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In his well-known work *La Peur en Occident* the French historian Jean Delumeu observes: “In the past, there is one place where the historian is certain to find open and unconcealed fear: this place is the sea.”1 If one investigates humanity’s changing relationship to the sea by considering the coastal communities of North Friesland from the perspective of environmental history, one is certain to encounter in the secondary literature an image of coastal dwellers that is as homogenous and undifferentiated as that presented by the French historian. According to this picture, life on Schleswig-Holstein’s western coast has always been shaped by humans’ struggle with the ocean.

The image of “the free Frisian” as the prototypical coastal dweller has its roots in the era of the formation of the German state.2 The version of this image that has persisted to the present day, however, was created by the National Socialists. The Nazis propagated an image of the inhabitants of the North Sea coast that was dominated by a warlike confrontation between man and the sea. According to this image, the “heroic” marsh-landers’ conquest of nature was analogous to the victorious struggle of all Germans fighting against foreign enemies. In 1935, Walther Schoenichen, one of the leaders of the Nazi environmental protection campaign (and to whom the environmental movement still refers uncritically), described life on the North Sea coast as “the uninterrupted struggle of a tough Nordic race against the surges.”3 In 1931, the so-called *Heimatpolitiker* Rudolf Muuß4 observed colloquially that although *der blanke Hans*, a popular term for the North Sea, had always been “North Friesland’s greatest nemesis,” it had made the Frisians “who and what they are: full of true love for their homeland, of defiance, and of a sense of freedom.”5 Muuß continues that the Frisians, destined from birth to be pitted against this watery element, “have fought against the North Sea, the mortal enemy of the marshes, and they have conquered it with their spades.”6

Though such images of North Friesland’s inhabitants are seldom used for political purposes these days, the assumption which underpins this image—that of a hostile confrontation between humanity and the sea—is still widespread. Indeed, the author of a 1999 study claimed that “the history of North Friesland has been shaped by the struggle of man against the sea, of the dike against the floodtides.”7 This assumption,
perpetuated by a large body of older secondary literature, has not only been retained in recent survey works; it can also be discerned in more critical studies which claim to offer new paradigms of coastal society. By taking for granted the assumption of a combative relationship between coastal dwellers and the ocean, and by working from the same body of published sources, the authors of these critical studies have been unable to adopt new perspectives on humanity’s encounter with the sea throughout history.

Rather than presupposing a primal opposition between people and the sea, the present study aims to understand coastal life in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries from the perspective of coastal dwellers themselves. How did they see the world, and how did they position themselves and the sea in the context of their worldview?

Because the aim of the present study is to determine how the farmers of North Friesland perceived life in their coastal communities, neither the contemporary scholarly discourse nor the statements and mandates of the secular and religious authorities occupy a central place in this investigation. Instead, the focus is on texts written (or claimed to have been written) by the marshlanders themselves.

Unfortunately for the researcher, the seventeenth-century inhabitants of North Friesland did not leave behind any personal testimonials in the strict sense of the word. This does not mean, however, that they did not produce any documents. What at first glance appears to be a lack of source material is partially compensated for by texts created by marshlanders in the context of disputes with their neighbors and with local and state authorities.

It is not surprising that one of the most frequent topics of dispute in the coastal society of North Friesland was the dike. Numerous complaints, petitions and recommendations for mediation which document the conflicts surrounding the construction, upkeep and repair of the dikes still exist. Because dike construction was a prerequisite for marshland settlement (which meant that the building, upkeep and repair of dikes was central to the affairs of coastal society), dike disputes were influenced by various political and social conflicts, as well as by the worldviews of the participants. Conflict over the dikes prompted the usually silent marshlanders to speak at considerable length. In an attempt to justify their positions, they articulated arguments that provide glimpses of their concepts of natural, social and political order. Rather than reiterating the same superficial observations about life in a coastal community that have appeared in past studies, an investigation based on sources such as these can grant new insights into people’s perception of nature in the early modern period.
A quick glance at the landscape of Schleswig-Holstein’s western coast creates an impression of how prominent the dike was (and still is) in the lives of the inhabitants. The so-called “main dikes” (Hauptdeiche)—which can reach a height of nine meters and a width of seventy meters—separate the mud flats leading to the ocean from the agrarian lands. Further inland are many former “outer dikes” (Aussendeiche), known today as “middle dikes” (Mitteldeiche) or “sleeping dikes” (Schlafdeiche). Today they serve mainly as a reserve dike-line which demarcates patches of land called polders (Köge) that were won from the sea long ago. Many of the Mitteldeiche have been covered with asphalt in recent years and are now used as roads. Houses frequently line the tops of these massive structures, which are suited perfectly for elevating and protecting homes during the occasional flood. At those places along the Mitteldeiche where roads tunnel through their sides, wooden planks stand at the ready so that the dikes can be sealed in the event of high water, a fact which testifies to the importance even today of the Mitteldeiche as a “second line of protection” against the sea.

In addition to helping shape the physical contours of North Friesland, the dike played a key role in determining the region’s beginnings as well as its later development. Indeed, dikes are what made a long-term habitation of the marshes possible. They allowed the settled and cultivated areas to expand whilst also protecting the land and the property—as well as the lives—of the resident population. By building dikes, the inhabitants of Schleswig Holstein’s western coast attempted to turn dangerous natural conditions to their benefit by drawing a clear line of separation between the “wild sea” and the cultivated lands, between a hostile “outer world” (Butenwelt) and a hospitable “inner world” (Binnenwelt). Thus, the dike not only made possible the habitation and expansion of the marshlands, it also shaped the mentality of their inhabitants in lasting ways.

The dike also exerted a powerful influence on the structure of coastal society because its building and upkeep required a high degree of social organization. “Ring dikes” (Ringdeichanlagen), first introduced on Schleswig-Holstein’s western coast in the twelfth century, replaced the earlier method of settlement through the creation of scattered mounds of earth (Warft or Wurt). Since a single dike could protect several villages at once, and since the construction and maintenance of a dike necessitated far greater sums of money than any individual could muster, marshlanders were forced to reach group decisions with respect to the dikes. Associations formed for this purpose played a prominent role in North Frisian society dating back to the region’s earliest efforts at dike building. As dike construction increased over time, these associations assumed even greater importance.
The dike not only shaped the inner structure of North Friesland’s society by initiating the creation of communal organizations, it also contributed to the formation of that society’s outer structure, in the sense that it was a major factor in the marshlanders’ relationship to their rulers, who over the course of the seventeenth century increasingly came to recognize the dikes’ importance for the region. The duchies of Schleswig and Holstein increased spending on their military and administrative apparatus as well as on princely representation, resulting in a severe shortage of funds. With the state coffers depleted, territorial princes began to take a greater interest in the profitable marshlands, whose contributions had long formed an important source of income. In order to increase and safeguard this revenue source, the princes tried to increase their influence over the diking of new lands, as well as over the protection of lands already won from the sea. Their attempts to gain greater control over the dikes often met with resistance from the population, who wanted to maintain their traditional rights and autonomies. The shoring up of new marshland and the protection of lands already won from the sea in North Friesland were more closely associated with the rulers’ attempts to broaden their claims to sovereignty than the marshlands’ peripheral location on Schleswig-Holstein’s western coast might suggest.

Aside from its social and political significance, the dike was a central element in the marshlanders’ worldviews, which were heavily influenced in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries by religious concerns. In the eyes of coastal dwellers, the building of a dike represented an act of human intervention in God’s creation, an intervention that could be carried out only with His blessing. While the successful completion of a dike was taken as a sign of the project having received God’s sanction, breaches of the dike and other damage caused by storms were interpreted as divine punishments which the people believed they had brought upon themselves owing to their sinful way of life.

Indeed, dike construction and repair, the organization and distribution of work related to the dike, investigations into the causes of breaches and—last but not least—public disputes concerning the dikes were all processes of social interaction that took center stage in North Friesland’s coastal communities. To some extent the dike can even be regarded as the materialization of the concepts, beliefs and attitudes of the North Frisians, for these things informed their every action with respect to the dikes.

These concepts, beliefs and attitudes became readily apparent in those cases when the marshlanders perceived reality to be at odds with their worldviews. Such cases often resulted in violent conflicts that sometimes dragged on for several years and have left behind a paper trail in the form of complaints and petitions. These conflicts cannot be dismissed as the result of an inherent belligerency in the people. Rather, given the
dike’s central importance in coastal society, disputes surrounding the dikes must be regarded as the expression of fundamental social conflicts that were a product of the time. Dike disputes functioned as a forum for diverse processes of social negotiation. These negotiations had become necessary due to the fact that society’s ideas of order had been thrown into question by rapidly shifting political and social conditions, by changing mentalities and by the scientific and technical innovations of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

In what follows, several case studies are presented to illustrate the extent to which analyses of dike disputes can grant insight into aspects of social, political and religious life on Schleswig-Holstein’s western coast in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

“Dike Solidarity”: A Contested Principle of Marshland Society

Any inquiry into the dike’s influence on social structures necessarily entails a consideration of the communal organizations created by marshlanders to build and to maintain the dikes, which in turn leads to a consideration of the issue of dike solidarity, commonly regarded as a characteristic element of North Frisian society.

In fact, the larger dike projects—which began as far back as the twelfth century and which encompassed multiple villages as well as their fields—required the banding together of all those whom the dike would protect. These associations were at first congruent with the parish and agrarian organizations already in place, yet as the building of dikes increased, associations formed for dike maintenance came to extend far beyond parish boundaries. These dike associations were organized for the purpose of providing emergency assistance and funds to members. Emergency assistance meant that in the case of damage to the dike, the member parishes of the association sent materials and help to the affected communities. Members received nothing in exchange for their assistance other than the certainty that, if they themselves needed help in the future, they could call upon the others. The dike association’s second purpose—to make funds available—applied more to everyday life. A complicated accounting system ensured that the costs of dike upkeep and repair were spread among members. Some means of splitting costs was essential, for as time went on and dikes proliferated, the inhabitants of polders which had been won from the sea in years past benefited when additional land separating themselves from the water was secured through the erection of a new dike. This meant that the residents of older lands did not have to devote as much time and attention to maintaining their dikes, which no longer directly bordered the sea. The dike associations, however, saw to it that costs continued to be spread by requiring the inhabitants of the
older lands to contribute funds for the maintenance of new dikes in neighboring communities. The amount of this contribution was a frequent subject of dispute, as was the extent to which a parish could afford to curtail spending on its own dike when a new dike was built closer to the ocean. Such disputes are interesting because they reveal a questioning of the meaning, the value and the limits of the concept of dike solidarity.

One can see marshlanders questioning the concept of dike solidarity in a complaint submitted to the Duke of Gottorf in 1628 by the inhabitants of Tetenbüll, a parish on the Eiderstedt peninsula. Tetenbüll’s residents felt that they had been unjustly called upon to assist in the repair of a dike in the neighboring parish Osterhever, which had been damaged in a storm:

Residents of the parish of Osterhever have recently complained to Your Highness about damages to their dike which are not to be found, and they have once again sought to retain . . . our assistance . . . We cannot neglect to bring to light the foolishness of the supplicants’ claim (as well as the legitimacy of our refusal to respond to their call for help), for they had at first stated that several hundred meters of the dike had collapsed . . . when in truth this was not the case, for the waves were not as large as they claimed them to have been.

Tetenbüll’s petitioners thus called into doubt the extent of the damage to the dike, which Osterhever’s residents asserted had been ruined along several hundred meters, allowing water to erode subsoil at its foundation. Beyond suggesting that the damage had been exaggerated, Tetenbüll’s residents expressed doubts about whether Osterhever’s call for help was justified. They argued that the neighboring parish had failed to maintain its dike due to laziness, and therefore the people of Osterhever should be held responsible for the catastrophe that had befallen them.

Although . . . we must admit that Osterhever’s dike was severely damaged, it is nevertheless true that this damage occurred not so much through the rushing waters . . . but through the people’s own negligence. They did not erect their dike at the proper time nor did they reinforce and repair it occasionally as other parishes do. While we and others have spent many thousands of Reichstaler on improvements to our dike, and poured our sweat and labor into it, the people of Osterhever have avoided working on their dike and have allowed it to deteriorate from one year to the next.

For this reason, and because they believed that by the grace of God Osterhever’s residents would be able to repair the dike themselves, the Tetenbüll petitioners asked that

the people of Osterhever’s request for aid be dismissed and that they be told to work more diligently, both for their own good and so that the lethargic dike...
workers are not given further cause to be lazy. Otherwise great confusion would arise in the land as everyone would abandon his dike to the assistance of others.17

While the ostensible object of dispute was the dike, the judgmental tone of the Tetenbüll petitioners’ arguments is suggestive of a deeper conflict between the two parishes, a conflict that involved normative ideas of diligence, duty and order. In addition, one gets a sense of the complicated network of relationships which bound the disputants to varying degrees, relationships which were not limited to interactions between the marshlanders, but also included the territorial prince and, to some extent, God (whose support the residents of Osterhever would receive if they only set their shoulders to the wheel). These relationships formed three main aspects of the world that was Schleswig-Holstein’s western coast in the Early Modern period.

The Tetenbüll petitioners’ ideas of order can be seen in their questioning of whether Osterhever’s call for help was justifiable. In their view, the request for emergency assistance was not legally binding, because Osterhever’s residents were themselves to blame for the calamity. Tetenbüll’s petitioners accused them first of squirreling away money which should have been invested in their dike’s upkeep and, second, of asking for help in order to avoid the consequences of their stinginess. While the authors of the complaint praised themselves as “very diligent” (fein fleissig) parishioners who had invested extensive funds and labor in the upkeep of their own dike, they condemned Osterhever for shirking its duties and allowing its dike’s condition to grow worse with each passing year. Unsurprisingly, therefore, the petitioners concluded their complaint by asking the duke to reject Osterhever’s request for assistance and to demand its residents become more industrious.

Two aspects of the Tetenbüll petitioners’ arguments are particularly interesting. Firstly, they attempted to apportion blame for the incident, a practice that was common in the context of dike breaches caused by storms. According to the religious worldview of the time, the cause of the breach could be none other than God’s anger, which had been aroused by the people’s sinful way of life. The authors of the complaint, however, attributed the cause of the breach to Osterhever’s poor upkeep of its dike. In the eyes of the petitioners, negligent dike maintenance alone had resulted in the crisis. This purely causal explanation of the catastrophe does not prove, however, that religious interpretations of dike breaches were foreign to Tetenbüll’s parishioners. Numerous case studies show that the interpretation of floods as divine punishments continued to be widespread well into the eighteenth century.18 Rather, it seems that Tetenbüll’s petitioners chose not to explain the damage to the dike in terms of
divine punishment in order to evade what the residents of Osterhever perceived to be an obvious duty to provide them with assistance in accordance with the principle of dike solidarity. In order to achieve this aim, Tetenbüll’s petitioners created an argument better suited to their purpose, namely that Osterhever itself was guilty of the calamity and had therefore forfeited its right to aid.

Also of interest is the recommendation that the petitioners included in their complaint. They proposed to the duke a course of action which, they argued, was best not only for themselves, but also for Osterhever. Osterhever’s request, they argued, should not only be denied; its people should also be instructed to “work more diligently,” which would encourage them to “help themselves.” If the duke were to grant Osterhever’s request for aid, then the lazy parishioners would become even more negligent with respect to the upkeep of their dike. This would lead to “a great confusion” throughout the land, because it would encourage other parishes to palm off work on their own dikes to neighboring parishes. Thus the Tetenbüll petitioners justified their refusal to give aid not by suggesting that they were financially incapable of doing so, but rather by posing as pedagogues concerned with the “moral improvement” of their neighbors.

Not surprisingly, the people of Osterhever saw the situation quite differently. In their reply, they responded only peripherally to Tetenbüll’s chief accusation—that they had not invested enough money in dike maintenance—by providing a few figures relating to dike expenditures. Their main purpose was to depict their neighbors as unfairly advantaged and miserly. Tetenbüll, the authors complained, had far more land and was much wealthier than Osterhever. The inequality between the two parishes, they suggested, gave Osterhever a right to demand Tetenbüll’s support in times of crisis.

This conflict reveals the existence of a wide spectrum of competing positions and polemical strategies with respect to the issue of dike solidarity. In order to further illustrate this spectrum, it is worth examining another conflict that differs markedly from the Tetenbüll-Osterhever dispute, both in terms of the time period and the arguments marshaled by the disputants.

In 1737, the heavily indebted residents of the Hol and Heverkøge on the Eiderstedt peninsula submitted a petition to their prince requesting a postponement of the auctioning-off of their lands.19 This petition took the form of a complaint directed against the eastern inhabitants of the peninsula. The easterners had loaned large sums to the Hol and Heverkøge in the past, sums which had not been repaid. The petitioners alleged that the easterners now intended to wrest their lands from them in the upcoming auction because they had not been able to repay the loans. They
accused the moneylenders of sacrificing marshland solidarity to their own material self-interest. The petition’s authors condemned this self-serving behavior, pointing out that in the past they had frequently aided the eastern parishes. In earlier times, it had been usual for a parish in a state of emergency to be “pulled up by the whole body, as if it were a limb of that body.” Now, however,

the love which should be mutual in a society such as ours has cooled. Everyone has plugged his ears and closed his eyes to the complaints of those whom God’s rod of discipline has punished through flood tides and bad harvests. Due to their inability to pay their debts, the call veteres migrate coloni\textsuperscript{20} is raised against these people.\textsuperscript{21}

This behavior, they suggested, was not only merciless. It also worked to the disadvantage of the entire land, for by forcing debtors to relocate, the countryside became depopulated of those who “have knowledge of the dikes and who know how to maintain them.” “There are hardly enough people here,” they continued, “who can protect the dikes and the dams from the frequent battering of the furious sea.”\textsuperscript{22}

Thus, while the residents of Tetenbüll had claimed to be acting for “the good of the land” by refusing to help Osterhever, a hundred years later the inhabitants of the Hol and Heverköge argued that “the good of the land” was best served when the other “limbs of the body” acted in accordance with the principle of solidarity by lending aid to their neighbors. It is interesting to note that this body metaphor, as well as the theme of the \textit{bonum commune}, featured prominently in the political discourse of the Enlightenment.\textsuperscript{23} Although the connection cannot be fully explored here, these passages provide suggestive examples of how contemporary socio-political discussions not only influenced disputes surrounding the dikes, but were also carried out to some degree in the context of those disputes.

\textbf{“Who Owns the Dike?” Dike Conflict as a Forum for Disputes about Property, Autonomy and Governance}

As mentioned above, from the early seventeenth century the princes of Schleswig-Holstein began to pay greater attention to the marshlands. Motivated by fiscal concerns, these rulers attempted to gain greater influence over the shoring up of new land, as well as over the dikes themselves. In the early seventeenth century this attempt led to the creation of the position of the so-called dike superintendent (\textit{Amt des Deichgrafen}), designed to regulate the dikes. Whereas in the past the administration of the dikes had been solely the responsibility of communal organizations,
from this point onward the dikes were to be overseen by officials who were appointed and paid by the territorial ruler.\textsuperscript{24} Such a centralization of the dikes in the hands of the territorial authority met with opposition from the communes, which desired to continue to administer the dikes themselves.\textsuperscript{25}

Eiderstedt’s residents had some success in this regard, for already in 1634 they won the right to propose a candidate to head the dike commission in the event that the office fell vacant. The commune was able to defend its autonomy owing to its political and economic significance. It had a major impact on state finances, not least because it had the power to bypass the provincial estates to negotiate taxes directly with the duke. It also made itself indispensable to the duke by agreeing to back the state’s projected tax revenue, which it sometimes loaned to the ruler on credit when he needed funds quickly. By wielding this tax security fund, the communities of Eiderstedt were able to promote their own interests. Their power is evidenced by the fact that, only a few years after the introduction of the dike commission, the head of the commune could claim for himself the right to a certain degree of representation.\textsuperscript{26} To the extent that this organization managed to maintain, at least for a while, its right of self-administration,\textsuperscript{27} it represents what Gerhard Oestreich characterized as “that which is not absolutist in absolutism.”\textsuperscript{28} The territorial administration’s reach was thus limited in the marshlands, where it by no means extended to all areas of social life.

Rulers were more successful in pursuing their economic interests through indirect means than by trying to gain greater influence over the administration of the dikes. As any expansion of arable land represented a substantial increase in revenue for the territorial state, princes encouraged the building of dikes. Starting in the early seventeenth century, this mercantilist policy took on a new form which has been described as the system of “\textit{oktroyierte Köge}.” According to this system, the territorial prince handed out various sorts of privileges and concessions (\textit{Oktroy}) in order to encourage the building of new dikes. These concessions had originally been conferred in exchange for a fee or as a reward for exceptional service to the state. But the princes were not predominantly motivated to grant these privileges by the fee which they stood to collect nor by the prospect that the recipients’ gratitude would make them more obedient subjects. Instead, they conferred them mainly in order to provide incentives for the construction of dikes so as to accelerate the shoring up of new farmland.

Whereas in the past marshlanders had decided among themselves when to begin construction of a dike, under the new system the prince declared when building would commence. The people were then given the opportunity to apply for the concessions being offered by the prince.
If they lacked the funds required to build the dike, they were forced to yield their bid to foreign investors, for whom dike building represented a risky but lucrative business venture.  

Foreign investors were responsible for erecting the Bottschlotter Werk, a dike located on Schleswig-Holstein’s northwestern coast. In 1610, Duke Johann Adolf advertised a Freiheitsbrief which was designed to attract domestic and foreign investors to take part in the shoring up of some 7,000 hectares. Among the applicants were 27 Dutchmen. The high number of Dutch applicants is partly explained by the immigration at the end of the sixteenth century of religious refugees from the Netherlands into the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. These refugees were welcomed in North Friesland not only because the region was noted for some degree of religious tolerance, but also because its rulers prized these immigrants for their capital and their dike-building expertise. The territorial princes conferred far-reaching freedoms and privileges upon the Dutch immigrants in exchange for the economic benefits which they brought with them.  

In addition to an influx of foreign skills and capital into North Friesland, another prerequisite for the system of oktroyierte Köge (which might also be termed a system of “speculative land reclamation”) was the role that private enterprise increasingly played in dike construction. Whereas in the past dike building and maintenance had been the tasks of local residents, the bidding-out of dike projects in exchange for concessions led to a situation in which wealthy investors hired private companies to build the dikes. These construction firms employed many day laborers and were typically headed by highly specialized building experts, many of whom were Dutch.  

With the introduction of a specialized workforce to build the dikes, the practice of a coastal community laboring together to erect its own dike increasingly became a thing of the past. Community involvement in dike building became largely limited to the contribution of funds. This development made possible the involvement of people in dike construction who neither lived in the marshlands nor had a work force at their disposal. In contrast, persons who could have provided materials and labor—but who did not possess the funds required to hire skilled workers—were excluded from dike projects. Among the latter were the marshlanders, most of whom were still engaged in subsistence agriculture.  

Four factors thus sustained the system of oktroyierte Köge: the princes’ need to generate more revenue owing to a shortage of state funds (a result of their efforts to expand their sovereignty); the fiscal importance of the marshlands; the growing monetization of the economy; and the interest of foreign investors in North Friesland, an interest that was given addi-
tional stimulus by the promise of religious freedom. The princes alone had the power to implement this system, which they found to be a more effective means of achieving their fiscal ends than were their attempts to wrest control of the dikes from the hands of the local population. The introduction of the dike commission, as well as the offering of concessions as incentives for dike construction, led to conflicts that reflected processes of social negotiation in the marshlands. These conflicts provide glimpses of how seventeenth-century political developments associated with rulers’ attempts to expand their sovereignty played out at a local level.

However, dike conflicts did not solely result from a collision of local and state interests. They also arose out of disagreements between marshlanders and the officials who mediated between the population and the state authorities, as indicated by a dispute in Eiderstedt at the beginning of the eighteenth century. On the one side of this conflict stood the local population, whose chief interest was to protect the dike that shielded their lands from the sea. On the other side stood a group of local officials who wanted to utilize the dike as a road.

Even the earliest known codification of laws governing North Friesland’s dikes includes discussion of the potential damage caused to dikes by using them for “secondary” purposes. For instance, while sheep were allowed to graze on dikes because their hooves packed topsoil firmly into place, the grazing of pigs and geese was prohibited because these animals were known to tear up the dike surface. Horses and carriages were not permitted on dikes for this same reason, except by specially authorized persons. The dike laws were particularly rigorous with respect to individuals who attempted to plow on the dikes, and anyone who did so was threatened with execution by hanging.

In order to curtail traffic on the dikes, the ruler of Eiderstedt erected gates on all dikes along the southern coast of his region. These gates could be opened only by the use of keys distributed to select persons. Everyone else was barred from riding across the dikes, and persons caught doing so risked the seizure of their horses and wagons. In addition, any blacksmith who forged a copy of a gate key was subject to a fine of fifty Reichstaler. Despite these stiff penalties, dike traffic continued to be a problem due to the fact that those who possessed keys often allowed “anyone and everyone to pass through for a small fee,” as the bailiff of Eiderstedt complained in 1733. In order to combat this abuse, the bailiff appointed four persons with the task of monitoring dike traffic and enforcing its restriction. These persons were to collect eight shillings from every offender whom they reported to the authorities. Any possessor of a gate key who granted passage to unauthorized persons would have their key confiscated and would face heavy punishment. In addition, dike traffic was
further restricted to a few privileged individuals who were permitted to cut across the dikes on horseback only in the event of severe weather. The drawing of carriages across the dikes was henceforth prohibited.

In the context of this heightened concern over dike traffic, a dispute arose between two tax collectors (Pfennigmeister) of Eiderstedt, the brothers Boye and Peter Hamkens, and the leaders of the five parishes of Wester-Cating, Welt, Vollerwieck, Katharinenheerd and Garding, concerning the claim of the Pfennigmeister that they had the right to use the dikes between St. Peter and Tönning as a road. The conflict was ignited when the leaders of the communal organizations in these parishes barred the officials from traversing the dikes by refusing to give them the gate keys. The Pfennigmeister responded by destroying the gates and forcing their way across.

Both sides tried to justify their actions in petitions addressed to the prince. The Pfennigmeister argued that they had the right to travel over the dikes in the course of “territorial business,” that is, as part of carrying out their official duties. They argued that this privilege was not only a right of custom (Gewohnheitsrecht), which, they claimed, was documented in the chronicles. Rather, “since we live in a marsh region,” it was also a law made necessary by the nature of the land itself. Not unexpectedly, the communal leaders did not agree with this reasoning. They challenged the Pfennigmeister to offer proof that their right to traverse the dike was indeed a right of custom, cynically suggesting that no one other than the Hamkens brothers themselves appeared to be aware of this particular Gewohnheitsrecht. Moreover, they suggested that the Pfennigmeister should look more closely at the chronicles which they had referenced in their petition, in particular the sections dealing with the potential causes of dike damage. The leaders also objected to the argument of the Pfennigmeister that North Friesland’s geography and climate made it imperative that the dikes be used as roads. They argued that nature dictated the utilization of the dikes as roads only in those cases when all other routes were impassable, which was not so in this case. According to the leaders, the Hamkens brothers had been moved to smash the gates and ride across the dikes due to their vanity and their desire for comfort, as well as their wish to inflict harm “at whim” on the parishes.

In spite of these arguments, the prince decided the case in favor of the Pfennigmeister. It is difficult to determine to what extent the brothers won over the prince with their argument. What is clear, however, is that the transport of tax money from St. Peter to Tönning was of the utmost importance, because only by means of this revenue could the public credit be held in good standing, thus securing “the marrow of the rural welfare.” A further indication of the importance which the prince attributed to the unobstructed collection of taxes is suggested by a mandate he
issued which stated that anyone who hindered the Pfennigmeister in their transport of tax revenues would be forced to pay the considerable fine of one hundred Reichstaler.

This conflict is an example of a clash between provincial officials and the parishes who were protected by the dikes and who were responsible for their maintenance. The object of dispute was the dike, or more precisely, the claims made by both parties with respect to the dike. The marshlanders’ main concern was to ensure the dikes’ function as a wall against the sea. They thus refused to allow any use of the dikes which might interfere with their protective function. Although the Pfennigmeister did not suggest that using dikes as roads superseded their function as a barrier against the ocean, they nonetheless felt the damage to the dikes caused by their horses would be less than the marshlanders predicted. In the eyes of the Pfennigmeister, the risk of damage was outweighed by the importance of their task—the transportation of tax revenues that were vital for the land’s welfare.

Structurally considered, this conflict arose from competing claims with respect to the dike: the claim to a thoroughgoing protection of the dikes clashed with the claim to the dikes’ multifunctionality. The parties which staked out these claims differed in their estimation of the risks associated with a secondary use of the dikes, as well as how reasonable it was to prohibit this secondary usage. The arguments which each side marshaled to support its position sometimes digressed from the actual questions relating to dike usage and the risks of damage. The debate about traffic on the dikes can thus be seen as part of a larger conflict concerning customary rights and privileges. Since it could not be meditated, it quickly took the form of an irreconcilable dispute in which only one of the two parties could see its perception of the case validated and its interests served. In the end it was the territorial ruler who determined the course of events by ruling on behalf of the Pfennigmeister.

“Can the Dike Provide Protection from God’s Punishments?”
Coastal Dwellers between Fatalism and Technological Optimism in the Seventeenth Century

Dike construction and repair were processes that were closely linked to the marshlanders’ worldviews and to their perceptions of their environment. When a dike was destroyed by a flood or when the erection of a new dike was planned, the marshlanders were led to meditate on God’s role in the event. With respect to a flood there was a consensus among seventeenth-century coastal dwellers: the flood was God’s punishment for their sinful behavior. They also sought God’s blessing prior to the erection of a dike, believing that without His support the project would
not be successful. In questioning the feasibility of a dike project, the marshlanders articulated a diversity of opinions with regard to the dangers posed by the sea and to the defensive capabilities of people. Their perceptions of the risks involved—perceptions shaped by their experiences of safety and danger—alternated between a sort of world-renouncing fatalism and a partly secular faith in technology.44

In 1685 the mayor of Husum, Harro Feddersen, spoke out in support of a dike project planned in the bay of Bottschlott.45 He was convinced that the dike could be successfully realized, and he supported his conviction by saying that God would bestow His blessing on the project, citing a vision that a trustworthy man had had with respect to the dike’s construction:

This man was walking in the late fall in the Hattstedt marshes on the other side of the dike which borders our new polder. As he later reported, he was deeply worried about the very bad condition of the dike, especially with regards to future generations. Alone he sighed and prayed to God that He would help keep this region safe, and that He would not allow the dike to be swept away, which would turn the region into a salty sea. At this moment he heard a cow bellow somewhere beyond the dike, where at that time of year there were no cattle to be seen or heard. The man was surprised but turned his thoughts again to the dike. As he ascended the ridge, he gazed out over a green field full of houses and cattle, as a good marshland appears at the peak of summer. This scene immediately vanished before his eyes, leaving him uncertain of what had happened and what exactly he had seen. He could not understand this as anything other than an assurance from above that the Hattstedt polder will endure, and that it will be delivered to safety by means of the endiking of the adjoining marshlands.46

According to Feddersen, the vision of this “credible and well-respected man” was to be interpreted as a sign from God that the dike project enjoyed His support. By citing this vision, Feddersen aimed to dispel any doubts about the feasibility of the project and to convince skeptics that God had called upon them to commence work.

Just as God’s support counted as a kind of guarantee that a dike project would be successful, it was assumed that without His help the project would fail. This is illustrated in several statements from contemporaries. In 1613, for instance, an inhabitant of the Sieversfleth polder in Eiderstedt wrote to the prince that his lands had been endiked “at our own expense, spread evenly among us, owing to the help and support of God the Almighty.”47 Hans Brodersen from Bupschlot and Wolf Nummesen from Lith shared the expectation that the damage to the dikes protecting their lands would be repaired with divine assistance. In February 1639 they asked the duke for permission to remain in Eiderstedt for
as long as was necessary before God granted them His mercy and His support in the reconstruction of their dikes.\textsuperscript{48}

Just as no dike could be built without God’s blessing, neither could any dike withstand a flood sent by God as a punishment. In a so-called “prayer of complaint” (Klag Gebet), the Holstein pastor Wilhelm Alardus emphasized the powerlessness of man in the face of a divine “punishing flood” (Strafflut):

\begin{quote}
Before God may not endure / the dike in all its power / with what are thought to be the strongest walls in the land / For when the waves / pound against them with violence / the strongest walls / are easily felled.\textsuperscript{49}
\end{quote}

Equally admonitory in tone were the words of the Husum school rector Abel Fink, who after the so-called Burchardi Flood of 1634 wrote a “rueful poem of mourning about the pitiable demise of the land of Nordstrand.”\textsuperscript{50} In the poem’s final lines Fink called upon his readers not to trust in the man-made dikes, which could not oppose a Strafflut: “Do not depend on your strong dikes / If it is God’s will / they must yield to the mighty waves.”\textsuperscript{51}

A petition written by the parishioners of Koldenbüttel at the end of the eighteenth century also expressed doubts about the effectiveness of the dikes, and thus about man’s ability to protect himself from the sea. In their petition the parishioners were mainly concerned with establishing why the dikes in their region had suffered such severe damage in the last storm. They concluded that this was due in part to the fact that the dikes’ repair had not been completed when the storm hit. Thus it was not surprising that the “early arrival of the exceptional storm combined with the lasting and violent storm tides” had destroyed the dikes.\textsuperscript{52} Yet the petitioners went on to argue that even if the repairs had been finished prior to the storm, the dikes could never have withstood the mass of water that God had directed at their lands. They made their pessimistic assessment of the situation still bleaker by calling into question their influence on the sea in general: “Who can explain the fury of the weather and of the sea, and who could ever demand such an explanation?”\textsuperscript{53}

Statements such as these confirm the contemporary notion that every instance of misery and happiness which people experienced was an expression of God’s will. Devastating floods could engender the belief that no dike, no matter how strong, could withstand a Strafflut and this belief could lead to a sense of futility among the marshlanders which threatened to erode their will to maintain the dikes. This fatalistic attitude could thus become a source of danger for the safety of the entire marshland.\textsuperscript{54} For instance, in early 1636 parishioners in Tönning, Kotzenbüll, Kating, Welt and Vollerwiek refused to contribute to the maintenance of a particular dike in their region, because in the last storm this dike had proven
to be useless and the parishes had been flooded.\textsuperscript{55} Just as pessimistic in outlook was the landholder Hennecke Meinstorff, who doubted that a dike could be repaired which God’s hand had intentionally destroyed. Meinstorff, who possessed a large polder on the eastern side of the former territory of Nordstand, gave up his holdings after experiencing several breaches of the dike that shielded them. He objected to the opinion of another landholder that he should take up repairs once again, arguing that “merciful God does not grant that such land shall be endiked.”\textsuperscript{56}

A similar attitude is expressed in the travel reports written by the popular philosopher Johann Nicolaus Tetens, who in his 1788 \textit{Reisen in die Marschländer (Travels in the Marshlands)} identified various causes for what he perceived to be the alarmingly poor condition of the dikes along Schleswig-Holstein’s western frontier. According to Tetens, the marshlanders’ lack of willingness to maintain their dikes was due partly to the devastating experiences of past storms and partly to a deep-rooted tendency in the people towards fatalism:

\begin{quote}
Past experience seems to have contributed to the people’s negligence. Because the strongest and highest of the storm tides only come once every twenty or thirty years, the people have many storms to look back on that did not result in dike breeches, despite the fact that the dikes had not been adequately maintained. These experiences thus confirm their belief that it makes no difference whether one makes the dikes stronger or higher, if one diligently improves them or not.\textsuperscript{57}
\end{quote}

Tetens thus argued that the belief among the marshlanders that “the floods are divine punishments” led them to conclude that they could not protect themselves from these disasters, “no matter how the dikes may be constructed.”\textsuperscript{58}

Although the belief was widely held that without God’s assistance man was powerless against the sea, in the eyes of some pastors this belief was challenged by a tendency among the marshlanders to sometimes estimate too highly their own contribution to the success of a dike project. This sentiment was expressed by Pastor Peter Bökelmann in a sermon which he delivered on the occasion of the successful completion of the dike protecting the Obbenskoogs in 1564. The pastor warned his listeners—and in particular the prince, who was also present—not to be too proud of their accomplishments with respect to the dike:

\begin{quote}
Your merciful prince should turn his heart to God and plead diligently on behalf of his subjects that the almighty Lord will preserve this land and this people, and will give nourishment to the poor women and children of this polder, which the prince should not think could have been won from the sea if it had not been God’s will, even if all the world’s people had labored together to make it so. You
the subjects should also plead to God from the bottom of your hearts that He grants His mercy and His blessing to this project, and that you will use it in such a way as to honor Him, to support the churches and the schools, to feed and provide for your poor women and children—in sum that you may utilize it for the good of the land and its people. If you choose instead to behave the way your ancestors did some years ago—thinking only of feasting and drinking, of whoring and arrogance—then God will surely do to you what he did to them.  

Bökelmann’s warning does not necessarily prove that the prince and his subjects had in fact fallen prey to a hubristic faith in their power to protect themselves from the sea. Rather, the sermon suggests that the clergyman feared the possibility of the people ceasing to recognize the all-important role of divine assistance in their lives, which would then cause them to lose their humility with respect to God. The same fear was expressed roughly 150 years later by the Oldenburg theologian Johann Friedrich Jansen. After the so-called Christmas Flood of 1717 had ravaged long stretches of the coastline, Jansen criticized the widespread view that better dikes could have protected the inhabitants from God’s wrath. The theologian argued that such a view could be held only by one whose heart “is not filled with true honor for God” because “it directs the trust / which is due to God / towards God’s creatures.”

Of particular interest in this context is a passage written by Petrus Petrejus, Provost of Gardingen, around the middle of the eighteenth century. According to Petrejus, the marshlanders’ belief that their dikes could keep them safe from floods was destined to have fatal consequences:

When, after successfully completing a diking project, the inhabitants of these lands trust in their own labor rather than giving thanks to God, and mistakenly and foolishly believe that they have defied the sea, is it any wonder that the Lord takes from them the armor on which they rely, thereby demonstrating that He alone is King, whom all elements—water, air, fire and earth—must obey with a wave of His hand?

Petrejus thus suggested that rather than relying on the security offered to them by that which they had erected with their own hands, the marshlanders would do better to reflect on their fragility and their powerlessness and to dedicate themselves to a God-fearing way of life.

Summary

The case studies presented here illuminate some of the ways in which dike conflicts served as a forum for diverse processes of social, political and religious negotiation within North Friesland’s coastal communities.
Because the question concerning the “correct order of the world” was debated within the context of these disputes, they also reveal the struggle between competing notions of stability and order in an Early Modern society.

The case studies suggest that the principle of solidarity did indeed form one of the pillars of life in North Friesland’s coastal communities. Yet, in practice, dike solidarity had to be negotiated, for marshlanders had to decide among themselves who was obliged to provide assistance to whom, as well as who stood to benefit from this assistance.

In regard to the persistent notion of a fundamental hostility between coastal dwellers and the sea, it has been shown that the marshlanders’ concern with protecting themselves from the ocean through the construction and maintenance of dikes did not serve to subordinate all other interests. In point of fact, there was continual wrangling among the people about how much money and labor should be invested in the dikes. Their degree of willingness to invest in dikes was closely linked to the extent to which they believed that these man-made structures could protect them from the caprice of the sea. This assessment was dependent on their religiously colored worldviews, in particular on whether they believed that people could (and should) defend themselves against a flood sent by God as a punishment.

The examples briefly discussed here show that by investigating North Friesland’s coastal society “from below,” one can gain new insight into diverse areas of coastal life from the perspective of the marshlanders themselves. Such analyses can give rise to a more multi-faceted understanding of humanity’s encounter with the sea throughout history in contrast to those studies which are based exclusively on published materials and which take for the granted the typical images of coastal life propagated in earlier studies. Our knowledge of Early Modern coastal societies can thus be expanded and partly revised.
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