throughout his reign, but, as the Council of State had established during the consultations leading up to the first regulations for the Reformed Church, it was not, on the basis of the constitution, in the interest of the state to approach theological disputes of any kind.[125] Faith communities that had constituted the large "dissident" minority in the Republic gladly accepted these new circumstances, which provided a much-desired sense of stability and legal protection after centuries of political marginalisation and exclusion.

The Old Catholic Church, on the other hand, experienced continuous difficulties with a new, secular state apparatus. Governmental stipends provided stability, yet also served to diminish the influence of those institutions and social networks that had formed the bulwark of their political and cultural influence under the *ancien regime*. Essentially, the clergy desired that both monarch and state would function as the

[121] Koch, *Koning Willem I: 1772-1843*, 418-419.
[122] Kluit, *Het protestantse réveil in Nederland en daarbuiten 1815-1865*, 14.
[123] E.H. Kossmann, "The Dutch Case: A National or a Regional Culture? The Prothero Lecture." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 29 (1979): 162-163.
[124] De Rooy, *Republiek van Rivaliteiten: Nederland Sinds 1813*, 26.
[125] P.D. van den Boogaard, "Een reglementaire kerk? Een evaluatie van het Concept-Reglement van 1809 en het Algemeen Reglement van 1816." *NTKR. Tijdschrift voor Recht en Religie*, no. 11 (2017): 39-54, 41.

protectors of the Church's "national freedoms and privileges".[126] This desire was impossible to fulfil on a constitutional basis. The constitution of 1814, which created a mixed form of government that sought to balance the revolutionary and reactionary tendencies in Dutch society,[127] and with its separate ministries for Protestant and Catholic affairs, had been established to maintain religious peace. As a result, the close relationship built up with the state during the eighteenth century provided the foundations for a future constitutional dilemma, where the advent of religious freedom became synonymous with the denial of historical rights that had continued to carry a deeply religious and political meaning. Correspondingly, this section will argue that the political activities of the Old Catholic clergy, in line with their culturally reactionary tendencies, represented a desire to retain the old Republican power structures and privileges that had allowed for their rise to prominence in the 1730s. This effectively entailed the normalisation within the ranks of the clergy of a strong scepticism and hostility towards the democratic state institutions, primarily the ministries, that made it difficult for the state to prevent the Church's gradual slide into political and cultural isolation. It is an important historical dynamic, since it showcases the vulnerability of new democratic principles within a cultural and political context that is still defined by the living memory of the former union of church and state. Additionally, it presents clearly the tension that can arise between church and state when the former is unable to embrace a more rational, societally stabilising form of worship,[128] and begins to conceive of the state as a persecuting, rather than securitising, force. It is based on this argument that the most important break with the perspectives of historians such as Dick Schoon takes shape, who states conclusively that the clergy's stance was "conservative" and "regalistic", and even profited from the king's supposedly "Josephinist"[129] sentiments.[130] By contrast, the next section will argue that the clergy gradually transformed into non-state actors within the realm of Catholic affairs, maintaining their episcopal structures by actively circumventing state authority.

2.2.1 - Old privileges and new ministerial jurisdictions

In his work *Republiek van rivaliteiten: Nederland sinds 1813*, P. de Rooy has noted the emergence of a nostalgic culture among various faith communities throughout the nineteenth century, characterised by the continuous intensification of theological disputes and the emergence of new churches and schisms.[131] Within the wider Protestant world, certainly, this reality had frustrated William I's vision for a united state church, but the churches had remained more or less deferential to the state that ensured their community's right to religious freedom.[132] As long as believers were prepared to request governmental recognition as a

[126] Johannes van Santen, Henricus Joannes Buul, and Wilhelmus Vet, *Bevelschrift Van De Doorluchtige En Hoogeerwaardige Heeren Den Aartsbisschop Van Utrecht, Den Bisschop Van Haarlem En Den Bisschop Van Deventer, Ter Aankondiging Van Het Jubilé, Verleend Door Onzen Heiligen Vader Paus Leo XII, En Voor De Geheele R.K. Christenheid Algemeen Gemaakt* (Haarlem: De Wed. A. Loosjes Pz., 1826), 6.
[127] Diederick Slijkerman, *Wonderjaren: Gijsbert Karel van Hogendorp, wegbereider van Nederland* (Amsterdam: Prometheus-Bert Bakker, 2014), 26.
[128] Ibid.
[129] The term "Josephinism" refers in this context to the ecclesiastical policies of Joseph II, Holy Roman Emperor (1765-1790), that sought to impose the state's strict control over monasteries, seminaries, church lands, and clerical activity. These reforms also influenced liturgical practice, with many ancient devotions and processions being suppressed as "superstitions", while vast amounts of church property were confiscated by the state to fund the emperor's reorganisation of public welfare.
[130] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 712-713.
[131] de Rooy, *Republiek van Rivaliteiten: Nederland Sinds 1813*, 28-29.
[132] In 1834, a schism within the state-controlled Dutch Reformed Church, also known as the "secession", occurred in response to the perceived pervasiveness of rationalist, liberal tendencies within the Church's theology and practice. The secessionist congregations, and their ministers, were labeled as dissenters by the government of William I, and

separate and new denomination, without laying claim to the goods, prerogatives, incomes, and titles of their former church, their manifestations and gatherings were constitutionally protected.[133] Unlike the vast majority of these Protestant churches, the Old Catholic Church quickly experienced difficulties with this sudden surrender of jurisdiction to the state. Already in 1814, the question of episcopal succession had already created a rift between the clergy, who saw it as their traditional prerogative to elect new (arch)bishops from among the members of the chapters, and governmental authorities such as the Secretary of State for Internal Affairs W.F. Röell, who chastised the clergy for consecrating a new archbishop of Utrecht without governmental permission.[134] This first incident with the restored Dutch state over jurisdiction arguably embodies the defining theme of relations between the clergy and the state throughout the nineteenth century, namely a continuous constitutional dilemma that confused issues of toleration, recognition, and state secularisation. In the previous section, it has been shown how the politicisation of religious tolerance undermined the first main pillar of the clergy's identity as the representatives of true, historical "Dutch" Catholicism. Now, with the advent of a modern state bureaucracy, the notion of simply being "recognised" as one church among many, regulated by the ministries, could not be squared with the clergy's former role as a politically influential body and servant of the state. It is precisely for this reason that Schoon's claim that the clergy's political activities were not led by a desire to return to Republican forms is,[135] at the very least, puzzling.

As Schoon himself notes, the clergy had protested against state intervention during the period of French occupation, when the right to consecrate new bishops had been denied by the state for the first time.[136] The confrontation with Secretary of State Röell may indicate that the clergy associated the return of the House of Orange with a restoration of privileges, and when its continued denial of the state's right to legalise episcopal appointments persisted, these historical rights necessarily became a political matter. The rigidity of the Church's Jansenist beliefs in a sense paralleled its adherence to an antiquated form of political activity, while also displaying a great deal of scepticism with regard to the state's ability to function as a neutral, secular entity. This went far beyond a mistrust of the supposedly "ultramontane" and "Jesuit" ministers who led the Ministry for Roman Catholic Worship,[137] but gradually developed into a public and private hostility towards governmental institutions. This reached an especial climax in the 1840s, when, in the early years of King William II's reign (1840-1849), the clergy began to behave more as non-state actors that sought to undermine the legitimacy of constituted state authority. The events following the death of Bishop Johannes Bon of Haarlem in June 1841 attest to this growing hostility towards state institutions. Following the bishop's death, Archbishop Johannes van Santen (1773-1858) sought to nominate a new candidate, but both the king and the Ministry of Roman Catholic Worship had delayed their decisions on the matter indefinitely.[138]

---

were subjected to punitive policing actions, fines, and imprisonments. This schism constituted a major exception to the generally peaceable disposition towards smaller Protestant confessions. The secessionists were, however, gradually reconciled with the state following the king's abdication in 1840, that put an end to the punitive measures. Yet, in their strict adherence to the theological legacy of the Synod of Dordt of 1618-1619, the secessionists may be seen to represent a comparable relationship between historicity and orthodoxy.

[133] Rasker, *De Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk Vanaf 1795*, 67.

[134] Neale, *A History of the So-Called Jansenist Church of Holland*, 349.

[135] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 713.

[136] Ibid, 92-93.

[137] Ibid, 96, 124-126.

[138] The reason for this delay is unclear. In the older histories of the Church of Utrecht by J.M. Neale and C.B. Moss, the assessment of the government's position is rather unsympathetic. Both historians express the view that by delaying approval, the government believed the separate episcopal succession would simply "die out", resolving the

Schoon makes careful note of the clergy's use of personal political relationships, cultivated in particular by Archbishop van Santen, with influential figures such as the lawyer and diplomat Baron Johan Karel van Goltstein (1794-1872), at that moment an independent politician in the House of Representatives.[139] According to Schoon, these relationships were aimed at facilitating both ministerial and royal approval for a new consecration,[140] which the parliamentary and ministerial connections of supportive individual parlementarians such as van Goltstein could potentially realise. In many ways, this strategy strongly resembles the oligarchic political manoeuverings enacted by the clergy during the 1730s, when specific regents could be made into political allies to ensure a smooth transition of power at the consecration of new (arch)bishops. However, the roles of the ministerial structures - and the parliamentary networks that surrounded them - that were to ensure the state's regulation of church life throughout the country, were not those of the regents of the old Republic. Despite the clergy's impressive reconstruction of the political networks that had been disrupted under French rule, these remained informal in nature, within a state system where the old aristocratic tendencies were now balanced out by democratic and monarchical checks and balances.[141] Either disregarding this reality, or as Schoon puts it, having a great deal of confidence in the support of the Old Catholic Chapter of Haarlem and the influence of van Goltstein,[142] Archbishop van Santen chose to circumvent government procedure, and in November of 1842, consecrated Henricus Johannes van Buul as the new bishop of Haarlem. Once again, it is important to turn to the clergy's internal correspondence to construct a more accurate image of their intentions. An internal circular letter dating to 1841 from Archbishop van Santen to the clergy of Haarlem appears to support the notion that any sentiments of constitutional legality or accountability did not play a role in the consecration process, as the following two questions from van Santen to the clergy indicate:

"*Or should I choose and consecrate a Bishop of Haarlem in silence, without informing either the King or the Pope?*"[143]

"*Or should I, notwithstanding the royal order to wait with the proceedings, endeavour to push through,* (with the consecration) *as if governmental procedure did not exist?*"[144]

These remarks cast doubt on the "regalistic" aspect of the clergy's political outlook emphasied by Schoon,[145] not least since the consecration had displeased the king personally, and William II desired sincerely to remain a "friend to all his subjects," not endeavouring to choose sides in such disputes in the

schism by itself. It is important to note that these are highly speculative assessments that, in spite of each author's contribution to the historiographical tradition, are characteristic of an older, confessionally-oriented polemical style. There are no known sources that suggest that any governmental body harbored such intentions. For the perspectives of Neale and Moss, see Neale, *A History of the So-Called Jansenist Church of Holland*, 365-366, and Moss, *The Old Catholic Movement*, 166.

[139] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 134.

[140] Ibid, 135.

[141] Slijkerman, *Wonderjaren*, 7.

[142] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 135.

[143] Beantwoording van drie vragen door den HoogEew: Heer J. van Santen, Aartsbisschop van Utrecht voorgesteld aan syn Hoogw. Kapittel en aan de Geestelijken van het Haarlemsch Bisdom, 1841, 86-1, 1.08., 296, Herderlijke brieven, circulaires en bevelschrift aan de geestelijkheid en gelovigen, 1826-1847. Minuten en gedrukte expedities, Archieven van de aartsbisschoppen van Utrecht, 1723-1937, Het Utrechts Archief, Utrecht.

[144] Ibid.

[145] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 177-179.

spirit of a more modern kingship.[146] In the same letter, it is also apparent that a great deal of suspicion was directed towards the state itself, whose delay was interpreted as a ploy by which the "eventual downfall" of the Church could be achieved.[147] This claim is often reiterated by more apologetic historians such as J.M. Neale and C.B. Moss, but in reality, the negative response from the state was borne out of the consecration's unconstitutional status. Beforehand, the clergy had even been sternly advised by the director-general of the Ministry for Roman Catholic worship not to proceed with van Buul's election. The meaning behind the government's ultimate rejection of van Buul's consecration should, from a historiographical point of view, not be reduced to "Jesuitical" influences within the ministries, as the defenders of the Old Catholic tradition have often asserted. Rather, this confrontation between the government and the clergy should be seen as an application of the 1814 constitution's *legaliteitsbeginsel* or "principle of legality" to the disorganised and disrupted structure of religious life in a post-revolutionary cultural context. This principle, which would be retained and strengthened in all subsequent constitutions, sought to eliminate the jurisdictional conflicts between state institutions that so debilitated political transperancy during the *ancien regime*,[148] when appointments of any kind were often more the product of the regents' oligarchic control over state organs, and oftentimes the sale thereof, than of notions of universal legality.[149]

The political movements and internal considerations of the clergy reflect their affinity for this older system, a system that could not be sustained within a state where, as the architect of the 1814 constitution Gijsbert Karel van Hogendorp had established, "*no patents, no rights, no practices would be legitimate, unless founded on the Constitution and the laws, or derived thereof*".[150] Since, as van Bilsen notes, the constitutions of 1814 and 1815 made no mention of a bishop of Haarlem, and William I's recognition of the bishops of Utrecht, Haarlem, and Deventer in 1825 only applied to the prelates who at that time were fulfilling these offices,[151] the government's delay in the matter can be more easily understood. Even the more outspoken, apologetic historians such as Neale, whose anti-papal sentiments can be easily discerned in his history of the Old Catholic movement, recognised that, despite the (privileged) toleration afforded to the clergy in the past, the prelates in no way ever formally possessed the titular sees they now laid claim to.[152] In the rare instances throughout the first half of the nineteenth century where the clergy are seeen to defend the government's right to interfere in ecclesiastical affairs, these exhortations express a nationalist sentiment that did not revolve around the ideal of a national Christian community, but one that sought to defend the political gains made under the *ancien regime* by interpreting these as inalienable historic liberties. Such was the case for the monarch's diplomatically precarious right of *ius placiti*, during the reign of William I in particular, whereby the king inherited from the former regent classes the right to approve or withhold any form of papal decree or appointment before its official implementation. This privilege, shown in Chapter I to have been championed by the clergy and their Archbishop Barchman Wuytiers since the late 1720s, was nearly a century later still upheld in episcopal edicts as a force by which the "sanctity" of the clergy's "national rights and privileges" could be protected.[153] By the onset of

[146] Jeroen van Zanten, *Koning Willem II: 1792-1849* (Amsterdam: Boom, 2013), 405.
[147] See footnote 147.
[148] Diederick Slijkerman, *Visionair conservatisme: Gijsbert Karel van Hogendorp (1762-1834)* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2020), 18.
[149] Williams, *The Ancient Regime in Europe: Government and Society in the Major States, 1648-1789*, 39-54.
[150] Slijkerman, *Wonderjaren*, 195.
[151] van Bilsen, *Het Schisma van Utrecht*, 148.
[152] Neale, *A History of the So-Called Jansenist Church of Holland*, 350.
[153] van Santen, Buul, and Vet, *Bevelschrift*, 6.

William II's reign in 1840, these remnants of Republican intolerance became increasingly unpopular within government circles, where the objective to reach a more stable settlement with the papacy, and finally implement the concordat of 1827, corresponded with the desire to eliminate completely the importance of confessional differences in political life.[154] In many respects, the concordat contributed very little to the achievement of religious peace, precisely because the government's maintenance of the *ius placiti* privilege was resented by the Roman Catholic majority, who disapproved of governmental interference in episcopal elections.[155] However, liberal sentiments against such forms of governmental regulation were still new and untested, but their gradual application to the state apparatus throughout the 1840s ensured that the clergy's system of personal patronage experienced a parallel process of collapse, as the letters of royal admonition received from William II, not to mention the government's refusal to recognise van Buul as bishop,[156] should be seen to indicate. By contrast, the consecration controversy initiated by Archbishop van Santen, which sough to make use of the aristocratic tendencies of parliamentary politics prior to 1848, in which forceful personalities and personal networks could still represent some sort of informal political influence outside the realm of ministerial control,[157] represented a fundamental rejection of the constitutional balance between monarchical, aristocratic, and democratic tendencies that were to regulate Dutch society after 1814.[158] By investing in these older modes of political preservation, the clergy sought, in effect, to prevent the complete realisation of the religious freedom desired by William II and his government, and the circumvention of constitutional procedure in van Buul's consecration was, arguably, the practical application of this faith in a more decentralised aristocratic power base. This contradiction in parliamentary procedure was readily observed by J.B. van Son (1804-1875), the temporary minister for Roman Catholic worship in 1845, who stated that it would be highly irregular to "grant to an unrecognised faith community of 5000 members the rights denied to 110000 Roman Catholics," and that it was not the government's prerogative to act as an intermediary between Rome and the Church of Utrecht.[159]

Yet in the Dutch Jansenist tradition, an exclusivist power base was seen as an extension of the authority of locally elected bishops and clerical power, a clear inheritance from the Gallican influences that had become entrenched in the Dutch Mission during the first half of the eighteenth century.[160] Additionally, the correspondence between Archbishop van Santen and the clergy of the Chapter of Haarlem demonstrate that when confronted with the prospect of governmental rejection, the clergy felt confident enough in their informal parliamentary networks and the legitimacy of their historical rights to function as non-state actors against the will of both the ministries charged with Catholic affairs, and the monarch. While it is certainly conceivable that the clergy sought to portray the monarch as a traditional "protector",[161] in keeping with the paternalistic image of kingship constructed by William I, the matter of van Buul's consecration certainly indicates that there were clear limitations to the supposedly "regalistic" attitude of the clergy, when its privileges appeared threatened by the introduction of secular thought within the state apparatus. It is, therefore, important to see the behaviour of the clergy as not only

[154] van Zanten, *Koning Willem II: 1792-1849*, 402.
[155] Dik van der Meulen, *Koning Willem III: 1817-1890* (Amsterdam: Boom, 2014), 268.
[156] van Bilsen, *Het Schisma van Utrecht*, 148-149.
[157] de Rooy, *Republiek van Rivaliteiten: Nederland Sinds 1813*, 38.
[158] Slijkerman, *Wonderjaren*, 203.
[159] H. Loos, *De Regering En De Klerezy: Een woord over de jongste beraadslagingen der tweede kamer betreffende de zaken der oud-bisschoppelijke klerezy* (Amsterdam, Gebroeders Diederichs, 1845), 31-35.
[160] Spiertz, "Anti-jansenisme en jansenisme in de Nederlanden in de achttiende en negentiende eeuw," 239-244.
[161] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 178.

"conservative", in the broad sense of the term as Schoon describes it,[162] but as the expression of a religious identity that embraced a fundamentally undemocratic, historicised form of religious freedom. As the next section will argue, this attitude towards the secularisation of political culture presented significant problems for the Old Catholic world's ability to integrate into an emerging "national" cultural feeling that aimed to transcend the confessional divisions in Dutch society.

2.2.2 - Undemocratic scepticism or competing nationalist ideals?

The previous section has argued for a direct correlation between the gradual secularisation of the state, and the intensification of anti-state activities by the Old Catholic hierarchy. The retention of privileges and historical rights, however, not only contained a challenge to the direct temporal authority of the state at the highest level of government jurisdiction, pertaining to the state's constitutional prerogative to ensure the wellbeing of all existing church communities, but arguably formed an alternative, religious interpretation of the distribtion of sovereign power in the Dutch nation. Skepticism towards democratic institutions therefore, also resulted from an antiquated ideal of the national community, the nature of kingship, and the role of the state itself as a political actor: essentially, a centralised, secular and liberal formulation of national culture in opposition to a theological and political memory culture centered around the "community of common place, blood, and custom".[163] It is from this perspective, as this section argues, that the clergy's negative response to emancipating reforms of William II and his government can be understood as part of a wider cultural conflict that emerged from the polarising responses from both Protestant and Roman Catholic circles when confronted with attempts at secularisation. Consequently, this section will consider the role of the clergy in a wider cultural sense, as representatives of an older tradition of Dutch constitutionalism, steeped in a historical image of the nation itself as the protector of a "particular sovereign and independent Dutch order against those who would impose foreign constitutional models",[164] in the tradition of Republican thinkers such as Hugo Grotius (1583-1645). Consequently, the clergy's transformation into non-state actors throughout the nineteenth century, and certainly up to 1848, should be seen as a direct consequence of the liberal movement away from these exclusivist perceptions of nationhood and national belonging, and its embrace of the ideal of universal citizenship as the natural outcome of greater state centralisation.[165] In the historiographical tradition of the Old Catholic movement, the lack of affinity with universal, nationalist aspirations appears not only to have concerned the place of Christianity within the new state, but also the desire to create a unified nation state in line with the French-Napoleonic model.[166] Indeed, the inclusion of the Southern Netherlands into the new kingdom in 1814 had been accomplished as a result of this same emphasis on certain liberal principles that were to facilitate the creation of a nation state, such as freedom of the press and the right of petition,[167] It was the proliferation of a new tradition of constitutionalism that rejected provincial and regional idiosyncrasies of the Republic as debilitating and inconsistent factors,[168] the

[162] Ibid.
[163] Ethan Alexander-Davey. "Nationhood and Constitutionalism in the Dutch Republic: An Examination of Grotius' 'Antiquity of the Batavian Republic.'" *History of Political Thought* 38, no. 1 (2017): 64–91, 68.
[164] Ibid, 70.
[165] Slijkerman, *Wonderjaren*, 215.
[166] Bart van Poelgeest, "Tussen oud en nieuw: Het ontwerpen van de grondwet als een rechtshistorisch mozaïek.," in *Een Nieuwe Staat. Het begin van het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden*., ed. Ido de Haan, Paul den Hoed en Henk te Velde (Prometheus-Bert Bakker, 2013), 67-75, 68.
[167] Ibid, 72.
[168] Ibid, 68.

separation of church and state and the generally pragmatic acceptance of Roman Catholicism were, therefore, seen as part of the foundation of the "Greater Netherlands".[169]
However, as historians such as de Rooy note, regional and religious particularisms remained rife beneath the surface of a greater "fatherland" ideal,[170] and the Old Catholic clergy's resistance towards state centralisation in the religious-cultural sphere may therefore be interpreted as a rejection of nationalist optimism. For instance, the addition of the Southern, overwhelmingly Roman Catholic provinces to the original territory of the Republic represented a significant danger for the clergy up until 1830. The already extant episcopal structures in the South, not to mention the strongly ultramontane character of the Southern clergy,[171] had necessitated the opening of new negotiations with the Holy See, leading to provisions for the creation of new bishoprics in the concordat of 1827 in Brugge, Amsterdam, and Den Bosch. While the concordat was never fully implemented, and only ratified in 1841, the clergy considered their presence as illegitimate, continuing to claim, as they had in the previous century, that their own (arch)bishops were the true successors to the episcopal hierarchy as it had existed before the onset of the Reformation.[172] Once more, the clergy's adherence to this form of inflexible memory politics hindered their ability to make use of a potentially advantageous political situation. William I had been eager to regulate all Catholic institutions, in the broadest sense of the term, by ensuring their loyalty to the state, and in the 1820s there existed a possibility for the Old Catholic hierarchy to contribute to these new constructions. In 1826, the Minister of Justice C.F. van Maanen (1769-1846) had already proposed the incorporation of the clergy and their "favourable" diocesan structures into a "national" Catholic Church,[173] as he saw the terms of the concordat as being too "lenient" towards Rome.[174] This was a clear sign, as Schoon remarks, of the government's initial willingness to seek out a place for the Old Catholic Church within the broader ecclesiastical framework of the country,[175] and more importantly, incorporate it into the king's ideal of a unified Christian national community.
When, in 1827, Bishop Johannes Bon of Haarlem (1774-1841) had, on the basis of van Maanen's outline for an Old Catholic inclusion into a new state-sponsored hierarchy, accepted the government's invitation for further negotiation,[176] this elicited a fiercely hostile reaction from the other prelates and the rest of the clergy. Bon had been singled out as a candidate for the new episcopal seat in Brugge by the Dutch ambassador to the Holy See, as he was uniquely predisposed towards a declaration that would "condemn in particular the errors known by the term Jansenism and Quesnellism", and request from Pope Leo XII the suspension of imposed upon him as a result of "my election as bishop and consecration, as well as the exercise of episcopal authority".[177] From a historiographical point of view, Bon's willingness to contribute to the creation of a unified Catholic episcopal structure arguably represented a break with the clergy's

[169] Slijkerman, *Wonderjaren*, 190.
[170] de Rooy, *Republiek van Rivaliteiten: Nederland Sinds 1813*, 22.
[171] Hamans, *Geschiedenis van de Katholieke Kerk in Nederland*, 415.
[172] This claim revolved around the defunct ecclesiastical reorganisation of the Dutch Church that had taken shape as a result of the papal bull *Super universas* (1559), issued by Pope Paul IV (reigned 1555-1559), whereby the bishopric of Utrecht was elevated to a metropolitan archdiocese, and new suffragan bishoprics in the Northern Netherlands were established in Groningen, Haarlem, Deventer, Middelburg, and Leeuwarden.
[173] Koch, *Koning Willem I: 1772-1843*, 423.
[174] Emo Bos, "Soevereiniteit en Religie: Godsdienstvrijheid onder de eerste Oranjevorsten" (Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam, 2009), 240.
[175] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 95.
[176] Dick J. Schoon, "Oude en nieuwe bisschoppen. De 'oud-katholieken' en 1853," in *Staf En Storm: Het herstel van de bisschoppelijke hiërarchie in Nederland in 1853 : actie en reactie*, ed. Jurjen Vis and Wim Janse (Uitgeverij Verloren, 2002), 172.
[177] Ibid.

longstanding fixation on complete national independence, corresponding far more with the unitarian ambitions of William I's government. The reactions of Bon's colleagues, however, indicated no inclination towards reaching a settlement with Rome that would allow for their integration into any sort of new national framework. Archbishop van Santen considered the whole proposal "an ultramontane deception", one cleric even accused Bon of "Jesuitical behaviour".[178] Most importantly, it was widely felt that Bon's attempted *rapprochement* with the Dutch state and the papacy nullified "the struggle of a century and a half" that had been waged by the clergy,[179] in defense of "the country's special rights and Ecclesiastical freedoms".[180] Again, there exists a historiographical tendency among both Old and Roman Catholic historians to locate the failure of these overtures to the specific theological dispute over Bull and Formulary, and consider the influence of Jansenism as purely doctrinal. Yet, as the previous chapter has demonstrated, the Dutch Jansenist tradition, much like its French counterpart in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, had acquired a distinctly political character.

In its defense of old medieval privileges, such as the local independence and equality of all bishops, a decentralised administration of the Church, and a protectionistic outlook on local jurisdiction,[181] this study argues that this also represented a clash between universal nationalist ideals and the clergy's desire to maintain these decentralising "liberties of the oligarchy", that had historically represented an older definition of the Dutch national identity.[182] In this respect, the clergy's rejection of Bon's overtures to become part and parcel of a new ecclesiastical organisation, therefore, can be interpreted as a loyalty to an older conceptualisation of nationhood that rejected foreign interference, supranational organisation, and any form of "democratic singularity".[183] The Old Catholic historiographical tradition lends further credence to this argument in its description of the clergy's reaction to the outbreak of the Belgian Revolution in 1830. Since the secession of the kingdom's Southern provinces derailed both the concordat and the projected foundation of the new bishoprics, the clergy considered the defeat of Dutch forces as a direct "intervention of God" in their favour, for "sometimes God needed to topple a kingdom to save the elect".[184] It was an attitude that, in light of the nationwide trauma that was experienced in the aftermath of the Revolution,[185] suggests that the clergy's gradual development into non-state actors can also be imputed to their inability to assimilate into a shared sense of national feeling, regardless of confessional loyalties. The perspectives on the Belgian Revolution are, in this sense, all the more remarkable, considering the sustained loyalty of Roman Catholics in the Northern provinces throughout the conflict, despite the widespread suspicion levelled against their faith communities as being potentially sympathetic towards the Belgian cause.[186] As a result, it is possible to speak of the Old Catholic Church's gradual social and political isolation as the outcome of a wider cultural confrontation between differing ideals of national belonging and citizenship: an exclusivist, decentralised and privilege-oriented form on the one hand, defined by "ancestral institutions",[187] and the gradual normalisation of democratising unity by breaking

[178] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 116,120.
[179] Schoon, "Oude en nieuwe bisschoppen. De 'oud-katholieken' en 1853," 172.
[180] van Santen, Buul, and Vet, *Bevelschrift*, 6.
[181] van Bilsen, *Het Schisma van Utrecht*, 21-22.
[182] Hans Kohn, "Nationalism in the Low Countries." *The Review of Politics* 19, no. 2 (1957): 159.
[183] de Rooy, *Republiek van Rivaliteiten: Nederland Sinds 1813*, 21.
[184] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 122-123.
[185] J.C.H. Blom, "Nederland sinds 1830," in *Geschiedenis Van De Nederlanden*, ed. J.C.H. Blom and E. Lamberts, Derde, herziene druk (Baarn: HB uitgevers, 2001), 314-315.
[186] Ibid.
[187] Alexander-Davey. "Nationhood and Constitutionalism in the Dutch Republic: An Examination of Grotius' 'Antiquity of the Batavian Republic,'" 68.

with the republican patrician aspect of Dutch political thought.[188] The argument that the clergy were "regalistic" in their political loyalties, therefore, is not only dispelled by the ease with which they sought to circumvent royal authority in their episcopal activities, but also by the role played by the House of Orange itself in creating a form of popular royalism that relied on a unifying patriotic history,[189] refuting the eighteenth century "Batavian" myth of decentralised sovereign power structures that stemmed from antiquity and the middle ages.[190] The Dutch Jansenist tradition, therefore, deserves to be seen as a reciprocal union of political norms and theological convictions that made the refutation of democratic change into a historical, moral obligation. The strict communal discipline this required, as the following chapter will demonstrate, prepared the ground for the Old Catholic world's cultural isolation in the Netherlands.

2.2.3 - Conclusion

In this chapter, a number of important historiographical points have been addressed with regard to the clergy's stance prior to the complete separation of church and state in 1848. This study has contested the argument put forward by Dick Schoon, that the Old Catholic hierarchy did not seek a return to the political and cultural conditions of the Republic and the *ancien regime*,[191] by emphasising the political ramifications of their Jansenist convictions which, as the previous chapter has shown, had gained a clear political usage in the eighteenth century. It is certainly true, as Schoon notes, that the gradual separation of church and state disrupted this sense of tradition,[192] but, as Chapter 2 has demonstrated, this separation was in itself not necessarily an obstacle to the creation of a new relationship with the state. However, the clergy's rigid adherence to a number of undemocratic political and cultural tendencies from the Republican period resulted in their rejection of any governmental attempt to transform their hierarchy into a potential "state church" or integrate them into a reunified Catholic episcopal structure. These loyalties expressed themselves in various forms, ranging from open confessional conflict with the Dutch Mission and an unwillingness to collaborate with Protestant institutions to the circumvention of governmental procedure in the organisation of the Church's hierarchy. In many respects this was a self-inflicted wound, since church politics of William I certainly welcomed any opportunity to fuse national feeling with religious observance, especially in relation to the Southern provinces, where the king sought to realise his "*union intime et complète*".[193] Increasingly, the clergy's resistance to these policies, which cast serious doubt on the "regalistic" stance attributed to their political activity by historians such as Schoon, manifested itself in a growth of unconstitutional actions that, as the private correspondence between Old Catholics clerics has indicated, reflected their lack of faith in the legitimacy of the monarch and the government at large to regulate ecclesiastical affairs. This resistance, which can be traced back to the restoration of the House of Orange in 1813-1814, not only made accusations of "sectarianism" appear more probable, but likely facilitated the political ascendancy of the clergy's Roman Catholic rivals - prelates such as de Méan de Beaurieux - who were prepared to concede certain prerogatives to the state to cultivate favourable ties with the ministerial circles around the monarch.

---

[188] Kohn, "Nationalism in the Low Countries," 160.
[189] Ibid.
[190] L.H.M. Wessels, "'Verandering Der Tyden': Een Historiografische Studie Over De Nederlandse Geschiedschrijver En Publicist Jan Wagenaar (1709-1773)" (PhD dissertation, Radboud Universiteit, 1996), 104.
[191] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 713.
[192] Ibid, 269.
[193] Roegiers and van Sas, "Revolutie in Noord En Zuid (1780-1830)," 250.

These trends were also accompanied by a more fundamental confrontation between differing ideals of nationhood between the Old Catholic Church and the state, reflecting the great cultural fragmentation between provinces, churches, cities, and institutions throughout the United Netherlands. As this chapter has shown, this was not merely reduced to a specific confessional objection to the reassertion of a Roman Catholic societal presence, but to changes in the state apparatus that served to disqualify the clergy's former political privileges. The interrelated networks of urban magnates, who enjoyed an informal "aristocracy of office",[194] had been swept aside by a new constitutional spirit that increasingly embraced a culture of transparent governance and universal virtues of citizenship that transcended social and confessional boundaries.[195] The clergy had, in many ways, by virtue of class and political acumen, been the product of the former system, and like any form of social aristocracy, resented deeply the dismantling of its power base. The feelings of "degradation" described by Schoon,[196] therefore, carried with them significant social, as well as purely doctrinal, implications for the clergy's attitude towards the state throughout the nineteenth century. Yet, since the Dutch Jansenist tradition entailed such strong episcopalian principles, as in France,[197] emphasised the role of the state as the protector of ancient rights and privileges, any sort of reintegration quickly became tantamount to betrayal, as the misadventures of Bishop Bon of Haarlem in the late 1820s made abundantly clear. From these confrontations, it can be observed that historical memory cultures, such as that represented by the clergy, should not be considered in purely theological or cultural terms, but as political continuities that were capable of destabilising democratising processes.

[194] Treasure, *The Making of Modern Europe, 1648-1780*, 475.
[195] Slijkerman, *Wonderjaren*, 205, 215.
[196] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 179.
[197] For a more extensive overview of the interaction between the Gallican and Jansenist schools of thought in France, particularly during the early disputes between the papacy and the French Church in the seventeenth century, see *Aimé Richardt, Le Jansénisme: de Jansénius à la mort de Louis XIV (François-Xavier de Guibert/OEIL, 2002)*, 11-16.

Chapter III
Restoration, Internationalisation, and the Relationship with Liberal Democracy 1848-1870

3.1 - The Limits of Cultural Participation

The introduction of complete religious freedom in the Constitution of 1848, which exempted the state from any sort of direct interference in religious affairs, had removed the last juridical barriers for the restoration of the Roman Catholic episcopal hierarchy in the Northern Netherlands.[198] In the previous chapter, the clergy's adherence to a more introspective, historicised nationalism has been presented as a major barrier to the Church's integration into a new state apparatus. In this chapter, another key aspect of the Old Catholic historiographical tradition will be assessed, namely the notion that, partially as a result of the reforms of 1848, the state and the papacy were responsible for the "isolated" position of the Old Catholic Church in Dutch society.[199] It is an argument that presents an interesting dilemma: could the implementation of complete religious freedom, including the right to an autonomous administration, result in an undemocratic example of societal exclusion? This chapter will put forward an alternative argument, namely that the clergy's societal estrangement should not be attributed to any sort of hostility from the state, as Schoon's argument implies, but rather to their inability to make effective use of popular tendencies, media, and influential symbology, or the political strategies associated with a "direct democracy" that were capable of creating extra-parliamentarian political bulwarks.[200] It is telling that, in works such as that of Schoon and van Kleef, little mention is made of the widespread anti-Catholic sentiments that permeated through Dutch society in the 1850s, or any reference to popular manifestations such as the *Aprilbeweging* of 1853.[201] By extension, it is argued that, in the climate of a new mode of mass political movements, exclusivist religious memory cultures such as that of the Old Catholic Church were unable to use democratic institutions to claim a place in a new "pillarised" society. Consequently, it will be argued that this unfamiliarity with new modes of cultural discourse, that resulted in the normalisation of a self-evident feeling of national unity that could be reconciled with strong differences in faith or political persuasion,[202] motivated the clergy to embrace an internationally-oriented move towards theological innovation that would give the Old Catholic movement a new sense of cultural legitimacy.

3.1.1 - Old Catholic culture and the "April Movement" of 1853-1854

When, in early March of 1853, Pope Pius IX signalled the restoration of a Roman Catholic episcopal hierarchy in the Dutch Mission following successful negotiations with the First Thorbecke cabinet, what historians have described as a "tidal wave" of Protestant opposition took hold of the Dutch political

[198] Blom, "Nederland sinds 1830," 323.
[199] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 271.
[200] For a further analysis of the growth of "mass politics" and political parties in the Dutch democratic system throughout the second half of the nineteenth century, see Henk te Velde, "Cannadine, Twenty Years on.: Monarchy and Political Culture in Nineteenth-Century Britain and the Netherlands." In *Mystifying the Monarch: Studies on Discourse, Power, and History*, edited by Jeroen Deploige and Gita Deneckere, 193–204. Amsterdam University Press, 2006.
[201] On the 4th of March, 1853, Pope Pius IX (1792-1878) promulgated the bull *Ex qua die arcano*, reestablishing the Roman Catholic episcopal hierarchy in the Netherlands. It decreed the reorganisation of one archdiocese (in Utrecht) and four suffragan dioceses (Haarlem, 's-Hertogenbosch, Breda, and Roermond). The Dutch Mission and the supporting apostolic vicariates that had formed its administrative core were disbanded in the same year.
[202] Blom, "Nederland sinds 1830," 337.

landscape.[203] If the symbology of the hundreds of pamphlets, articles, poems, and broadsides produced by the *Aprilbeweging* are taken at face value, with their references to the many historical episodes recounting the struggle against Roman "tyranny" during the Eighty Years' War, the Inquisition, and the historical role of the House of Orange as the nation's protector against "popish" practices,[204] a symmetry with the Old Catholic tendency towards historisation is conceiveable. Yet, the question of why the clergy did not participate actively in the April Movement remains largely unaddressed in the Old Catholic historiographical canon. In his article *Oude en nieuwe bisschoppen. De "oud-katholieken" en 1853*, Dick Schoon appears to suggest that internal conflicts within the Old Catholic seminary at Amersfoort prevented the clergy from delivering a more vigorous protest against the new hierarchy.[205] Without denying the influence of the internal disputes that had periodically divided the clergy since at least 1807,[206] this section will argue that the more pressing reason for the lack of Old Catholic participation in the uproar of 1853 can be attributed to the clergy's lack of engagement in public discourse at this crucial interval. Differences in the literary cultures between the Old Catholics and the major Protestant and Roman Catholic cultural enclaves may provide an indication as to why the clergy's media presence was so sparse. The numerous publications that the April Movement inspired espoused a Protestant nationalism that used popular historical images that evidently resonated with the collective cultural imagination of Dutch society: anonymous songs such as "*Vivat de Geus!*" proclaimed the national struggle against "Rome's bonds", referring to the famous "Water Beggars" of the Dutch Revolt.[207] In opposition, and perhaps most importantly, the Roman Catholic world had experienced something of a "cultural awakening" since the 1840s, and a great number of Catholic publications and newspapers were capable of forming a cultural counterweight.[208]

For Roman Catholics, this development represented the democratic expression of the hard-won liberties of 1848, and, as the Dutch historian Gerlof D. Homan notes, the ability to make pragmatic use of the otherwise unorthodox alliance with liberal political currents.[209] Arguably, the April Movement simply represented the clash between a reviving Christianity in both Protestant and Roman Catholic circles, and political modernisation,[210] that expressed itself on the stage of a freer press culture. By contrast, the participation of the Old Catholic clergy, and indeed laypersons, was severely limited. Demographic observations from historians such as Moss depict a small community of no more than 5,000 members around 1853, with apparently little interaction with the wider world outside their own ranks.[211] The publications produced by the clergy in 1853-1854 are indicative of this cloistered temperament. Pastors such as Henricus Loos composed extensive historical tracts on the origins of the Church, such as the *Schets eener geschiedenis van de Roomsch-Katholijke oud-bisschoppelijke klerezy in Nederland* (1853),

[203] Piet de Rooy, "Inleiding," in *Staf En Storm: Het herstel van de bisschoppelijke hiërarchie in Nederland in 1853 : actie en reactie*, ed. Jurjen Vis and Wim Janse (Uitgeverij Verloren, 2002), 11.
[204] J.G. Kikkert, *Koning Willem III 1817-1890: Biografie* (Het Spectrum, 1990), 215.
[205] Schoon, "Oude en nieuwe bisschoppen. De 'oud-katholieken' en 1853," 178.
[206] In 1807, the pastor Martinus Glasbergen (1777-1837) initiated the short-lived "Ireneist" movement within the Old Catholic clergy, seeking to pursue a path of definitive reconciliation with Rome. This movement, which was essentially sidelined by the Chapters and Archbishop van Santen, was particularly popular among the younger generation of clergymen in the Old Catholic diocese of Haarlem.
[207] van der Meulen, *Koning Willem III: 1817-1890*, 272.
[208] Gerlof D. Homan, "Catholic Emancipation in the Netherlands." *The Catholic Historical Review* 52, no. 2 (1966): 203-204.
[209] Ibid, 204.
[210] James W. Skillen, and Stanley W. Carlson-Thies, "Religion and Political Development in Nineteenth-Century Holland." *Publius* 12, no. 3 (1982): 43.
[211] Moss, *The Old Catholic Movement*, 166.

with countless references to old ecclesiastical disputes, such as the deposition of Petrus Codde and the rights of the medieval Chapter of Utrecht, historical episodes that had long since disappeared from popular memory. More fundamentally, it is important that these histories and polemics, such as that between the Old Catholic priest J.H. de Vries and his Roman counterpart H.J. Sonjee,[212] should be seen not only as devotional works, but as political manifestos that were incongruent with the nature of an emerging Christian democracy in the Netherlands. Following the analysis of religious scholars such as James Skillen and Stanley Carlson-Thies, the Dutch "peculiarity" in its Christian democratic tradition was that it did not deny politics as a dimension of religious life, but did clearly separate this from ecclesiastical matters that would have "reduced" political activity to specific theological issues.[213] Works such as those of Pastors Loos and de Vries, as the previous chapter has shown, carried with them real political implications, given the strong historical bond in the Old Catholic imagination between episcopal power and state authority, and therefore went against the grain of this development in Dutch political culture. Consequently, it may be argued that the Old Catholic literary tradition reflected the clergy's inherent objection to the beginnings of the *verzuilde maatschappij*, or "pillarised society", whereby the autonomy of each confession or "pillar" would gradually redefine the very nature of national interest through compromises and parliamentary coalitions,[214] rather than competition. For all its aggressive Protestant nationalism, even the April Movement was beholden to this secular reality within Dutch political culture, and once the political objective of the Movement had been achieved in the fall of the liberal first Thorbecke cabinet, it quickly dissipated after barely a year.[215] Indeed, the objections to the Movement by some Protestant theologians, who described the events of 1853-1854 as a "circus" or a "comedy" of Calvinist agitation,[216] arguably reflect this same shift in the confessional political consciousness taking place in the nineteenth century, where churches no longer represented special interest groups as in the days of the Republic, but increasingly oriented themselves on participating in a "national life" in a parliamentary system.[217]

It is also argued here that the cultural participation of the Old Catholic Church in this new context of mass confessional politics was also hampered by the social structures of its communities. The April Movement, and the Roman Catholic reactions it ellicited, may have been headed by ecclesiasitics, but were backed by large contigents of laypersons that made up the country's religious "subcultures",[218] making use not only of press freedoms but the new right to public manifestation, making their respective traditions of Christian revival coherent with nascent democratic institutions.[219] By contrast, there are no clear signs of any comparable forms of involvement by Old Catholic laypersons in the existing historiography, before and during the April Movement, a conclusion supported by the authorship of the few publications brought out by the community in 1853-1854. All of the pamphlets, books, and petitions that emerged from the Church in response to the *Ex qua die* were produced by clerics, both (arch)bishops and priests alike, their refined

[212] Published in 1854, see, J.H. De Vries and H.J. Sonjee, *De Bisschoppelijke Klerezy Onder De Oude Staats-kerk En Later, of … Tegen De Nieuwe Inlichtingen Van Den Zeer Eerw. Heer H. J. Sonjee* (Arnhem: G.W. van der Wiel, 1854).
[213] Skillen and Carlson-Thies, "Religion and Political Development in Nineteenth-Century Holland," 44.
[214] Hans Knippenberg, "How Pope Pius IX Stimulated 'Pillarization' in the Netherlands," *Historical Life Course Studies* 10 (March 31, 2021): 163.
[215] Kikkert, *Koning Willem III 1817-1890: Biografie*, 219-220.
[216] Ibid, 220.
[217] Skillen and Carlson-Thies, "Religion and Political Development in Nineteenth-Century Holland," 44.
[218] Ibid.
[219] Henry Boelaars, "Catholic Life in Holland." *The Furrow* 3, no. 2 (1952): 60.

historical and theological content being directed at individuals in high government circles, the pope, or Roman Catholic clergymen. Such oligarchic practices may have ensured that any dialogue with the outside world remained in the hands of a clerical elite, but also led to the societal "isolation" of the Church as a whole, making it more challenging to partake as a faith community in any shared feelings of national belonging. The advent of mass media, therefore, tested the ability of faith communities to adapt to new modes of communication, not only with the state, but also with a new public of constituents that were required to attain parliamentary representation. For communities that had long been treated as second-class citizens, such as Roman Catholics, the arrival of a free press could be liberating, but, as in the case of the Old Catholics, could well have functioned as a culturally repressive and isolating social dynamic. This may point to a more paradoxical aspect of the emergence of Christian democracy, where the ability to gain representation suddenly becomes dependent on the ability of a faith community to adapt to new modes of public relations in order to assert its cultural presence. As the next section will show, the clergy approached this question of cultural relevance by cultivating new definitions of ecclesiastical legitimacy.

3.1.2 - The growth of internationalism in the Old Catholic world, 1854-1870

The stance of the clergy in the decades leading up to the restoration of 1853 presents us with the image of a faith community that grappled with its cultural role in Dutch society. While the Law on Religious Communities of 1853 had deigned to "recognise" the titles of the Old Catholic episcopate, these simply coexisted with the restored Roman titles, putting a definitive end to a struggle for episcopal supremacy between two faith communities that had lasted over a century. In this section, it will be argued that, as a result of the clergy's great difficulty with the new pillarised structure of Dutch political and religious life, greater departures from the doctrine of the Catholic tradition were embraced in a more internationalised context to provide the Church with a new sense of cultural direction. The question of the clergy's Catholicity has, in histories such as that of Schoon, been presented as a doctrinal question, in which international "friends" in France, Germany, and Italy supported the clergy's misgivings about the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church.[220] This study does not concern itself with the question of Catholicity in the theological or doctrinal sense of the term, but does argue for a broader, cultural interpretation in which the question of nationality and national feeling is also seen as an aspect of the clergy's conceptualisation of orthodoxy. Indeed, this section will demonstrate that, as the breakdown in relations with the Dutch state accelerated in the 1840s, the significance of these foreign relations for the Church's increased, not only from a theological standpoint, but as an alternative to the otherwise strictly "national" orientation that had dominated the internal culture of the Church previously. If one revisits the clergy's relationship with the emerging Christian democratic, pillarising dynamics of the mid-nineteenth century, this shift towards internationalisation may also be interpreted as an attempt to stimulate revival, given the clergy's isolation from the new domestic facets of Christian political action that existed outside the traditional boundaries of church life in Dutch society.[221]

At the onset of the Schism of Utrecht, contacts with foreign Jansenist groups, predominantly with the French *appelant* movement, played an important role in the national party's initial assertion of independence from the Dutch Mission. By the end of the Napoleonic period, the overall Jansenist tendency in France had, however, splintered into several small sects, who aimed in diverse ways to preserve the legacy of Port-Royal through their refusal to accept the state of the French Chuch as defined

[220] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 184-192.
[221] Skillen and Carlson-Thies, "Religion and Political Development in Nineteenth-Century Holland," 45.

by the Concordat of 1801.[222] Likely as a result of these internal divisions, many of these splinter groups looked to the Old Catholic hierarchy as a legitimate external authority in theological matters, which, given the strong apocalyptic and millenarian tendencies of some of these groups, allowed personalities such as Archbishop van Santen and Bishop van Buul of Haarlem to act as mediators and custodians of a parallel Jansenist orthodoxy. The clergy's correspondence with the so-called *Petite Église* of Lyon, through which the clergy directly influenced the teachings of a group of French Jansenists who had formed their own church, is representative of this foreign involvement.[223] While the relationships between the Old Catholics of the Netherlands and the Jansenist groupings abroad warrants a separate study of its own, it can be concluded that the clergy's intensifying relationship with foreign Catholic dissident movements, however small and obscure, gradually came to represent an alternative public sphere that could provide a sense of belonging outside the boundaries of a newly pillarised Dutch society. Indeed, it may even be appropriate to speak of an "alternative" form of survival in a pillarised society in the case of the Old Catholics, that resulted from the breaking down of the old, nationally-oriented religious paradigms in the 1840s and early 1850s. The introduction of complete religious freedom, as the previous section has argued, required religious communities to adapt quickly to new modes of cultural discourse, primarily through the use of press freedom and the right to association. The clergy grappled with the effects of these unwelcome effects of democratisation, as it did not, unlike other churches in Dutch society, stimulate the creation of religious organisations that could be formed outside the direct boundaries of clerical authority.[224]
By contrast, the reverence with which foreign groups of Catholic dissidents viewed the clergy of Utrecht, as evidenced by translated historical works such as the *Histoire Abregee de L'Eglise Metropolitaine D'Utrecht* (1852), relied on a revived historical appreciation for the shared struggle against the perceived excesses of papal power, embodied by Bull and Formulary. Prior to 1853, it is clear that these contacts did not lead to any sort of theological changes, as the interactions with more "extreme" dissident groups, such as that of Johannes Ronge in 1845,[225] showcase the clergy's strict sense of theological conservatism.[226] Yet, as in the case of the divided French Jansenist groupings, the clergy arguably represented to Catholic dissidents a symbol of historical legitimacy, to which their own movements could adhere in opposition to papal authority. As the Old Catholic historian Wietse van der Velde notes, the expansion of foreign contacts provided new inspiration for the clergy, through which new reforms in liturgy and teaching could be realised.[227] Yet, in the cultural context of pillarisation, the importance of this shift towards Catholic

[222] For a more detailed overview of the various Jansenist offshoots that continued to operate in the aftermath of the French Revolution and into the mid-nineteenth century, see, Jean-Pierre Chantin, *Les Amis De L'Œuvre De La Vérité: Jansénisme, miracles et fin du monde au XIXe siècle* (Presses Universitaires Lyon, 1998).
[223] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 239-245.
[224] Marcel Maussen. "Religious Governance in the Netherlands: Associative Freedoms and Non-Discrimination After 'Pillarization.' The Example of Faith-Based Schools." *Geopolitics, History, and International Relations* 6, no. 2 (2014): 45.
[225] Johannes Ronge (1813-1887) was a Silesian priest who, together with fellow clergymen Jan Czerski (1813-1893), levelled fierce criticism against the perceived abuse of relics, pilgrimages, and the associated plenary indulgences. Collectively, their small congregations were known as the "New Catholics" (also referred to as the "German Catholics"), formed in 1844. The Old Catholic pastor Casparus Johannes Rinkel (1826-1906), later bishop of Haarlem, made note of an appeal made to Archbishop van Santen by a follower of Ronge in 1845, who had requested ordination. This request was not honored. For further details of this contact in Rinkel's chronicle, see, Casparus Johannes Rinkel and Dirk Jan Schoon, *Kroniek Van Gebeurtenissen Betreffende De Oud-katholieken Inzonderheid in Nederland (1845-1894)* (Valkhof Pers, 2006), 3.
[226] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 239-240.
[227] Wietse van der Velde, "De geschiedenis," in *De Oud-Katholieke Kerk Van Nederland. Een Inleiding*, ed. Peter-Ben Smit (Uitgeverij Boekencentrum, 2018), 28.

dissident movements abroad, especially in Germany during the aftermath of the First Vatican Council of 1869-1870, was not purely theological. It arguably represented a gradual, but sweeping paradigm shift from a cloistered, nationally-oriented sense of ecclesiastical independence, to an international outlook in which the clergy wielded authority on the basis of their historical Jansenist-inspired orthodoxy. Especially among the small French congregations who adhered to the *appelant* cause, the "Church of Utrecht" represented a last "remnant" of true believers,[228] enhancing the diplomatic reach of the clergy in structuring opposition to the perceived expansion of papal authority. When considering the mainstream historiographical perspectives on pillarisation as an overall socio-political phenomenon, often characterised as an amalgamation of "comprehensive self-contained worlds",[229] the growth in communication between the Old Catholics of the Netherlands and the dissident movements in other parts of Europe takes on a new meaning as the answer to political isolation experienced at home. For the Old Catholics, then, the associative aspect of pillarisation did not express itself on the stage of national politics, but on the sustained growth of foreign contacts that allowed for a broader, more oecumenical approach to religious identity. Consequently, it can be argued that the image of a completely "isolated" Old Catholic faith community requires nuancing, but rather represents a largely successful attempt to transition to an alternative system of "international" pillars, where the Old Catholic Church made up a senior segment of a whole league of foreign churches.

3.1.3 - Conclusion

The second half of the nineteenth century not only witnessed a definitive break between the Old Catholic Church and the Dutch political establishment, but also an estrangement from cultural life, at a crucial interval when the widespread resentment against the rise of "ultramontanism" should have revived the public presence of the clergy. This chapter has demonstrated that this was not, as Schoon has argued, simply the outcome of the "withdrawal" of government protection or unilateral decision-making on the part of the papacy,[230] but of a more fundamental rupture with new ideas of nationhood, political participation, and democratisation. In relation to what Chapter II has demonstrated, the second half of the nineteenth century witnessed a continued rejection of any sense of national Christian feeling in cultural and political life. This chapter has shown that the "isolation" this created was also linked with the social hierarchies that regulated the Old Catholic world, in a sense mirroring their political creed, with a small, oligarchic clerical leadership that remained intensely occupied with increasingly obscure doctrinal disputes, while the strength of lay participation among other faith communities was contributing to a general Christian revival in the new parliamentary mould of 1848. New freedoms, new forms of political participation, then, were capable of creating a "pillarised" mode of religious coexistence, yet, in the case of the Old Catholics, created a form of competitive mass politics and media (as the events of 1853-1854 have shown) that were also capable of excluding smaller confessions from societal involvement. While a separate study would be required to more accurately assess the further relationship between the Old Catholic Church and pillarisation, this chapter has been able to conclude that innovations in political discourse, such as press freedom or the right to association, were left untouched by the clergy and their followers.

---

[228] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 271.
[229] Staf Hellemans, "Pillarization ('Verzuiling'). On Organized 'Self-Contained Worlds' in the Modern World." *The American Sociologist* 51, no. 2 (2020): 126.
[230] Schoon, "Oude en nieuwe bisschoppen. De 'oud-katholieken' en 1853," 187.

Under these circumstances, the clergy's strong national orientation was gradually superseded by an increasingly internationalist attitude towards questions of Catholic orthodoxy and opposition to papal authority. Initially, these contacts were derived from other hotbeds of Jansenist resistance, primarily in France, who looked upon the clergy as the leading historical heirs of the *appelant* cause. Based on this legitimacy, which could no longer be applied to a concomitant domestic political reality in the Netherlands, the clergy increasingly functioned as a beacon for Catholic dissent movements in other parts of Europe, such as Germany and Italy. The Old Catholic Church's participation in a pillarised society, then, certainly challenges the historiographical image of a pillarised society as being entirely closed, with "unyielding borders" between confessions,[231] but also indicates that for smaller faith communities, foreign contacts represented a crucial alternative when dealing with otherwise inaccessible Protestant and Roman Catholic cultural enclaves. This, perhaps diasporic, quality of Catholic dissent in the second half of the nineteenth century meant that, in contrast to the various revivalist Protestant churches throughout Europe, there were no large-scale attempts at utopic emigration. Rather, through multilateral agreements with other churches, embodied by multilateral agreements such as the *Declaration of Utrecht* in 1889, the formerly "nationalistic" character of the Old Catholic identity arguably became largely symbolic, rather than political, in its meaning.

[231] Hellemans, "Pillarization ('Verzuiling'). On Organized 'Self-Contained Worlds' in the Modern World," 127.

Conclusion

This study has followed the life of the Old Catholic Church of the Netherlands through the political upheavals of two centuries, during which the very role of the Christian faith in Dutch society experienced irrevocable transformations. The analysis of the Old Catholic clergy's political activities in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has, in keeping with the central argument of this study, demonstrated the importance of outlining the interaction between static religious doctrines and the degree to which faith communities are capable of adapting to democratic principles such as universal tolerance, confessional coexistence, or freedom of organisation. From a historiographical perspective, the political aspects of the Schism of Utrecht presented here challenge some of the more common perspectives on the nature of religious tolerance in Dutch political culture. Historians such as Ernst Troeltsch, for instance, contributed much to the myth of a growing religious toleration, in works such as *Die Bedeutung des Protestantismus für die Entstehung der modernen Welt* (1906), by arguing for the development of Protestantism from a system of religious political legitimation to a personal conviction around the dawn of the eighteenth century.[232] Yet, as the first chapter of this thesis has demonstrated, the specialised political interests of the Protestant regents in the Dutch Republic -in relation to the large Roman Catholic subculture- made use of the doctrinal struggle caused by Jansenism to weaken the unity of still substantial confessional rivals within a Protestant state. In this respect, the "confessional definitions"[233] of the sixteenth century did not lose their political usage, but were simply integrated into the cultural strategies of a ruling confessional elite. The "toleration" extended to the national party and the later Old Catholic clergy by the regents should be considered as one of these strategies, since, as in the case of the June Panic of 1734, it made use of widespread anti-Catholic sentiments to strengthen the cultural legitimacy of the clergy as loyal servants of the state.

In the context of the Dutch Republic, this created an exceptional situation, in which a relatively small body of dissident Catholic clergymen could wield real political influence, not only acting in support of placards against the Dutch Mission, but, as in the case of prelates such as Archbishop Barchman Wuytiers, actively encourage further judicial measures against the missionaries. It can be stated that this interaction between state and clergy formed an effective symmetry with the Jansenist convictions of the Old Catholic movement, where any form of papal intervention was seen to contradict a sense of local episcopal independence, rooted in age-old rights, privileges, and devotional customs. In the age of revolution and democratisation, new ideas of religious coexistence and tolerance clashed with these paradigms, and the strongly politicised memory cultures that had once proven expedient in the clergy's relationship with the state now formed a barrier to political adaptation and integration. While ruptures between churches and secular governments were by no means unique during the period of French occupation (1795-1813), the Old Catholic clergy were practically unique in their increasingly undiplomatic attitude towards the state, even after the restoration of the House of Orange in 1813. This study has argued that these confrontations were not merely the product of the government's increasingly conciliatory attitude towards Roman Catholics, but with the new pillars of nationhood that were being established in the wake of the Napoleonic period. Fundamentally, this amounted to a clash between two differing visions of national identity: ideas of a collective Christian ideal on the one hand, embodied in

[232] Joke Spaans and Jetze Touber, "Introduction: Enlightened Religion: From Confessional Churches to Polite Piety in the Dutch Republic," in *Enlightened Religion: From Confessional Churches to Polite Piety in the Dutch Republic*, ed. Joke J. Spaans and Jetze J. Touber (Brill, 2019), 1-2.
[233] Ibid.

the ecclesiastical policies of William I, for whom unity was the "highest virtue",[234] placed against a tradition of decentralised corporate privileges and local clerical bodies. These institutions, leftover from the *ancien regime*, derived their exclusivity from confessional struggle, the "law enforcement" tactics that were directed at politically dangerous confessions,[235] such as Roman Catholicism. The gradual shift towards secularisation, which achieved its apotheosis in the reforms of 1848, meant that the memory cultures associated with this historical role could function as politically disruptive belief systems, inspiring professions of faith that sought to circumvent state authority. As the personal correspondences between the (arch)bishops and clergymen of the Old Catholic Church cited in this study have shown, this could also entail the direct disobedience of royal authority, contesting the image of a "regalistic" clergy, put forward by historians such as Dick Schoon.[236]

The isolation of the clergy, however, was not only the product of an inability to create a positive relationship with new state structures. New democratic forms of cultural discourse, realised through the expansion of press freedoms in 1848, led to the creation of mass political movements that were defined by confessional "pillars" operating within a new parliamentary system. The antiquated social structure of the Old Catholic Church, with its strong emphasis on clerical and episcopal authority, hindered any effective use of these new freedoms by laypersons. These developments, in combination with the clergy's strict adherence to largely obscure doctrinal disputes, such as that concerning Bull and Formulary, meant that Old Catholics could not contribute meaningfully to public debates and potentially useful popular movements, such as the *Aprilbeweging* of 1853-1854. As Chapter III indicated, the limited literary output of the clergy reflected this reality, making use of arcane historical and theological symbols that were understandable to few outside the Old Catholic world. The experiences of isolation, however, shed light on a less well-appreciated aspect of the democratisation of Dutch political culture in the nineteenth century. Despite the growth in constitutional freedoms, the Christian "awakening"[237] of large Protestant and Roman Catholic cultural enclaves could, albeit indirectly, lead to forms of cultural exclusion for smaller, less culturally accessible religious minorities. In many respects, then, the fate of Old Catholicism may, to some extent, represent how the advent of mass democracy can inadvertently push away minorities from participating in any sense of collective identity. For this reason, as Chapter III also demonstrates, the decades following the restoration of 1853 witnessed a strong shift in Old Catholic circles towards international groups of dissident Catholics, exercising an arbitrating influence over various affiliated faith communities abroad. These international associations should, therefore, not only be seen as a response to specific doctrinal issues, such as papal infallibility or the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, but as an alternative to the Church's old nationalistic orientation.

In this study, the relationship between church, state, and theology functions as the central theme. The consulted materials constitute an analysis of state activities and ecclesiastical perspectives. Further research would, however, certainly benefit from a more bottom-up analysis of the schism and its political origins. For instance, the perspectives of Old Catholic laypersons, their relationship with Jansenist-inspired memory cultures and their relationship with the clergy, would form a valuable contribution to understanding the role of faith in strengthening or weakening societal participation. Nonetheless, it may be concluded that reducing the legacy of the Schism of Utrecht to an internal

[234] Kikkert, *Geld, Macht En Eer: Willem I: Koning Der Nederlanders En Belgen 1772-1843*, 125.
[235] Spaans and Touber, "Introduction: Enlightened Religion: From Confessional Churches to Polite Piety in the Dutch Republic," 4-5.
[236] Schoon, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 178-179.
[237] Homan, "Catholic Emancipation in the Netherlands," 203-204.

doctrinal dispute within the Dutch Roman Catholic world does little justice to the surprisingly far-reaching political influence of a largely forgotten religious minority, whose actions pose significant questions about the true extent of the much-lauded culture of "growing tolerance" in the eighteenth century,[238] and its later transition as a leading principle of parliamentary democracy in the following century. The history of Old Catholicism provides a unique window into the exchange between historical memory and the pressure that confessional pluralism can exert on religious minorities. Moreover, it suggests that the capacity to survive as a culturally and politically relevant force in a democratising national community relies on a confession's ability to adhere to the separation between doctrinal conviction and universal values of citizenship, necessary for establishing a collective "people's sovereignty", characterised in Dutch politics by balancing forms of local autonomy with national aims and customs.[239] Freedom to practice, on its own, could for the Old Catholic Church not be equated with a stake in collective sovereignty, and the Church's experience with isolation can only accentuate the need to understand how processes of democratic integration can become entangled by competing interpretations of historical legitimacy.

[238] Israel, *De Republiek, 1477-1808: Band II: Vanaf 1647*, 1160.
[239] Blom, "Nederland sinds 1830," 320.

Bibliography

Consulted archives

Het Utrechts Archief, Utrecht (HUA)
- Archieven van de aartsbisschoppen van Utrecht, 1723-1937.

Noord-Hollands Archief, Haarlem (NHA)
- Oud-Katholiek Bisdom Haarlem, 1561-1967.

(Published) Primary sources

Arnauld, Antoine. *Phantosme du jansénisme, ou justification des prétendus jansénistes par le livre mesme d'un Savoiard, Docteur de Sorbonne, Leur Nouvel accusateur, intitulé: "Les préjugez légitimes contre le jansénisme"*. Colonia: N. Schouten, 1686.

Buijs, Petrus. *Drietal Vragen Aan Den Eerw. Heer Wennekendonk, Tot Verdediging Der Bisschoppelijke Clerezie*. Utrecht: S. Alter, 1842.

Buul, Henricus Joannes. *Herderlijk Onderrigt van Henricus Joannes van Buul, Bisschop van Haarlem over de kerkscheuring onder de Katholijken dezer gewesten*. Rotterdam: H. Aewerdonk, 1844.

Dagverhaal der handelingen van de Nationale vergadering representeerende het volk van Nederland. Vol. II. In De Haage: Uitgegeven door Swart en Comp, 1796.

du Pac de Bellegarde, Gabriel. *Histoire Abrégée De L'église Metropolitaine D'Utrecht: principalement depuis la Révolution, arrivée dans les sept provinces-unies des Pays-Bas, sous Philippe II, jusqu'à l'an 1784*. Utrecht: J.A. van Woestenberg, 1852.

Loos, H. *De Regering En De Klerezy: Een woord over de jongste beraadslagingen der tweede kamer betreffende de zaken der oud-bisschoppelijke klerezy.* Amsterdam: Gebroeders Diederichs, 1845.

Neale, J.M. *A History of the so-called Jansenist Church of Holland*. Oxford: John Henry, 1858.

van der Pels, Johannes Augustinus. *Dichtmatige Levensschets Van Wijlen Den Hoog Eerwaardigen Doorluchtigen Heer Willebrordus Van Os, Aartsbisschop Van Utrecht, President En Pastoor Van Het Bisschoppelijke Seminarium Te Amersfoort, En Aldaar Den 28sten Februarij 1825 Overleden in Den Ouderdom Van Één En Tachtig Jaren En Zes En Twintig Dagen*. Amsterdam: Scholten en Gortmans, 1825.

Rinkel, Casparus Johannes, and Dirk Jan Schoon. *Kroniek Van Gebeurtenissen Betreffende De Oud-katholieken Inzonderheid in Nederland (1845-1894)*. Valkhof Pers, 2006.

van Santen, Johannes, Buul, Henricus Joannes and Vet, Wilhelmus. *Bevelschrift Van De Doorluchtige En Hoogeerwaardige Heeren Den Aartsbisschop Van Utrecht, Den Bisschop Van Haarlem En Den Bisschop Van Deventer, Ter Aankondiging Van Het Jubilé, Verleend Door Onzen Heiligen Vader Paus Leo XII, En Voor De Geheele R.K. Christenheid Algemeen Gemaakt*. Haarlem: De Wed. A. Loosjes Pz., 1826.

Slicher, Antonis. *Vervolg an Het ontdekte slangetje, of nader beantwoording van eenige argumenten, die voor de hofpartydige roomsgezinden gemaakt werden.* 's Gravenhage: By Johannes Kitto, Boekverkoper in de Spuystraat, 1727.

De Vries, J.H., and H.J. Sonjee. *De Bisschoppelijke Klerezy Onder De Oude Staats-kerk En Later, of ... Tegen De Nieuwe Inlichtingen Van Den Zeer Eerw. Heer H. J. Sonjee*. Arnhem: G.W. van der Wiel, 1854.

Wiltens, Nikolaas. *Kerkelyk Plakaat-boek, Behelzende De Plakaaten, Ordonnantien, Ende Resolutien, Over De Kerkelyke Zaken, By een gebragt door Nikolaas Wiltens*. Vol. I. In 's Gravenhage: By Paulus en Isaac Scheltus, 's Landts Druckers, 1722.

Secondary sources

Alexander-Davey, Ethan. "Nationhood and Constitutionalism in the Dutch Republic: An Examination of Grotius' 'Antiquity of the Batavian Republic.'" *History of Political Thought* 38, no. 1 (2017): 64-91.

van Bilsen, B., O.F.M. *Het Schisma van Utrecht*. Utrecht-Brussel: Uitgeverij het Spectrum, 1949.
Blom, J.C.H. "Nederland sinds 1830," in *Geschiedenis Van De Nederlanden*, ed. J.C.H. Blom and E. Lamberts, Derde, herziene druk. Baarn: HB uitgevers, 2001.

Boelaars, Henry. "Catholic Life in Holland." *The Furrow* 3, no. 2 (1952): 59-68.

van den Boogard, P.D. 'Een reglementaire kerk? Een evaluatie van het Concept-Reglement van 1809 en het Algemeen Reglement van 1816', *NTKR. Tijdschrift voor Recht en Religie*, no. 11 (2017): 39-54.

Bos, Emo. "Soevereiniteit en Religie: Godsdienstvrijheid onder de eerste Oranjevorsten." Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam, 2009.

Chantin, Jean-Pierre. *Les Amis De L'Œuvre De La Vérité: Jansénisme, miracles et fin du monde au XIXe siècle*. Presses Universitaires Lyon, 1998.

Deploige, Jeroen, and Gita Deneckere, eds. *Mystifying the Monarch: Studies on Discourse, Power, and History*. Amsterdam University Press, 2006.

van Deursen, A.Th. "De Republiek der Zeven Verenigde Nederlanden (1588-1780)." In *Geschiedenis Van De Nederlanden*, edited by J.C.H. Blom and Lamberts, Derde, Herziene druk. Baarn: HB uitgevers, 2001.

van Eijnatten, Joris. "Religie en het Koninkrijk: Een dwars verband." In *Een Nieuwe Staat. Het Begin van Het Koninkrijk Der Nederlanden.*, edited by Ido De Haan, Paul Den Hoed, and Henk Te Velde, 285–307. Prometheus-Bert Bakker, 2013.

Ferguson, Wallace K. "The Place of Jansenism in French History," *The Journal of Religion* 7, no. 1 (January 1, 1927): 16-42.

Frijhoff, W.T.M. "De paniek van juni 1734." *Archief Voor De Geschiedenis Van De Katholieke Kerk in Nederland* 19, no. 2 (1977): 170-233.

van Gennip, Joep. "A great swarm of nocturnal raptors shrieking horribly" Negative Images of the Jesuits in the Netherlands between the Restoration of the Order and the Establishment of the Dutch Jesuit Province, 1814-1850." In *The Survival of the Jesuits in the Low Countries, 1773-1850*, edited by Leo

Kenis and Marc Lindeijer S.J., 279-301. Leuven University Press, 2019.

Golden, Richard M. “The Mentality of Opposition: The Jansenism of the Parisian ‘Curés’ during the Religious ‘Fronde.’” *The Catholic Historical Review* 64, no. 4 (1978): 565-80.

Gosses, I.H., and N. Japikse. *Handboek tot de staatkundige geschiedenis van Nederland*. Vol. VI. ’s Gravenhage: M. Nijhoff, 1927.

Hamans, P.W.F.M. *Geschiedenis van de Katholieke Kerk in Nederland*. Brugge: Tabor, 1992.

Hellemans, Staf. “Pillarization (‘Verzuiling’). On Organized ‘Self-Contained Worlds’ in the Modern World.” *The American Sociologist* 51, no. 2 (2020): 124-47.

van den Hoeck, F., S.J. *Schets van de geschiedenis der Jezuieten in Nederland*. Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt N.V., 1940.

Houkes, Annemarie. “Het succes van 1848: Politiek in de Aprilbeweging,” in *Staf En Storm: Het herstel van de bisschoppelijke hiërarchie in Nederland in 1853 : actie en reactie*, ed. Jurjen Vis and Wim Janse (Uitgeverij Verloren, 2002), 87-105.

Jacobs, J.Y.H.A. “Over oecumeniciteit en confessionaliteit : De beoefening van de kerkgeschiedenis als uitdaging.” *Verzameling Bijdragen Van De Vereniging Voor Nederlandse Kerkgeschiedenis*, no. 5 (1993): 3-17.

de Jong, Johannes. *Handboek Der Kerkgeschiedenis: De Nieuwere Tijd (1517-1789)*. Vol. III. Utrecht-Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt N.V., 1948.

Kikkert, J.G. *Geld, Macht En Eer: Willem I: Koning der Nederlanders en Belgen 1772-1843*. Uitgeverij Scheffers, 1995.

Kikkert, J.G. *Koning Willem III 1817-1890: Biografie*. Het Spectrum, 1990.

Kossmann, E. H. “The Dutch Case: A National or a Regional Culture? The Prothero Lecture.” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 29 (1979): 155-68.

Kleef, B.A. van. *Geschiedenis van de Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland*. 2e herz. en Uitgebr. dr. Assen: Van Gorcum [etc.], 1953.

Kluit, M. Elisabeth. *Het protestantse réveil in Nederland en daarbuiten 1815-1865* . Amsterdam: Paris, 1970.

Knippenberg, Hans. “How Pope Pius IX Stimulated ‘Pillarization’ in the Netherlands.” *Historical Life Course Studies* 10 (March 31, 2021): 162-66.

Knox, R.A. *Enthusiasm: A Chapter in the History of Religion, With Special Reference to the XVII and XVIII Centuries*. Oxford University Press, 1950.

Knuttel, W.P.C. *De Toestand Der Nederlandsche Katholieken ten tijde der republiek*. Vol. II. ’s Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff, 1892.

Koch, Jeroen. *Koning Willem I: 1772-1843*. Amsterdam: Boom, 2013.

Kohn, Hans. “Nationalism in the Low Countries.” *The Review of Politics* 19, no. 2 (1957): 155-85.

Maussen, Marcel. “Religious Governance in the Netherlands: Associative Freedoms and Non-Discrimination After ‘Pillarization.’ The Example of Faith-Based Schools.” *Geopolitics, History, and International Relations* 6, no. 2 (2014): 37-63.

van der Meulen, Dik. *Koning Willem III: 1817-1890*. Amsterdam: Boom, 2014.

Molhuysen, P.C., and P.J. Blok. *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*. Vol. I. Leiden: A.W. Sijthoffs Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1911.

Moss, C.B. *The Old Catholic Movement: Its Origins and History*. Berkeley, CA: Apocryphile Press, 2005.

Polman, P. *Katholiek Nederland in de achttiende eeuw*. Vol. II. Paul Brand, 1968.

Ploeger, Mattijs. “De geloofsleer,” in *De Oud-Katholieke Kerk Van Nederland. Een Inleiding*, ed. Peter-Ben Smit. Uitgeverij Boekencentrum, 2018.

van Poelgeest, Bart. “Tussen oud en nieuw: Het ontwerpen van de grondwet als een rechtshistorisch mozaïek.,” in *Een Nieuwe Staat. Het begin van het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden*., ed. Ido de Haan, Paul den Hoed en Henk te Velde. Prometheus-Bert Bakker, 2013.

Rasker, Albert J. *De Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk Vanaf 1795: Haar geschiedenis en theologie in de negentiende en twintigste eeuw*. Kampen: Uitgeversmaatschappij J.H. Kok, 1974.

Richardt, Aimé. *Le Jansénisme: de Jansénius à la mort de Louis XIV*. François-Xavier de Guibert/OEIL, 2002.

Roegiers, J., and N.C.F. van Sas. “Revolutie in Noord en Zuid (1780-1830).” In *Geschiedenis van de Nederlanden*, ed. J.C.H. Blom and E. Lamberts, Derde, herziene druk. Baarn: HB uitgevers, 2001.

Rogier, L.J., and N. de Rooy. *In vrijheid herboren: Katholiek Nederland, 1853-1953*. ’s Gravenhage: N.V. Uitgeversmij Pax, 1953.

Rooy, Piet de. *Republiek van Rivaliteiten: Nederland sinds 1813*. S.l.: Park Uitgevers, 2018.

Rooy, Piet de. “Inleiding,” in *Staf En Storm: Het herstel van de bisschoppelijke hiërarchie in Nederland in 1853 : actie en reactie*, ed. Jurjen Vis and Wim Janse (Uitgeverij Verloren, 2002), 9-16.

Schoon, D.J. *Van Bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk: Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis van het katholicisme in Nederland in de 19de eeuw*. Nijmegen: Valkhof Pers, 2004.

Schoon, Dick J. “Oude en nieuwe bisschoppen. De ‘oud-katholieken’ en 1853,” in *Staf En Storm: Het herstel van de bisschoppelijke hiërarchie in Nederland in 1853 : actie en reactie*, ed. Jurjen Vis and Wim Janse (Uitgeverij Verloren, 2002), 166-187.

Skillen, James W., and Stanley W. Carlson-Thies. “Religion and Political Development in Nineteenth-Century Holland.” *Publius* 12, no. 3 (1982): 43-64.

Slijkerman, Diederick. *Visionair conservatisme: Gijsbert Karel van Hogendorp (1762-1834)*. Hilversum:

Verloren, 2020.

Slijkerman, Diederick. *Wonderjaren: Gijsbert Karel van Hogendorp, wegbereider van Nederland*. Amsterdam: Prometheus-Bert Bakker, 2014.

Snapp, Harry F. "Church and State Relations in Early Eighteenth-Century England." *Journal of Church and State* 15, no. 1 (1973): 83-96.

Spaans, Joke, and Jetze Touber. "Introduction: Enlightened Religion: From Confessional Churches to Polite Piety in the Dutch Republic." In *Enlightened Religion: From Confessional Churches to Polite Piety in the Dutch Republic*, edited by Joke J. Spaans and Jetze J. Touber, 1-18. Brill, 2019.

Spiertz, M.G. "Anti-jansenisme en jansenisme in de Nederlanden in de achttiende en negentiende eeuw." *Trajecta* 1, no. 3 (1992): 233-251.

Tans, J.A.G. and Kok, M. *Rome-Utrecht. Over de historische oorzaken van de breuk tussen de rooms katholieke en de oud-katholieke kerken en de huidige beoordeling van die oorzaken*. Hilversum/Antwer pen: Paul Brand, 1965.

Treasure, Geoffrey. *The Making of Modern Europe, 1648-1780*. London & New York: Routledge, 1985.

van der Velde, Wietse. *1723 Een Aartsbisschop Voor Utrecht: Cornelis Steenoven, "een Ijverig, werkzaam, .vroom man" Aartsbisschop van Utrecht 1723-1725*. Metropolitaan Kapittel / Stichting O.K. Uitgeverij Pascal, 2023.

van der Velde, Wietse. "De geschiedenis," in *De Oud-Katholieke Kerk Van Nederland. Een Inleiding*, ed. Peter-Ben Smit. Uitgeverij Boekencentrum, 2018.

van der Vorst, M. *Holland En De Troebelen in De Hollandse Zending, 1702-1727*. Nijmegen: Drukkerij Gebr. Janssen N.V., 1960.

Wessels, L.H.M. "'Verandering Der Tyden': Een Historiografische Studie Over De Nederlandse Geschiedschrijver En Publicist Jan Wagenaar (1709-1773)." PhD dissertation, Radboud Universiteit, 1996.

Williams, E.N. *The Ancien Régime in Europe: Government and Society in the Major States, 1648-1789*. Pimlico, 1999.

Zamoyski, Adam. *Rites of Peace: The Fall of Napoleon and the Congress of Vienna*. HarperCollins UK, 2008.

van Zanten, Jeroen. *Koning Willem II: 1792-1849*. Amsterdam: Boom, 2013.