

Cahiers de la Méditerranée

n° 104 - juin 2022

Noblesses et ordres militaires.
Réseaux, familles, pouvoirs

Sous la direction de Anne Brogini et Germain Butaud

Cahiers de la Méditerranée

Revue scientifique fondée en 1970, publiée par le Centre de la Méditerranée moderne et contemporaine (Université Côte d'Azur).

Directeurs

Jean-Paul PELLEGRINETTI et Barbara MEAZZI

Anciens directeurs

André NOUSCHI (†), Robert ESCALLIER, Pierre-Yves BEAUREPAIRE, Silvia MARZAGALLI

Rédacteur en chef

Jérémy GUEDJ

Secrétariat de rédaction

Adeline BEAUREPAIRE-HERNANDEZ, Julien CONTES, Magali GUARESÌ, Matthieu MAGNE, Marieke POLFLIET, Alain ROMÉY

Secrétaire d'édition

Claire GAUGAIN

Comité de rédaction

Bernard ANDRES (UQAM, Canada), Maurice AYMARD (Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris), Eric BAILLY, Hervé BARELLI (Nice, Direction de la Culture), Arnaud BARTOLOMEI, Pierre-Yves BEAUREPAIRE, Anne BROGINI, Jean-Pierre DARNIS, Anne-Laure DUPONT (Sorbonne Université), Hassen EL ANNABI (CERES, Tunis), Robert ESCALLIER, Jacques FREMEAUX (Sorbonne Université), Jean-Yves FRÉTIGNÉ (Université de Rouen-Normandie), Katsumi FUKASAWA (Université de Tôkyô), Bernard HEYBERGER (EHESS), Maria GHAZALI, Héroïse HERMANT, Xavier HUETZ-DE-LEMPS, Stéphanie LANFRANCHI (ENS Lyon), Cathy MARGAILLAN, Luis P. MARTIN, Joseph MARTINETTI, Silvia MARZAGALLI, Véronique MERIEUX, Jean-Marie MIOSSEC (Université Paul-Valéry, Montpellier 3), Daniel NORDMAN (CNRS, Paris), Jean-Pierre PANTALACCI, Romain RAINERO (Université de Milan), Didier REY (Université de Corse), Giuseppe RICUPERATI (Université de Turin), Maurizio RIDOLFI (Université de la Tuscia, Viterbe), Alain RUGGIERO (†), Biagio SALVEMINI (Université de Bari), Jean-Charles SCAGNETTI, Ralph SCHOR, Francesca I. SENSINI, Isabel VIOLANTE

Comité de lecture – Comité scientifique

Olivier BOUQUET (Université Paris VII Diderot), Marco CINI (Université de Pise), David DO PAÇO (Sciences Po), Maria FUSARO (University of Exeter), Anthony JONES (Harvard et Northeastern University), Wolfgang KAISER (Université de Paris I Panthéon Sorbonne et EHESS), Marc LAZAR (Institut d'Études Politiques de Paris), Luca LO BASSO (Université de Gênes), Frédéric ROUSSEAU (Université de Montpellier III), Marie-Carmen SMYRNELIS (Institut Catholique de Paris et EHESS)

Les opinions exprimées dans les articles n'engagent que leurs auteurs

Les Cahiers de la Méditerranée en ligne : <http://journals.openedition.org/cdlm/>

Contactez la rédaction

Centre de la Méditerranée moderne et contemporaine
Rédaction des Cahiers de la Méditerranée
Université Côte d'Azur

98, boulevard Edouard-Herriot B.P. 3209 F-06204 Nice cedex 3

Tél. : +33 (0)4 93 37 54 50

CahiersMediterranee@unice.fr

Soumettre une proposition d'article

Les propositions d'articles doivent être adressées directement à la rédaction de la revue sous forme numérique (.doc), accompagnées d'une présentation biobibliographique de l'auteur, d'un résumé et d'une liste de mots clés. Tout auteur accepte la mise en ligne de son article dès lors qu'il est publié par la revue.

Revue soutenue par l'Institut des Sciences Humaines et Sociales du CNRS

ISSN : 0395-9317 / ISSN-E : 1773-0201

Sommaire

Dossier : Noblesses et Ordres militaires. Réseaux, familles, pouvoirs

Anne Brogini, Germain Butaud , Noblesses et Ordres militaires. Réseaux, familles, pouvoirs	7
Daniel K. Gullo , Identifying the Knights. Database Management and Authority Files for Person and Family Names in HMML's Reading Room	15
Valeria Vanesio , Rediscovering the archival history of the Order of Saint John: the proofs of admission of the Langue of Italy (c.15th-c.18th)	27
Damien Carraz , Un Hospitalier provençal et ses réseaux au XIII ^e siècle. Le commandeur Bérenger Monge	51
Anne Brogini, Germain Butaud , Les familles nobles du pays niçois et l'ordre de Rhodes et Malte (XIV ^e -XVIII ^e siècles)	67
Laure Bagneris , La noblesse urbaine à travers les procès de l'ordre de Malte. L'exemple du second ordre toulousain (XVI ^e -XVII ^e siècles)	91
Anton Caruana Galizia , The Maltese Nobilities and the Order of St. John. A New Approach	107
Krzysztof Kwiatkowski , The relations of the Teutonic Order in Prussia with the local nobility in the 13th-early 16th century. Scope of issues, research state and research perspectives	117
Mathieu Olivier , <i>L'Ancienne Chronique des Grands-Maîtres</i> , produit et instrument d'un réseau nobiliaire au sein de l'ordre Teutonique	145
Renger De Bruin , An Elite within Dutch Nobility. The Teutonic Order Bailiwick of Utrecht, 1640-1840	159
Davide Balestra, Albane Cogné , Les Italiens dans les ordres militaires espagnols à l'époque des Habsbourg : une forme de « noblesse impériale »?	175
Gema Belia Capilla Aledón , Nobles et humanistes. Les élites de pouvoir du <i>Quattrocento</i> italien, Alphonse le Magnanime et le début de la modernité	191
Juan Francisco Pardo Molero , Noblesse, éthique et gouvernance chez les fonctionnaires locaux du roi. Bailes et alcaides dans le royaume de Valence (env. 1500-1560)	213

Notes et travaux de recherche

Adnen El Ghali , Médecin du prince et <i>primo enter pares</i> . Médecins et agents d'influence à la Cour du Bardo dans la Tunisie husseinite (1757-1881)	229
Maria Sofia Corciulo , La Constitution de Cadix et la Révolution constitutionnelle napolitaine de 1820-1821	249
Florjan Bombaj, Dominique Barjolle, Jean-Marc Touzard, François Casabianca , How does the pressure of demand for pastureland impact local farming systems? Developments and evidence from South-East Albania	261

Note de lecture

Stéfanie Prezioso, Leone Ginzburg et la lutte antifasciste. À propos d'Angelo d'Orsi, *L'intellettuale antifascista. Ritratto di Leone Ginzburg*, Neri, Pozza, 2019 277

Comptes-rendus

Jean-Baptiste Delzant, Cécile Troadec, Roma crescit. *Une histoire économique et sociale de Rome au xv^e siècle*, Rome, École française de Rome, 2020, 556 p. 289

Ralph Schor, Olivier Dard et Didier Musiedlak (dir), *Être nationaliste en régime de dictature*, Bruxelles, Peter Lang, 2020, 514 p. 293

Guyon, Claire Miot, *La Première Armée française. De la Provence à l'Allemagne (1944-1945)*, Paris, Perrin, 2021, 448 p. 297

Constance De Gourcy, Schmoll Camille, *Les damnées de la mer. Femmes et frontières en Méditerranée*, Paris, La Découverte, 2020, 248 p. 301

Ibrahim Bechrouri, Marie-Pierre Ulloa, *Le nouveau rêve américain. Du Maghreb à la Californie*, Paris, CNRS Éditions, 2019, 384 p. 305

Résumés et mots clés 311

Les auteurs 323

An Elite within Dutch Nobility. The Teutonic Order Bailiwick of Utrecht, 1640-1840.

Renger DE BRUIN

The Netherlands has the image of being an egalitarian country, with limited social differences, extensive opportunities for social rising, a high degree of citizen participation and, above all, a large amount of tolerance. The existence of a powerful nobility, even in the past, does not fit into this picture and is therefore downplayed. There is much to be said about this image. As far as it goes, it mainly refers to the situation around 1970, with Amsterdam as the “magic centre” of the world.² After 1980, social disparities have grown considerably. Then came the realisation that the vision of the Dutch past was a projection of the society that had grown in the decades after World War II.

Historians and social scientists have shown that Dutch nobility played a significant role, also after the Middle Ages. During the Ancien Regime, nobles did not constitute an insignificant relic of feudal times and after the revolutionary period 1795-1815, in which the nobility was indeed threatened, this position came back stronger. Nobles had networks through which they could exert a great deal of influence on politics and society. One of those networks was the exclusive Teutonic Order Bailiwick of Utrecht.

In this contribution, I first want to sketch the changing image of Dutch nobility in the research of the past decades, including the networks through which this group exerted its influence. Next, I will follow the developments of that one network, the Bailiwick of Utrecht. After a brief outline of its genesis until 1640, the year in which it became an independent Protestant institution, I want to analyse its functioning, during three periods: from 1640 to 1795, the moment when French armies brought the revolution with them, next the revolutionary period 1795-1815, in which the Order was threatened and even abolished, and finally, the years of restoration after the fall of Napoleon. For the period after 1840, I would

-
1. I want to thank Dr. Paul Brusse, Dr. Luc Nagtegaal and Dr. Egbert Wolleswinkel for their useful comments.
 2. Robert Adlington, “Expressive Revolutions: 1968 and Music in the Netherlands”, in Beate Kutschke and Barley Norton (eds.), *Music and Protest in 1968*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013, p. 12-28; James C. Kennedy, *Building new Babylon: cultural change in the Netherlands during the 1960s*, Ph.D. University of Iowa, 1995, p. 139-140.

like to outline the contours in the final paragraph, which focuses on the importance of research on the Bailiwick of Utrecht as a noble network in the context of a broader study of Dutch elites in an international perspective.

This contribution is based on an elaborate archival study. Previous publications of the results place the research in the context of the Military Orders, but here the emphasis is on the function of the Bailiwick of Utrecht as part of noble networks.³ I will mainly refer to literature in English, German and French, since Dutch is not accessible for many readers. However, in some cases it will be necessary to cite titles in Dutch. Also, most archival sources are in Dutch. Quotations will be translated into English, with the original text in footnotes.

The changing vision on the role of nobility in Dutch society

The image of Dutch society after the Middle Ages used to be urban, mercantile, maritime, and bourgeois. Also Simon Schama's splendid portrait of Dutch society in the Golden Age bears these characteristics.⁴ For bourgeois or middle-class, the Dutch word *burgerlijk* is used, which can be translated into German with *bürgerlich*, but an exact equivalent in English is difficult to find. The notion *burgerlijk* is essential for the self-image of the Dutch. As the famous Dutch historian Johan Huizinga (1872-1945) put it:

Whether we fly high or low, we Dutchmen are all *burgerlijk* – lawyer and poet, baron and labourer alike. Our national culture is *burgerlijk* in every sense that you can legitimately attach to that word.⁵

3. Renger E. de Bruin, *Bedreigd door Napoleon. De Ridderlijke Duitse Orde, Balije van Utrecht, 1753-1838*, Hilversum, Verloren, 2012; *id.*, “Hidden in the Bushes: The Teutonic Order of the Bailiwick of Utrecht in the 1780-1806 Revolutionary Period”, in Peter Edbury (ed.), *The Military Orders 5. Politics and Power*, Farnham, Surrey, Ashgate, 2012, p. 349-361; *id.*, “Eine gelungene Neuordnung. Die Ballei Utrecht des Deutschen Ordens, 1753-1795”, in Roman Czaja and Jürgen Sarnowsky (eds.), *Ordines Militares. Colloquia Torunsia Historica. Yearbook for the Study of the Military Orders XXI*, 2016, p. 189-220; *id.*, “The narrow escape of the Teutonic Order Bailiwick of Utrecht, 1811-1815”, in Jochen Schenk and Mike Carr (eds.), *The Military Orders 6.2, Culture and Conflict in Western and Northern Europe*, London-New York, Routledge, 2017, p. 222-232; *id.*, “Des croisades catholiques à l’assistance protestante aux pauvres. Le bailliage d’Utrecht de l’ordre teutonique (1200-2006)”, in Anne Brogini, Germain Butaud, Maria Ghazali and Jean-Pierre Pantalacci (coord.), *Nobles et chevaliers en Europe et en Méditerranée, Cahiers de la Méditerranée*, n° 97/2, 2018, p. 357-371; *id.*, “Die Entwicklung der regionalen Herkunft der Ritter der Ballei Utrecht im Zeitraum 1640-1840”, in Udo Arnold (ed.), *Globale und regionale Aspekte in der Entwicklung des Deutschen Ordens. Vorträge der Tagung der Internationalen Historischen Kommission des Deutschen Ordens in Würzburg 2016*, Weimar, VDG, 2019, p. 119-149.
4. Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches. An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age*, London, Fontana Press, 1987, p. 289-372.
5. Johan Huizinga, “The spirit of the Netherlands”, in Johan Huizinga, *Dutch Civilisation in the Seventeenth Century*, London, Collins, 1968, p. 112 (Johan Huizinga, *Nederland's geestesmerk*, Leiden, Sijthoff, 1935, cited by Henk te Velde, “How High Did the Dutch Fly? Remarks on Stereotypes of Burger Mentality”, in Annemieke Galema, Henk te Velde and Barbara Henkes (eds.), *Images of the Nation. Different Meanings of Dutchness, 1870-1940*, Amsterdam, Rodopi, 1993, p. 60-61.

In Marxist historiography, the bourgeois character of Dutch society was crucial, an early example of a post-feudal structure. The Dutch Revolt (1565-1648) was seen as a “frühbürgerliche Revolution”.⁶

The traditional view resulted in a limited attention for the position of nobility in the Dutch Republic and after. In the 1990s, the British historian J.L. Price stated that writings in English on the subject were almost absent, whereas most Dutch publications treated nobility as a picturesque survival of a former age.⁷ As an explanation Price points to the tendency to concentrate on Holland, the largest, most populous, and richest of the seven provinces in the Dutch Republic, the state that arose from the Revolt. In this province, which gave its name to the country as whole, at least for a common use abroad, nobility played indeed a limited role. In the 17th century, this province was highly urbanised, commercial, and maritime, for European and even for Dutch standards. In the rest of the Republic, nobles played a far larger role. However, in line with the emphasis on Holland, also in Dutch historiography not much attention was paid to them, at least until some decades ago. From the 1970s onwards, the Hollandocentric approach shifted slowly to a more balanced view.⁸

Historians like Johan Aalbers, Henk van Nierop, Hidde Feenstra and Sherrin Marshall, social scientists like Yme Kuiper, Joop van den Berg and Jaap Dronkers, and jurists like Egbert Wolleswinkel have studied the position of Dutch nobility from the 16th century to the present, both on a regional and a national level.⁹ They revised the aforementioned picture fundamentally. At first, nobles played an important part in the Dutch Revolt. Rather than being a “frühbürgerliche Revolution”, it started as a noble reaction against the centralist policy of Philip II, especially in the field of religion.¹⁰ Apart from Marxist historians, this fact was generally acknowledged before, at least for the first stage of the Revolt, but

6. Laurenz Müller, *Diktatur und Revolution: Reformation und Bauernkrieg in der Geschichtsschreibung des Dritten Reichs und der DDR*, Stuttgart, Lucius & Lucius Verlag, 2004, p. 255.

7. John Leslie Price, “The Dutch Nobility in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries”, in H.M. Scott (ed.), *The European Nobilities in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries I*, London-New York, Pearson, 1995, p. 82.

8. Paul Brusse and Wijnand W. Mijnhart, *Towards a New Template for Dutch History. De-urbanization and the balance between city and countryside*, Zwolle, Waanders, 2011, p. 63-97.

9. For research overviews, see John Leslie Price, “The Dutch Nobility...”, art. cit., p. 82-113; Yme Kuiper, “Eine rein bürgerliche Nation? Adel und Politik in den Niederlanden im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert”, in Jörn Leonhard and Christian Wieland (eds.), *What makes the Nobility Noble? Comparative Perspectives from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011, p. 201-217; *id.*, “Landed elites, landed estates and lifestyles in Europe (1880-2000). A historiographical balance and research agenda”, *Virtus. Journal of Nobility Studies*, n° 23, 2016, p. 82-99. For a recent state-of-the-art, see Conrad Gietman, “Noblesse”, in Catherine Secretan and Willem Frijhoff (eds.), *Dictionnaire des Pays-Bas au Siècle d’or, de l’Union d’Utrecht à la Paix d’Utrecht*, Paris, CNRS Éditions, 2018, p. 523-525.

10. Geoffrey Parker, *The Dutch Revolt*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1979, p. 48-50; Sherrin Marshall, *The Dutch Gentry 1500-1650. Family, Faith and Fortune*, New York-Westport-London, Greenwood Press, 1987, p. 117-158; Jonathan Israel, *The Dutch Republic. Its Rise, Greatness and Fall, 1477-1806*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1995, p. 137-166; Friso Wielenga, *Geschichte der Niederlande*, 3^d ed. Stuttgart, Reclam, 2018, p. 38-46; James C. Kennedy, *A Concise History of the Netherlands*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017, p. 119-123.

nowadays the role of the nobility in the later phases is given much more weight. The lesser nobility, in particular, played an important role in the conflict and was rewarded for it. As the years went by, this group got rid of the competition by the high nobility, who eventually reconciled with Philip II, except for the Nassau's, who, as stadholders, took up a semi-monarchical function in the new Dutch Republic. In that state, the seven provinces were sovereigns and in their governing assemblies, the States, the nobility played an important, if not dominant, role. Only in the two western provinces, Holland and Zeeland, this was not the case. There, urban patricians, originating from the merchant class, dominated. They, however, displayed increasingly aristocratic traits, with the purchase of estates and castles, seigniorial rights and foreign aristocratic titles.¹¹ The nobility managed to keep its institutions, the knighthoods, closed to these newcomers. Precisely in a republic, where the king was absent as a creator of nobility, an almost hermetic closure emerged.

After the occupation of the Republic by the armies of revolutionary France and the outbreak of the Batavian Revolution in 1795, the nobility formally disappeared. The legislation during the Kingdom of Holland (1806-1810) and the annexation to France (1810-1813) did bring possibilities, but not the recovery desired by nobles.¹² This only came about under the reign of King William I, who ruled over an enlarged Kingdom of the Netherlands after the fall of Napoleon. To bring a balance between the considerable group of nobles in his southern provinces and the greatly reduced nobility in the north, he went to great lengths to create nobility.¹³ There has always been consensus that the nobility played a major role in this kingdom, even after the secession of Belgium in 1830, but until recently the dominant opinion was that this ended with the introduction of a liberal constitution in 1848. When the nobility lost most of its formal privileges, more and more attention has been paid to the long-term maintenance of actual positions, a "long goodbye".¹⁴ Well into the 20th century, nobles held influential positions in Dutch society.¹⁵ Of great importance for the preservation of noble positions were the prestige that the descent entailed and the maintenance of excellent networks. An institution that contained both elements to a high degree, was the Teutonic Order Bailiwick of Utrecht. This most exclusive noble network in the Netherlands will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

11. John Leslie Price, "The Dutch Nobility...", art. cit., p. 82.

12. Otto Schutte, "Les titres du Premier Empire Français en relation avec les Pays Bas", *De Nederlandsche Leeuw*, n° 97, 1980, p. 323-358; Egbert J. Wolleswinkel, *Nederlands adelsrecht. Wettelijke adelom als historisch gegroeid instituut*, The Hague, Stichting De Nederlandse Leeuw, 2012, p. 27-42.

13. Egbert Wolleswinkel, *Nederlands adelsrecht...*, op. cit., p. 43-71; C.O.A. Schimmelpenninck van der Oije, "De Ridderschappen in Noord en Zuid, 1815-1830", *Bulletin Trimestriel / Driemaandelijks Bulletin (de l'van de) Association de la Noblesse du Royaume de Belgique/Vereniging van de Adel van het Koninkrijk België*, n° 276, octobre/oktober 2013, p. 24-33.

14. Jaap Moes, *Onder aristocraten. Over hegemonie, welstand en aanzien van adel, patriciaat en andere notabelen in Nederland, 1848-1914*, Hilversum, Verloren, 2012, p. 56-121.

15. Jaap Dronkers, "Has the Dutch Nobility Retained its Social Relevance during the 20th Century?", *European Sociological Review*, n° 19/1, 2003, p. 81-96.

The Bailiwick of Utrecht until 1640

The Teutonic Order Bailiwick of Utrecht originated from one of the Military Orders, the fighting monks during the Crusades. After the Templars and the Hospitallers (Order of St. John), the Teutonic Order was founded in 1190 during the siege of Acre, an episode of the Third Crusade.¹⁶ The struggle for the Christian faith in the Holy Land, and later in the Baltics, was financed by donations, given mostly by nobles, mainly in the Holy Roman Empire. The Order also gained property in the Northern Netherlands, a part of the Empire, only a few decades after its foundation.¹⁷ These possessions became a separate bailiwick in the mid fourteenth century. In the same period, the Utrecht land commandery received new housing inside the city walls. Utrecht did not differ essentially from the other bailiwicks in the Empire, initially financing the wars of the grand master (*Hochmeister*), but becoming more and more a *Spital des deutschen Adels*, a hospice of the German nobility.¹⁸ Gradually, admission criteria became stricter. By 1500, proofs of nobility for four noble grandparents (four quarters) were needed.¹⁹

The 16th century was to bring fundamental changes. In 1525, the grand master broke away from the Order, becoming the Protestant duke of Prussia. Emperor Charles V assigned the authority to the German Master (*Deutschmeister*), who resided in the South-German castle of Mergentheim. The Bailiwick of Utrecht remained loyal to the central Order and Catholic, even after the outbreak of the Revolt against Charles' son Philip II of Spain, which made Calvinism the official religion in the emerging Dutch Republic. The States of Utrecht, being the sovereign of the Order after the abjuration of Philip II in 1581, considered this situation untenable and demanded from 1615 onwards that new members should adhere to the "holy Reformed faith".²⁰ Four years later, the first non-Catholic land commander was installed, after a failed attempt by Mergentheim to put forward

16. Klaus Militzer, *Von Akkon zur Marienburg. Verfassung, Verwaltung und Sozialstruktur des Deutschen Ordens, 1190-1309*, Marburg, N.G. Elwert Verlag, 1999, p. 7-23; Nicholas Morton, *The Teutonic Knights in the Holy Land, 1190-1291*, Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 2009, p. 9-30.

17. Jerem J. van Duijl, "Collecting property for the founding of a Teutonic House in Utrecht (1218-1235)", in Nicholas Morton (ed.), *Piety, pugnacity and property. The Military Orders 7*, London-New York, Routledge, 2020, p. 59-74.

18. Johannes A. Mol, "The Hospice of the German Nobility: Changes in the Admission Policy of the Teutonic Knights in the Fifteenth Century", in Jürgen Sarnowsky (ed.), *Mendicants, Military Orders and Regionalism in Medieval Europe*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 1999, p. 115-130.

19. Klaus Militzer, "Die Aufnahme von Ritterbrüdern in den Deutschen Orden. Ausbildungsstand und Aufnahmevoraussetzungen", in Zenon Hubert Nowak (ed.), *Das Kriegswesen der Ritterorden im Mittelalter, Ordines Militares Colloquia Torunensia Historica VI*, Toruń, Universitas Nicolai Copernici, 1991, p. 9.

20. "de heylige christelijcke gereformeerde religie". Archief Ridderlijke Duitse Orde Balije van Utrecht- Oud-Archief [ARDOU-OA], inv. nr. 178, Afschriften van resolutiën van de Staten en Gedeputeerde Staten van Utrecht, betreffende de Balije van Utrecht, 1580, 1615-1792, ff. 4r-4v; Johannes A. Mol, "Trying to survive: The Military Orders in Utrecht, 1580-1620", in Johannes A. Mol, Klaus Milltizer and Helen J. Nicholson (eds.), *The Military Orders and the Reformation. Choices, State building and the Weight of Tradition*, Hilversum, Verloren, 2006, p. 207; Daniela Gröger-Schiemann, *Die Deutschordensballei Utrecht während der Reformationszeit: die Landkommende zwischen Rebellion und Staatsbildung*, Weimar, VDG, 2015, p. 167-168.

a Catholic. This Jasper van Lynden (1574/75-1620) was not an outspoken Calvinist, but after his death, he was succeeded by Hendrik Casimir of Nassau-Dietz (1612-1640), a relative of the strictly Reformed stadholder and supreme commander of the Dutch army, Prince Maurice of Orange. Hendrik Casimir was still a child, but first under the tutorship of his father, the stadholder of the province of Friesland, and, after reaching the age of majority, independently, he pursued a policy of Protestantization, culminating in the decision to abolish celibacy in 1640.

This decision, approved by the States of Utrecht, was unacceptable to Mergentheim. The Bailiwick of Utrecht was no longer part of the central Order. This position was in line with the depart of the Dutch Republic from the Holy Roman Empire, recognised at the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. Reunification attempts stranded on the issue of celibacy and on the attitude of the States of Utrecht.²¹ Thenceforth, the bailiwick was an independent organisation of lay, mostly married nobles. The admission criteria remained proofs of nobility in four quarters and membership of the Reformed Church. In 1640, dispensation for the admission of a Catholic was granted for the last time.²² However, Catholic members were not expelled, but could stay until their death. New candidates were put forward as children by the incumbent commanders. Upon reaching the age of adulthood, these “expectants” could, provided they fulfilled the conditions, be raised to the rank of *jonkheer* (esquire). Whenever the death of a commander caused a shift in the chapter, the oldest *jonkheer* could accede. First, however, this had to be affirmed by the chapter and by the States of Utrecht.

Because of the rupture with the central Order, the Bailiwick of Utrecht did not follow the upgrade to sixteen noble quarters, but remained with four. Nevertheless, this criterion made the bailiwick an increasingly exclusive network within Dutch nobility, since it debarred the offspring of marriages between nobles and non-noble women. Such marriages were concluded, either out of love, or to strengthen the capital of impoverished noble families, but these were rather exceptional, at least in the eastern provinces. Endogamy was the rule there.²³

-
21. Udo Arnold and Bernhard Demel, “Die kalvinistische Ballei Utrecht”, in Udo Arnold and Gerhard Bott (eds.), *800 Jahre Deutscher Orden. Ausstellung des Germanischen Nationalmuseums Nürnberg in Zusammenarbeit mit der Internationalen Historischen Kommission zur Erforschung des Deutschen Ordens*, Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1990, p. 252; Bernhard Demel, “Die Deutschordensballei Utrecht in der Reichs- und Ordensüberlieferung von der frühen Neuzeit bis in die Zeit Napoleons”, in Bernhard Demel (ed.), *Unbekannte Aspekte der Geschichte des Deutschen Ordens*, Vienna-Cologne-Weimar, Böhlau Verlag, 2005, p. 9-92; Udo Arnold and Maïke Trentin-Mayer, *Deutscher Orden 1190-2000. Ein Führer durch das Deutschordensmuseum in Bad Mergentheim*, Bad Mergentheim, Deutschordensmuseum, 2004, p. 79; Renger de Bruin, *Bedreigd door Napoleon...*, *op. cit.*, p. 63-64, p. 170-175, p. 204-208.
22. Willem Jan d’Ablaing van Giessenburg, *Wapenboek der Ridders van de Duitse Orde Balije van Utrecht sedert 1581*, The Hague, Van Doorn, 1871, p. vii.
23. John Leslie Price, “The Dutch Nobility”, *art. cit.*, p. 105; Sherrin Marshall, *The Dutch Gentry 1500-1650...*, *op. cit.*, p. 31-52; Conrad Gietman, *Republiek van adel. Eer in de Oost-Nederlandse adelscultuur (1555-1702)*, Utrecht, Van Gruting, 2010, p. 148-169.

Within the structure of the Dutch Republic, 1640-1795

After the transformation between 1615 and 1640, the Bailiwick of Utrecht became fully integrated into the structure of the Dutch Republic. The land commander who brought Protestantization into force, was stadholder of Friesland and army commander. After he was killed in action, he was succeeded both as stadholder and as land commander by his brother Willem Frederik (1613-1664). After an Utrecht nobleman, Floris Borre van Amerongen (1602-1675), and a relative by marriage of the Nassau dynasty, Hendrik Trajectinus Count of Solms-Braunfels (1636-1693), Willem Frederik's son Hendrik Casimir II (1657-1696) became land commander. For these men, leading the Bailiwick of Utrecht was no longer a main task, as had been the case for their predecessors, but only a lucrative sideline. Willem Frederik kept as much as 18,000 guilders a year from the landcommandership, while he spent little time on it.²⁴

His main duties were stadholder of the northern provinces and officer in the Dutch army. He resided in Leeuwarden or was on campaign. Only occasionally did he visit the Teutonic House in Utrecht. Then he could develop his network with the States of Utrecht. For the commanders, too, membership in the chapter had a networking function and provided a source of income. They collected the proceeds of the commanderies without living there, as had mostly been the case before 1615. They lived at their castles and in their town houses or were on a campaign trail. The commandery houses were rented out, sold or demolished. The administration left more and more to be desired. Land commander Godard van Reede-Ginkel (1644-1703) tried to do something about it around 1700, but under his successors the decay continued. Poor management, exacerbated by the European agricultural crisis, floods, and livestock diseases, caused revenues to decline.²⁵

Around 1750 the bailiwick was in crisis. During the chapter meeting of September 1753 those present realised that things really could not go on like this. Co-adjutor Unico Wilhelm Count van Wassenaer van Twickel (1692-1766) analysed the situation and was then tasked to come up with a plan of action. In ten years, he carried out a reorganisation that he completed as land commander.²⁶ The administration of the landed property, the heritage of the medieval donations, was concentrated in Utrecht and came into the hands of a professional steward, who reported in writing and orally to the land commander. The steward collected the rents and kept accounts. The commanders only retained a supervisory function during the chapter meetings, which were held once every three to four years. In between, a committee audited the books. For this light duty, the commanders received an annual stipend, which increased by rank. The land commander received

24. Geert H. Jansen, *Princely Power in the Dutch Republic. Patronage and William Frederick of Nassau (1613-1664)*, Manchester-New York, Manchester University Press, 2008, p. 75.

25. Johannes Alle Faber, "Cattle Plague in the Netherlands during the Eighteenth Century", *Mededelingen van de Landbouwhogeschool te Wageningen*, n° 62, 1962, p. 1-7; Jan de Vries and Ad van der Woude, *The First Modern Economy: Success, Failure, and Perseverance of the Dutch Economy, 1500-1815*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997, p. 258-259.

26. Renger de Bruin, "Eine gelungene Neuordnung...", art. cit., p. 189-220.

5500 guilders per year, a considerable sum compared to a labourer's annual wage of 300 guilders.²⁷ For Van Wassenaer, the land commander's stipend amounted to a quarter of his total income, which further consisted of political offices and proceeds from his extensive estates. The reorganisation he implemented was a great success. In the first year after the introduction of the bookkeeping system there was still a deficit, but afterwards the surpluses rapidly increased. This was certainly due to the abilities of the appointed steward, Gijsbert Dirk Cazius (1722-1804), but also to the favourable economic climate. After a century of low food prices, these started to rise again around 1750, partly as a result of the beginning of the Industrial Revolution in England, from 1773 further spurred on by war conditions. Dairy products were particularly in demand and these could be supplied by the Order's possessions in the meadowlands of the western Netherlands. The farmers could once again afford higher rents and Cazius made sure that they paid them.²⁸

The increasing surpluses could be partly distributed among the chapter members, on top of their stipends. These rose as commanders rose in rank. When a commander had been in the chapter for twenty years or so, the amount could increase considerably and form a large part of his total income, thus contributing not only to the political, social, and cultural capital, but also to the economic capital of the members, to use the terms of Pierre Bourdieu.²⁹ A noble income consisted of proceeds from estates, investments and offices. Most Teutonic knights were either politicians or army officers. The following table shows how the distribution developed between 1640 and 1795.³⁰ The years 1696 (the death of the last stadholder as land commander), 1753 (the beginning of the reorganisation) and 1795 (the end of the Dutch Republic) have been chosen as subdivisions.

Table 1. Main positions of the members, 1640-1795

	1640-1696	1697-1753	1754-1794
States Assemblies	13 (43%)	20 (69%)	20 (77%)
Stadholder	3 (10%)	- (0%)	- (0%)
Army officer	9 (30%)	6 (21%)	5 (19%)
Other/unknown	5 (17%)	3 (10%)	1 (4%)
Total	30	29	26

27. ARDOU OU, inv. nr. 11, Resolutiën van de landcommanderij van Utrecht (1561-1827) 4; Renger de Bruin, *Bedreigd door Napoleon...*, *op. cit.*, p. 115; Renger de Bruin, "Eine gelungene Neuordnung...", art. cit., p. 198-199. For wages, see Jan Luiten van Zanden, "Wages and the Standard of Living in Europe, 1500-1800", *European Review of Economic History*, n° 3, 1999, p. 175-198; Jan Luiten van Zanden, *The prices of the most important consumer goods, and indices of wages and the cost of living in the western part of the Netherlands, 1450-1800*, Amsterdam, Datafile International Institute of Social History, (on line: <http://www.iisg.nl/hpw/brenv.php>, last access 23-12-2020).

28. ARDOU OA, inv. nr. 337.0.1-51, Generale rekeningen van de rentmeesters-generaal van de D.O. van alle commanderijen (1762-1811); Gelders Archief (GA) 609, Archief van de familie Van Randwijck, 1292-1870, inv. nr. 222, Brieven ingekomen bij F.S.C. van Randwijck als landcommandeur (1767-1785); Renger de Bruin, *Bedreigd door Napoleon...*, *op. cit.*, p. 105-114; *id.*, "Eine gelungene Neuordnung...", art. cit., p. 201-204.

29. Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction. A social critique of the judgement of taste*, Cambridge Mass, Harvard University Press, 1984, p. 11-168.

30. The tables 1-3 are based on Willem Jan d'Ablaing van Giessenburg, *Wapenboek der Ridders...*, *op. cit.*

The table shows that the proportion of members of the Provincial Assemblies increased over time. The stadholders are limited to the first period. Their successors did not join the chapter again. The category 'other' includes for the first period some Catholics, who did not hold any office. Although the Dutch Republic had a relatively tolerant religious climate, Catholics were barred from the Assemblies.³¹ Their questioned political loyalty was the reason for this and therefore it is remarkable that they could become army officers. Army duty was considered incompatible with membership of the States. This also applied to family relationships that were too close, e.g., father and son or two brothers. Membership of a Provincial Assembly and an officer's position yielded an average annual income of around 5,000 guilders, but it could be considerably more.³² Again, the longer one served, the higher the income. The commanders belonged to the States of four Dutch provinces. The following table gives an impression of their regional origin.

Table 2. *Regional origins of the members (1640-1795)*

	1640-1696	1697-1753	1754-1794
Holland	3	3	-
Zeeland	-	-	-
Utrecht	8	3	2
Gelderland	7	13	12
Overijssel	8	9	7
Friesland	3	-	-
Groningen	-	-	1
Drenthe	-	-	-
Status-Brabant	-	-	-
Holy Roman Empire	1	1	4
Total	30	29	26

In the course of time, we see a clear shift towards the eastern provinces of Gelderland and Overijssel, which had the strongest noble positions. The largest province, Holland, dominated by an urban patriciate, had very limited representation in the chapter. By the end of the 18th century, the nobility in this province was largely extinct.³³ The only foreign members admitted were Germans, as a remains of the origins of the Teutonic Order. Most of them came from the Duchy of Cleves, which had strong ties with Gelderland. From further afield came Charles Louis prince of Anhalt-Bernburg-Schaumburg-Hoym (1723-1806). He had served in the Dutch army and had returned to his homeland to succeed his

31. Jaap Geraerts, *The Catholic Nobility in Utrecht and Guelders c. 1580-1702*, Ph.D. University College London, 2015, p. 81-94; James C. Kennedy, *A Concise History...*, *op. cit.*, p. 151-153; Genji Yasuhira, *Civic Agency in the Public Sphere. Catholics' Survival Tactics in Utrecht, 1620s-1670s*, Ph.D. Tilburg University, 2019, p. 133-144.

32. Johan Aalbers, "Reinier van Reede van Ginckel en Frederik Willem van Reede van Athlone. Kanttekeningen bij de levenssfeer van een adellijke familie, voornamelijk gedurende de jaren de jaren 1722-1742", *Jaarboek Oud-Utrecht*, 1982, p. 100; *id.*, "Geboorte en geld. Adel in Gelderland, Utrecht en Holland tijdens de eerste helft van de achttiende eeuw", in Johan Aalbers and Maarten Prak (eds.), *De bloem der natie. Adel en patriciaat in de Noordelijke Nederlanden*, Meppel, Boom, 1987, p. 73.

33. Henk F. van Nierop, *The Nobility of Holland: From Knights to Regents, 1500-1650*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993, p. 63-66.

father in the small German principality. Belonging to *Reichsfürstenstand*, he was of a different noble category than most of the other members, who belonged to the Dutch (and Cleves) knighthoods. Initially, the share of nobles from Utrecht was still quite large, but it declined sharply. Possible explanations are the weakening of the bond with the States of Utrecht and the fact that more and more Utrecht nobles no longer met the admission criterion of four old noble quarters. In the knighthoods of Gelderland, that criterion was also required, where the Utrecht knighthood demanded only descent in the male line and possession of a knight's estate.³⁴ The enforcement of the criteria made bailiwick membership a special noble distinguishing mark. It was therefore highly sought after. The commanders, who were allowed to nominate a boy each chapter meeting, regularly received requests from parents, who wanted their son to be registered. Usually, however, commanders nominated their own or each other's children and grandchildren, so that membership remained in a limited number of families. Of the Gelderland family Van Goltstein, as many as four consecutive generations served on the chapter between 1698 and 1872.³⁵

The income and prestige membership of the Bailiwick of Utrecht brought, was clearly an element of noble distinction in the sense of Bourdieu.³⁶ However, one element, so typical for knightly orders, that of wearing robes and uniforms, missed. The Teutonic Knights of Utrecht did not wear a uniform, only the black cross. They discussed introducing a uniform several times during the 18th century, but could not reach an agreement. The installation of new members was an austere ceremony: the candidate was called in, he signed the rules, after which the land commander shook his hand, and hung the order's cross round his neck.³⁷

Surviving in revolutionary times, 1795-1815

The prosperity of the Order came to an abrupt end when the armies of revolutionary France conquered the Dutch Republic in the winter of 1794-1795. Stadholder William V, great-grandson of land commander Hendrik Casimir II, fled to England with some of his followers and Dutch revolutionaries deposed the local and regional rulers.³⁸ With the formal abolition of the nobility, it was clear

34. Johan van de Water (ed.), *Groot Placaatboek 's Lands van Utrecht I*, Utrecht, Van Poolsum, 1729, p. 292; Evert de Jonge en Marc V.T. Tenten, "De drie kwartierlijke ridderschappen als deel van de soevereine Staten van het vorstendom Gelre en graafschap Zutphen, 1621-1795", in Coen O. A. Schimmelpenninck van der Oije *et al.* (eds.), *Adel en ridderschap in Gelderland. Tien eeuwen geschiedenis*, WBooks, Zwolle, 2013, p. 151.

35. Willem Jan d'Ablaing van Giessenburg, *Wapenboek der Ridders...*, *op. cit.*, p. 48, p. 86, p. 113, p. 160, p. 163.

36. Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction. A social critique of the judgement of taste*, *op. cit.*, p. 1-9.

37. ARDO-OA, inv. nr. 199, Vragen, met de antwoorden daarop, in het Nederlands en Frans, betreffende de plechtigheden te vervullen bij het aanstellen van een commandeur, 18th century.

38. Simon Schama, *Patriots and Liberators. Revolution in the Netherlands 1780-1813*, New York, A. Knopf, 1977, p. 211-244; Thomas Poell, *The Democratic Paradox. Dutch Revolutionary Struggles over Democratisation and Centralisation, 1780-1813*, Diss. Univ. Utrecht, 2007, p. 68-77.

that the revolutionaries, like their French examples, were targeting aristocratic institutions. The fate of the Hospitallers and the bailiwicks of the Teutonic Order in France and the occupied territories was well known.³⁹ Initiatives taken by the provincial government of Utrecht, such as stopping the commanders stipends or plans to confiscate property, could be reversed or prevented by the steward, the clerk and commander Volkier Rudolph Bentinck van Schoonheten (1738-1820), who rented an apartment in the Teutonic House. The other commanders did not show up in Utrecht and kept quiet in their Dutch castles or abroad. When the chapter met again in August 1802, Bentinck and the two officials were complimented on their efforts, "which have prevented many unpleasant events, which could have had very harmful consequences".⁴⁰ A year later, coadjutor Johan Walraat Count van Welderen (1725-1807), staying in London, characterized the low-profile policy of the Order with the words: "to some extent hiding us from Government scrutiny, in order to save us through the bushes, as one says".⁴¹ With this strategy, the Bailiwick of Utrecht was the only noble institution that had survived the revolution. The knightships had been dissolved in 1795 and had met clandestinely for a while, until the revolutionary authorities put an end to this. An attempt to revive them after 1801 had failed.

A restoration of nobility came into view when Louis Napoleon, the younger brother of the French Emperor, came to the throne of the newly created Kingdom of Holland in 1806. The king's aim was to restore nobility, whereby he also wanted to recognise old titles, against the wishes of his imperial brother, but in addition he wished to create new nobility.⁴² The Teutonic Knights of Utrecht felt threatened by the proposals, because these affected the exclusivity of the knightly nobility and also included the admission of Catholics and newcomers. Most threatening was the Napoleonic idea of primogeniture, very unpleasant for the younger sons in the chapter. The nobility law was delayed for some time and then had to be repealed under pressure from Napoleon.⁴³ The bailiwick was directly affected by Louis Napoleon's policy when, in December 1807, he claimed the Teutonic House for the Ministry of Finance as part of the plans to move the

39. Alain Blondy, "Malta and France 1789-1798: The Art of Communicating a Crisis", in Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed.), *Hospitallar Malta*, Msira, Malta, Mireva Publications, 1993, p. 659-662; H. J. A Sire, *The Knights of Malta*, New Haven-London, Yale University Press, 1994, p. 134; Rudolf Fendler, *Die Kammerkommende des Deutschen Ordens in Weissenburg im Elsass*, Marburg, N.G. Elwert Verlag, 1995, p. 160-166; Jozef Mertens, *Van page tot landcommandeur. Opleiding, intrede en promotie in de Duitse Orde, en militaire loopbaan van de ridders van de Balije Biesen in de 18^{de} eeuw*, Bilzen, Historisch Studiecentrum Alden Biesen, 1998, p. 294-295; Klaus Oldenhage, *Kurfürst-Erzherzog Maximilian Franz als Hoch- und Deutschmeister (1780-1801)*, Bad Godesberg, Wissenschaftliches Archiv, 1969, p. 263; Suzanne Vanaudenhoven, *Alden Biesen van de Franse Revolutie tot heden*, in Johan Fleerackers (ed.), *Landcommanderij Alden Biesen. Acht eeuwen Europese geschiedenis in het land van Rijn en Maas*, Tiel, Uitgeverij Lannoo, 1988, p. 101.

40. ARDOU-OA inv. nr. 11-4, f. 39.

41. ARDOU-OA inv. nr. 131, Briefwisseling [...] over de hereniging van de Balije van Utrecht met de D.O. (1662-1672, 1775, 1791-1805), stuk 65.

42. Simon Schama, *Patriots and Liberators...*, *op. cit.*, p. 545; Egbert Wolleswinkel, *Nederlands adelsrecht...*, *op. cit.*, p. 32-39.

43. Egbert Wolleswinkel, *Nederlands adelsrecht...*, *op. cit.*, p. 36-37.

government from The Hague to Utrecht. Bentinck, meanwhile land commander, managed to negotiate a generous ransom of 50 000 guilders and was able to buy a building in The Hague for a much lower price.⁴⁴

This ended well, but Bentinck feared that the annexation of the Kingdom of Holland to France, as decided by Napoleon in July 1810, would entail great dangers. He was right: on 27 February 1811, the emperor signed a decree putting an end to the centuries-long existence of Utrecht institutions that were of great importance to the elite, the five collegiate churches that had lost their religious function but had not been abolished at the end of the 16th century.⁴⁵ Although the Bailiwick of Utrecht was not explicitly mentioned, Alexander Gogel (1765-1821), the highest official in the *Departements Hollandais*, who had to execute the decree, declared that these institutions did fall under the terms of the decree. The purpose of the dissolution was the confiscation of the extensive goods for the benefit of the French treasury. The emperor constantly needed money for the military and his expectations of using the Dutch riches were high. The argument used for the abolition was that these were spiritual goods, “biens d’origine ecclésiastique”.⁴⁶ The dissolution was in line with the expropriation of church property in France in 1789. The affected institutions denied their spiritual character and brought up the right to property. The chapters soon succumbed to Gogel’s offer of compensation. The right to compensation had already been established in 1789 and had always been an important element in all dissolution proceedings. It had also been granted to the knights of the Order of Malta and of the Teutonic Order in the Confederation of the Rhine, when Napoleon put an end to their existence.⁴⁷

Bentinck offered more resistance. He hired a lawyer, who in an extensive objection letter spun out the arguments concerning the essence of the Order and the property rights and came to the conclusion that membership was nothing more than a life annuity, a “tontine”, fully in accordance with French law. The bailiwick was not a “ordre militaire” and could continue to exist as a private institution.⁴⁸ The notice of objection was presented to Governor General Charles François Lebrun (1739-1824), who, sent it on to Paris. There was no reply. When, during Napoleon’s visit to Holland commander Frederik Gijsbert van Dedem van de Gelder (1743-1820), who sat in the French Senate, cautiously inquired

44. ARDOU-OA, inv. nr. II-4, ff. 90-92; ARDOU-OA, inv. nr. 14; Renger de Bruin, *Bedreigd door Napoleon...*, *op. cit.*, p. 329-336; Renger de Bruin, “The narrow escape...”, *art. cit.*, p. 223.

45. Archives Nationales [AN], Paris, Archives du pouvoir exécutif (1789-1815) AF IV, Secrétairerie d’État impérial (an VIII-1815), inv. nr. 530, Minutes des décrets impériaux (24-28 février 1811), Décret impérial au Palais des Tuileries, 27-2-1811, p. 1; ARDOU-OA, inv. nr. 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) I omslag; Renger de Bruin, *Bedreigd door Napoleon...*, *op. cit.*, p. 390-397; *id.*, “The narrow escape...”, *art. cit.*, p. 224-225.

46. AN, AF IV, inv. nr. 530; ARDOU-OA, inv. nr. 19.

47. Friedrich Täubl, *Der Deutsche Orden im Zeitalter Napoleons*, Bonn, Wissenschaftliches Archiv, 1966, p. 171-173; Ernie Bradford, *The Shield and the Sword. The Knights of St. John*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 2002, p. 215-216.

48. ARDOU-OA, inv. nr. 19.

with the Minister of Finance about the appeal, the members of the Order were “grievously disappointed”, according to Bentinck.⁴⁹ There was little choice but to accept the facts. The land commander reached an agreement with Gogel and his staff on compensation, which Bentinck presented to the assembled commanders. This chapter session in June 1812 seemed to be the last meeting of the Order. Now that agreement had been reached, the financial settlement could begin, of which the payment of the damages and the distribution of the remaining cash should be the final piece. However, the settlement was extremely difficult because steward U.W.T. Cazius (1766-1832) refused to provide the necessary documents. Gogel and his men suspected that he was doing this to mask his fraudulent actions. Intrusive talks and angry letters were to no avail. Bentinck became increasingly cross with Cazius, not least because of his tone of voice. As long as the quarrel lasted, the former members of the Order did not receive a franc.

Restoration and a new role, 1815-1840

While the procedures for the liquidation of the Bailiwick of Utrecht dragged on, the man who had destroyed the old institution with his signature came under increasing pressure. In October 1813 Napoleon suffered a crushing defeat at Leipzig. One ally after another deserted him and after a few weeks French authority in the *Départements Hollandais* also began to falter. In the second half of November, the imperial troops largely withdrew from the area north of the great rivers. At the request of a provisional government, the son of the last stadholder returned to his native soil and was proclaimed sovereign. Bentinck now saw an opportunity to undo the abolition of the Teutonic Order and addressed a request to the prince.⁵⁰ This was favourably received and after the institutions of the new state had gone through procedures, the restoration came about in the summer of 1815. On 8 August, William I, king by now, signed an Act to this effect.⁵¹ The Order regained most of its the confiscated property, containing the remnants of the medieval donations. The main argument for restoring the Order, where the collegiate churches, abolished in the same decree, had not done so, was that the commanders had not received compensation and the canons had.

Six weeks later, the knights gathered again and the land commander expressed his gratitude to God and the King for the resurrection of the Order.⁵² These sensitive words seemed to herald a pleasant reunion, but the atmosphere soon soured due to the criticism of three members, who felt that Bentinck had not done a proper job of handling the finances of the dissolution and had wrongly

49. ARDOU-OU, inv. nr. II-4, f. 147.

50. ARDOU-OU, inv. nr. II-4, f. 196; Letter of V.R. Bentinck to William I, 20-4-1814; ARDOU-NA, inv. nr. 004, bijlage X; Renger de Bruin, “The narrow escape...”, art. cit., p. 228.

51. Staatsblad nr. 43, Wet waarbij de Duitse Orde, Balije van Utrecht, wordt hersteld, gearresteerd 8-8-1815 no 55; ARDOU-NA (Nieuw Archief), inv. nr. 031. Renger de Bruin, “The narrow escape...”, art. cit., p. 229.

52. ARDOU-OA, inv. nr. II-4, fol. 113.

not reappointed the steward because of their conflicts. Moreover, the three men thought that the Order should re-establish its seat in Utrecht, whereas Bentinck wanted to stay in The Hague. Bentinck's death in 1820 made a return possible, but it would take more than fifteen years before a building could be purchased there. That it took so long was due to internal conflicts and a fraud case. The main issue was the drafting of new regulations, and the question was how much autonomy the Order still had. The king appointed new members, after the Supreme Council of Nobility had checked the admission requirements and regular reports had to be submitted to the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

In the kingdom of William I, which comprised the old Dutch Republic as well as the former Austrian Netherlands and the principality of Liege, the restored Bailiwick of Utrecht had a new distinctive function. The traditional admission criteria, expressively upheld and now described as “Knightly, Old Noble and Irreproachable Quarters” and the “true Reformed Christian Religion”, excluded both the newly created nobility and the old Catholic in the South.⁵³ Both groups threatened the nobles that had formed the top segment of society in the old Republic. The men ennobled by William I were mostly from the families of patricians and merchants who had adopted an aristocratic lifestyle with their lavish titles and country estates, but who had been successfully kept out of the knighthoods. Now the old barons and counts saw in the newly established knighthoods patricians and even newcomers from the revolutionary period sitting next to them. Some of these men were Catholic. Catholics also encountered the old knights in the First Chamber, the Upper House of Parliament, mainly as representatives from the new southern provinces. Whereas the descendants of the old noble families in the north of the country looked down upon the newcomers, the opposite was true of the southerners. Some of them were descendants of Burgundian knights of the Golden Fleece, who felt themselves elevated above the descendants of the lesser nobility from the time of Charles V, who spoke poor French and adhered to a heretical faith. Moreover, the southerners were far more numerous.⁵⁴ At the chapter table of the Bailiwick of Utrecht, men from the old Dutch knighthoods could be together again, without the newly ennobled and without the southern princes and dukes.

Within the kingdom, the members of the Teutonic Order were just as active as under the old Republic, after they had played no or only a limited public role during the revolutionary period. The following table shows the political functions the commanders fulfilled during the reign of King William I (1815-1840).

53. ARDOU-OA, inv. nr. 11-4, ff. 374-375, “Riddermatige, Oud Adellijke en irreprochabele kwartieren” and “de ware Hervormde Christelijke Godsdienst”.

54. Schimmelpenninck van der Oije, Schimmelpenninck van der Oije, “De Ridderschappen in Noord en Zuid, 1815-1830”, art. cit., p. 24-33; Paul Janssens, *L'évolution de la noblesse belge depuis la fin du Moyen âge*, Brussels, Crédit Communal, 1998, p. 281-299; Arnout Mertens, *Nobles into Belgians. The Brabant estate nobility between the Ancien Régime and the nation state, 1750-1850*, Diss. European University Institute, Florence, 2007, p. 217; Els Witte, “L'aristocratie belge et l'orangisme (1815-1830)”, *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, n° 93, 2015, p. 439-486.

Table 3. *Public offices held by the members, 1815-1840*

Minister	2
First Chamber	5
Second Chamber	3
Provincial Estates	20
Provincial Executives	2
Governor	1
Mayor	3
Army officer	6

The Teutonic Knights were active at the local, regional and national levels of government. The big difference with the pre-revolutionary period was that before 1795 the States were autonomous and their members exercised real power, whereas in the centralist, authoritarian kingdom of William I, public officials, from minister to mayor, were executors of royal orders. The nobility played an important role in the kingdom (for example, almost the entire Upper House and a large part of the Lower House, Second Chamber, were nobility), but these noble administrators possessed few formal powers. However, the informal influence could be considerable. This was, for example, the case of commander Albert Carel Snouckaert van Schauburg (1763-1841), who was well introduced to the court.

Research perspectives

The image of the Bailiwick of Utrecht outlined above stems from a research project, which I started at Utrecht University in 2017. This research, entitled “New light on the nobility”, consists of two tracks. One is a synthesis on the nobility in the province of Utrecht, from the early Middle Ages to the present, based primarily on secondary literature and published sources. The second track is a prosopographical study of the members of the Bailiwick of Utrecht between 1640 and the mid-20th century, the sequel to an earlier research. My work ties in with the research project “Investment behaviour, political change and economic growth in the Netherlands, 1780-1920”.⁵⁵ Both research projects aim to gain a better understanding of power and property relations in the Netherlands in the early modern and modern eras. The project questions the image of the Netherlands as an open society, with a relatively low degree of inequality and a high degree of opportunity for ascent. These questions touch on the current debate about inequality, as sparked by Thomas Piketty and Walter Scheidel.⁵⁶

55. This project, financed by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) is carried out at the University of Utrecht by Oscar Gelderblom, Paul Brusse, Piet van Cruyningen and Bas Michielse. <https://www.nwo.nl/projecten/360-53-200-0>.

56. Thomas Piketty, *Le Capital au XXI^e siècle*, Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 2013 / *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, Cambridge Mass., Harvard University Press, 2014; Walter Scheidel, *The Great Leveler. Violence and the history of inequality from the Stone Age to the twenty-first century*, Princeton-Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2017.

The initial results reinforce doubts already expressed about the egalitarian and open character of Dutch society. There are strong indications for widespread capital concentration in the second half of the 18th century and later again in the decades after the fall of Napoleon.⁵⁷ That the nobility, as a birthright an obvious form of inequality, did not play a marginal but rather a crucial role, seems to be confirmed. In the long-term study of the Utrecht nobility, a picture emerges of a successful maintenance and even expansion of positions, a development interrupted by disasters, which Scheidel describes as apocalyptic horsemen (wars, revolutions, epidemics, and collapse of state systems).⁵⁸ The Viking raids, the late medieval plague epidemics, the post-1650 agricultural crisis, and the impact of the French Revolution on the Netherlands represented such interruptions in the growth of power and wealth of the nobility. Networks such as family ties, administrative bodies, the military and charities played an important role in strengthening positions. The Bailiwick of Utrecht formed such a network, providing additional income, prestige and contacts. Because of the proofs of nobility, membership was a clear noble distinction. The prosopographic study should elaborate on this and shed new light upon Dutch nobility and Dutch society in the past centuries. The study aims to contribute to a new template for Dutch history.⁵⁹

57. One of the papers indicating this result is Piet J. van Cruyningen, "Régulation des eaux, investissement urbain et croissance agricole. L'agriculture dans les provinces littorales des Pays-Bas, 1400-1900", in Laurent Herment (dir.), *Histoire rurale de l'Europe XVI^e-XX^e siècle*, Paris, Éditions de l'EHESS, 2019, p. 47-68. More papers from the project are forthcoming.

58. Walter Scheidel, *The Great Leveler...*, *op. cit.*, p. 5-9.

59. Paul Brusse and Wijnand W. Mijnhardt, *Towards a New Template...*, *op. cit.*, p. 9-11.