

The Military Orders

Forty papers link the study of the military orders' cultural life and output with their involvement in political and social conflicts during the medieval and early modern period. Divided into two volumes, focusing on the Eastern Mediterranean and Europe respectively, the collection brings together the most up-to-date research by experts from fifteen countries on a kaleidoscope of relevant themes and issues, thus offering a broad-ranging and at the same time very detailed study of the subject.

Jochen Schenk (PhD Cantab) was Lecturer of Medieval History at the University of Glasgow. His recent publications include *Templar Families. Landowning Families and the Order of the Temple in France, c.1120–1312*. He is also the author of a number of articles dealing mainly with the Order of the Temple's social structure, the Templars' religious life and the military orders' contribution to state building in the Latin East. He is currently working on a cultural history of the crusader states.

Mike Carr (PhD London) is a Leverhulme Early Career Fellow at the University of Edinburgh. His first monograph, *Merchant Crusaders in the Aegean, 1291–1352*, was published by Boydell and Brewer in 2015. He has published articles on his main interests, which include relations between Latins, Greeks and Turks in the Eastern Mediterranean, the crusades, trade, maritime history and the papacy. He is also the co-editor of the volume *Contact and Conflict in Frankish Greece and the Aegean, 1204–1453*, with Nikolaos Chrissis (Ashgate, 2014).

The Military Orders

Volume 6.2: culture and conflict
in Western and Northern Europe

Edited by
Jochen Schenk and Mike Carr

First published 2017
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2017 selection and editorial matter, Jochen Schenk and Mike Carr;
individual chapters, the contributors.

The right of Jochen Schenk and Mike Carr to be identified as the authors of
the editorial material has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and
78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or
utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now
known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in
any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing
from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or
registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation
without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

LCCN: 94-17896

ISBN: 978-1-4724-7638-8 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-46625-5 (ebk)

ISBN: 978-1-138-21284-8 (pack)

Typeset in Times New Roman
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	xi
<i>List of table</i>	xii
<i>Editors' preface</i>	xiii
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xv
<i>Notes on contributors</i>	xvii

VOLUME 6.2

Culture and conflict in Western and Northern Europe

Introduction	1
JONATHAN RILEY-SMITH (UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE)	
1 Military orders at the frontier: permeability and demarcation	3
NIKOLAS JASPERT (UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG)	
2 Frontier conflict, military cost and culture: the master of Santiago and the Islamic border in mid-fourteenth-century Spain	29
PHILIPPE JOSSERAND (UNIVERSITY OF NANTES)	
3 The symbolic power of spiritual knighthood: discourse and context of the donation of Count Thierry of Alsace to the Templar Order in the county of Flanders	46
XAVIER BAECKE (GHENT UNIVERSITY)	
4 'Segnoría', 'memoria', 'controversia': pragmatic literacy, archival memory, and conflicts in Provence (twelfth and thirteenth centuries)	57
DAMIEN CARRAZ (UNIVERSITY OF CLERMONT-FERRAND)	

vi *Contents*

- 5 Conflicts and codices: the example of Clm 4620, a collection about the Hospitallers** 76
KARL BORCHARDT (MGH, MUNICH)
- 6 ‘Maligno spiritu ductus et sue professionis immemor’:
conflicts within the Culture of the Hospitaller Order on
Rhodes and Cyprus** 89
SIMON PHILLIPS (UNIVERSITY OF CYPRUS)
- 7 Ad celebrandum divina: founding and financing perpetual
chantries at Clerkenwell priory, 1242–1404** 100
NICOLE HAMONIC (UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA)
- 8 Through the local lens: re-examining the function of the
Hospitallers in England** 111
CHRISTIE MAJOROS-DUNNAHOE (CARDIFF UNIVERSITY)
- 9 The use of the double-traversed cross in the English priory
of the Order of Saint John of Jerusalem** 121
ANTHONY M. J. LOMBARDO DELARUE (LONDON)
- 10 The Templars’ estates in the west of Britain in the
early fourteenth century** 132
HELEN J. NICHOLSON (CARDIFF UNIVERSITY)
- 11 Defensive elements in the architecture of Templar and
Hospitaller preceptories in the priory of Navarre** 143
JULIA BALDÓ ALCOZ (UNIVERSITY OF NAVARRA)
- 12 The commandary of Noudar of the Order of Avis in the
border with Castile: history and memory** 154
LUÍS ADÃO DA FONSECA AND MARIA CRISTINA PIMENTA
(CAPESE – UP)
- 13 Vera Cruz de Marmelar in the XIIIth–XVth centuries:
a St John’s commandery as an expression of cultural
memory and territorial appropriation** 164
PAULA PINTO COSTA AND LÚCIA MARIA CARDOSO ROSAS
(UNIVERSITY OF PORTO)
- 14 The military orders and the local population in Italy:
connections and conflicts** 172
MARIAROSARIA SALERNO (UNIVERSITY OF CALABRIA)

15	The Sforzas, the papacy and control of the Hospitaller priory of Lombardy: second half of the fifteenth century	183
	ELENA BELLOMO (UNIVERSITY OF CARDIFF)	
16	Advocacy and ‘defensio’ – the protection of the houses of the Teutonic Order in the region of the Upper Rhine during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries	193
	CONRADIN VON PLANTA (FREIBURG IM BREISGAU)	
17	The role of the legend of Saint Barbara’s head in the conflict of the Teutonic Order and Świętopelk, the duke of Pomerania	203
	MARIA STARNAWSKA (JOHN-DŁUGOSZ UNIVERSITY)	
18	The European nobilities and the Order of St John, sixteenth to eighteenth centuries	213
	ANTON CARUANA GALIZIA (NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY)	
19	The narrow escape of the Teutonic Order Bailiwick of Utrecht, 1811–1815	222
	RENGER E. DE BRUIN (CENTRAAL MUSEUM, UTRECHT)	
	<i>Index</i>	233

Contents for Volume 6.1: culture and conflict in the Mediterranean World

<i>List of colour plates</i>	xi
<i>List of figures</i>	xii
<i>List of tables</i>	xiv
<i>Editors' preface</i>	xv
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xvii
<i>Notes on contributors</i>	xix

VOLUME 6.1

Culture and conflict in the Mediterranean world

Introduction	1
JONATHAN RILEY-SMITH (UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE)	
1 The Hospital's privilege of 1113: texts and contexts	3
ANTHONY LUTTRELL (BATH)	
2 Reflections of conflict in two fragments of the liturgical observances from the primitive rule of the Knights Templar	10
SEBASTIÁN SALVADÓ (NORWEGIAN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY)	
3 Friend or foe: Islamic views of the military orders in the Latin East as drawn from Arabic sources	20
KEVIN JAMES LEWIS (UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD)	
4 Massacre or mutual benefit: the military orders' relations with their Muslim neighbours in the Latin East (1100–1300)	30
BETTY BINYSH (CARDIFF UNIVERSITY)	

- 5 The battle of Arsuf/Arsur, a reappraisal of the charge of the Hospitallers** 44
STEPHEN BENNETT (QUEEN MARY, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON)
- 6 Pope Honorius III, the military orders and the financing of the Fifth Crusade: a culture of papal preference?** 54
THOMAS W. SMITH (TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN)
- 7 Between Jaffa and Jerusalem: a few remarks on the defence of the southern border of the kingdom of Jerusalem during the years 1229–1244** 62
KAROL POLEJOWSKI (ATENEUM UNIVERSITY)
- 8 Ritual and conflict in the Hospitaller church of St John in Acre: the architectural evidence** 70
VARDIT SHOTTEN-HALLEL (HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM)
- 9 Hospitaller patronage and the mural cycle of the Church of the Resurrection at Abu-Ghosh (Emmaus) – a new reading** 82
GIL FISHHOF (TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY)
- 10 Tracing knights: their pictorial evidence in the art of the Eastern Mediterranean** 94
ANNA TAKOUMI (NATIONAL AND KAPODISTRIAN UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS)
- 11 The manumission of Hospitaller slaves on fifteenth-century Rhodes and Cyprus** 106
NICHOLAS COUREAS (CYPRUS RESEARCH CENTRE)
- 12 Back to Baffes: ‘A Castle in Cyprus attributed to the Hospital?’ revisited** 115
JAMES PETRE (TOBERMORY)
- 13 Hospitaller statecraft in the Aegean: island polity and mainland power?** 123
MICHAEL HESLOP (ROYAL HOLLOWAY)
- 14 A culture of consensus: the Hospitallers at Rhodes in the fifteenth century (1420–1480)** 137
PIERRE BONNEAUD (PARIS)

x	<i>Contents</i>	
15	Holy spaces in the urban fabric: religious topography of the town of Rhodes during the Hospitaller period	147
	EMMA MAGLIO (FOUNDATION FOR RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGIES OF HELLAS)	
16	Some developments in Hospitaller invective concerning the Turks, 1407–1530	159
	GREGORY O'MALLEY (HUGGLESCOTE)	
17	Crisis and revival: the convent of the Order of Malta during the Catholic Reformation (16th–17th centuries)	169
	ANNE BROGINI (UNIVERSITY OF NICE SOPHIA-ANTIPOLIS)	
18	The Hospitallers and the Grand Harbour of Malta: culture and conflict	177
	EMANUEL BUTTIGIEG (UNIVERSITY OF MALTA)	
19	Piety and ritual in the Magistral Palace of the Order of St John in Malta	187
	THERESA VELLA (MALTA)	
20	Venice, Hospitaller Malta, and fear of the plague: culturally conflicting views	197
	VICTOR MALLIA-MILANES (UNIVERSITY OF MALTA)	
21	Censoring the Hospitallers: the failed attempt at re-printing Ferdinando de Escaño's <i>Propugnaculum Hierosolymitanum</i> in Malta in 1756	207
	WILLIAM ZAMMIT (UNIVERSITY OF MALTA)	
	<i>Index</i>	217

Figures

3.1	The descendants of Count Baldwin V	50
6.1	The Castellania, Rhodes	91
6.2	A Hospitaller brother's name is concealed, later referred to as 'Fr. Loudovico' in the same document. Malta, Cod. 339, f. 263v.	92
6.3	The Hospitaller Hospice of St Catherine, Rhodes	93
6.4	The remains of what are thought to be St Catherine's Church, Rhodes, adjacent to St Catherine's Hospice	94
8.1	Map of Bedfordshire	117
9.1	Seal of Blessed Raymond du Puy	121
9.2	Codex Urbinatus Latinus – Church of the Holy Sepulchre	123
9.3	Photograph of St James's church, Ansty, Wiltshire	127
9.4	Prior Docwra's banner from a Tudor manuscript	129
10.1	Location of Templar properties under discussion	133
11.1	Induráin Commandery, general view	145
11.2	Echávvarri Commandery, general view	145
11.3	Aberin Commandery, ramparts and platforms	146
11.4	Aberin Commandery, church tower	147
11.5	Cizur Menor Commandery	149
12.1	The Order of Avis in Portugal (twelfth to sixteenth centuries)	156
12.2	No. of documents/theme	157
17.1	Eastern Pomerania and the State of the Teutonic Order circa 1242	205

Table

10.1	Income and profit for Templar houses in Herefordshire, Worcestershire, South Wales and Cornwall, 1308–1313	135
------	---	-----

Editors' preface

The present volume contains papers from the sixth conference on the military orders, which was held on 5–8 September 2013 at the Museum of the Order of St John, St John's Gate, Clerkenwell, London, under the auspices of the London Centre for the Study of the Crusades, the Military Religious Orders and the Latin East. We welcomed scholars from at least twenty-five countries who between them presented over eighty papers. It has been possible to publish only a selection of the papers here; however, we should like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who took part in the conference for helping make the event such a success.

For the first time the proceedings are being published in two volumes. Although each volume stands on its own and can be obtained and consulted independently, the volumes are best appreciated as an ensemble, for they are intended to provide the reader with the broadest overview of the most current research in the field of military order studies relating to their military lives and culture. It should be noted here that the term 'culture' is understood by the conference organizers and the editors as denoting the visible and tangible products of human endeavour as well as the forms and means of ritualistic and symbolic communication and representation which are at the heart of what has been labelled the 'new cultural history'. Whereas each volume focuses on a very broad geographical region (Europe and the Eastern Mediterranean respectively), their internal structure is chronological rather than thematic or geographic. That this should be the most satisfying order presenting itself is, of course, testimony to the vast variety of topics, approaches and geographical regions presented within each volume. This should come as no surprise: the study of the military orders has always been an international and truly interdisciplinary endeavour!

As editors we should like to express our gratitude to the editorial committee, Tony Luttrell and Helen J. Nicholson for their support and sage advice throughout, as well as to Jonathan Riley-Smith for writing the introductions to these volumes. Thanks are also due to John Smedley and his colleagues at Ashgate Publishing, Michael Bourne at Routledge, and Autumn Spalding at Apex CoVantage for their help and patience. The conference turned out to be an immense success because of the many months of careful planning by its dedicated organizing committee led by Michael Heslop, namely Alan Borg, Christina Grembowicz, Tony Luttrell, Helen J. Nicholson, Jonathan Phillips, Jonathan Riley-Smith, Keith

xiv *Editors' preface*

Schnaar and Pamela Willis. It is to them that we extend our gratitude for helping lay the foundation for these two volumes.

Very special words of thanks are due to our sponsors and those who have contributed to the conference: Cardiff Centre for the Study of the Crusades, Cardiff University, the Grand Priory of England, the Sovereign Military Order of Malta, the Most Venerable Order of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem, the St John Historical Society, Royal Holloway, the University of London, Cambridge University Press, Ashgate Publishing, the Institute of Historical Research, Brepols Publishers NV and to the Seven Pillars of Wisdom Trust for its subvention towards the publication of the proceedings. We are also grateful to three anonymous donors for enabling the conference committee to give seven bursaries to students, and to the Priory of England of the Order of St John and the Museum of the Order of St John for the use of St John's Gate and the Priory Church. Finally, we would like to thank the volunteers and staff at St John's Gate, in particular the members of the St John Historical Society and the St John Fellowship, the Reverend Gay Ellis (Little Maplestead), Paula Dellamura (Temple Crossing) and Stephane Bitty (Rosebery Hall).

Jochen Schenk (Glasgow) & Mike Carr (Edinburgh)

Abbreviations

<i>AASS</i>	<i>Acta Sanctorum Bollandiana</i>
AHN OO.MM	Archivo Histórico Nacional, Madrid, Ordenes Militares
AIM	Archive of the Roman Inquisition in Malta
ANTT	Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo
<i>AOL</i>	<i>Archives de l'Orient Latin</i>
AOM	Archive of the Order of Malta
ASV	Archivio Segreto Vaticano
ASVen	Archivio di Stato, Venice
BL	British Library
BN	Bibliothèque Nationale de France
<i>CCCM</i>	<i>Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis</i> , 316 vols (Turnhout, 1945–)
<i>CH</i>	<i>Cartulaire général de l'Ordre des Hospitaliers de Saint-Jean de Jerusalem, 1100–1310</i> , ed. J. Delaville le Roulx, 4 vols (Paris, 1894–1906)
<i>Cont WT</i>	<i>La Continuation de Guillaume de Tyr (1184–1197)</i> , ed. M.R. Morgan, Documents relatifs à l'histoire des croisades, 14 (Paris, 1982)
<i>CT</i>	<i>Cartulaire général de l'Ordre du Temple 1119?–1150. Recueil des chartes et des bulles relatives à l'ordre du Temple</i> , ed. Marquis d'Albon (Paris, 1913)
<i>Eracles</i>	<i>L'Estoire de Eracles Empereur et la Conqueste de la Terre d'Outremer</i> , in RHC Occ, 1.2 (Paris, 1859)
<i>HC</i>	<i>A History of the Crusades</i> , gen. ed. K.M. Setton, 2nd edn, 6 vols (Madison, 1968–89)
Malta, Cod.	Archives of the Order of St John, National Library of Malta, Valletta
<i>MGH SS</i>	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores</i>
<i>MO 1</i>	<i>The Military Orders: Fighting for the Faith and Caring for the Sick</i> , ed. M. Barber (Aldershot, 1994)
<i>MO 2</i>	<i>The Military Orders, vol. 2: Welfare and Warfare</i> , ed. H. Nicholson (Aldershot, 1998)

xvi *Abbreviations*

MO 3	<i>The Military Orders, vol. 3: History and Heritage</i> , ed. Victor Mallia-Milanes (Aldershot, 2008)
MO 4	<i>The Military Orders, vol. 4: On Land and By Sea</i> , ed. Judi Upton-Ward (Aldershot, 2008)
MO 5	<i>The Military Orders, vol. 5: Politics and Power</i> , ed. Peter W. Edbury (Aldershot, 2012)
MOA	<i>Militarium Ordinum Analecta</i>
Montjoie	<i>Montjoie. Studies in Crusade History in Honor of Hans Eberhard Mayer</i> , ed. B. Z. Kedar, J. Riley-Smith and R. Hiestand (London, 1997)
NLM	National Library of Malta, Valletta
P&C	<i>Prier et combattre: dictionnaire européen des ordres militaires au Moyen Âge</i> , ed. N. Bériou and P. Josserand (Paris, 2009)
PL	<i>Patrologia Latina</i>
PPTS	Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society
PUTJ	<i>Papsturkunden für Templer und Johanniter</i> , ed. R. Hiestand, 2 vols (Gottingen, 1972–84)
QuStDO	Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte des Deutschen Ordens
RHC	<i>Recueil des Historiens des Croisades</i>
<i>Arm</i>	<i>Documents arméniens</i>
<i>Occ</i>	<i>Historiens occidentaux</i>
<i>Or</i>	<i>Historiens orientaux</i>
RHGF	<i>Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France</i>
RIS	<i>Rerum Italicarum Scriptores</i>
ROL	<i>Revue de l'Orient Latin</i>
RRH	<i>Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani and Additamentum (Ad)</i> , ed. R. Röhricht (Innsbruck, 1893–1904)
RS	Rolls Series
RSJ	<i>The Rule of the Spanish Military Order of St James, 1170–1493</i> , ed. E. Gallego Blanco (Leiden, 1971)
RT	<i>La Règle du Temple</i> , ed. H. de Curzon (Paris, 1886)
SDO	<i>Die Statuten des Deutschen Ordens nach den ältesten Handschriften</i> , ed. M. Perlbach (Halle, 1980)
SRP	<i>Scriptores Rerum Prussicarum</i> , ed. T. Hirsch et al. (Leipzig, 1861)
WT	<i>Guillaume de Tyr, Chronique</i> , ed. R.B.C. Huygens, <i>Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis</i> , 63, 63A (Turnhout, 1986)

Notes on contributors

Xavier Baecke holds an MA in history from Ghent University, Belgium. He wrote his master dissertation on the perception of the Templar Order in the Southern Low Countries. Afterwards, he collaborated on the digital database project ‘Sources of the Medieval Low Countries’ (www.narrative-sources.be and www.diplomata-belgica.be) and is currently working on a doctoral thesis on the sacralization of knighthood in the Southern Low Countries.

Julia Baldó Alcoz (PhD University of Navarra, Pamplona) is the author of numerous articles on the military orders in Spain and currently works as a Visiting Researcher on the project “The Military Orders and the Shaping of the Medieval World”, directed by Julia Pavón Benito, as part of the project “Boundaries and Culture” (directed by Caridad Velarde, 2011–2013) at the University of Navarra.

Elena Bellomo is honorary research associate at Cardiff University and collaborates with the Università degli Studi di Verona. Her publications include articles on the crusades and the military orders and the monographs *A servizio di Dio e del Santo Sepolcro. Caffaro e l’Oriente latino* (Padua, 2003) and *The Templar Order in North-west Italy. 1142-c. 1330* (Leiden-Boston, 2008).

Karl Borchardt is Professor of Medieval and Regional History at the University of Würzburg and a Permanent Fellow of the Monumenta Germaniae Historica in Munich. He has published numerous articles on the Hospitallers in Germany and other parts of Europe and is author of a monograph on the Celestines.

Renger E. de Bruin studied history at the University of Utrecht. His PhD thesis was on the impact of the French Revolution on the local politics of Utrecht. Between 1979 and 1994 he worked as a lecturer, researcher and visiting professor at the Universities of Utrecht, Leiden and Greifswald. Since 1994 he has been a curator at the Centraal Museum Utrecht. Moreover, he was a professor of Utrecht Studies from 2001 to 2011.

Damien Carraz is ‘maître de conférences’ in medieval history at the University of Clermont-Ferrand. He is currently working on the military orders and on the social and political background of Southern France. In addition to several

xviii *Notes on contributors*

articles, he has published *L'Ordre du Temple dans la basse vallée du Rhône (1124–1312)* (Lyon, 2005), *Les Templiers et la guerre* (Clermont-Ferrand, 2012) and edited *Les ordres religieux militaires dans la ville médiévale* (Clermont-Ferrand, 2013).

Lúcia Maria Cardoso Rosas received her PhD in Art History (1996) from the Faculty of Arts, University of Porto with a thesis: *Monumentos Pátrios. A Arquitectura religiosa medieval – património e restauro (1835–1928)*. She is full Professor (Department of Heritage Studies – Faculty of Arts, University of Porto), member of CITCEM (Transdisciplinary Culture, Space and Memory Research Centre), and Director of the PhD in Portuguese Art History in the same Faculty.

Anton Caruana Galizia holds a doctoral degree in History from the University of Oxford and is presently a Teaching Associate in History at Newcastle University. His research interests relate broadly to the history of the European nobilities and currently focus on the Order of St John in Malta.

Anthony M. J. Lombardo Delarue is an architect. He studied antiquities in Rome. He works in the classical style, specializing in liturgical architecture, and has a lifelong interest in heraldry. A knight of Malta, he is working on a roll of arms for the 900th anniversary.

Luís Adão da Fonseca is Full Professor at the University of Porto, President of the Scientific Council and member of CEPSE (Research Centre for the Study of Population, Economy and Society), and editor-in-chief of the *e-Journal of Portuguese History* (University of Porto-Brown University).

Nicole Hamonic is Assistant Professor of History at the University of South Dakota. She holds a PhD from the Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto. Her research focuses on Hospitaller and Templar estate management in England and diplomatic editing of Latin charters. She has published articles on the authorship of Hospitaller charters in England and visitation indulgences to the New Temple in London.

Nikolas Jaspert is Professor of Medieval History at the University of Heidelberg. He has published on medieval Iberia, the crusades and religious orders. He is the author of *Stift und Stadt. Das Heiliggrabpriorat von Santa Anna und das Regularkanonikerstift Santa Eulàlia del Camp im mittelalterlichen Barcelona* (1996) and *The Crusades* (2006) and has co-edited a collection of essays on *Jerusalem im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter* (2002).

Philippe Josserand is maître de conférences at the University of Nantes. He is the author of *Église et pouvoir en péninsule Ibérique. Les ordres militaires dans le royaume de Castille (1252–1369)* (2004), *Les Templiers en Bretagne* (2011) and *Les Templiers en France* (2013). He is the co-editor of *Prier et combattre. Dictionnaire européen des ordres militaires au Moyen Âge* (2009), *La mémoire des origines dans les ordres religieux-militaires au Moyen Âge* (2012) and *Élites et ordres militaires au Moyen Âge* (2014).

Christie Majoros-Dunnahoe is a PhD candidate at Cardiff University, researching the function of Hospitaller houses in England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales.

Helen J. Nicholson is Professor of Medieval History at Cardiff University, Wales (UK), and has published on the military orders, crusades, medieval warfare and related subjects. Her most recent book is *The Proceedings against the Templars in the British Isles*, 2 vols (Ashgate, 2011), an edition and translation of the manuscripts recording the proceedings of 1309–1311. She is currently researching into the Templars' and Hospitallers' properties in England and Wales.

Simon Phillips is a Research Fellow at the University of Cyprus. He has taught as a visiting lecturer at the University of Malta. His main research interests are on the military orders, late medieval ecclesiastical and political history, and island history. His publications include the monograph *The Prior of the Knights Hospitaller in Late Medieval England* (2009) and, with Emanuel Buttigieg, *Islands and Military Orders* (2013).

Maria Cristina Pimenta received her PhD in History (1999) from the University of Porto. She is a researcher at CEPESE (Research Centre for the Study of Population, Economy and Society), and an assistant to the Editors of the *e-Journal of Portuguese History* (University of Porto-Brown University).

Paula Pinto Costa received her PhD in History (1999) from the Faculty of Arts, University of Porto with a thesis: *A Ordem Militar do Hospital em Portugal: dos finais da Idade Média à Modernidade* (edited in *Militarium Ordinum Analeta*, vol. 3 / 4. Porto, Fundação Engº António de Almeida, 2000). She is full Professor at the Faculty of Arts, University of Porto, researcher at the CEPESE (Research Centre for the Study of Population, Economy and Society), and Vice-President of the Scientific Council of the Faculty of Arts.

Conradin von Planta is archivist of a private nobiliary archive near Freiburg im Breisgau (Germany). He holds a PhD from the University of Freiburg and a secondary thesis (habilitation à diriger des recherches) from the University of Strasbourg (France).

Mariarosaria Salerno holds a PhD from the University of Basilicata and is an assistant professor at the University of Calabria, where she teaches the economic and social history of the Middle Ages. Her interests are in the Military Orders, the Crusades and relations between Southern Italy and Northern Africa in the Middle Ages.

Maria Starnawska is Professor of Medieval History at the John-Długosz University in Częstochowa in Poland. She is the author of several works on the history of the military orders and the cult of saints and their relics in medieval Poland.

19 The narrow escape of the Teutonic Order Bailiwick of Utrecht, 1811–1815¹

Renger E. de Bruin

On 27 February 1811, Napoleon signed a decree ordering the dissolution and impropriation of church property in the Dutch departments he had annexed eight months earlier. The properties identified in the decree were three former convents in the east of these territories and six chapters in and around Utrecht. But it was clear that more might follow: scope for further confiscations was provided by the following passage: ‘*Qu’il se trouve d’autres biens d’origine ecclésiastique, qui ont appartenu à des ordres militaires ou à d’autres corporations supprimés*’.² Izaak Jan Alexander Gogel, the most senior officer in the Dutch departments, promptly declared that the decree also applied to the *Ridderlijke Duitse Orde Balije van Utrecht*: The Teutonic Order of the Bailiwick of Utrecht. After nearly six centuries, the demise of the Order seemed near.

In what follows, after briefly describing the Bailiwick of Utrecht, I will reconstruct the genesis of the decree of 27 February 1811, before describing the Order’s response and how the decree was carried out. I will close with the eventual success of the lobby for its reinstatement organized by the land commander, Volkier Rudolph Bentinck, after the collapse of French authority in November 1813.

The Bailiwick of Utrecht

The institution led by Bentinck was the product of one of the bailiwicks of the Teutonic Order in the Holy Roman Empire. Although founded in 1231 as a commandery under the Bailiwick of Biesen, Utrecht had been an independent bailiwick with extensive possessions in the Northern Netherlands ever since the fourteenth century. Eventually there were fourteen commanderies under the land commander of Utrecht. Since 1346, the Bailiwick of Utrecht had its headquarters in the *Duitse Huis* – “the Teutonic House” – in a western quarter of the city. In the fifteenth and sixteen centuries, the Bailiwick of Utrecht shared the destiny of the rest of the Teutonic Order: decline and a crisis involving its survival in the period after the Reformation.

During the Dutch Revolt, despite the best attempts of the land commander of the day, Jacob Taets van Amerongen, to ensure that the bailiwick remained Catholic and maintained its ties with the grand master, the Provincial States of Utrecht imposed a Protestant land commander and the abolition of celibacy.³ This led to a

break with the central authorities that could not be repaired. The Bailiwick of Utrecht became an independent secular association of Protestant nobles under the authority of the Provincial States of Utrecht. The admission criteria – four noble quarters (i.e. four noble grandparents) and membership of the Dutch Reformed Church – made it somewhat exclusive. The bailiwick became a noble bulwark in a republic dominated by urban patricians.

This difficult transition exacerbated the decline of the bailiwick. In 1753, Unico Wilhelm van Wassenaer van Twickel (1692–1766), then coadjutor, analyzed the problems and proposed reforms. These led to far-reaching changes, the most important being the automatic succession of the land commander by the coadjutor, the concentration of management in Utrecht under a newly appointed steward general (Gijsbert Dirk Cazius), and the introduction of proper book-keeping.⁴ The commanders lost their responsibility for an individual commandery and became mere members of the Order, for which they received a fixed stipend. The reorganization was a success. Cazius was able to turn the deficits into an ever-increasing surplus, thanks especially to better income from leases. By the time he passed on the office to his son Unico Willem Teutonicus in 1789, the Order's finances were in excellent shape.

Serious problems followed after the invasion by French troops in January 1795 and the outbreak of the Batavian Revolution, which repudiated the class-based society embodied by exponents such as the Bailiwick of Utrecht. The Order averted concrete threats by keeping a low profile.⁵ The knights no longer met and left matters of management to steward Cazius and Volkier Rudolph Bentinck van Schoonheten (1738–1820), the knight who resided in the Teutonic House. It was only after the revolution was over that the members could meet once more – to conclude, among other things, that the financial situation was rosy. The rise in agricultural prices since 1750, which had been accelerated by the hostilities, had helped to further increase the income from leases.

In 1806 and 1807, the bailiwick underwent various changes of leadership, with three elderly land commanders dying within the space of a single year. In August 1807, the office of land commander passed to Volkier Rudolph Bentinck. A former officer in the British and Dutch armies, he was already the *de facto* leader of the bailiwick, a position to which he now acceded formally. Some months after taking office, he was faced with an expropriation order from Louis Napoleon, who intended to move the capital of the Kingdom of Holland to Utrecht and thus needed accommodation for the ministries.⁶ After negotiations, the Teutonic House passed into government hands; in return, the Order received a building in The Hague.⁷ Although not financially disadvantageous, the fact that the authorities could summarily requisition a house so rich in tradition presaged nothing good. A further threat was the new law on nobility of 1809.

In the same period, the Dutch king's imperial brother dissolved the Teutonic Order in Germany. Ever since the outbreak of the revolutionary wars in 1792, the French had been helping themselves to ecclesiastical possessions in the Holy Roman Empire, sharing them with allied states. After the Treaty of Pressburg in December 1805, this process gathered momentum. On 24 April 1809, Napoleon

signed the decree for the abolition of the Teutonic Order in the Confederation of the Rhine, the confederation of German states allied with France. At the stroke of a pen, Napoleon ended a centuries-old institution, just as he had twelve years earlier with the Order of St John in Malta.⁸

The preparation of an order for dissolution

The French emperor had just as little respect for institutions he himself had created. Finding his brother in Holland to be insufficiently obedient, he annexed his kingdom in July 1810. Land Commander Bentinck was quick to observe that ‘the union of Holland and the French Empire’ would bring futures worries. Which precautions might ‘dissipate’ them, he wondered?⁹ He had every reason to be concerned: Napoleon intended his new territories to fill his ever-empty treasuries. Fiscal measures and the decision to reduce the national debt to a third – the so-called *tiercering* – hit wealthy individuals and institutions alike, including the Teutonic Order. And the plans went further, one option being the confiscation of goods. Although individual expropriation was ideologically unacceptable, an alternative had been found in France in 1789: the dispossession of church property and properties of feudal origin. This was wholly in line with revolutionary doctrine. As a result, churches, monasteries and military orders in France and the occupied territories lost their possessions wholesale.

The first sign of such plans came in September 1810, when the French minister of finance questioned Charles François Lebrun (1739–1824), the governor general of the Dutch departments, on the revenues of the *Hospices, Etablissements de Charité, Institutions Pieuses et autres de même nature*.¹⁰ Four months later, the burgomaster of Utrecht forwarded questionnaires to the town’s chapters (the Cathedral, St Saviour’s, St Peter’s, St John’s and St Mary’s). All responded that they were not ecclesiastical institutions. In the same period, late January 1811, Lebrun reported on the possible confiscation of church property in the area under his administration. He based his finding on preliminary inquiries by two members of the *Conseil d’État*, Izaak Jan Alexander Gogel (1765–1821) and Jean Henry Appelius (1767–1828). As minister of finance under Louis Napoleon, Gogel, by this time intendant-general of the imperial treasury in the Dutch departments, had proposed the dispossession of former church property. He now began by proposing the expropriation of the former convents at Zennewijnen, Ter Hunnepe and Opheusden. When Lebrun’s report was being discussed by the *Conseil d’État*, these possessions were joined by the five chapters in Utrecht. In the ensuing weeks, the proposal developed into a draft decree that referred explicitly to the three former convents, the five Utrecht chapters and the chapter of St John’s in Wijk bij Duurstede. Napoleon signed it on 27 February in the Tuileries Palace.¹¹

Because of the loss of the archives of the ministry of finance and the *Conseil d’État* in the fire of 1871,¹² we cannot trace the decision-making process in detail. Between them, however, the appendices to the decree and the surviving archives in the Netherlands provide sufficient information to support the aforementioned reconstruction. Napoleon seems to have had no personal involvement in the

measure: on 27 February 1811 he signed over seventy decrees, and the text of the dissolution order did not diverge from the original draft. But as the French empire was by nature authoritarian, it was of course Napoleon who was responsible for the decision. The decree was also fully consistent with his policy on ecclesiastical institutions.

How the Bailiwick of Utrecht responded

Once the decree had been signed, its implementation followed the procedures one would expect. On 2 March, it was the turn of the ministry of finance to deal with it. It was then sent to Amsterdam, where responsibility for it lay with Gogel – who, having been closely involved in its preparation, already knew what it entailed. After discussing it with his weekly meeting with his senior staff on 14 March, Gogel composed a letter to those it targeted: the deans of the chapters and the land commander of the Teutonic Order. Gogel declared the decree to be of immediate application to the Order.

Rumours were circulating even before the letters were received. After briefly considering a protest – and even sending a delegation to Paris – the chapters quickly decided to resign themselves to the situation and to explore Gogel's offer of compensation. But the Teutonic Order resisted. Land Commander Bentinck conferred with coadjutor Jan Arend de Vos van Steenwijk (1746–1813). Drawing comfort from the fact 'that the Teutonic Order was not named explicitly in the Decree',¹³ they had the lawyer Cornelis Anthony Fannius Scholten (1767–1832) write a petition to Napoleon.

After stating that the decree did not explicitly identify the Order, the petition explained the institution's *nature réelle*.¹⁴ Its origins did indeed lie in the establishment of the *Ordre Teutonique* in the twelfth century. However, when the Netherlands became a republic in the sixteenth century, it had entirely changed in nature: since then, it had been only a 'simple association'. Despite bearing the word bailiwick in its name, it had none of the powers of a bailiwick. The members derived no the advantages from it that would set them apart from other people in the Netherlands – they were, for example, equally liable to taxation. And as its members were not subject to a vow of celibacy, the Bailiwick of Utrecht was essentially different from a military order.

With regard to its possessions, the petition observed that these were not originally *biens ecclésiastiques*, but had been derived from *donations particulières ou de legs testamentaires*.¹⁵ They had increased as a result of wise policy and the members' contributions. In a reference to the successful reorganization under Van Wassenaer fifty years earlier, it was stressed that this had above all been the case since 1760, members now receiving *répartitions fixes* according to seniority. Together, the above meant that the Bailiwick of Utrecht was no *ordre militaire*, but a *tontine*, to which a man could accede only when a place became available upon a member's decease, and even then only if he had been registered as a child upon the payment of a fee (525 guilders). It was therefore a form of life assurance that was most expressly permitted under French law. The bailiwick – referred to

throughout the petition as *cette association* – was not therefore a *corporation privilégiée* and had never belonged to a *corporation religieuse* or to the *ordres militaires*.¹⁶ In no way could the *association* be said to violate the empire's constitution.

The petition was delivered to Governor General Lebrun by De Vos van Steenwijk and Fannius Scholten. Bentinck was ill. Lebrun informed them that the petition had little chance of success: it was the emperor's intention to dissolve bodies that benefited individual members. He referred to the Knights of Malta who, just like the commanders in Utrecht, had paid a *fournissement* upon registration, but whose order had nonetheless been dissolved. He then reminded them of the rules that had been proposed for compensation, which would also apply to those who registered. However, agreeing that the Bailiwick of Utrecht had not been named explicitly in the decree, he declared the petition admissible, and promised to dispatch it to Napoleon.

No response came from Paris. When, in October 1811, the emperor visited the annexed territories, one of the members of the Order – Frederik Gijsbert van Dedem van de Gelder (1743–1820), who was also a member of the French Senate – inquired discreetly how matters stood. When it came, the answer was both clear and disappointing: in a decree signed in Amsterdam on 22 October, Napoleon confirmed the Order's abolition. It also indicated the revenue that was estimated to result from the confiscation: 16 million francs. The sum was to be spent on improvements to the military infrastructure in the Dutch departments and also on road building, which was of equal strategic importance.¹⁷

How the order for dissolution was carried out

Once the decision with regard to the Teutonic Order was definitive, Gogel could set the Order's liquidation in motion. Taking a decision to this end on 31 December 1811, he deployed his confidant Elias Canneman, and also Everard Temminck, the officer at *Domeinen*, the property-administration authority, who was already in the process of liquidating the chapters and had also been dealing with the Order. Land Commander Bentinck, who had now abandoned the struggle, provided his full collaboration. In consultation with Canneman and Temminck, he convened a general meeting in June 1812 to discuss the liquidation of the Order's possessions. Turning their attention to the compensation and distribution of the funds promised by the authorities, the members now agreed a timetable with Gogel's men.¹⁸

An obstacle soon became apparent: the attitude of the steward, U.W.T. Cazius, who refused repeatedly to submit the documents needed for completion. Gradually, Canneman and Temminck began to suspect that Cazius had something to hide. There were indications that his accounts were not in order. When Gogel's decision of December 1811 had been announced, there had already been signs that Cazius was unwilling to supply the documents. Although the parties to the liquidation had hoped to settle matters quickly after the agreements of June 1812, it was only a few weeks before Temminck noted new delays. The deadline agreed for submitting

the final accounts covering the period until the Order's dissolution was 31 December 1812. When it passed without result, Bentinck and Canneman attempted in vain to spur Cazius into producing the papers.¹⁹

With Cazius consistently claiming that he was motivated by his loyalty to the Order, the authorities fixed their hopes on Bentinck, but when Bentinck fell gravely ill in late February 1813, the process ground to a halt. If, as he himself feared, he did not survive the illness, continuity was uncertain, seeing as the coadjutor De Vos van Steenwijk had died in the same period.²⁰ The elderly land commander asked Commander Van Dedem van de Gelder to take over in the event of his death – even viewing him as the new coadjutor, although the regulations provided no basis for this.

But Bentinck recovered. In April, he resumed his exhortations of Cazius. Though the tone became increasingly bitter, Cazius would not budge. Canneman and Temminck's approaches were equally unsuccessful, and nothing was solved even when Gogel talked to Cazius. Though Cazius was indeed trying to hide his own financial bungling, it is remarkable that these high government officers were unable to persuade him to submit the documents they needed to wind up the estate of the Teutonic Order and finalize its dissolution. French control may not have been so tight after all – a point that may also have applied to its censorship.²¹

In the meantime, agreement was reached on a different point: compensation for the members. Though the settlement offered in October 1811 had been rejected as being too low, the Order changed tack in the general meeting of June 1812. In exchange for compensation and for sharing the funds between them, the members were prepared to accept dissolution – but if Cazius continued not to submit the documents, this would be impossible.²²

Compensation was a matter on which Bentinck had written to Napoleon, engaged by now in his Russian campaign. The only answer Bentinck received was that he could continue to live in the Order's house in The Hague – a promise subsequently laid down in a decree signed by Napoleon in Vitebsk, where the Russian army had just slipped his grasp.²³ After the emperor's safe return to Paris in late 1812, Bentinck tried once more, asking Appelius how matters stood with regard to the compensation. He was advised to approach the ministry of finance, which eventually made a concrete proposal. On 13 August 1813, Napoleon signed a decree in Dresden that allotted a fixed annual pension to the members of the order after its dissolution.²⁴

The pensions were never paid: before the complex procedures for registering the national debt could get under way, the machinery of the French state was immobilized by developments on the front. When Napoleon had signed, the truce with the allies had just ended, and the fighting – now involving Austria – led to progressive collapse, a process that came to a head in mid-October at the Battle of the Nations near Leipzig. Some weeks later, French troops began their withdrawal from Holland. In mid-November, a group of prominent Dutchmen seized power and called for the return of the son of the last stadholder. On 30 November, he duly landed on the beach at Scheveningen and was inaugurated as Sovereign Prince in Amsterdam two days later.²⁵

The lobby for reinstatement

At the French departure and the prince's return, Bentinck saw immediately that the Bailiwick of Utrecht could be reinstated. He approached the sovereign in person and received a favourable answer. On 20 April 1814, he followed this up with an official petition. In the rhetoric that became customary after the fall of Napoleon, all blame was attributed to 'the whim of the despot'.²⁶ When requesting the Sovereign Prince to reverse the injustice and return the 'stolen goods', he pointed out that none of the compensation promised had been paid – something that would become an important element in achieving a settlement.

On 21 February 1815, after reporting by the ministries of finance and the interior, a proposal for the annulment of the dissolution was submitted to the *Raad van State*, the sovereign's new advisory council – a body that decided on fundamental questions in a debate on the reversal of revolutionary measures that was now raging throughout Europe. Its opinion was that, if compensation had been paid, the actions of previous governments – justified or otherwise – should not be reversed.²⁷ For this reason, it recommended that the ministry of the interior's proposal with regard to the Utrecht chapters should not be adopted, as their members had already received compensation. But in the case of the Teutonic Order the situation was different, as no compensation had been paid.

William I accepted the recommendations of the *Raad van State* and signed a Royal Decree to this effect on 25 March 1815, nine days after proclaiming himself king. He reversed the dissolution of the Teutonic Order and, to the extent that they were still under the management of *Domeinen* and were not now in private hands, promised the return of the goods that had been confiscated. The king requested the Office and the ministry of finance to prepare the submission of a bill to the *Staten-Generaal*, the parliament of the new kingdom.

Obtaining a clear picture of the Order's former possessions was still a complicated matter, partly because it was still necessary to process the papers previously held by Cazius, now ex-steward. Eventually, a bill was put before the *Staten-Generaal* on 31 July – ironically the very day that Napoleon embarked for St Helena. The first article described the principle upon which restitution would be made: 'The Teutonic Order, Bailiwick of Utrecht, shall be restored to the condition pertaining at the time of its suppression in the year 1811.'²⁸ However, the king was to exercise greater authority over the Order than had previously been exercised by the Provincial States of Utrecht. The accompanying letter contained an important consideration regarding the policy on those affected by the Napoleonic measures. The king expressed his heartfelt sympathy with regard to 'the detriment to their property and essential interests that so many of our countrymen suffered during the foreign occupation'. But although he had originally intended to repair all such damage, he had quickly concluded that the sheer extent and complexity of the losses would make this impossible.²⁹ He realized that options for redressing injustices were possible only if they did not threaten the running of the state and would not harm any interests that had developed in the meantime. The reinstatement of the Bailiwick of Utrecht through the restitution of goods was

possible only if it did not harm the interests of those to whom its possessions had been auctioned.

The restitution policy of William I resembled that of Louis XVIII in France and the agreements made at the Vienna Congress. Like the Order of St John, which had hoped to recover Malta, the Teutonic Order in Germany received nothing.³⁰ On 4 August the *Staten-Generaal* debated the bill, accepting it with the rider that although the proposed reinstatement of the Order entailed the restoration of its name and of some remaining goods, it did not entail the restoration of the Order as it had existed for nearly six centuries.³¹ On 8 August, the king signed it into law. The final step in the process was the publication in the *Staatsblad* – the bulletin of acts, orders and decrees – of the Act for the reinstatement of the Teutonic Order of the Bailiwick of Utrecht.³²

The procedures for reinstatement could then begin. Although the preparatory work had already been done by *Domeinen* and the ministry of finance, it would take six years for the process to be completed. Eventually, however, the Teutonic Order recovered the greater part of its possessions. In terms of land, this amounted to nearly 75 per cent: 1,420 *morgen* – some 1,150 hectares. It had already been determined that only land administered by *Domeinen* would qualify for return.³³ That only a quarter of the confiscated estates had been sold was due partly to the delays caused by Cazius but also to the cautious approach to sales taken by *Domeinen*. The authorities had learned much from the inflationary effects of the rapid sale of church property in France after 1789. Lots that could not be sold at auction for more than their reserve price were now withdrawn immediately and might be put back on the market later. It was for similar reasons that the sale of chapter possessions, which continued after 1814 because the chapters would not be reinstated, was to last for decades.³⁴

Now the Teutonic Order had been reinstated by law, Land Commander Bentinck was able to convene the remaining knights. On 27 September 1815 they met in the Order's house in The Hague. Much moved, Bentinck began his address as follows:

Gentlemen, after the storms and shocks that have shaken the world for many years – shocks that also uprooted our noble Order – this is one of the happiest moments of my life. For that Order is risen anew, its former lustre undimmed.³⁵

But the mood during the meeting was anything but festive. First, three members responded frostily to Bentinck's account of his actions between 1811 and 1815. They then attacked his proposal to dismiss Cazius and replace him by Christiaan Paulus de Vos (1781–1857), a *Domeinen* officer. Although the land commander was able to assert his will, relations were soured, and remained so for years.

Furious arguments also followed Bentinck's death in later 1820, this time about finances, new regulations, and the Order's official seat. When De Vos decamped to London with the funds, the Order was in a serious predicament once more. Peace was restored only after new regulations had been accepted in 1830, finances had been put in order and, in 1836, new premises had been purchased in Utrecht.³⁶ Here

the Order remained until the end of the twentieth century, when the old Teutonic House that had been confiscated in 1807 became vacant, part of which was bought back. In the meeting room, the bust of King William I now stands behind the land commander's chair, an arrangement that symbolizes the king's saving of the Order in 1815.

Conclusion

The history of the Teutonic Order of the Bailiwick of Utrecht in the revolutionary period – specifically that of 1811–1815 – epitomizes not only the attack on institutions of the *ancien régime*, but also the tenacity of these institutions. The attacks were the product of a revolutionary ideal that wished to bring an end to anything reminiscent of feudalism and ecclesiastical dominion. Conveniently, revenue from their dissolution would also help eliminate state deficits, which were largely the product of the wars that had been waged. Mixing active and passive resistance with flexible responses to events as they unfolded, the exponents of the old order did their best to save their skins. To recover their lost positions, they tried to use moderation in the revolutionary process and the fall of the Napoleonic regime. Their success depended on circumstance and those in power. Although some endeavoured to rectify revolutionary injustice, this could not be done if the cost was too high and if any recently gained interests were jeopardized. Property – ancient and recent alike – was inviolable. The Teutonic Order of the Bailiwick of Utrecht was able to return because its members had received no compensation and because the property of which they had been deprived was still largely in government hands. Other institutions such as the Utrecht chapters were disbanded for good. But because the Bailiwick of Utrecht was able to resume in 1815, the city still boasts an institution whose descent dates back directly to the time of the crusades – 1231, the year in which the commandery in Utrecht was founded.

Notes

- 1 This article is based on research conducted between 2007 and 2012 the results of which were published in a Dutch monograph: R. E. de Bruin, *Bedreigd door Napoleon. De Ridderlijke Duitse Orde, Balije van Utrecht 1753–1838* (Hilversum, 2012).
- 2 Décret impérial au Palais des Tuileries, 27–2–1811, p. 1; Archief Ridderlijke Duitse Orde Utrecht (ARDOU) Oud Archief 1200–1811 (OA) inv. no. 19; Decreet van keizer Napoleon waarbij ook de D.O. Balije van Utrecht wordt opgeheven. Met copie van een adres aan de keizer, houdende verzoek om dit decreet niet van toepassing te doen zijn voor de Balije van Utrecht (1811) 1 omslag. Archives Nationales (AN), Paris, AF, Archives du pouvoir exécutif (1789–1815) IV, Secrétairerie d'État impérial (an VIII–1815), inv. no. 530, Minutes des décrets impériaux (24–28 février 1811) 1 carton.
- 3 J. A. Mol, 'Trying to survive. The Military Orders in Utrecht, 1580–1620', in *The Military Orders and the Reformation. Choices, State building and the Weight of Tradition*, ed. J. A. Mol, K. Millitzer and H. J. Nicholson (Hilversum, 2006), pp. 181–207.
- 4 De Bruin, *Bedreigd door Napoleon*, pp. 79–88.
- 5 R. E. de Bruin, 'Hidden in the Bushes: The Teutonic Order of the Bailiwick of Utrecht in the 1780–1806 Revolutionary Period', in *MO* 5, pp. 349–61.

- 6 ARDOU-OA, inv. no. 11–4, fols. 86–7; G. A. Evers, *Utrecht als koninklijke residentie* (Utrecht, 1941), pp. 62–3.
- 7 ARDOU-OA, inv. no. 11–4, fols. 90–1; Nationaal Archief (NA) 2.01.12, inv. no. 601, Minuut verbal, uitgaande brieven en ingekomen stukken 23–31 januari 1808.
- 8 F. Täubl, *Der Deutsche Orden im Zeitalter Napoleons* (Bonn, 1966), pp. 171–177; C. Testa, *The French in Malta 1798–1800* (Valetta, 1997), pp. 23–24; A. Blondy, ‘Malta and France 1789–1798: The Art of Communicating a Crisis’, in *Hospitaller Malta*, ed. V. Mallia-Milanes (Msira, 1993), pp. 662–3.
- 9 ‘de vereeniging van Holland met het Fransche Keizerrijk’, ARDOU-OA, inv. no. 11, fol. 137.
- 10 Brief van de minister van Financiën aan de Gouverneur-Generaal, 1–9–1810; Nationaal Archief (NA), The Hague, 2.01.01.08 Archieven van de Prins Stedehouder 1810–1813, inv. no. 11, Ministre des Finances (1810–1813) 1 portefeuille.
- 11 AN AF IV, inv. no. 530, Minutes des décrets impériaux, doss. 4129, 27 February 1811.
- 12 Communication from Dr Joke Roelevink 18–5–2010; <http://www.historici.nl/Onderzoek/Projecten/GidsBataafsFranseTijd/Instellingen/144>; <http://www.archivesnationales.culture.gouv.fr/chan/index.html>: État général des fonds des Archives nationales (Paris), AF Archives du Pouvoir Executif, p. 8.
- 13 ‘dat de Duitsche Orde niet nominativ in het Decreet was uitgedrukt’, ARDOU-OA, inv. no. 11–4, fol. 137.
- 14 ARDOU-OU, inv. no. 19, adres, p 3.
- 15 ARDOU-OU, inv. no. 19, adres, p 4.
- 16 ARDOU-OU, inv. no. 19, adres, p 5.
- 17 Décret Impérial à Amsterdam, 22–10–1811; NA 2.21.005.30, inv. no. 20, Capittelzaken en Duitsche Orde, balije van Utrecht (1803, 1811–1814) 46 stukken; origineel: AN AF IV inv. no. 593, Minutes des décrets impériaux (19–22 octobre 1811) doss. 4691, no. 17.
- 18 ARDOU-OU inv. no. 11–4, fols. 150–63.
- 19 ARDOU-OA inv. no. 11–4, fol. 167–70; ARDOU-NA inv. no. 004; NA 2.01.23, inv. no. 93, Ingekomen stukken Intendant-Generaal van Financiën (1812); *Een vriendschap in het teken van 's lands financiën. Briefwisseling tussen Elias Canneman en Isaac Jan Alexander Gogel, 1799–1813*, ed. M. van Leeuwen-Canneman ('s-Gravenhage, 2009), pp. 587, 597–8, 602–7.
- 20 Letter from V. R. Bentinck to F. G. van Dedem van de Gelder, 16–4–1813, ARDOU-NA, inv. no. 006.
- 21 L. Jensen, *Verzet tegen Napoleon* (Nijmegen, 2013) pp. 33–52, 134.
- 22 ARDOU-OA, inv. no. 11–4, fol. 163.
- 23 Décret impérial à Witebsk, 6–8–1812, AN AF IV, inv. no. 680, Minutes des décrets impériaux (1–6 août 1812) 1 carton, doss. 5437 no. 25. A. Zamoyski, *1812. Napoleon's Fatal March to Moscow* (New York, 2005), pp. 169–75; D. Lieven, *Russia against Napoleon* (London, 2009), pp. 191–203.
- 24 Décret Impérial à Dresde, 13–8–1813; ARDOU-NA, inv. no. 004, bijlage W1; AN AF IV inv. no. 976, doss. 6395 no. 95.
- 25 J. Koch, *Koning Willem I 1772–1843* (Amsterdam, 2013), pp. 228–44.
- 26 ‘de willekeur van de despoot’. Letter from V. R. Bentinck to William I, 20–4–1814; ARDOU-NA, inv. no. 004, bijlage X. Verzoekschrift van V. R. Bentinck aan Napoleon, 31–7–1812; ARDOU-NA, inv. no. 007, Memorie van de Landcommandeur over zijne bemoeienissen om een schadevergoeding te verkrijgen voor de leden van het voormalig kapittel der Orde, 2 exemplaren met bijlagen (1813) 1 omslag, bijlage a.
- 27 Notulen Raad van State, 21–2–1815; NA 2.02.06 inv. no. 5.
- 28 ‘De Duitsche Orde, Balije van Utrecht, wordt hersteld, zodanig als dezelve tijde van suppressie in den jare 1811 heeft bestaan.’ Concept-besluit, houdende bepalingen omtrent de teruggave der goederen door de Duitsche Orde, Balije van Utrecht, voor- maals bezeten, 31–7–1815, art. 1; ARDOU-NA, inv. no. 031.

232 *Renger de Bruin*

- 29 ‘in de slagen welken door zo veelen onzer landgenooten geduurende de vreemde overheersching in hunne waardste belangen en in hun vermogen getroffen zijn’. Letter from William I to the Staten-Generaal, 3–8–1815; ARDOU-NA, inv. no. 031.
- 30 D. Buschinger and M. Olivier, *Les chevaliers teutoniques* (Paris, 2007), pp. 372–3; A. Zamoyski, *Rites of Peace: The Fall of Napoleon and the Congress of Vienna* (London, 2007), p. 429.
- 31 Handelingen Kamer 4–8–1815; ARDOU-NA, inv. no. 031.
- 32 Staatsblad no. 43 Wet waarbij de Duitse Orde, Balije van Utrecht, wordt hersteld, gearresteerd 8–8–1815 no 55; ARDOU-NA, inv. no. 031.
- 33 NA 2.02.06, inv. no. 5, Notulen van de Raad van State, 21–2–1815.
- 34 De Bruin, *Bedreigd door Napoleon*, p. 521; R. de Kam, F. Kipp and D. Claessen, *De Utrechtse Domtoren, trots van de stad* (Utrecht, 2014), p. 303; *Utrecht in 1832. Grondgebruik en eigendom. Kadastrale atlas provincie Utrecht*, ed. D. J. Wijmer, D. T. Koen and H. P. Deys (Utrecht, 2000).
- 35 ‘Hoog Wel Geboren Heren, Een der gelukkigste ogenblikken van mijn leven is het tegenwoordige na al de stormen en schokken die sedert zo vele jaren de waereld beroerd hebben, en die ook onse eerwaardige Orde hadde omvergeruckt herrijst deselve met glans, onder de luisterrijkste bescherming’. ARDOU-OA, inv. no. 11–4, fol. 113.
- 36 Het Utrechts Archief (HUA), Utrecht, Akte notaris G.H. Stevens 1–12–1836, dl. 133, no. 31.