

# Cunegonde Interrupts a Baptism Ceremony – Interview with Benjamin Kaplan

**Natália da Silva Perez** 00:21

Hi, my name is Natália da Silva Perez and you are listening to the Privacy Studies Podcast. Today I am joined by my co-host, Johannes Ljungberg. Hi, Johannes.

**Johannes Ljungberg** 00:35

Hello, Natalia.

**Natália da Silva Perez** 00:37

It's very nice to have you with me. We have the pleasure to have as our guest, Benjamin Kaplan. Hi, Ben, it's really nice to have you at the Privacy Studies Podcast.

**Benjamin Kaplan** 00:46

Thank you, Natália, nice to see you. And Johannes.

**Natália da Silva Perez** 00:51

Today we're going to talk about your book Cunegonde's Kidnapping. This is a story about the perils of interfaith marriage, about family interference on marriage, about the lack of privacy for these people who are in interfaith relationships, and conflicts over baptism. Can you tell us an overview of this story? What is the story about?

**Benjamin Kaplan** 01:18

It's a story about a Calvinist woman and a Catholic man who marry and have a child. And the question is, is that child going to be baptized Calvinist or Catholic. Now, the woman... her name is Sarah... was a Calvinist and she was Dutch. She came from the Dutch side of the border, which was officially Calvinist. And the man Hendrik came just across the other side of the border from the German land, German territory of the city of Aachen. Catholic and very strongly, even militantly Catholic, so how could they have met? Well, they met in this border where it was normal for people of different religions to encounter one another. The whole story takes place, and a little village called Vaals. And this village has the distinction of being situated right on the border of three different countries, not just to modern day Belgium, and Holland and Germany, their borders meet right there. So it's the far southeastern corner of Holland, the provinces called Limberg. And the location plays an important role in the story almost as great as the conflicts and issues surrounding interfaith marriage in this early modern era. Because, as you were suggesting before, early modern culture had great qualms about interfaith marriage, the importance of religion, and both individual and communal identity, made interfaith marriage profoundly problematic. And so sometimes, these problems in interfaith marriages burst out into the open. That's exactly what happened dramatically, in this case.

**Johannes Ljungberg** 03:36

So Henrik, and Sarah, they, they met, and they married, and they had a child. And what happened then?

03:44

Well, they didn't agree about how the child should be baptized and raised, and that was that dispute between them started involving more and more people outside the household. So first of all, a question

of who is going to marry them? Are they going to marry in a Catholic church who are Protestant church? Well, the minister or I should say, the priest of the Catholic Church in a very tricky and underhanded way as it happens, basically coerced them, forced them to agree as a condition of his marrying them, that they would raise all their children Catholic. But privately, Hendrik, the Catholic, agreed privately to Sarah and gave her a little document even as evidence of this, that he would allow all their children to be raised Calvinist. Now they didn't have to raise all of their children one way or the other. In fact, one of the more common practices back then, was for the boys to be raised in the father's religion and the girl roles in the mothers, there was a kind of compromise, not approved, or encouraged, of course, by any ecclesiastical authorities, but a very common one. At any rate, there were four different agreements about how these children would be raised split one way or the other. Only Hendrik and Sarah concern even knew about all of this. But the point is that there was great uncertainty in the wider community, and both the Protestant and Catholic communities in that little area, were very intent on having a child be part of their community. So what happens after that child is born is that the Catholic Sexten of the Catholic Church in the village of Vaals goes to where Hendrik comes from, he goes back to his family, which lives on the opposite side of the border in a little village called Würselen to fetch a member of the family to reason with Hendrix to support Hendrik and his insistence the child be baptized Catholic, and to serve as godparent. And he brings back one of Hendrix sisters, named Cunegonde, in English, Cunegunda, in German, and she comes to the village. And by the time she gets there, the baby is in the Calvinist church, being baptized, the mother's family has prevailed up to that point, is winning the contest, the child is being baptized, literally being held over the baptismal basin. Cunegonde rushes into the church, the reformed Protestant church in Vaals, grab grabs the child and tries to just physically pull it away, and run off with it, to bring it to the Catholic priest for it to be baptized Catholic. Well... this is an act of what shall we say, madness? Folly? It didn't succeed. One woman against it was, I don't know somewhere between seven and a dozen people, Protestants, there in the church. And she's arrested. She is arrested for something quite serious. That is she had disrupted the administration of a Holy Sacrament of the communist congregation, which was the official congregation the official religion of the Dutch Republic, and tried to kidnap a baby. So she's arrested. And everybody knows what her fate is going to be. She'll be branded and whipped and otherwise punished. So the Catholics in the community, especially the ones just on the offensive side of the border, very unhappy about what's happening to the baby and what is about to happen to Cunegonde... they gathered in particular group of young men, about 30 of them, farm hands, apprentices, laborers, they gather just on the German side of the border. And they get some weapons together clubs, a pistol, a soldier comes along with them. And they, at night, go into the village of vows and they basically bust Cunegonde out of jail, because he was being held in, you know, not a literal jail because the village didn't have one, but under guard in a tavern. And they grabbed her physically and dispersed the the guard who run for their lives and, and whisker across the border back on to German soil, beyond the jurisdiction of the Dutch authorities, where they hope she'll be safe. But now, another crime has been committed. And one which from the perspective of the Dutch government is even worse, actually, because this is an armed band from a foreign land has crossed over the border and attacked the The guards who represent the Dutch state in effect, and seize Cunegonde. This is a flouting of the sovereignty, the territorial control of the Dutch government over this Dutch village. It's a capital offense, Cunegonde's wasn't. So the Dutch government decides to go after these people. And it sends in a company of troops. It dispatches a military contingent, to help apprehend these malefactors. And they don't succeed, they lay a trap, that doesn't work. What the Dutch do succeeded in doing is pressuring the Afghan authorities. I mean, after all, the Dutch government rule, a very prosperous and militarily powerful state in the 17th century, in the 18th century, now it's less powerful, but still very considerable. The city of Auckland is just a city. It's part of this very large but very loose, Holy Roman Empire, but it's essentially pretty impotent politically and militarily. So they successfully pressure the Aachen magistrates to return Pentagon to them. But really, they're not satisfied. They want those farmhands who committed the most violent act. And, more importantly, they want to catch the mastermind, the m&s greys, the person behind the events,

**Natália da Silva Perez 11:59**

and there's something important about their suspicion as well, right? Because Pentagon is not completely aware of the seriousness of her crime. Correct. There was something special about kindergarten, you, you say in the book, that she must have had some sort of cognitive disability. And there's someone in specific that they think was behind this right father Boston?

**Benjamin Kaplan 12:30**

Yes, absolutely. The, the Catholic priest of the village of Laos, that's who they think, is the mastermind. He, after all, is a Catholic priest. And the Dutch authority is, however, quote, unquote, enlightened they are in the Age of Enlightenment, they still harbor a very powerful anti Catholic prejudices, their anti Catholicism and their social prejudice, you might say, combine to leave them to come to the conclusion on the basis of very limited evidence so far, that it was the Catholic priest who ordered Pentagon to go into the church and grab the baby and bring it to him for him to baptize it. Likewise, that he told the boys who are members of his parish congregation now after all, that you would really appreciate it if they went and free Hakuna God because he felt in fact himself kind of responsible for what happened to her again, there's plausibility to it. And ultimately, the story becomes a who've done it. They ended up prosecuting father Boston, they arrest him and prosecute him, it takes five years for the case to proceed to its conclusion. And all that time. They gather evidence, but there's evidence on both sides of the case, did he do this? Did he not do this? That was, besides the point as far as anybody at the time was concerned, they wanted to prosecute the farmhands. But far more they wanted to nail the priest, someone responsible. And so in fact, I mean, the Dutch authorities themselves act in very underhanded and arguably immoral ways. One of them in particular, the lieutenant governor. So he offers as a were a pardon to some of those farm hands in American English, we would say, he told them that if they turned state's evidence, that is if they testified against father Boston, they would be, you know, found innocent and not prosecuted, and they did. So on the basis of that evidence they arrest, Father Boston, and And then things get all more out of control. Because the arrest of the priest is an act of great significance for the entire Catholic community as well as Catholic authorities in the area. But it's not the authorities. It is ordinary Catholic laypeople who live in Aachen, the city and its territory, who take the law into their own hands, their magistrates had kind of, you know, given Pentagon up, they weren't, the authorities weren't able to stand up to the Dutch. But the ordinary people were, what they start doing, is attacking Protestants, they start assaulting. And they said that hardly the first time that they had done this, there was a whole history, Protestants who lived in Aachen and other places had to travel to vowels in order to worship. And along that road, they were passing through woods and were vulnerable, and so they would be attacked on Route. So now, with the rest of father Boston, you might say, the Catholic lay people start doing reprisals. They start attacking more and more, and they kill somebody with the death, the killing of our product, and the Dutch authorities now close all the Catholic churches, on their territory in that region. All of them that in turn, concerns the Catholic princes of the entire region, the bishop of liasion, the counter victim, and it becomes an international incident.

**Johannes Ljungberg 16:48**

You mentioned in the preface that you felt fortunate very fortunate to find this material. Can you tell us a little bit about this archival discovery, what were you looking for?

**Benjamin Kaplan 17:01**

I was looking for cases of child kidnapping things. In the course of my research into the history of interfaith marriage, I found a certain number of cases where the children of interfaith couples got kidnapped. And I soon started discerning a pattern, which the Pentagon case exemplifies that is, it's a struggle between the families basically, it's usually a family member who does the kidnapping. Actually, the most common scenario is that the kidnapping follows the death of one of the parents step back and

think about it for a second you've got, say, Catholic father, Calvinist mother, like Hendricks and Sarah, let's say the Calvinist mother dies. Well, what will naturally happen then, is that the Catholic father would raise all the children in his faith from that point on. And that would upset the relatives of the deceased Calvinist spouse, it would be one of them, who in many cases I found, perpetrated or arranged the kidnapping, to get the child or children multiple, in many cases, out of the hands of the surviving spouse who was going to impose their religion on him and, you know, save them for what the relatives think of as the true religion. So and I started systematically looking for cases of child kidnappings, and even without reference to interfaith marriage, because now I knew that a great number of child kidnappings, and I would venture to say probably a majority of them in that era, were triggered by struggle over the religious upbringing of the child. So I looked systematically for mentions of child kidnapping, in archival sources, and archival inventories. And that's what I found a mention of a child kidnapping in this obscure place. That's what attracted my attention. That's how I found the dossier of judicial sources.

**Natália da Silva Perez 19:27**

These child kidnappings, they happened because one side of the family wanted to make sure the child was baptized in their own religion, as opposed to the religion of the other side of the family. Right. However, the baptism in the Catholic Church was officially recognized by the Reformed Church and vice versa, right. But this seems to have been privileged information, right? It's only people who are educated in theological matters who are aware of that

**Benjamin Kaplan 20:00**

I would put it a little bit differently. So, for instance, in the story of Hendrik and Sarah, there's the figure of the midwife who helps the the birth of the child. She's illiterate. She's a pious Catholic. She attends mass every morning, as far as we can tell. She knows, she knows that Protestant baptisms are, in fact, deemed theologically valid by her Catholic Church, and vice versa. She even defends her practice when criticized by other Catholics, because as a midwife operating in this place, she's under a legal obligation to bring Protestant children to the Protestant church to be baptized, as well as Catholics to the Catholic Church. And when criticized, she says, baptism is baptism. And I like hearing the service in German, as opposed to the Latin that you priests use, because you can understand that German, she doesn't have any Latin. So it's not necessarily a matter of elites, knowing the theology and ordinary people misunderstanding. And in fact, I mean, what's I think, really going on is that at all social levels, people think of baptism as more than just a feel logical transaction. They think of it as a rite of initiation, you might say they wouldn't use fancy terminology like that. But they think of it as the ritual through which an infant becomes a member of their community, which is a religious community. And so if you're baptized in the Catholic Church here, you join the Catholic community, and then a Protestant church, you joined the Protestant community. So the mutual validity isn't to the point, you might say. And in fact, really was true, that in the vast majority of cases, whatever church you were baptized in as a religion, you would be raised in and practice as an adult, the only exception being people who, later on convert. So it did function that way. In this society, you might say, in some ways, it still does. It has significance, social and cultural for people who aren't particularly religious today. So it had these layers of significance back back then

**Natália da Silva Perez 22:52**

I have here, the quote from her, she says, I hear no evil, they're referring to the reformed baptism. You say everything in Latin, she's talking to the priest. But in the Reformed Church, I hear the baptism in German, I find that it's really an interesting example of toleration in practice.

**Benjamin Kaplan 23:14**

Absolutely. And it's the pre east, who is far more educated who is so and the child must be baptized by a Catholic priest in a Catholic Church. The theology is not to the point as far as he's concerned,

### **Johannes Ljungberg 23:30**

as these events became more publicly known, for started as a family conflict about where this child would be baptized, has escalated quite quickly, quite rapidly to something that involved quite many people in the region in France, and in Akron. And there was one group of people attacking Sarah's father and so forth. And who were these people? Why did they intervene? And and was this something that was going on in Europe during these time days?

### **Benjamin Kaplan 24:04**

We think of the 18th century as the Age of Enlightenment, we think of it as an age of toleration when it's true. Great authors like Voltaire in the very year as of this episode, are championing toleration. But if you go and look on the ground, as it were, and study actual relations in towns and villages and Borderlands, between people of different faiths, is you'll see a different picture. The story of Hendrik and Sarah may not have been average kind of an ordinary kind of episode. But it gives you a glimpse into some of those realities for ordinary people at the time and they out region Protestant Catholic relations were very bitter, even in the late 18th century. And there are reasons for that special bitterness. If you go back to the protestant reformation of the 16th century, actually, Aachen initially went largely Protestant, over a period of decades. Partly their native embrace Protestantism partly, they received a lot of Protestant immigrants. By the late 16th century, Aachen was a majority Protestant city, and Protestants and Catholics vied bitterly for control of the city government. And so the city ended up Catholic and very militantly, so only because the Protestants had twice risen up in a kind of uprising against the Catholic authorities there. And those uprisings had been violently put down. And then ultimately, there was a huge purge, and Protestantism was suppressed. This could only happen through the intervention of outside Catholic forces, including the Holy Roman Emperor, himself. So the Catholics have often remembered Protestants as the people who tried to take control of their city as the people who were traitors who were insurgents who had seized arms and rebelled. And the taint of that was something that stuck to Protestants long after they lost numbers and cloud, and the slightest chance of wielding any political authority nevermind seizing control, because by the middle of the 17th century, there were only a few 100 Protestants left in the city. So if I only was put down and the only reason why Protestantism survived, and often at all, from that point on was, because of the Dutch authorities and valves, they could travel about an hour's walk, depending on your case. Out from the territory of their city across the border onto this Dutch territory, this task village where Protestant worship was not only legal, it was in fact, the official from worship. And the Dutch authorities, very consciously and purposefully promoted vows as a way to save the protestants in Aachen and other Catholic states in the region. So, the Catholics in Aachen were furious with the Dutch authorities for doing this. I mean, it was only by virtue of this foreign intrusion into the region, you might say that Protestantism survived. That is that the seditious rebels were encouraged and given support, and allowed to persist. So the bitterness had roots going back almost 200 years, the memories of what had happened in the 16th and the early 17th century, were very much alive. And you hear them echoed in the utterances of Catholics in the course of this episode.

### **Johannes Ljungberg 28:58**

So we have the roots of conflict here. And we have the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, as an important watershed, which provide rights to religious groups two, together, the subtitle of your book is a story of religious conflict in the Age of Enlightenment. And this raises the question, how we should approach this period right, as historians What could this story teach us about how we can approach the Age of Enlightenment?

**Benjamin Kaplan 29:33**

There are elements of enlightened culture that play a significant role, especially towards the end of the story. Father, Boston is convicted, jailed until he can pay a big fine and the cause of his imprisonment for the period of the trial, and the total amounts to a sum far beyond what he can pay has been handled pretty roughly at points treated in a way few priests were. So on the one hand, the Dutch authorities were very intent on prosecuting and convicting him, but a kind of humanitarian enlightenment in formed sentiment leads to his eventually being well released without paying the full amount there was an intervention, which, on enlightened grounds, mitigates it. I'll call it a humanitarian kind of kind of sentiment, so it mitigates the anti Catholicism. Another thing that the story brings out is how old confessional hostilities and enlightenment attitudes were not just simply opposed to one another. Many enlightenment authors, their readers thought of Catholicism as fanatical. They thought of it as among the different religions, the least enlightened, there's, in the day, enlightened religion and less enlightened religion, people back then weren't involved in the Enlightenment were not for the most part anti religious, that's a stereotype or oversimplification. There are some figures who you would say were pretty powerfully anti clerical, if not anti religious. But for the most part, especially in Protestant lands, like the Dutch Republic, they tended to think that there was good that is enlightened religion and bad is unenlightened religion they just wanted they wanted to reform and change religion, not abolish or suppress it. And in the kind of rank ordering of different versions of Christianity in particular religions more generally, some were more civilized and enlightened than others. Protestantism, in other words, was in life and then Catholicism was backward, primitive, bigoted, ritualistic on thinking, authoritarian, that was part of the image of it, that Protestants held. So you can be Protestant, and enlightened. And on both grounds, you could be anti Catholic.

**Johannes Ljungberg 32:47**

I think it's fascinating with the book that you can see how some people may carry Enlightenment ideas, but that that could function still as a fuel for these conflicts. While on the other hand, people like Anna Olivier, who is a devout Catholic, she could buy that faith, be more tolerant in practice or in attitudes, so that it all meets in a way it can. When you meet historical people, you can see unexpected things.

**Benjamin Kaplan 33:24**

The wonderful thing about the episode ultimately is that it's a slice of real life. It's a slice not of kind of high politics and decisions taken, you know, in council chambers. It's not a story of, of high minded ideas being formulated by brilliant minds and then published and disseminated. It's a story of what life was like and what people actually did. That is a dimension of religious history that's often lost sight of that label for the 18th century, the Age of Enlightenment is one that attracts that focuses all the attention on the high ideas and ideals, and it distracts or diverts our attention from the practical realities on the ground, the character of life for for most people, it also, of course, focuses our attention on elite groups

**Natália da Silva Perez 34:27**

diverts our attention and distract us from actually seeing the possible well, strategies of compromise and even conflict resolution that normal people manage to come up with in their everyday life.

**Benjamin Kaplan 34:45**

Well, I and many other historians now to our devoted to trying to understand the genuine kind of real life character of relations between people of different faiths. Instead of studying the history of religious toleration, and conflict in terms of wars or in terms of ideas, we do now know a lot more than we did say 20 years ago about what happened in this community. What happened in that community, how the local could be Lutheran and Calvinist, or Calvinists, and then a Baptist or Calvinist in Canada, you know, every, every community different, you do find lots of patterns, you find lots of things. Like for instance,

that practice I was *laufen*, walking out literally, which was performed by the Protestants of often traveling out to vows where they could worship. Now, the Peace of Westphalia made it concrete that Calvinists and Catholic territories, for instance, had a right to do that it was a legal right, it became practically constitutionally enshrined. But it wasn't the invention of the authors of the Peace of Westphalia, we can find instances of this going very far back to almost Well, the 1530s actually, so the early years of the Protestant Reformation. And it was an ad hoc thing originally, I mean, there were, you know, some Protestants in the Catholic canton of Switzerland, who weren't being allowed to, to worship in the manner they thought true and right. They could not do it without being punished in their community. So what did they think to do? Well, they, they traveled somewhere else to to worship just someplace where the local authorities, you know, didn't have any jurisdiction, and it was safe to do it. And of course, if you happen to have a state of that other religion, close enough to travel to that makes it really great because then you can cross the border and not just kind of worship in an ad hoc manner, but attend the services of another established congregation, one of your own religion. So we find this from early on people in different parts of of Europe, coming up with *House laufen* as a practical response to the suppression not of their beliefs, not of not of their presence or not being expelled. But usually, the bottom line for authorities was was not what people thought in their minds. It was more public, it was what they said in public is what they did in public. And, and worship. I mean, the act of venerating God and performing certain rituals. That's what was unacceptable.

**Natália da Silva Perez 38:03**

It's a way that the ideas got disseminated right, by being visible. And so that was what's caused most anxiety, I guess, on authorities, right? Well,

**Benjamin Kaplan 38:15**

it also if you allow it to take place, on your turf, as it were, and you're responsible for that turf, that community that town that territory, well, then you bear responsibility before God for what happened and for his dishonor, for for the heresy of the idolatry being perpetrated by these people, you have a duty and frankly, if the authorities aren't taking proper action, or ordinary people might, because if this was allowed to continue, God, God's wrath might come down on everybody in the community. So people have felt a kind of collective responsibility and authority is a special added responsibility to prevent really evil things from happening in plain daylight in their community in such a way that could not be ignored. Because if you let that happen, then that act was something for which everyone was responsible. It wasn't the private.

**Natália da Silva Perez 39:28**

Sorry.

**Benjamin Kaplan 39:30**

It wasn't what religious worship wasn't in that sense, just a private matter.

**Natália da Silva Perez 39:35**

Yeah, absolutely. So before we we wrap up, I think that we wanted you to comment on microhistory. Right. So Johan, is you wanted to ask about that?

**Johannes Ljungberg 39:47**

Yeah, perhaps we were talking about that. And we could perhaps end with a brief question about that. I just want to say that I think one fascinating thing with your book is that you can really see the these different elements together in a conflict dynamics that so we have this collective responsibilities of religious communities, we have these legal principles in play, which builds on previous practices, but they are there the legal principles, but they depend very much on the current social practices and what

happens, which people are living there and how they are interacting. Second feedback loop, it's really a feedback loop. Yes. And for a last question, we wanted to ask something about microhistory. Since this is this is a book which builds on on that method to take one specific specific case, one particular case and and let it speak. So, you have dialogues in your book, reconstructive dialogues. And sometimes you have, as far as I've understood, several witnesses which have recounted different stories, how did you? How did you manage to reconstruct these dialogues?

**Benjamin Kaplan 41:23**

Okay, well, I guess I would first just say, make clear that I didn't put any words into anybody's mouth, right? There's not a word in quotation marks, that is not in the original sources. Every little quotation in the book comes from a witness deposition, where the witness before, you know, the inquiring court says, Yeah, and I said to Father Boston, that blah, blah, blah. And Father Boston said to me, dadadada, da, the difficulty of reconstruction was that I had multiple accounts,

**Natália da Silva Perez 42:11**

and they contradicted themselves,

**Benjamin Kaplan 42:14**

sometimes they they contradicted each other. Yes. And ultimately, of course, there were two different versions of events being presented. And the case, as there always are, where there's a defense and the prosecution, they give different versions. But here, you find some people being questioned more than once and giving variants testimony on different occasions as as well, which wouldn't be uncommon. And anytime it plays, probably if people are questioned about the same thing, especially over an extended period of time, Qunar, God gave testimony seven times over those years. And yeah, her story evolved. So where things were uncertain, I make that clear to the reader. I tell them, there are two versions here, so and so says that this is what happened. And somebody else says that this was what happened. However, and the vast majority of cases, there was a there was agreement about many, you know, I said this and he said that. And so then I reported as simply an empirical fact that so and so said, X, I figure if there's agreement by parties on both sides about it, okay, it's not contested, it's pretty as reliable as any evidence in historical work, I suppose. But the Yeah. So, so, I dealt with it by stating as fact, what was uncontested and making clear to the reader what was contested and leaving it to them ultimately, to judge again, I I do tip my hand. So for instance, I mean, when Kuhn adorned, is first arrested. She says something, and ultimately, I rate the reliability of that initial statement higher than what she says two or three or more years later about what happened. And later she says, Yeah, Father Boston told me to go into the church and grab the baby. But that's not what he said. On that day. She said that it was the father of the sexton, who had gone to her village reversal and fetch her back to evolve to talk to her brother and to serve as godparents the child that it was, it was this man on juries who told her to go into that Searching grab the child, I suspect. I don't claim to know for sure. But it was probably injuries.

**Natália da Silva Perez 45:08**

I think that this was one of the things that fascinated me about the book is how you write yourself in the interpretation. And you make it really clear for as the reader that you have a particular stance that you arrived at by reading this evidence, but you don't try to hide yourself as the interpreter of the story. And I think that's what makes this book really worthwhile reading. And I just, I'm really, really happy that you talk to us about consequence kidnapping today, Ben, and it was really a pleasure reading it and a pleasure talking to you about it. I just want to know, do you have any last thoughts that you'd like to make sure to give to the reader and Johan is the same for you, if you want to say something? Before we wrap up, this is the time



**Benjamin Kaplan** 46:01

I think we've covered the ground really well. And thank you, both of you, Natalia Yohannes. For you know, bringing out the complexities of the story and for being so appreciative. It you know, it's, it's a slice of real life. That's what I would, you know, underline and the final word and that is studying the past. One gets a deeper understanding when you reach that level, and micro history, indeed, helps make that possible. And it's got limitations and drawbacks to but, but above all, I think we can understand history better when we reconstruct the three dimensional character of of people and life in the past.

**Natália da Silva Perez** 47:12

The Privacy studies podcast is produced by me Natália da Silva Perez with the support of the Center for privacy Studies at the University of Copenhagen. In the Danish National Research Foundation. The theme music is pyramid folk by sector helix. This podcast is released under a Creative Commons license attribution noncommercial sharealike thank you so much for listening