Early Modern Ethnic and Religious Communities in Exile

Early Modern Ethnic and Religious Communities in Exile

Edited by

Yosef Kaplan

Early Modern Ethnic and Religious Communities in Exile

Edited by Yosef Kaplan

This book first published 2017

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

Following the fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans in 1453 and the flight of multitudes of Greeks, mainly to Italy, and especially as a result of the wars of religion that shook Europe after the inception of the Reformation, confessional migration, to use the term defined by the historian Heinz Schilling, became widespread.[1] As he wrote, "the religious refugee became a mass phenomenon" to an unprecedented extent. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the religious refugee became a constant presence in the European landscape, a presence felt on other continents as well. Processes of globalization following the geographical discoveries and the expansion of maritime trade created new horizons and for the refugee in flight from religious persecution as well, possibilities emerged for migration to areas of refuge that had previously been inaccessible.

Severe attacks upon religious minorities, mass expulsions, and, above all, forced conversions, took place frequently at that time in many regions. In the Iberian monarchies at the end of the fifteenth century the presence of Jews and Muslims ceased. In the wake of the Decree of Expulsion enforced by the Catholic Monarchs of Spain in 1492, tens of thousands of Jews fled the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon, as well as Sicily, to the Ottoman Empire and to North Africa, and a few thousand were also received in several cities in Italy. Although Spain was void of Jews, a rather large population of *conversos*, known as "New Christians," remained there. These people were mainly the descendants of Jews who had converted in Castile and Aragon during and following the murderous persecutions of 1391. However, they also included many people who were baptized truly at the last minute in order to spare themselves the tribulations of expulsion. Also nearly a hundred thousand Jews who had taken refuge in Portugal were baptized against their will in 1497, only five years after their arrival, as ordered by King Manuel. The fate of the Muslim population of Spain, some 660,000 souls, was similar: in 1502 the decree of expulsion of the Muslims of Castile was promulgated, and those

---

[1] Heinz Schilling, "Innovation through Migration: The Settlements of Calvinist Netherlanders in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Central and Western Europe," *Histoire Sociale-Social History* 16 (1983): 7–34, and see 32.

who remained were forced to convert to Christianity. The same thing happened to the Muslims of Valencia in 1525 and to those in Aragon in 1526.

Moreover, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, thousands of New Christians of Jewish origin emigrated from Spain and Portugal. Some did this in order to return to the Jewish religion and join the communities of the Sephardic Diaspora in the Levant, the Maghreb, and Italy. In addition, during the seventeenth century, Portuguese New Christian refugees who left Iberia and returned to the Jewish religion established communities of their own in Amsterdam, Livorno, Hamburg, London, Bordeaux, and Bayonne. Some of them took part in the colonial enterprises of Holland and England and settled in various places in the Caribbean and North America, where they founded their own Jewish communities. Many of the New Christians who emigrated from Spain and Portugal did not do so in order to abandon their new religion. Rather they settled in Catholic countries like France and Italy, or even went so far as Mexico, Brazil, and Peru. Among the New Christians who chose to join Catholic religious orders, a considerable number were Jesuits and became part of the Jesuit diaspora, which spread over the entire world. Many of these emigrants left the Iberian Peninsula to avoid the Inquisition and to escape the social consequences imposed upon them by the Statutes of Purity of Blood, which were enforced in many institutions. The Moriscos as well, Muslims forced to accept the Catholic religion, were also subject to investigation by the Inquisition and to prolonged social discrimination. Beginning in 1568, those in Granada launched revolts, which were suppressed with an iron hand. About eighty thousand Moriscos were forcibly removed from southern Spain and dispersed among the cities of Castile. In 1609 King Philip III published the decree of expulsion against them, and by 1614 additional decrees were passed, bringing about the expulsion of nearly three hundred thousand Iberian Muslims. Most of those expelled went to the Maghreb, but many of them managed, by means of various stratagems, to steal back into Spain.

In his book on religious refugees in the early modern period Nicholas Terpstra, whose article opens the present volume, relates to the important role played by "the sharp language of purification and purgation" in religious reform movements during the struggle between Catholics and Protestants: "The drive to purge and purify reshaped Europe and the globe throughout the early modern period."[2]

---

[2] Nicholas Terpstra, *Religious Refugees in the Early Modern World. An Alternative History of the Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2015), 2.

The drive to "purify" society of elements regarded as hostile and dangerous did indeed nourish the processes of confessionalisation, which were intended to produce religious uniformity in the states of Europe. Catholics fled from Protestant countries like England, Scotland, Sweden, and the new Dutch Republic, and Protestants abandoned the countries that remained loyal to the Catholic Church such as Italy and Spain. Italian Protestants from various denominations fled from Italy, in fear of the Roman Inquisition, emigrating to Switzerland, England, Germany, Transylvania, and Poland. Similarly, tens of thousands of Protestants left the Southern Netherlands between 1567 and 1573, fearing the cruel persecution of the Duke of Alba. During the 1580s nearly one hundred and fifty thousand Protestants fled from there when the Spanish army reinforced its control over Antwerp. Moving in the opposite direction, thousands of Catholics left Holland when Calvinism became the official public religion of the new republic.

Similarly, during the reign of Catholic Queen Mary (1553–1558), English Protestants (the Marian Exiles) emigrated, mainly to Frankfurt, Strasbourg, Zurich, and Basel. By contrast, during the reign of Edward VI (1547–1553) and Elizabeth I (1558–1603), many Catholics left the kingdom of England, mainly for Louvain and Antwerp, or else to France, especially Rheims, Rouen, and Douai. Among the English religious refugees the Pilgrim Fathers were prominent—they were radical Puritans who seceded from the Church of England. First they emigrated to Holland and established a community in Leiden, but in 1620 they sailed to North America and founded the colony of Plymouth, Massachusetts.

Alongside the Christian refugees belonging to a plethora of churches and sects, in this context one should also mention the Ashkenazic Jewish refugees from Germany, Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia, whose existence was undermined by the Thirty Years War. During the time of the great war, masses of Jews from these countries wandered both in Central Europe and also to the east and the west, seeking a safe haven. Similarly, the wars that afflicted Poland during the Cossack Rebellion of 1648 led by Chmielnicki, the Swedish invasion, and the war against the Muscovites in the 1650s brought about the destruction of Jewish communities throughout Poland and Lithuania and caused mass emigration to Central and Western Europe.

Another religious group that underwent severe upheavals was the Moravian Brethren, who numbered about two hundred thousand, with about four hundred parishes in Bohemia and Moravia. Following the Battle of White Mountain in 1620, the Protestant nobility suffered a severe downfall, and the Brethren were forced to go underground. Many of them

were scattered to Northern Europe and the Netherlands. Their important centers then moved to Poland, and isolated groups were active in Moravia. The great educator and philosopher Comenius, who served as a pastor of the Moravian Brethren, was forced to wander between Poland, Sweden, Prussia, England, and Transylvania. He was active in England along with other prominent foreigners such as the Scot John Dury and Samuel Hartlib, who was from Elbing, Poland, in preparing a series of educational and scientific initiatives under Oliver Cromwell.

The French Calvinists, known as the Huguenots, were undoubtedly the most significant and influential group of religious refugees in this period. During the sixteenth century they constituted about ten percent of the French population, and their major centres were located in the south and west of the kingdom. After the ferocious attack against them in Paris in 1572, known as the Saint Bartholomew Massacre, many of them fled to Geneva, England, and Holland. After the Edict of Nantes in 1598 restored their right to hold religious services, many of them returned to their homeland. However, during the seventeenth century, the agitation did not subside and the revolts of the Huguenots in the 1620s led to the rescinding of many of their political and military rights. In 1685, Louis XIV revoked the Edict of Nantes, and, after that fateful decision, nearly eight hundred thousand French Calvinists were forced to choose between exile and conversion. Between one hundred and fifty thousand and two hundred thousand of them decided to leave France. They called their emigration the Refuge, and they called themselves the *réfugiés*. Like other religious refugees at that time, but even to a greater degree, they accorded religious significance to their exile, drawing inspiration from the status of the biblical Israelites. Many of these exiles went to Holland, England, and Prussia. However, some also went to Switzerland, Ireland, Sweden, Russia, and even North America. Their contribution to the early Enlightenment, to intellectual life, science, and commerce in Europe was invaluable. One of the most famous Huguenot exiles was Pierre Bayle, who settled in Rotterdam and taught in the École Illustre. He described the Dutch Republic as "la grande Arche des fugitifs" (the great Ark of the fugitives), and their presence in Amsterdam, The Hague, and Rotterdam played an important role in the flourishing of culture in the Dutch Republic.

Indubitably, religious refugees were one of the formative factors in European culture in the early modern period. A considerable proportion of the men of science, the most prominent thinkers, authors, and theologians in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were exiles, and the experience of exile left a deep mark on them and on their work. This is a fact we must

not forget today, seeing the evil winds blowing from various directions against the arrival of refugees and immigrants who are depicted as aliens hostile to the spirit of the nation or to Western culture.

**

The articles in the present volume are based on papers given at the international conference held at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem on April 27–29, 2015. The idea for the conference took shape in the discussions in the seminar of the research group which I directed on "A Diaspora in Transition – Religious and Cultural Changes in the Early Modern Western Sephardic Communities."[3] They deal with a variety of issues connected to some of the most prominent ethnic and religious communities that underwent the experience of exile during the early modern period. The articles relate, among other things, to the ways in which they preserved and defined their identity; how they organised themselves in their new places of residence, and the institutions they created; the connection they maintained with their countries of origin; the connection between religious faith and ethnic affiliation; and the various ways in which they expressed their sense of exile and coped with it.

Since the conference was held in Jerusalem and in connection with a project connected to the history of the Jews, it is appropriate to add a few words in this context.

The historian Fritz (Yitzhak) Baer arrived in Palestine from Germany in 1930 and became the first professor of history at the Hebrew University. He was a major historian of medieval Jewry and became one of the shapers of historical research in Israel. Baer belonged to an impressive group of Jewish scholars from Central and Eastern Europe (especially Germany), who settled in Jerusalem and took part in launching the young university on Mount Scopus. They were imbued with Zionist ideology and certainly would have rejected any attempt to define them as exiles or refugees. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that their situation conformed to most of the criteria that characterise the experience of exiles: the sense of loss, displacement, and alienation. The fact that most of them saw themselves as participating in the fulfillment of the Zionist enterprise could not eradicate their sense of loss after leaving their bourgeois lives behind in Europe. Many of them emigrated from Germany after the Nazis' rise to power. They were forced to abandon the leading universities where

---

they had studied, the rich libraries where they acquired knowledge, and the vital cultural life they left behind after settling in Palestine. However, not only the feeling of isolation and loss characterized their situation as exiles. Like other groups of exiles in the course of human history, they, too, became cultural agents, who made a deep impression not only on the academy but also on the economy, jurisprudence, and the arts in the society of Palestine and of the young State of Israel. It is no coincidence that some of them, in the spirit of the humanistic values in which they had been educated, sought to bring about reconciliation between Jews and Arabs. However, contrary to their impact in other areas, in this one, regrettably, they remained a minority, devoid of influence.

In 1936, Fritz Baer published his book *Galut*, the Hebrew word for "exile." In it he investigates the meanings that the term received in Jewish thought from the end of Antiquity to the early modern period.[4] Appearing in German, in Berlin, the book conveys the distress that Baer experienced at that time. It became clear to him that quite a few of his former teachers and fellow students had joined the National Socialist Party.

In *Galut*, Baer harshly condemned the Jewish Diaspora, and this is not the only reason why this work still raises many perplexities. As he wrote in 1980: "When I wrote this book I felt great anguish, though at the time I could not have imagined the events that later surged up and engulfed us."[5] Indeed the essentialist and providentialist approach that permeates every page of the book reached its peak toward the conclusion: "there is a power that lifts the Jewish people out of the realm of causal history."[6] In the epilogue to the English edition published in 1947, he added: "Our history follows its own laws, maintaining its innermost tendencies in the face of the outward dangers of dispersal, disintegration, secularization, and moral and religious petrification."[7]

Jewish historians and intellectuals criticized Baer for denying the unity of the human spirit, and the American Jewish essayist, Milton Himmelfarb, wrote at the end of a highly critical review published in early 1948: "There is much admirable piety toward ancestral ideals in *Galut*. But we shall continue to insist that the alternative vision—that of a

---

[4] Jizchak Fritz Baer, *Galut* (Berlin: Schocken, 1936). See the English translation by Robert Warshow (New York: Schoken Books 1947).

[5] See the introductory remarks to the Hebrew edition (Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1980), 7.

[6] See the English edition, 120.

[7] Ibid., 122.

common humanity—gives equal shelter to unique tradition, and that indeed it can base itself on better Jewish doctrine."[8]

To Baer's credit it must be stated that his splendid historiographical work on medieval Jewry and later on the Jews under Roman rule clearly contradicts the words he wrote in 1936, in his despair and distress.

The present conference arose out of the discussions of the research group on the communities of the Western Sephardic Diaspora in disagreement with Baer's approach in *Galut.* We believe that it is impossible to understand the history of the Jews in isolation from the history of the societies in which they were active. The Western Sephardic Jews were an ethno-religious minority, a Diaspora created following the expulsion of the Jews from the Iberian monarchies and the restrictions and discrimination suffered by the conversos in Spain and Portugal. They were comparable to other religious minorities which were forced to go into exile in the wake of processes of confessionalisation and the wars of religion that struck their countries. The Sephardic Jews shared with the other religious refugees both the experience of separation from their origins and also that of being scattered among many states and continents.

The exiled Sephardic Jews and the other early modern religious minorities shared a rather extensive common denominator. They were all forced to cope with problems of adaptation and the retention of religious uniqueness and a cultural heritage. In Venice and Livorno, in Amsterdam and Hamburg, in The Hague and in London, they encountered a large variety of ethnic and religious minorities. The members of all these minorities were in contact on many levels and even cooperated with each other, though they also came into conflict at times; they engaged in friendly conversations with each other about philosophy and theology, about science and biblical interpretation, but they sometimes held bitter and penetrating theological disputes. These religious refugees became cultural agents of the first rank and produced works that became classics in philosophy, theology, art, historiography, biblical exegesis, and biblical criticism. They migrated within Europe and around the world, shaping the early modern period and exerting deep influence in every area of society and culture. Indeed, the immigration of these minorities, and their presence in their host countries are among the principal characteristics of the early modern period.

Yosef Kaplan

---

[8] Milton Himmelfarb, "*Galut* by Yitzhak F. Baer," *Commentary*, May 1, 1948.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

MOBILITY, COMMUNITY, AND RELIGIOUS IDENTITY IN THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD: AN ALTERNATIVE READING OF THE LONG REFORMATION

NICHOLAS TERPSTRA

This volume and the conference from which it grew are devoted to exploring religious communities in exile, particularly in the early modern period. My own research into this has been comparative and synthetic, and based more on secondary than archival sources. Above all, it was shaped from the beginning by the classroom. It was in anticipating and seeking to answer the questions of students of different ages and backgrounds that the idea grew of finding some other window through which to look into the house we call Reformation Studies. Not all students ask questions driven only by their own background, position, experience, or point of view, but many certainly start there. Much of the parochialism which long dogged Reformation historiography came precisely out of treating the subject as a species of family history by those who grew up in the closeted domestic space of one or another denomination or confession. Some who found it claustrophobic escaped the closet, while others wanted to defend the door, or simply took it for granted. Others may have grown up with no personal experience of the house, but by virtue of growing up in the European or Anglo American world, they knew the neighbourhood well and had some cultural familiarity with the lay of the rooms and the shape of the furniture. But what of those with no direct or indirect experience of the house?

My effort to approach the history of the Reformation from the point of view of the refugee experience first arose some years ago when I had the opportunity to write a textbook on the Reformation for twelve and thirteen-year-old children in senior primary school.[1] Attempting to visualise my

audience, the readers that came to mind were children in and around Toronto, where I live. Canada has been profoundly shaped by immigration. While most immigrants from the seventeenth into the late twentieth century came from France, the United Kingdom, and then a widening range of European countries, the majority now arrive from other parts of the globe. Few among my target audience of pre-teen readers would have had any personal roots into or identity with the history of European Christianity. There were Somali and Tamil immigrants, and many others from across South Asia, Africa, or the Caribbean; they are now joined by others from the Middle East. Some indeed had an indirect connection to European Christianity, like the children of the Bosnian diaspora who were largely Muslim refugees fleeing the ethno-religious cleansing carried out by Croat and Serbian armies in the Balkans. Rightly or wrongly, while thinking about how to organise my primary school textbook, I assumed that few of these global immigrants would have much interest in the finer points of justification by faith alone, the working of prevenient grace, or the distinction between temporal and plenary indulgences. Moreover, the textbook publisher had encouraged me to try out a new approach while, of course, giving no indication of what that might be.

Aiming to find some point of identification from which to start, I thought of the fact that many of these children were not simply immigrants, but actually refugees. It was not only the Bosnian Muslims among them who had been expelled or had fled their homes for a host of reasons including national, ethnic, racial, and religious identities. These combined in a cauldron of colonial and postcolonial legacies stirred to a boil by opportunistic political regimes both local and foreign. In many cases, it was religious differences that provided the most convenient shorthand for identity, and the most immediate reason for their expulsion, as with South Sudanese and Somalis, for example. It dawned on me that one way to make a period as distinct but distant as the European Reformation relevant to twelve-year-old immigrants would be to approach it through the nexus of mobility, community, and religious identity—that is, through the experience of refugees, and of *religious* refugees in particular.

This was around the time that the late Heiko Oberman had been writing about Calvin as a refugee theologian whose doctrine and ecclesiology were profoundly shaped not just by the particular circumstances of sixteenth-

century Geneva, but by the experience of being a life-long and very reluctant refugee.[2] Might that also work as a way to explain Reformation and *the* Reformation in a modern religiously and ethnically-mixed culture? It gradually grew into an opportunity to rethink and reconceptualise the Reformation more broadly. The immediate question was when and why Europe had become a culture so wedded to driving out others or, essentially, to creating refugees?

Europe had long been a "persecuting society," and R. I. Moore had controversially located the origins or formation of this impulse in a combination of religious ideologies and elite clerical manipulations from the tenth through the thirteenth centuries. I don't wish here to dwell on the validity of his thesis or the debates it generated, and certainly don't think that a phenomenon that expands radically in the early modern period could *not* have medieval roots; it would be strange if there were no antecedents or precursors.[3] But even assuming some connection, the question rises of what might have been different about a "persecuting society" as it took shape in the Long Reformation from the fifteenth through the late seventeenth or even eighteenth century.

It seemed to me that three differences merited considering the Long Reformation as a distinct "persecuting society" on its own terms: volume, breadth, and impact. With regard to volume, it was clear that through the two or three centuries from the fifteenth, exile and expulsion became far more widespread than they had been in the high Middle Ages. They were organised by states, driven by or legitimated through religious reasons, and more often took the form of *mass* expulsions. It was in the early modern period that the Religious Refugee became a mass phenomenon. With regard to breadth, exile became a phenomenon found across *all* religious groups. Apart from Calvin with his eye cast continually over his shoulder to France or the thousands who crammed into Geneva, there were the perennially peripatetic Radicals like David Joris, Menno Simons, and those who gravitated to Moravia and points further east, and Reginald Pole, John Foxe, and other Henrician and Marian exiles sailing back and forth over the English Channel to different European refuges. Even

---

[2] Heiko A. Oberman, *John Calvin and the Reformation of the Refugees* (Geneva: Droz, 2009).

[3] Moore first published his study in 1987, and one of his sharpest critics was David Nirenberg: David Nirenberg, *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998). In the second edition of his ground-breaking work, Moore discussed the controversies: Robert Ian Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority & Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007).

Luther's year in hiding in the Wartburg as Junker Georg cast him as a refugee. Virtually all the major religious reformers of the first and second generation in the early sixteenth century experienced some period of time as an exile or refugee, and all religious communities had some period in which forced migration became an existential reality for at least some of their members. All took this experience, direct or indirect, and internalised it in some way so that it became part of the group's tradition and identity. Moreover, this was true not only for Christians of all confessions, but even more so for Jews and Muslims in Europe and sometimes beyond. Thinking again of my textbook's readers, it occurred to me that a focus on the refugee experience would allow me to write a history of the Reformation that moved Jews and Muslims from a footnote or epilogue and into the heart of the narrative—really, to the *opening* of the narrative. Finally, with regard to impact, the early modern migrations driven at least in part by religion reshaped the map of Europe, and fundamentally shaped Europe's global expansion. Exiles, refugees, missionaries, and inquisitors created diasporic communities across Europe and around the world. Most of these survived intact until the twentieth century, when new waves of religious, racial, and national purification generated new waves of holocausts and expulsions that destroyed some of them. Some of the children coming to Canada as religious refugees in the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries came out of diasporic communities that were first settled centuries earlier in the upheavals of the Long Reformation. Here was a connection.

The primary school textbook fell victim to a publisher's bankruptcy, but the idea itself evolved through a number of conferences, courses, and publication projects into a textbook oriented now to university students. I've advertised this as an "alternative reading" or "alternative history" of the Reformation because it seems to me that the questions that it raises are, if anything, even more far reaching at the university level than they are for twelve year-olds who are gaining their first exposure to the topic. Briefly, if exile, expulsion, and the refugee experience become the window through which we look at the Reformation, might our view of the Reformation and its dynamics shift? Might we see new approaches, emphasise different conjunctions and implications, identify new themes? How do mobility, community, and religious identity fit together, and what drives them?

All of this begs the question: what is Reformation? And when? The question has currency, if not urgency, because of what in Germany is being called the *Lutherjaar*, the five hundredth anniversary of Martin Luther's posting of his ninety-five theses against indulgences on the door

of the Wittenburg Cathedral church. The theses spread quickly across the Holy Roman Empire, physically, intellectually, and politically, and triggered a series of events that then rippled out from the Empire across Europe. These sent Luther to the Wartburg in 1521, and soon put many religious non-conformists on the road, including of course with some of Luther's former allies-turned-enemies like Karlstadt and Muntzer. Traditional histories that focused on Germany and Luther as the heartland of Reform saw 1517 as the "origin" of the Reformation. Of course, Czech historians might point to the execution of Jan Huss in 1415, which galvanised his Bohemian followers to rise against the Holy Roman Empire and frame a distinct confession within Christianity that lasted for over two hundred years. English historians might point to the year 1534, when Henry VIII set himself as Head of a separate Church of England that could grant him the annulment that the Church of Rome would not deliver. Any dates we chose are artificial and heuristic, of course, so most historians prefer not to think in such fixed and definite ways about origins. It's a slippery slope to Hegel, with clear theses, antitheses, and syntheses; beginnings and endings; essential character, and progressive or regressive movements.

Hegel is *indeed* the ghost in the closet here, and thanks to him and his successors, dates do have a way of insinuating themselves and putting their mark on popular consciousness. In Western European and Anglo-American thought, Hegel's legacy was a tendency to see the Reformation as a forward leap for liberal individualism and secularism. The key characteristic was the schism that broke up Europe's largest religious monopoly corporation into a host of separate and warring units. This definition cast ecclesiastical reformers as the main protagonists in the unfolding drama of European history. Conflicts of the kind that John Huss, Martin Luther, and Henry VIII triggered were historically progressive inasmuch as they advanced individualism, secularism, and the state. Even those who were more religiously-minded Hegelians emphasised the Reformation as a period of interiority and conscience when individuals freed themselves from clerically-mediated external rituals, began relating directly to God in vernacular Bible reading and prayer, and so demonstrated the priority of individual intellect and will.

Historians today are more likely to pick up the opposite end of the stick and look at the inverse of Hegel's liberal individualist Reformation: we now emphasise not the heroic individual, but the broader collective; not the interior will, but the exterior social context; not the decline of ecclesiastical structures, but the repristinating, repurposing, and redeploying of them; not the breakup of a religious corporation, but the

remarkable ability of its lay and clerical elites to metamorphose and adapt; not the secular state, but the sacred state. All these inform an "alternative history" of the Reformation that begins with the exile and refugee experience, takes it before and beyond the institutional ruptures in the Catholic Church, and aims to understand why this should have been the period when the religious refugee became a mass phenomenon.

In what follows, I would like to explore this question on three distinct levels. We need to identify shifts in the ways some communities defined and defended themselves from the fifteenth into the sixteenth centuries and understand why religiously-driven mobility is critical to that. There is a nexus of concerns here: the drive to purity, the fear of contagion, and the use of enclosure or purgation to protect purity. I will begin on the micro level with the example of Italian confraternities to explore how concerns about purity, contagion, and purgation expanded steadily from the fifteenth century in the form of Observance movements, and how these communities sought to preserve their communal purity through discipline. Confraternities are significant because they express a *lay* and *civic* religion, which I think gives a better idea of popular and political sentiments than ecclesiastical and clerical religion does. I will then move to the macro level to explore some broader instances of how Reformation societies enact their same concerns around purity, contagion, and purgation— particularly enclosures, some charitable, some not. Finally, I will turn briefly to the imaginary, where mobility, community, and religious identity come together. How do "exile" and "refugee" become identities that are internalised and develop into marks of identity and pride? How do they feed into the invented traditions that define—and bind—imagined communities of faith? These were the issues that participants at the conference on religious communities in exile explored, and that the essays in this volume expand on further.

The Microcosm: What is a Pure Community?

In 1494, when Florence faced waves of French troops washing down the coast and into Tuscany, Savonarola preached a sermon comparing the city to Noah's ark—a place of refuge and of promise as Divine punishment swept away sinners. He could have adjusted the maritime reference with another image soon to become more popular through engraved and widely published aerial views—the city as an island with churches, homes, and monasteries within the walls and nothing but blank space or open fields outside. This of itself would have been the mapped equivalent of an older and more distinctly religious visual image—the Madonna of Mercy or

Misericordia with her cloak outspread to protect citizens from the spears and arrows of natural disaster and divine judgment.

Ark, island, protective shelter. Images of the city as a bounded community, with inside and outside sharply distinguished, grew ever more common across Europe through the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. They gave visual and rhetorical form to the idea of the city as a pure, holy, and exclusive space. They imposed an obligation on those inside the space to maintain that inner spiritual purity and holiness as a means of maintaining the integrity of the protective boundaries. If the community dropped its moral guard and allowed the boundaries to deteriorate, disasters of various kinds could break through and devastate those inside.[4]

Preachers, artists, and engravers could paint the verbal and visual images, but it was up to community members to put the ideas into practice. One way of doing this was by refining the means of identifying and expelling those who threatened the moral purity of the community inside the boundaries. This disciplinary imperative became an ever more important driving factor in lay spirituality over the course of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Historians often associate discipline with Protestant Church Orders and Catholic Reform movements, particularly in their more Tridentine and clerical forms, both expanding through the sixteenth century. Yet the deeper shifts in mentalities lie within the Observance movements of the century before. It was through them that the linked ideas of purity, contagion, and community first reshaped lay piety from the fifteenth century, and helped feed a thrust towards radical purgation. Tracking lay piety is critical here, as we want to trace *not* a few key intellectual changes, but the spread of a broader civic religious mentality spanning church and state. This is why it is helpful to look at lay confraternities in particular. If we study sets of confraternal statutes and membership records, we can identify three stages by which efforts to define the confraternities' devotions and discipline became steadily more intense and move from what people *do* to what they *are*.[5] I will focus on the Italian cities of Bologna and Modena, fully aware that the forms of lay piety north of the Alps do not flow as powerfully through confraternities,

---

[4] Alexandra Walsham, *Charitable Hatred: Hatred and Intolerance in England, 1500–1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006). As Ethan Shagan has shown, even the virtue of "moderation" could be promoted aggressively and exclusively in the political discourses of reform. Ethan Shagan, *The Rule of Moderation: Violence, Religion, and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

[5] Nicholas Terpstra, *Lay Confraternities and Civic Religion in Renaissance Bologna* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 83–133.

which were generally neither as ubiquitous nor as well documented in Northern Europe as around the Mediterranean.

Fourteenth-century confraternity statutes set very general standards for admission and communal life. Bologna's Company of St Francis required, in its 1317 statutes, that members keep away from gambling and bad places, and obey company officials. There was no disciplinary process, in part because there was not much communal life. This was Bologna's largest confraternity with well over three thousand male and female members, or perhaps five percent of the total population. It shaped their spiritual life through some light obligations for daily prayers and by providing an outlet for charitable action; members volunteered weekly in St Francis' large hospital and left it their alms and legacies.[6] This was the default position in what we could describe as a first stage of loose community. We can see it continuing in other fourteenth-century confraternities like the Company of St Mary of Charity, which reformed itself at the time of the 1399 Misericordia devotional movement and indeed adopted the name of "Misericordia." Even though decades had passed, and in spite of the stimulus of a new devotional movement, this Misericordia confraternity adopted a version of the eighty-year-old St Francis statutes that did little more than add prohibitions against blasphemy and against swearing on the body and blood of Christ.[7]

This changes in a second stage that we can trace from around the 1420s, as Observant mendicants and other clerical reformers began engaging more intensely with Bolognese confraternities, stimulating reforms and new foundations; at this point, it is not just community but activities which define confraternal life. In the 1430s, the influential bishop Niccolò Albergati pushed some prominent existing civic confraternities like St Mary of Death and St Mary of the Baraccano to intensify their devotional community while also taking on larger roles in the public cult. In the decade that followed, both Dominican and Franciscan brotherhoods undertook significant reforms to protect their community's moral purity. In the early 1440s, the company of St Dominic tightened its regulations while brothers of the company of St Francis established a distinct new devotional confraternity alongside the existing

---

[6] The 1317 S. Francesco statutes can be found in C. Mesini, "La compagnia di Santa Maria delle Laudi e di San Francesco di Bologna," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 52 (1959): 366–72.

[7] ASB Dem, Compagnia di S. Maria della Carità, 4/7673, no. 1. See also Mario Fanti, "Il moto dei Bianchi e la Confraternita di Santa Maria della Misericordia detta della Carità in Bologna," *Confraternite e città a Bologna nel medioevo e nell'età moderna* (Rome: Herder, 2001), 320–27.

charitable one so that members could choose whether they wanted to pursue their salvation by the path of observant devotions or by the path of hospital charity.[8]

These new groups were more explicit about the higher moral standards expected of members. It wasn't enough to be individually pure; members also had to shun the contagion of others' immorality, and confraternity statutes expanded the list of prohibited activities. Don't practice illicit arts like making playing cards, don't practice usury, don't engage in infamous, dangerous, or scandalous activities like sodomy or adultery, don't keep a concubine, don't blaspheme or use bad language. Avoid bad companions who might tempt you to sin: gamblers, tavern owners or tavern goers, "others of low condition." Neither women nor boys under fifteen years of age could join these groups, again because of the temptation they represented. Members were beholden to the community of their brothers: they had to obey its officials and keep its secrets, and they were bound to observe the full range of its extensive spiritual exercises and mutual obligations. But it was not all prohibition: these groups aimed to practice together a more deeply emotional piety, framed round the imitation of Christ (particularly his passion) and exercised through flagellation, foot washing, frequent worship, and daily prayer. They were small (often just twelve members), selective, and demanding.

What distinguishes these statutes of the second stage from earlier ones is the care taken to preserve the community's purity by recruiting new members more selectively, training them more intensively, and then expelling them when they failed to live up to standards. Earlier confraternity statutes had included only vague provisions allowing officials to expel members. The Dominican and Franciscan Observant confraternal statutes of the 1440s, like those of St Mary of Death in 1436, made the standards and procedures for expulsion more explicit and effective, encouraging members to inform on their fellows, setting out distinct penalties for first, second, and third offenses, and allowing a return only if the violator confessed his fault and reformed his behaviour.

---

[8] Albergati's prodding brought reform to both S. Maria della Morte (1436) and S. Maria del Baraccano (1439). The Morte's statutes can be found in the Biblioteca Communale di Bologna (hereafter BCB) Fondo Ospedale, ms. 83, while the Baraccano's earliest statutes are not extant. S. Domenico's 1443 statutes: BCB Fondo Gozzadini 207, no. 2. An edition can be found in Gilles Gérard Meersseman, *Ordo fraternitatis: confraternite e pietà dei laici nel mondo medioevo* (Rome: Herder, 1977). For a broader discussion of this phenomenon of controlled schism as part of Observant reform: Terpstra, *Lay Confraternities and Civic Religion*, 28–30, 63–65, 86–87, 124–25, and 139–44.

The timing of the Franciscan statutes was particularly significant. They were written in 1443, just as the Franciscan Order was in the throes of the dispute that almost split it into two. When Eugenius IV attempted to engineer the appointment of an Observant as Franciscan Master General, the Conventuals reacted violently. The Observant friar Bernardino da Siena brokered a peace deal which kept a Conventual friar as Master General. Although it cost him considerably with his own supporters, this model of accommodation and compromise seems to have offered an example of peacemaking which Bolognese laymen then followed. Bologna's existing confraternity of St Francis, with its thousands of male and female members, its hospital, and its relatively relaxed membership standards, stayed within the Conventual church of St Francis with a Conventual friar as its Spiritual Father. In 1443 a small group of more devotionally-observant members broke off and established a distinct group of their own in the local Observant Franciscan house of the Annunciation, taking one of its friars as *their* Spiritual Father. They kept the name of St Francis and the two groups distinguished themselves as St Francis Broad (*Larga*) and St Francis Narrow (*Stretta*), the broad Conventual and the narrow Observant.[9] That was simple enough, but things soon got more complicated. When preaching in Bologna in 1422, Bernardino da Siena had reformed on older confraternity which adopted the new name of Good Jesus (Buon Gesu) in recognition of his distinctive promotion of the Holy Name of Jesus. That confraternity then took an Observant Franciscan from the newly-built Annunciation friary as its Spiritual Father.[10] Then when Bernardino da Siena was canonized in 1450, scarcely half a decade after his death, the lay confraternal brothers and sisters associated with the Conventual house of St Francis established a new Broad confraternity in San Bernardino's name and honour and built a prominent chapel projecting off the nave of the Conventual church. They did not, however, adopt Bernardino's stricter observant discipline.[11]

What resulted must have been a little confusing even to contemporaries: Bologna by the mid-fifteenth century had two separate confraternities with the name of St Francis, one Conventual and one Observant. It also had two

---

[9] The Franciscan stretta statutes: BCB ms B983.

[10] This was the confraternity of S. Maria della Mezzaratta del Monte, which oversaw a shrine on one of the hills immediately south of the city. Its earliest extant statutes date from 148r (BCB Fondo Gozzadini 203, no. 7) and 1490 (BCB Fondo Gozzadini 203, no. 8).

[11] This confraternity's statutes date from 1454: Archivio di Stato di Bologna (hereafter ASB) Fondo Demaniale, Compagnia di S. Bernardino, ms. 8/7639, no. 1.

confraternities dedicated to the memory of the Franciscan Observant friar San Bernardino da Siena, again one Conventual and one Observant. The two Broad/Conventual confraternities underscore the importance of *affect* in lay confraternal piety—Bolognese lay women and men *loved* Francis and Bernardino, and wanted to use Franciscan and Bernardine songs, images, and signs—like Bernardino's sunburst IHS mandala—as markers of identity with the spiritual cause of imitating Christ's love and charity. The two Narrow/Observant confraternities underscore the importance of discipline, conviction, and exclusivity as markers of identity with the spiritual cause of imitating Christ's suffering—and *these* became the more influential drivers of later change.

The Narrow/Observant Franciscan brotherhoods dominated confraternity reform in mid-fifteenth century Bologna and indeed through much of Italy. In 1454 Bologna's oldest confraternity, St Mary of Life, spawned its own devotional Narrow group which adopted the Observant St Francis statutes, some parts verbatim and others with a few modifications. Other confraternities both in the city and outside of it followed suit in the decades following, including St Mary of the Guarini (1454) and St Mary of the Angels (1479), so that by the end of the fifteenth century there were at least six influential Narrow groups operating in the city.[12] All adopted stricter standards of purity, and all exercised cautions against those—like women, young boys, gamblers, blasphemers, and tavern goers—who could be considered a bad and contagious influence. This was a movement seen across Italy, and it is important to remember that these groups were *not* large and inclusive. Narrow confraternities were often small, but they exercised disproportionate social and spiritual influence because they tended to recruit professional and elite members with significant social capital to invest in broader change and a motivation to do it.

This concern with purity and contagion expanded and intensified in the third stage, beginning in the late fifteenth century, when the reciprocation of devotion and discipline intensified around concerns of identity. In 1520, the Observant Franciscan confraternity of Good Jesus undertook a new inner reform that marked the first emergence in the city of some of the stricter disciplinary and devotional forms associated with Catholic and

---

[12] S. Maria della Vita's 1454 statutes: BCB Fondo Ospedale, no. 10. A modern edition can be found in Giancarlo Angelozzi, *Le confraternite laicali: un'esperienza cristiana tra medioevo ed età moderna* (Brescia: Queriniana, 1979), 118–41. The Padre Spirituale was Maestro Giminiano da Volterra, Master of Theology with Augustinian Order. For S. Maria dei Guarini BCB Fondo Gozzadini 210, no. 11, cc. fols.169r–194v; for S. Maria degli Angeli BCB Fondo Gozzadini 203, no. 7.

Tridentine reform.[13] On the disciplinary side, the familiar list of faults meriting expulsion expanded significantly. The list was now headed by two signal defects: "heresy" and "rebellion against the Church." It was rounded out with a far longer list of those individuals who were to be excluded by virtue of their origin, profession, or identity: pimps, actors, singers, magicians, murderers, practicing Jews, and thieves. Like women and young boys, these men were excluded by definition as contagious agents who would disturb the purity of the confraternal community. The statutes sometimes enjoined members not to be too judgmental and faultfinding, while at the same time they intensified the *procedures* for judgment and fault-finding, adding explicit instructions for identifying, judging, and expelling errant brothers. Once annually, each member met with the Spiritual Father to go over the entire matriculation list and report on the faults of each brother individually. The Father then called in each brother again to start a process of correction that could end in expulsion if that brother refused to recognise and amend his faults.

Looming larger among those faults were failures to respect the corporate life of the brotherhood: not just the failure to take the sacraments, obey the officials, maintain the peace, or offer mutual aid, but even the failure to post the Bernardine IHS symbol at the doorway of the house and, above all, the failure to respect the privacy and secrecy of the brotherhood and its oratory. Members had keys so that they could use the oratory for personal devotions. Sharing a key, letting a stranger in to the oratory, or allowing that stranger to read the statutes without permission could win expulsion. Members were to maintain the privacy and even secrecy of the bounded space.

These were the new and intensified regulations on the disciplinary side. On the devotional side, members of the Narrow/Observant Company of Good Jesus pledged themselves to more intense daily devotions, to posting images of St Francis and St Bernardino in their homes, and to following elaborate sets of spiritual exercises of the *imitatio Christi* adjusted to their degree of literacy and their working lives. Adopting a common Observant trope that soon became Reformation boilerplate for both Catholics and Protestants, they idealised the fervour and devotion of the primitive church and the apostolic period generally, and decried the negligence, frailty, and tepidity of more recent times which had caused all religious orders, congregations, and confraternities to decline from their original fervour. The disciplinary and devotional regulations combined to

---

[13] A matriculation list from 1490 and the new statutes of 1520 can be found in Biblioteca Universitaria di Bologna, ms. 2022, cc. 37–67. See also ASB Fondo Demaniale, Compagnia di Buon Gesù, 9/7631, ms 1.

perfect the community by eliminating the contagion of immorality and advancing the purity of an intense spiritual life. In these same decades of the early sixteenth century, other Bolognese confraternities that had earlier adopted the Observant/Narrow reforms, now reinforced their commitments with new statutes as Good Jesus had, including St Mary of Charity (1518), Sts Sebastian and Rocco (1520), St Mary of the Baraccano (1521), St Mary of the Angels (1522).[14]

These three sets of statutes demonstrate a steady ramping up of the rhetoric on purity, contagion, and community in the fourteenth, the mid-fifteenth, and the early sixteenth centuries. It is not simply that immoral types impede purity; *their* immoral activity—and then increasingly their very *identity*—impedes the others in the community from realising *their own* devotional purity. There is an intensification of the emotional nexus between discipline and devotion. The earlier statutes exclude people for what they *do*, while the later ones come to exclude them for what they *are*. They aren't just bad and "inappropriate" in themselves (as in the fourteenth-century statues); they aren't just bad in their pollution (as in the fifteenth-century Observant statutes); they are bad for the contagious effect that they have on others, and hence have to be removed in order for the brotherhood and its members to realise their own potential as a pure community. If the community is an ark, these ones have to be thrown overboard to prevent the whole ship from sinking.

These statutes trigger two questions. Was this just a Bolognese phenomenon? More to the point, did any of these regulations ever find a life off the page?

It certainly was not simply a Bolognese phenomenon. In nearby Modena we can find a similar development in the eleven confraternities founded from the mid-thirteenth to mid-sixteenth century. Three emerged in the first century and a half, all drawing broadly with male and female members, all closely related to charity and hospitals, and all having somewhat general expectations about members' morality. Then there came a burst of four brotherhoods founded under the direct influence of Bernardino da Siena, who preached in Modena in 1423. All these had the far stronger devotional expectations we saw in Bolognese Observant confraternities, including flagellation. All had far stronger disciplinary provisions including expulsion of members who failed to meet an explicit and rigorous moral code, who disobeyed the officials, or who were

---

[14] S. Maria della Carità, BBA Fondo Gozzadini 210, no. 6. SS Sebastiano e Rocco: ASB Fondo Demaniale 16/6620, ms. 1 (the *stretta* emerged in 1520, but its statutes were not written until 1525). S. Maria del Baraccano, BCB Fondo Gozzadini 213, no. 1. S. Maria degli Angeli, BCB Fondo Gozzadini 203, no. 7.

negligent in performance of spiritual exercises and obligations to the brotherhood. These included the first groups to explicitly ban women and the first to establish clear procedures for getting rid of the morally-contagious member. One of the groups allied with the Dominican Observants and one with the Franciscan Observants, but the greater clerical influence seems to have been the Benedictines of the house of St Peter. Finally, a further four groups founded in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century offered charitable services while also practicing the devotional and disciplinary purity associated with Observant reform.[15] They were more selective in who they recruited, and more ready to expel those who undermined the community.

It was one thing to write stiff disciplinary regulations and another entirely to actually throw members out. Did the stiff rules set out in statutes ever translate into reality? In the period we are looking at they certainly did, at least in those brotherhoods for which we have matriculation lists. In the Modenese groups just noted, an average of one member in five was expelled through the fifteenth to the mid-sixteenth centuries: St Peter Martyr shed a quarter of its members from a 1439 reform to the mid-sixteenth century, while St Erasmus, which was one of the four confraternities immediately associated with the Bernardine Observant movement, expelled forty percent of all members from its origins until 1552.[16] Bologna had far more confraternities, and a far wider variety of results: Sts Jerome and Anna expelled twenty-five of the 106 members recruited in its devotional spurt of the 1440s, and then twenty-five percent again of those recruited in a second spurt of 1492–1501. St

---

[15] Matteo Al Kalak and Marta Lucchi, eds., *Gli statuti delle confraternite modenesi dal X al XVI secolo* (Bologna: CLUEB, 2011) is a collection that gathers the edited texts of all Modense confraternal statutes from 1261–1552. The first group of confraternities that emphasised charity included S. Pietro Martire (1261), S. Geminiano (1348), and S. Giovanni Battista (1372). S. Giovanni's first statutes are lost, but a reformed set was produced in 1452 and then a revision (with involvement of the prior of Benedictine house of S. Pietro) in 1482. The second group of Observant groups inspired directly or indirectly by Bernardino da Siena when he preached in Modena in 1423 included Sant'Erasmo (1422), and S. Annunziata (established in 1423 by S. Bernardino and still preserving a relic he gave; first statutes were written in 1436, and then reformed in 1452), il Gesù (1423; formerly once thought to be 1452, but new documents point to this earlier date), and S. Bernardino (1450). The third group of charitable confraternities of the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries included: S. Rocco (1480, though its first statutes are lost), S. Geminiano (1492), S. Sebastiano (1501), and S. Giuseppe (1532, though its first statutes are also lost).
[16] Al Kalak and Lucchi, *Gli statuti*, 11–12.

Mary of Charity, the group in our first stage which took on the name of the Misericordia in 1399, saw significant growth after it undertook an Observant reform in 1518, yet in the next two and a half decades it went on to expel thirty-one percent (46 of 146) of the new members that it attracted. St Mary of Death's group of comforters who assisted prisoners condemned to death adopted new statutes in 1555 instituting a censor to check into members' morals, and within six years expelled half its members.[17] John Henderson estimated that one Florentine confraternity expelled sixteen percent of its members annually, most of them from the pool of the newest recruits. He found further that periods of rapid growth inevitably resulted in high rates of expulsion, with most of those expelled having been members for only five years or less.[18] It's a pattern we see in most observant or reformed confraternities across Italy whose membership records are extant.[19] Expulsions did ease off considerably in Modena, Bologna, and Florence by the later sixteenth century when devotional currents shifted once again and confraternities became parish auxiliaries whose work and membership were tied more closely to the spiritual and charitable needs defined by the local priest and bishop.

The Macrocosm: Discipline, Enclosure, Purgation

What happens if we look beyond the microcosm represented by lay confraternities in a few North Italian cities? At the heart of the three stages that I've tracked in confraternal statute provisions and disciplinary actions is an obsession that is omnipresent in the organised religious life of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Some see it as discipline; I would suggest we intensify this as purgation. Because discipline extends to purgation, it is the most contentious element of many disputes within religious groups, both Protestant and Catholic, through the first half of the

---

[17] ASB Fondo Demaniale, Compagnia di SS. Girolamo ed Anna, 5/6722, ms 1. ASB Codici Miniati, ms 65, cc fols. 1r–7v. For S. Maria della Carità: BCB Fondo Gozzadini 210, no. 6. "Conforteria della Morte – Catalogo delli autori," Biblioteca Arcivescovile di Bologna, Aula 2°. C.VI.3, pp. 10–18.

[18] John Henderson, *Piety and Charity in Late Medieval Florence* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 137.

[19] We can contrast this to the very low expulsion rates of the large companies that ran confraternal hospitals, including S. Maria degli Angeli (fifteen out of 466 members—3.2 percent—recruited from 1479 to the early sixteenth century: BCB Fondo Gozzadini 203, no. 5) and S. Maria del Baraccano (eighteen of 722 members—2.4 percent—on an undated list of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries: ASB Fondo Ospedale, no. 3).

sixteenth century: Radicals and Anabaptists insisted on the ban, Calvinists and Anglicans developed the consistory courts, Catholics and Lutherans regularised the visitation. Whatever we think of the reality or success of "confessionalisation" or "christianisation," we can recognise that all religious communities within Christendom obsessed over purity and multiplied the efforts and tools that protected their purity from contagion—from confessions and catechisms to enclosure and purgation. Thanks to the work of Yosef Kaplan and Tijana Krstic, we see some of the same forces at work within contemporary Jewish and Muslim communities.[20] The devotional and disciplinary impulses are more closely intertwined by the sixteenth century than they ever were in the fourteenth, and that then directs attention to the fifteenth century to understand how and in what forms the emphasis on purity, contagion, and community take ever sharper definition. One expression of that, as I mentioned earlier, is ever more people being thrown out of communities not just for what they *do*, but for what they *are* —an important development of essentialist identities.

It's important to recognise that the disciplinary developments within lay confraternities and within Christian churches of all confessions are usually the results of lay-clerical collaboration. While professional tensions abounded, there was no fundamental distinction between Church and State. The question on everybody's mind and the grand collaborative project is: how do we build a holy society?[21] As we saw, there is a steady ramping up of the rhetoric of purity from the fourteenth, to the mid-fifteenth, to the early sixteenth centuries. The emerging conviction among Bolognese and Modenese confraternity members is not simply that immoral members bring the rest of the group into disrepute—that's a banal and common complaint. The intensification is that in the first instance it is *their* immorality that prevents the rest of us from realising *our* devotional purity; it then becomes their very *identity* and *presence* that is the problem. In this emerging essentialist scapegoating, we move from actions to identity as the marker of contagion (something that both R. I. Moore and

---

[20] Yosef Kaplan, "Between Christianity and Judaism in Early Modern Europe: The Confessionalization Process of the Western Sephardi Diaspora," in *Judaism, Christianity, and Islam in the Course of History: Exchange and Conflict*, ed. Lothar Gall and Dietmar Willoweit (Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2011), 307–41. Tijana Krstić, *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011).

[21] See the essays on this theme in Nicholas Terpstra, Adriano Prosperi, and Stefania Pastore, eds., *Faith's Boundaries: Laity and Clergy in Early Modern Confraternities* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012).