



## The Hospitallers' Early Written Records<sup>1</sup>

*Anthony Luttrell*

Modern historians of the military-religious Order of Saint John have been able to use a variety of written records dating back virtually to the crusaders' conquest of Jerusalem in July 1099. The Hospital may well have lost some documents when Jerusalem fell in 1187 and others disappeared in 1291 at the fall of Acre; furthermore, whatever records were kept on Cyprus from 1291 to 1310 were somehow lost thereafter, and much of what was in the chancery on Rhodes, where the Hospital's Convent or headquarters moved from Cyprus in about 1310, was destroyed or abandoned in the course of the next two centuries or during the final siege of 1522. A significant portion of the Rhodian archive was, however, taken in 1530 to Malta where it still remains.

After 1099, the Hospital accumulated a collection of privileges and charters, together with its Rule and its own legislation in the form of its statutes, its customs or *usances* and its *esgarts* or judgements, its various liturgical texts, the *Miracula* or Legends concerning the Hospital's origins and much other material.<sup>2</sup> Many documents from the Syrian period were saved by being sent

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper employs various largely unexplored texts to question in interim fashion the accepted impression that the Hospital's legislative corpus survives in a single reliably established version. I am most grateful to Anne-Marie Legras who has collected many manuscripts of the Hospital's statutes on microfilm at the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes at Orleans; for the numerous comments of Katja Klement who generously communicated her unpublished doctoral thesis; for important observations from Rudolf Hiestand; for the extensive contributions from Munich sent by Karl Borchardt; and for many points and materials kindly provided by Alain Beltjens.

<sup>2</sup> Many texts are published in *Cartulaire général de l'ordre des Hospitaliers de S. Jean de Jérusalem, 1100-1310*, ed. J. Delaville le Roulx, 4 vols (Paris, 1894-1906) [hereafter *Cartulaire*]; for the archives in general and especially for the papal documents to 1198, see R.

to safety, probably in the West, before 1291. An inventory of what remained of these materials from Acre was made at Manosque in Provence in 1531 but documents from this collection were not generally available to the Hospital's historians before the seventeenth century when part of what survived was transferred to Malta; some documents remained in Provence and much was lost or dispersed, but something of the missing materials is known from the summaries in the inventory. A different group of texts was preserved through translations and copies made between about 1278 and 1303 for the Hospitaller Fr. Guglielmo of Santo Stefano. Other early documents from the East were kept in the provincial archives of the Hospital's many Western priories and commanderies, while miscellaneous texts found their way into other archives and libraries.<sup>3</sup> Further collections, such as the records of the Hospital's German house in Jerusalem or of its Syrian centres outside Acre, were lost, as indeed were many registers and other chancery materials kept on Cyprus and on Rhodes between 1291 and 1522.

The Hospital of Saint John originated in a pilgrim hospice founded in Jerusalem probably in about 1070 as a dependency of the Benedictine Amalfitan monks of Sancta Maria Latina.<sup>4</sup> This hospice apparently had no endowments but relied on support from the merchants and Benedictines of Amalfi,<sup>5</sup> so that before 1099 it probably had little or no need for any archive of its own. With a few minor exceptions,<sup>6</sup> the records of Sancta Maria Latina were lost. There

---

Hiestand, ed., *Papsturkunden für Templer und Johanniter, Vorarbeiten zum Oriens Pontificius* 1-2, 2 vols (Göttingen, 1972-84) [hereafter Hiestand, *Templer und Johanniter*].

<sup>3</sup> The Western archives are not discussed here, but many documents are published in *Cartulaire*, which also provides an overall survey of the Hospital's provincial archives (*Cartulaire*, I.xxvii-ccxxx); Hiestand, *Templer und Johanniter*, adds important details. For provincial chancery practice: S. García Larragueta, 'La Escribanía señorial navarra de San Juan', in *Landesherrliche Kanzleien im Spätmittelalter* (Munich, 1984), and Daniel le Blévec and Alain Venturini, *Cartulaire du Prieuré de Saint-Gilles de l'Hôpital de Saint-Jean de Jérusalem: 1192-1210* (Paris, 1997), pp. xiii-xvii.

<sup>4</sup> J. Riley-Smith, *The Knights of St. John in Jerusalem and Cyprus, c. 1050-1310* (London, 1967), pp. 32-7; R. Hiestand, 'Die Anfänge der Johanniter', in *Die geistlichen Ritterorden Europas*, ed. J. Fleckenstein and M. Hellmann (Sigmaringen, 1980), pp. 32-8; M. Matzke, 'De origine Hospitaliariorum Hierosolymitanorum – Vom klösterlichen Pilgerhospital zur internationalen Organisation', *Journal of Medieval History* 22 (1996); A. Luttrell, 'The Earliest Hospitallers', in *Montjoie: Studies in Crusade History in Honour of Hans Eberhard Mayer*, ed. B. Kedar, J. Riley-Smith and R. Hiestand (Aldershot, 1997), pp. 37-41.

<sup>5</sup> WT, pp. 123, 816-17.

<sup>6</sup> R. Hiestand, ed., *Papsturkunden für Kirchen im Heiligen Lande, Vorarbeiten zum Oriens Pontificius* 3 (Göttingen, 1985), pp. 32-5 [hereafter Hiestand, *Kirchen im Heiligen Lande*].



may have been documents dating before 1099 in the Hospital's later archives, but these would probably have concerned gifts made to the Holy Sepulchre or other bodies some of whose properties or claims subsequently passed, together with their documentation, to the Hospital.<sup>7</sup> Following the conquest, the hospice was detached from Sancta Maria Latina and acquired a measure of autonomy under its *institutor*, Gerard, and from 1099 or 1100 onwards it was receiving privileges and donations in its own name.<sup>8</sup> The Hospitallers must also have had various administrative and other papers, presumably kept in their own house or church. Some early documents remained in the Order's possession; for example, no less than four early versions of the royal confirmation of 1110 are in the Hospital's pre-1798 central archives still in Malta, as are the acts given in 1112 by the patriarch of Jerusalem and the archbishop of Caesarea and the original of the first papal privilege of 1113.<sup>9</sup>

That privilege recognized the Hospital as a partially independent institution and subsequent popes confirmed it in 1119, 1123 and 1135; all these privileges were at Manosque in 1531.<sup>10</sup> After 1113, there were royal charters, episcopal exemptions, property deeds, records of arrangements with other institutions and so on. A *cancellarius* of the Hospital was mentioned in 1126 but thereafter the description lapsed,<sup>11</sup> though the Order evidently employed notaries and scribes, and presumably kept its documents, in its central writing office and treasury.<sup>12</sup> The Hospitallers apparently preserved the two papal letters of 1143 which granted them jurisdiction over Hospitallers in German lands and over the hospital of Sancta Maria Alemannorum in Jerusalem.<sup>13</sup> Many other pre-1291 documents were at Manosque in 1531. Some early materials, apparently including the papal confirmation of the Rule issued in 1185, survived the Muslim reconquest of Jerusalem in 1187, perhaps because they were sent away in good

<sup>7</sup> Some early datings once advanced for Hospitaller texts have subsequently been rejected: e.g., *Cartulaire*, 1.1 n. 1; 4.311.

<sup>8</sup> Luttreil, 'Earliest Hospitallers', pp. 40-52.

<sup>9</sup> *Cartulaire*, nos. 20, 25, 29, etc.

<sup>10</sup> Texts in Hiestand, *Templer und Johanniter*, 2.194-201, 206-7, 210-12; discussion in R. Hiestand, 'Feierliche Privilegien mit divergierenden Kardinalslisten? Zur Diplomatik der Papsturkunden des 12. Jahrhunderts', *Archiv für Diplomatik* 33 (1987), pp. 242-56.

<sup>11</sup> *Cartulaire*, no. 77; J. Delaville le Roulx, *Les Hospitaliers en Terre Sainte et à Chypre, 1100-1310* (Paris, 1904), p. 347. After 1126, the title of Chancellor lapsed until the early fourteenth century.

<sup>12</sup> Riley-Smith, *Knights*, pp. 240, 255, 278, 285, 304, 310-12, 427.

<sup>13</sup> *Cartulaire*, nos. 154, 155 = Hiestand, *Kirchen im Heiligen Lande*, pp. 169-72, both texts inventoried at Manosque in 1531 and now in the Hospital's Provençal archive at Marseilles.

time or because those Hospitallers who stayed on in the city were able to preserve them. After Jerusalem fell, the Hospitaller brethren who were still there succeeded in ransoming a number of poor people who then left the city under a guard of Hospitallers and Templars, and ten brethren of the Hospital were permitted to stay in the Jerusalem hospital for a year in order to tend those patients who were too sick to be moved.<sup>14</sup> One remarkable reliquary remained in Jerusalem, buried in the crypt of the Hospital's church.<sup>15</sup>

After 1187, the archives may at first have been kept in one of the Hospital's castles; the Rule and other regulations were available to the chapter general at Margat in 1206. In Syria, a brief gap in the process of copying documents followed the loss of Jerusalem, but the transmission and diffusion of charters and privileges, with copies sometimes being kept in certain Western houses, was soon continued.<sup>16</sup> At some point after 1189, the Convent was established in the new capital at Acre where it accumulated an important archive; after 1255, the documents of the Benedictines of Mount Tabor also passed to the Hospital.<sup>17</sup> The need to conserve records was inescapable and a statute of 1262 decreed that every prior in the West should keep a register listing his priory's rents and properties.<sup>18</sup> Some time before the fall of Acre in 1291, an important part of the archive there was sent to safety. These documents were at Manosque in 1531 when they were summarized in an inventory.<sup>19</sup> What was considered to be the body of a 'beatus Gerardus', presumably the Hospital's founder, was in a 'very precious silver gilt box with many precious stones' in the Hospital's chapel at Manosque by 1283,<sup>20</sup> and the bulk of the

<sup>14</sup> Riley-Smith, *Knights*, pp. 108, 247.

<sup>15</sup> J. Folda, *The Art of the Crusaders in the Holy Land, 1098-1187* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 297-9.

<sup>16</sup> Hiestand, *Templer und Johanniter*, 1.13 et passim, giving diplomatic details and textual variations frequently ignored in the *Cartulaire*.

<sup>17</sup> Texts from Mount Tabor in *Cartulaire*, 2, Appendix nos. I-XXVI; cf. Hiestand, *Kirchen im Heiligen Lande*, pp. 68-70, 92-9, 179-80.

<sup>18</sup> *Cartulaire*, no. 3039 # 23.

<sup>19</sup> An inventory of 1741 was used in J. Delaville le Roulx, 'Inventaire de pièces de Terre Sainte de l'ordre de l'Hôpital', *Revue de l'Orient latin* 3 (1895), and throughout the *Cartulaire*. The 1531 inventory was discovered by Rudolf Hiestand, who will publish it with a detailed study of these important materials, which are not considered here: Hiestand, *Templer und Johanniter*, 1.23, 48-50; 2.19-28 et passim. There is no sign that they were on Rhodes between 1310 and 1522.

<sup>20</sup> F. Reynaud, *La commanderie de l'Hôpital de Saint-Jean de Jérusalem de Rhodes et de Malte à Manosque, XII<sup>e</sup> siècle-1789* (Gap, 1981), pp. 141, 195-8; A. Luttrell, *The Hospitallers of Rhodes and their Mediterranean World* (Aldershot, 1992), Study XVIII, p. 9; Addenda, p. 3.



documents from Acre could have been sent there at about that time, possibly in more than one consignment.<sup>21</sup> Other texts, including Lucius III's confirmation of the Rule with his bull, were lost at Acre 'cum aliis rebus non modicis' in 1291;<sup>22</sup> also lost were the copy of the 1206 statutes sealed by Master Alfonso of Portugal<sup>23</sup> and the Hospital's holy relics.<sup>24</sup>

At Acre a number of constitutional texts were available to Fr. Guglielmo of Santo Stefano who always used the French language rather than Italian or Latin but who apparently belonged to the Priory of Lombardy and was probably an Italian. Fr. Daniele of Santo Stefano was presumably a kinsman; in 1315, while acting in the same priory as lieutenant there, he had a copy made of a codex which contained the statutes in a form related to that of Fr. Guglielmo's two codices.<sup>25</sup> Fr. Guglielmo had strong legal and historical interests, and at Acre in 1282 he commissioned Jean of Antioch to translate from Latin into French the *Rhetoric* then attributed to Cicero. While in Acre he had certain documents in the Hospital's archive copied and also translated into French, and these were included in the compilation of Hospitaller texts he made apparently between 1278 and 1283. Subsequently he returned to Lombardy where he had available a collection of documents, at least some of which he had presumably brought from Acre, and between about 1296 and 1300 he produced further works which included his own treatise on the Hospital's legislation and constitution. He was Commander of Cyprus, an office of considerable responsibility, at least from 1299 until probably about 1303, after which he disappeared. Fr. Guglielmo was important for his copying and conservation of Hospitaller records, for his mature attitude to the Hospital's historiography and his rejection of the legendary accounts of its origins, for his appreciation of the importance of preserving the *esgarts* dating after 1291, and for his constitutional treatise. He increased the number of texts available in French, and some of these he arranged in a quasi-historical, or at least chronological, format.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Fr. Guglielmo of Santo Stefano's two codices (discussed below) made no mention of any of these documents being either at Acre in about 1283 or in the West.

<sup>22</sup> *Cartulaire*, no. 4496; the 'other things' were not necessarily all writings.

<sup>23</sup> *Infra*, p. 149.

<sup>24</sup> Luttrell, *Hospitallers of Rhodes*, Study XVIII, pp. 10-11; Addenda, p. 3.

<sup>25</sup> L. Delisle, 'Maître Jean d'Antioche, traducteur, et Frère Guillaume de Saint-Étienne, hospitalier', *Histoire littéraire de la France* 33 (1906), p. 23.

<sup>26</sup> The best appraisal is Riley-Smith, *Knights*, pp. 32-6, 260-1, 272-3; important additions in K. Klement, 'Alcune osservazioni sul Vat. Lat. 4852', *Studi Melitensi* 3 (1995), redating the first codex to probably 1278/1283. Considerable parts of the two codices are published in *Cartulaire* and elsewhere; in addition to Delisle, 'Maître Jean d'Antioche', see *RHC Oc.*, 5.cxx-

A number of these documents related to the grave constitutional conflict within the Hospital between 1295 and 1300 in which Fr. Guglielmo himself played some role. His writings must have buttressed the position of the Conventual oligarchy which was an indispensable element of stability within the Order.<sup>27</sup>

The first codex compiled for Fr. Guglielmo began with a French translation of the Rule as confirmed in 1185 by Lucius III with the later additions of 1206 arranged in the form of a marginal gloss also in French, and with a copy of Lucius's *rota*. There followed Master Jobert's privilege for the sick of 1176; various customs of Master Roger of Moulins of 1181/2; the statutes and other items confirmed or newly enacted in 1206; the statutes of 1262 to 1268 in a *grant chartre* and those of 1270 to 1278 in a *petite chartre*; and, in a new hand, those of 1287. Next came an *ordenement* concerning the Jerusalem hospital<sup>28</sup> and then what were termed the *usances* and the *esgarts*, the final *esgarts* of later codifications naturally being absent. The manuscript was probably compiled in the scriptorium at Acre which was associated with Jean of Antioch, who may well have made the translations from the Latin. This first codex stated that it had used four writings which had leaden bulls, one of

cxxv, and on the Acre 'scriptorium', J. Folda, *Crusader Manuscript Illumination at Saint-Jean d'Acre, 1275-1291* (Princeton, 1976), pp. 42-6. Delisle, 'Maître Jean d'Antioche', p. 24, and Riley-Smith, *Knights*, p. 273, claim that Fr. Guglielmo was Commander of Cyprus in 1296. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale [hereafter BN]: ms. fr. 6049, stated (fol. 298) that his treatise entitled *Saterian* was completed on Cyprus in September 1296, and (fol. 217) that the other *livre* in that codex was done while Fr. Guglielmo was Commander of Cyprus; it did, however, contain a text of 1304: *Cartulaire*, no. 4672. Fr. Guglielmo was Commander by 3 June 1299 and Fr. Simon le Rat was named Commander in November 1303: *Cartulaire*, nos. 4464, 4620.

<sup>27</sup> Riley-Smith, *Knights*, pp. 296-303; A. Forey, 'Constitutional Conflict and Change in the Hospital of St. John during the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 33 (1982), pp. 20-7; A. Luttrell, 'Gli Ospitalieri di San Giovanni di Gerusalemme dal continente alle isole', in *Acri 1291: la fine della presenza degli ordini militari in Terra Santa e i nuovi orientamenti nel XIV secolo*, ed. F. Tommasi (Perugia, 1996), pp. 87-9.

<sup>28</sup> Klement, 'Alcune osservazioni', pp. 241-3, notes this unknown text at fols 89-104; it is published in K. Klement, *Von Krankenspeisen und Artzen...: Eine unbekannte Verfügung des Johannitermeisters Roger des Moulins (1177-1187) im Codex Vaticanus Latinus 4852* (unpublished thesis: Salzburg, 1996). It is evidently a French version of a text also preserved in an equally unknown Latin version in Marseilles, Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône [hereafter Marseilles]: 56 H 4055 no. 2, datable in or after 1181 by a reference to the *casale* of Cole or Chola acquired in 1181: *Cartulaire*, no. 603, wrongly given as of 1189 in A. Luttrell, 'The Hospitaller's Medical Tradition, 1291-1530', in *The Military Orders: Fighting for the Faith and Caring for the Sick*, ed. M. Barber (Aldershot, 1994), p. 67. S. Edgington, 'Medical Care in the Hospital of St John in Jerusalem', in *The Military Orders, Volume II: Welfare and Warfare*, ed. H. Nicholson (forthcoming) studies this important text.



Lucius III, one of Master Alfonso of Portugal, and two of Master Hugues Revel; Revel's statutes were contained in two *chartres*, one *grant* and one *petite*, both with a leaden bull, and added to the latter were Master Nicholas Lorgne's statutes of 1278 which had no bull as they were passed before his magistral seal had been made.<sup>29</sup>

Fr. Guglielmo's second codex described more fully the documents he had seen in Acre, probably in about 1282.<sup>30</sup>

*Ci testimoigne le compileor de cest lieure que il uit cestes choses bulles soute la bule de Lucius pape et de maistre Anfons. Et deuse aucunes coustumes et aistances qui fuerent iointes par aucun leuc de regle au Margat.*

Se sont les ordenemens de sus escrits si come la regle et les autres ordenemens. Je vis et tins en mes mains bulles de plomb. Ce est assavoir la regle si come uous laue oye deuant qui estoit bullee de la bulle apostolial. Et de lapostoille Lucius et estoit en latin. Et puis la fais translater et metre en frances, si come est dite et translatee deuant le co[n]trescrit en latin en latin.<sup>31</sup> Quant Je parti dou prioure de Lombardie demora la les autres choses ensi auant. Cest le priuilege que maistre Jobert fit de pain blanc et les autres ordenations que il fist. Et celes qui uienent apres de maistre Rogier de Molix. Et puis la recordation dou Margat atresi. Je vis et tins et oys proprement por faire cont[r]escrire. Et estoit bullee de la bulle de plomb, dou nom de Maistre Anfons les quels Je fis contrescrire autresi en latin. Et [quant] ce lieure<sup>32</sup> fu compile Je auee<sup>33</sup> le dit cont[r]escrit qui proprement fu pris de sous la bulle de maistre Anfons et la uoie<sup>34</sup> en Chipre.

Cestes choses ay ci dit por ce que la dite regle qui estoit bullee de la bulle de lapostoly, et les autres choses que estoient soute la bulle de Maistre Anfons furent perdues ala perte dAcre, si que au jor<sup>35</sup> que cest liure fut compile nous non auions regle bullee dou pape ne les choses desus escrites recordees et confermees au Margat, non auions nous sous nule bulle. Et por ce que elles ne fussent mise en obli par negligence, ou que autre error non fust per aucuns escrits descordables des escrits qui les freres ont, ay Je dit la ou la uerite seroit trouee. Et qui Je eusse la

<sup>29</sup> Rome, Biblioteca Vaticana: Codex Vaticanus Latinus [hereafter Vat. Lat.] 4852; analysed in Klement, 'Alcune osservazioni'.

<sup>30</sup> BN: ms. fr. 6049, fols 240<sup>v</sup>-241<sup>v</sup>; earlier publication (here amended) in Delisle, 'Maître Jean d'Antioche', pp. 23-4; J. Delaville le Roulx, *De prima origine Hospitaliorum Hierosolymitanorum* (Paris, 1885), pp. 40-1; J. Delaville le Roulx, 'Les statuts de l'ordre de l'Hôpital de Saint-Jean de Jérusalem', *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 48 (1887), pp. 350, 351 n. 2.

<sup>31</sup> Possibly meaning a copy of the Latin text in Latin.

<sup>32</sup> Ms: 'Et ce lieure ...'.

<sup>33</sup> Ms: 'auce'.

<sup>34</sup> Probably to read 'l'auoie'?; Delaville illogically amends to 'l'a[n]voie'(!).

<sup>35</sup> Ms: 'lor' (or 'ior').

regle cont[r]escrite sous la bulle dou pape et les ordenemens desus dis bulles sous la bulle de Maistre Aufons, Je traie a testimoingne frere B[ru]n<sup>36</sup>, qui estoit Tresourier au jour, et auoit la dite regle et escrit fait au Margat en sa garde qui les presta por faire contreescrire.

*de ce meismes.*

Meismes as diz escritz fais au Margat conte[n]loit la regle la qual regle et tous les escritz desus ditz estoient en vne chartre bullee souz la bulle de plomb au nom dou dit Maistre Anfon.

*de ce maismes.*

Aucunes choses ajosteront lois a la droite escripture de la regle laquel ajostance tient leuc solement destabliment non pais de regle. Et non auons pas juste vser de Tout selonc celes ajostances Car ou la regle parole de .iiij. choses que len doit prometre lajostance par la main dou prestre et por liure mas lusance si est que le bailli ou autre des freres qui face aucun frere tieigne en ses mains le liure sur lequel cil qui doient estre frere prometent. Et puis le porte sur lauter et le reporte au bailli se il le fait freire ou a autre des freres que laura fait frere ...<sup>37</sup>

Fr. Guglielmo was anxious to emphasize that the Rule had been altered at Margat. He said that he had himself seen the confirmation of the Rule with Lucius III's leaden bull, and also the customs and statutes of 1176 and of later dates which were approved at Margat together with the new statutes enacted there, all in Latin and sealed in 1206 by Master Alfonso. Fr. Guglielmo had the Rule copied in Latin and translated from the Latin into French, which implied that no French version was then available in the Convent at Acre. On leaving the Priory of Lombardy, presumably to go to Cyprus, he left there his copies and translations of the privilege of the sick and of the other *ordenations* of Master Jobert, those of Master Roger of Moulins and the *recordation* of Margat, all in the Latin version sealed by Master Alfonso. Fr. Guglielmo had had these copied in Latin and translated into French; he wrote both that he had left them in Lombardy when he went to Cyprus in or before 1296 but that they were with him in Cyprus when, presumably later, he compiled the *lieure* which formed the second part of his second codex, which did indeed contain these materials in French. The sealed documents of 1185 and 1206 were lost at Acre in 1291. After that the Hospital no longer had a copy of the Rule with a papal seal; Fr. Guglielmo's insistence on that point suggests that he wrote that

<sup>36</sup> Or 'B[er]n'. Riley-Smith, *Knights*, p. 273, proposes Fr. Bernard of Chemin, Treasurer in 1299: *Cartulaire*, no. 4469. Delaville, 'Statuts de l'ordre', pp. 350, 351 n. 2, reads 'Brun' and gives him as alive in 1204(!).

<sup>37</sup> There followed (fols 241<sup>v</sup>-242<sup>v</sup>) further examples of changes to the Rule.



passage before, or just after, the renewed papal confirmation of the Rule which was issued in Italy in 1300 while he was in Cyprus. As witness that he had indeed copied these documents, Fr. Guglielmo cited the Treasurer at Acre who had held them in his custody. The texts bulled at Margat contained an example of the Rule which varied from that confirmed by Lucius III, and these additions and variations were carefully noted in French in the gloss to the French translation in Fr. Guglielmo's first codex. He remarked that these variations had the value of statute but not that of the Rule, since they lacked papal confirmation. In 1184 and 1185 Lucius had confirmed Master Roger of Moulins's hospital *ordenement* but not the other magistral ordinances of 1176 and 1181/2.

Some central records were naturally kept in the Western priories. The Rule and an early version of the Legends were in England probably between about 1181 and 1185, at which time they were turned from Latin into Anglo-Norman verse; the text was copied in a codex compiled in England between 1300 and about 1310.<sup>38</sup> A Latin version of the Rule as amended in 1206 was transcribed in 1253 and sent to the German brethren, who preserved it in a Swiss commandery.<sup>39</sup> One early surviving legislative text is the thirteenth-century fragment in Latin in a mutilated parchment in Provence. The fragment surviving begins with items at least some of which were confirmed at Margat but which were earlier in origin;<sup>40</sup> there followed the hospital *ordenement* probably datable between 1181 and 1185 which was also copied in French in Fr. Guglielmo's first codex; next came variant forms of certain regulations for the reception of brethren and *confratres* and concerning prayers, feasts and fasts which were later considered as *usances*; the rest of the Provençal fragment was lost.<sup>41</sup> Further variant forms of these same texts also followed the *ordenement* concerning the hospital in the French translation which was given in Fr. Guglielmo's first codex but not in the second.<sup>42</sup> Thus, even after 1291, there survived traces of texts and information which had possibly been removed

<sup>38</sup> *The Hospitallers' 'Riwle' (Miracula et Regula Hospitalis Sancti Johannis Jerosolimitani)*, ed. K. Sinclair (London, 1984), pp. xxv, xlv-xlviii. The Anglo-Norman Legends were taken from the Latin: K. Sinclair, 'The Anglo-Norman Miracles of the Foundation of the Hospital of St. John in Jerusalem', *Medium Aevum* 55 (1986), p. 103.

<sup>39</sup> *Cartulaire*, no. 70: facsimile in G. Lagleder, *Die Ordensregel der Johanniter/Malteser* (St. Ottilien, 1983), p. 86, showing *plica* and seal. A Latin version in Strasbourg, Archives départementales du Bas-Rhin: H 1363 no. 1, with *plica*, is almost identical in its hand and its text.

<sup>40</sup> Several of these items are similar to those apparently confirmed in 1206: *Cartulaire*, no. 1193/2.36-7).

<sup>41</sup> Cf. *Cartulaire*, no. 2213 ##121-2, 124?.

<sup>42</sup> Klement, 'Alcune osservazioni', pp. 234, 241-2.

from the corpus in or before 1206, and which differed from what were to become the standard codifications which were themselves derived from Fr. Guglielmo's collections in French.

A South German miscellany of Hospitaller documents, probably compiled or copied between 1287 and 1292, included many of the same texts as Fr. Guglielmo's first codex. These began with the Rule in the amended form of 1206 in German translation; also in German were the various customs of Master Jobert of 1176, there wrongly dated to 1181, and of Master Roger of Moulins of 1181/2.<sup>43</sup> The second part of the 1181/2 statutes was twice said to have been 'passed' at Margat under Master 'Arnul' or 'Arnoldes', evidently Master Alfonso of Portugal acting in 1206.<sup>44</sup> These statutes, at one point headed 'Rvgerus' presumably for Master Roger of Moulins, were roughly similar to those later considered as of being of 1206. After the first seventeen items came the heading, 'Diez wart gesezzet ze Akers', perhaps alluding to a chapter general at Acre held before 1206, possibly by Master Roger of Moulins. At the end of this section were passages on the reception of brethren and on prayers which corresponded, as in Fr. Guglielmo's first codex and also in the Latin fragment in Provence, to certain of the later *usances*. There followed some, but not all, of the statutes which were passed before 1262, wrongly given as 1272, in the 'Alberie' – that is the *auberges* – at Jaffa, Acre and Vigne Neuve, but which were approved in 1262 and subsequently ascribed to that year, and then others dating to 1262 and chapters down to 1287. These may have been based on a text earlier than that used by Fr. Guglielmo, since they included some eight statutes of Master Hugues Revel which were not in Fr. Guglielmo's codification of c. 1283 or in any subsequent corpus, while other statutes were omitted, presumably having been lost or suppressed; many were either in garbled form or inaccurately translated.<sup>45</sup>

The German collection next copied many regulations later described as *esgarts*; again the form was garbled and much, including the first twenty so-called *esgarts*, was omitted. These regulations were given not in German but in Latin, perhaps because they came from a different source. There then followed, still in Latin, about twenty of the various statutes approved at Margat,

<sup>43</sup> French translations in *Cartulaire*, nos. 494, 504, 627; the dates given here as 1176, 1181/2 and 1206 may be marginally approximate.

<sup>44</sup> Other versions (eg. *Cartulaire*, no. 1193: preamble) recorded a chapter at Caesarea not mentioned in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek [hereafter Munich]: Clm 4620, fol. 94<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>45</sup> Note that the Munich manuscript in German omits statutes ## 24-5, 31, 34-6, 40, 50, of 1262, of which ## 24, 31, 34-6 are also lacking in the Latin version of 1357: cf. *Cartulaire*, no. 1193. Other variations in this manuscript await detailed analysis.



given with many omissions with respect to the standard text established later, and then another seventeen or so statutes which corresponded to no group in the later standard compilations, though some of the items were approximately similar to individual regulations of various dates. This section closed by stating that these regulations were approved in the chapter general at Margat following their attestation by 'old and other' brethren:

quod adunato capitulo generali apud Margatum omnes iste constitutiones subscriptae recitate fuerint coram fratre Al. et fratre Con [sic] Portugali reuerendo magistro Hospitalis et coram antiquis et probis fratribus eiusdem domus unde per testimonium fratrum antiquorum et aliorum predicta statuta inuenta sunt et pro comuni vtilitate aprobata et [uera facta?].

The Master involved was evidently Fr. Alfonso of Portugal; the date was given as 29 September 'm.cc.liij', presumably in error for 'm.cc.uj' or 1206.<sup>46</sup> There followed a selection of papal, royal and imperial privileges dating from 1185 to 1274, a version of the Legends,<sup>47</sup> and a unique Latin treatise on the Jerusalem hospital.<sup>48</sup> Many of the privileges apart, much of this material presumably originated in Syria. It may have been contained on parchments similar to the *chartres* at Acre, one or more of which was in Latin.

---

<sup>46</sup> Munich: Clm 4620, summarily analysed in G. Glauche, *Katalog der lateinischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München Clm 4501-4663*, rev. edn (Wiesbaden, 1994), pp. 210-14. Lagleder, *Die Ordensregel*, pp. 154-81, with facsimiles, gives the regulations of 1176 and 1181/2 in German but breaks off at the end of fol. 84. This codex is being studied by Karl Borchart who kindly communicated a partial transcription and some preliminary findings, with the suggestion that the language points to a Bavarian origin; nothing is known of the Hospitaller section of this codex before the fifteenth century. The two earliest manuscripts date the '1287' statutes to that year while Munich: Clm 4620, fol. 103<sup>v</sup>, gives 1286, but *Cartulaire*, no. 4022, prefers 1288, as given in later manuscripts. The Latin of the *esgarts* is not that of the 1357 translation given in *Cartulaire*, no. 2213. The Margat chapter was most probably held in 1206 (Riley-Smith, *Knights*, p. 120) and 'uj' could easily have become 'lij'. Throughout the so-called *esgarts* there are variations between the versions given in Fr. Guglielmo's two codices, in that of Fr. Daniele of Santo Stefano (BN: ms. fr. 1978) and in BN: ms. fr. 13,531 (datable 1320/30) which contains additional items: *Cartulaire*, no. 2213 and notes. *RHC, Oc.*, 5.cxxiv, notes that the burnt Turin manuscript of the statutes (datable 1344/7) was very close to Fr. Guglielmo's second codex; it may have derived from materials of his available in Lombardy. *Cartulaire*, no. 2213, gives ## 45 ter and quater from Fr. Guglielmo's second codex, and these are also in Munich: Clm 4620, fol. 112<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>47</sup> This version of the Legends, published in *RHC, Oc.*, 5.405-10, is also in BN: ms. lat. 5515 and ms. lat. 14,693.

<sup>48</sup> Studied in B. Kedar, 'An Anonymous Twelfth-Century Description of the Jerusalem Hospital', in *The Military Orders, Volume II: Welfare and Warfare*, ed. H. Nicholson (forthcoming).

A roll which survived in Provence contained some of the same texts. The opening section being missing, the portion remaining opened with the end of the Rule as amended at Margat but given in French and in a form varying notably from that of Fr. Guglielmo's French text. It was followed by Lucius III's confirmation of 12 January 1185 given in Latin and thereafter, all in French, by the ordinances of Masters Jobert and Roger of Moulins dating from 1176 onwards, and by the statutes approved in 1206, in 1262 and thereafter down to 1294, with significant variations in content and wording, and with various omissions but including certain statutes for 1292, 1293 and 1294 which were subsequently suppressed and so remained unknown. The so-called *esgarts* and *usances* were not included.<sup>49</sup>

Fr. Guglielmo's second codex was an amalgamation of two separate books, one section called the *Saterian* being completed in Cyprus in September 1296. That involved some repetition of materials in the ensemble, which eventually survived only in a copy made apparently between 1330 and 1332. The first part opened with two versions of the Legends; the Rule and its papal confirmation of 1300 both in French; various punishments, fasts and feast days; many *usances* and statutes down to 1304; a supposed charter of Godfrey of Bouillon; prayers for the sick, the dead and the chapters general; a very brief version of the Chronology of the Deceased Masters; texts concerning the constitutional disputes of 1295 to 1300; a crusade treatise by Charles II of Naples written in 1291/2; a passage on the Hospital's *confratres*; further *usances* and *esgarts* dating between 1301 and 1303; and more on *confratres* and punishments. The second part was more juridical in character, with Fr. Guglielmo's own critical and commonsense account of the Hospital's origins and with a jumble of customs, privileges, statutes, letters and a different version of the Chronology of the Deceased Masters; much of this was arranged chronologically to form an uneven historical account. There followed Fr. Guglielmo's own treatise on the Order's constitution, the *Saterian*. Finally, in the same hand and added after 1319 or more probably after 1330, were three further statutes, a passage on the Order's seals, a list of Hospitaller dignitaries, those statutes of 1311 which were not revoked in 1330, and the statutes and *recordia* of 1330.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>49</sup> Marseilles: 56 H 4055 no. 1; e.g., where Fr. Guglielmo (*Cartulaire*, no. 4259 #1) gives *Denamarche*, the Marseilles manuscript has *dosterriche*. The suppressed statutes are not in *Cartulaire*, nos. 4194, 4234, 4259; one is published in Luttrell 'Gli Ospitalieri', p. 81 n. 31.

<sup>50</sup> Various dates have been attributed to this codex (BN: ms. fr. 6049); Delisle's incomplete description indicates only some of the passages published. The final section dates after 1319 since it refers to the Prior of Catalunya, an office only created in that year.



Fr. Guglielmo reproduced, as always in French translation, a charter of Godfrey of Lorraine which was dated 1183 but which, with some lack of scruple, he ascribed to Godfrey of Bouillon in 1099/1100 in order to buttress an argument of his own.<sup>51</sup> His various collections ignored the many other charters and privileges which did survive, including the earliest papal privilege of 1113, perhaps because they had already been sent to the West or possibly because he could not read Latin; indeed his two codices contained virtually nothing in that language. Whether Fr. Guglielmo was a priest or a *miles*,<sup>52</sup> he was interested primarily in juridical and constitutional matters. The legislative tradition established in his corpus, which passed to later codifications, was basically that of 1206. By that time there were already many confusions, some of them further compounded in Fr. Guglielmo's translations and rearrangements.

A papal letter of 1172 mentioned the regulations – 'vestigia et statuta' – of the Hospital's early rulers 'G.' and 'R.', presumably Gerard and Raymond of Puy. The formal written Rule was established by Raymond of Puy, perhaps in the 1130s; and, according to Lucius III in 1184, it was confirmed by Eugenius III, pope from 1145 to 1153.<sup>53</sup> Lucius reconfirmed it in 1184 and 1185 at the request of Master Roger of Moulins who was with the pope in November 1184. Lucius's phrase 'ut accipimus' suggests that he did not at first see Eugenius's confirmation. Indeed Lucius's confirmation, issued and reissued on a number of dates from 4 November 1184 onwards, did not originally include the text of the Rule;<sup>54</sup> only the confirmation of 22 August 1185,<sup>55</sup> as given in

<sup>51</sup> Delaville, *De prima origine*, pp. 124-7; Delisle, 'Maître Jean d'Antioche', pp. 29-30.

<sup>52</sup> Folda, *Crusader Manuscript Illumination*, p. 45, claims that he was a lawyer; Riley-Smith, *Knights*, p. 32, that he was a knight.

<sup>53</sup> *Cartulaire*, nos. 434, 690; cf. Hiestand, *Templer und Johanniter*, 1.361, 2.228-30; K. Klement, 'Le prime tre redazioni della Regola Giovannita', *Studi Melitense* 4 (1996). Two versions of the Legends and Fr. Guglielmo held that the Rule was confirmed by Innocent II between 1139 and 1143 (Klement, 'Le prime tre redazioni', p. 51), possibly a confusion with Innocent's privilege in *Cartulaire*, no. 130 (original in Marseilles).

<sup>54</sup> *Cartulaire*, no. 690: facsimile in Lagleder, *Die Ordensregel*, p. 46; further dates noted in Hiestand, *Templer und Johanniter*, 1.361, 363.

<sup>55</sup> Lucius III's privilege of 22 August 1185 in Latin, with *rota* and cardinalate subscriptions but without the text of the Rule, was published by G. Bosio, *Dell'istoria della sacra religione et ill<sup>ma</sup> militia di San Giovanni Gerosolimitano*, vol. 1 (2nd edn: Rome, 1621), pp. 65-7, from a version then in the Hospital's archives at Paris; this seems to be the version used in Klement, 'Le prime tre redazioni', pp. 237-40. Bosio presumes that when such copies were sent from Syria to the priories the text of the Rule was omitted from it since it would already have been available in the priories: Bosio, *Dell'istoria*, 1.68-71, published the Rule from Boniface VIII's register.

Fr. Guglielmo's French translation,<sup>56</sup> included it, perhaps because only then did the text reach Lucius at Verona. By that time, four extra clauses seem to have been added to the end of the earlier text, since the clause preceding them is clearly a terminating one. Fr. Guglielmo saw and copied at Acre a version of Lucius's confirmation containing the Rule; his copy, which included Lucius's *rota* and its subscriptions, eventually survived only in the French translation. Apparently between 1181 and 1185 the Rule was translated from the Latin into Anglo-Norman verse but with various elaborations and explanations, some of them possibly derived from the later customs of 1181/2.<sup>57</sup> The Provençal roll contained the Rule as amended in 1206 but in French; it was followed by Lucius III's confirmation, in Latin and without the Rule, dated 12 January 1185. At Acre, Fr. Guglielmo also saw a *chartre* with the Latin Rule as amended in 1206 and under the seal of Master Alfonso of Portugal, and in his first codex he annotated the changes there made. He noted: 'Cestes choses que sont escrites en maniere de glose en ce livre tant come la regle tient; aiousta maistre Amfos a la dite regle selonc quel ytient a son escrit fait au Margat'; again he referred to: 'Ce changement que [est] en lescrit fait au Margat de maistre Amphos'.<sup>58</sup>

All other known texts datable before 1300 contained the Rule as amended at Margat in 1206. In 1253 Master Guillaume of Châteauneuf sent a transcription of the Latin Rule, with his own seal attached, to the 'preceptor Alamanie' to be read yearly in chapter and to replace any other text being used in the German province. That copy survived, as did a similar thirteenth-century copy

<sup>56</sup> Vat. Lat. 4852, fol. 18; fols 14<sup>r-v</sup>, in Klement, 'Le prime tre redazioni', pp. 240-1, shows Lucius III confirming a written text of Roger of Moulin's hospital *ordenement*, though without including the text in his privilege; the *ordenement* dates, therefore, before August 1185.

<sup>57</sup> Riley-Smith, *Knights*, pp. 47-8; *The Hospitallers' 'Riwle'*, pp. xlvi-xlviii; K. Sinclair, 'New Light on Early Hospitaller Practices', *Revue Bénédictine* 96 (1986).

<sup>58</sup> Cited from Klement, 'Alcune osservazioni', pp. 235-7, which lists variations given in the gloss. *Cartulaire*, no. 70, presents Fr. Guglielmo's French translation of the 1185 text of the Rule alongside the Latin copy of 1253 which has various additions. The complete text of Lucius's privilege from Vat. Lat. 4852, with the Rule, *rota* and subscriptions all in French, is in P.A. Paoli, *Dell'origine ed istituto del sacro militar ordine di S. Giovambattista Gerosolimitano* (Rome, 1781), Appendix pp. xvii-xxxi. *Cartulaire*, no. 70, ignores the gloss, but Lagleder, *Die Ordensregel*, pp. 89-115, gives it in text and facsimile. *The Hospitallers' 'Riwle'*, pp. 70-4, gives the 1300 text in a copy datable 1300/10, noting variants with respect to the 1253 copy; Klement, 'Le prime tre redazioni', pp. 254-9, also analyses these changes. E. King, *The Rule, Statutes and Customs of the Hospitallers, 1099-1310* (London, 1934), pp. 3, 20 n. 1, considers that the phrase 'and the defence of the Catholic faith' was probably added to the first clause of the Rule in 1206, but it appeared in no version datable in or before 1300.



at Strasbourg.<sup>59</sup> The 1206 version, in German, was in the Munich codex with the statutes to 1287 which is datable before 1292, and also, in French, in the Provençal roll with the statutes down to 1294; this French translation varied significantly in language and word order from Fr. Guglielmo's French text, and it contained phrases not included in the 1300 confirmation. The copies sealed by Lucius III and by Master Alfonso were lost at Acre in 1291, as Fr. Guglielmo noted.<sup>60</sup>

In 1300, explicitly in view of this loss of 'apostolicas litteras, regule vestre seriem continentes', Pope Boniface VIII confirmed a text of the Rule making certain unspecified changes: 'quibusdam verbis de mandato nostro amotis et correctis, in ea presentibus fecimus annotari'. This confirmation stated that it contained the Rule of Raymond of Puy with that Master's seal which had been provided by the Hospitallers: 'cum vos nonnullas litteras, quondam fratris Raymundi, tunc eiusdem Hospitalis custodis, qui predictam regulam condidit, eius plumbeo sigillo signatas, in quibus ipsa regula continetur expresse, prout asseritis, habeatis'.<sup>61</sup> Raymond of Puy did have a seal,<sup>62</sup> but the phrase 'prout asseritis' suggests that Boniface's chancery did not really see a Rule with Raymond's seal but rather that it accepted something else. The gloss to Fr. Guglielmo's French translation noted certain additions to the Rule, pre-sumably those made in 1206 which he identified by comparing the 1185 and 1206 versions he obtained at Acre, but his French translation contained other phrases which were not noted in the gloss as additions and which were not present in the 1300 text. That suggests that Boniface's chancery had available other unidentified texts which it used to remove additions already made in or before 1185. The resulting text of 1300 became the standard version; precisely how it was established and how it may have differed from that written down by 1153 remains uncertain.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> *Cartulaire*, no. 2653; supra, p. 143 n. 39.

<sup>60</sup> Supra, pp. 141, 144, 146, 148.

<sup>61</sup> *Cartulaire*, no. 4496.

<sup>62</sup> G. Schlumberger, *Sigillographie de l'Orient latin* (Paris, 1943), p. 232.

<sup>63</sup> However, Klement, 'Le prime tre redazioni', pp. 254-8, argues that Boniface VIII did see a Rule with Raymond's seal which could have been sent to the West before 1283, so that Fr. Guglielmo did not then see it at Acre. Fr. Guglielmo never mentioned a Rule with Raymond's seal, nor did he mention the Latin copy of the Rule contained in Lucius III's confirmation as among the documents left in Lombardy when he went to Cyprus in c. 1296. A detailed collation of all the texts might clarify this problem. The French Rule # 18 in *Cartulaire*, no. 70, concludes: 'il non est frere'. Fr. Guglielmo's gloss, at fol. 14, ends: 'il non est frere bon, et cele paine seuff[r]ir que lautre deurot souffrir se la chose fust prou[e]r'. The 1253 copy reads:

The history of the early statutes is equally complex. Fr. Guglielmo may, in c. 1283, have made the first attempt since 1206 to assemble in a single codex the Hospital's legislation, which had been periodically collected in successive sealed *chartres*. Some earlier statutes not in Fr. Guglielmo's first collection were contained in the South German codex of 1287/92 in which the materials translated into German and those left in Latin were probably taken from sources similar to the *chartres* in existence at Acre in c. 1283. The system involving successive *chartres* created confusions, partly because ongoing legislation required repeated additions to the corpus and the elimination of obsolete items,<sup>64</sup> and partly because scribes continually introduced errors, misunderstandings or variations. By 1206 almost nothing, apart from the Rule itself, seems to have remained in writing which was earlier than the regulations of Masters Jobert and Roger of Moulins; these were added to the statutes in 1206 when all these materials were collected in a new *chartre* under Master Alfonso's seal. An exception was the hospital *ordenement* datable between 1181 and 1185 which survives only in the Provençal fragment in Latin and in Fr. Guglielmo's first codex in French.

The preamble to the *coustumes*, which were apparently already in writing when they were confirmed at Margat in 1206, stated that they were there recognized as 'ancient' by 'old and wise' brethren; they may have included various ordinances going back to 1176.<sup>65</sup> Some element of confusion was thus to be expected. In Fr. Guglielmo's first codex the materials from Margat were followed by the supposed *usances* and the supposed *esgarts*, all given without

---

'ipse frater bonus non est, et eandem penam sustineat quam accusatus, si probari posset, sustineret'. The Provençal roll reads: 'il nen est pas bon frere, et susteigne cele paine que li acusor sousteng[...]'. The German translation, fol. 78': 'er ist ain gut pruder nicht und shol die puze leiden die der geruegete pruder leiden sholdt ob er bewert moechte werden'. The 1300 text restores the presumed 1185 reading 'ipse frater non est'. Klement, 'Le prime tre redazioni', pp. 242-53, analyzes the changes made in 1206. Note that Boniface VIII did amend earlier papal decretals when preparing Book VI of the *Corpus juris canonici*. Other problems remain. The Latin version of Lucius III's privilege of 22 August 1185 given in Bosio, *Dell'istoria*, 1.65-7, mentioned four 'medici' and four 'chiurgici' while Fr. Guglielmo's translation of it gave them as five and three. The 1300 version in Bosio, *Dell'istoria*, 1.68-71, included a number of variations given in the 1253 copy (*Cartulaire*, no. 70) but not followed in the Cambridge text of 1300 as given in *The Hospitallers' 'Riwle'*, pp. 70-4.

<sup>64</sup> E.g., a statute of 1297 was annulled in 1300: *Cartulaire*, no. 4515 # 20.

<sup>65</sup> *Cartulaire*, no. 1193: preamble; Latin version, *supra*, p. 145. Klement, 'Le prime tre redazioni', p. 242 n. 29, suggests a possible oral tradition but without considering the Latin version. Some documents may have been lost at the fall of Jerusalem in 1187.



any date.<sup>66</sup> It is evident from their form that many of the so-called *esgarts* were not judgements derived from judicial cases which had been built up into a cumulative system of case law, but simply regulations, or maybe *usances* or customs, never passed in chapter general as statutes. Many were probably statutes passed at Margat, as the dating in the Latin version in Munich suggested.<sup>67</sup> The first twenty *esgarts* are datable before 1239 at latest<sup>68</sup> and a good many may have been earlier than 1206.<sup>69</sup> Some of the *usances* presumably also preceded 1206 when the Hospital's 'customs' were confirmed. The oldest surviving texts must be those at Munich in Latin, in the mutilated Provençal fragment in Latin, in the Provençal roll in French and, also in French, in Fr. Guglielmo's codices. In subsequent manuscripts, in which they appear in varying order,<sup>70</sup> the so-called *esgarts* and *usances* were accepted as forming an essential part of the Hospital's legislative corpus which was in practice derived from Fr. Guglielmo's compilations.

Equally it was supposed that there was no legislation at any chapter general between 1206 and 1262,<sup>71</sup> even though the preamble to the 1262 statutes explicitly stated that many of them had been passed in earlier chapters general at Caesarea, Jaffa, Acre and the Vigne Neuve.<sup>72</sup> The 1262 chapter general produced a new partial codification contained in a bulled *chartre* seen at Acre, along with subsequent statutes down to 1278, by Fr. Guglielmo. Some further statutes down to 1287 appeared in German translation, much garbled, in the Munich codex, while the Provençal roll with the statutes in French down to 1294 included some which had by 1300 been replaced.

---

<sup>66</sup> *Cartulaire*, no. 2213.

<sup>67</sup> *Supra*, p. 145. King, *Rule, Statutes and Customs*, pp. 40-1, already made this suggestion, noting that the Latin translation of 1357 described the 1206 statutes as the 'prima pars'. King repeatedly cites the Chronicle of the Deceased Masters in its Latin version of 1357; it is here ignored since its remarks on pre-1291 legislative matters appear to be based merely on the texts available to Fr. Guglielmo in c. 1283.

<sup>68</sup> Riley-Smith, *Knights*, p. 260.

<sup>69</sup> Forey, 'Constitutional Conflict and Change', pp. 18-19.

<sup>70</sup> *Cartulaire*, no. 2213/2.536 n. 1.

<sup>71</sup> This has led to inflated interpretations of Revel's legislative achievement: eg. C. Humphery-Smith, *Hugh Revel, Master of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem, 1258-1277* (Chichester, 1994), pp. 43-5.

<sup>72</sup> *Cartulaire*, no. 3039. The Hospital had a 'vigne neuve' outside Acre in 1261: *RHC, Arm.*, 2.730.

Many subsequent manuscripts with the Rule and statutes contained the *Miracula*, which had been placed in front of the Rule by about 1181/5,<sup>73</sup> and the Chronology of the Deceased Masters, which presumably originated in a prayer list and contained very brief, and often divergent, remarks on successive Masters.<sup>74</sup> Neither item was in Fr. Guglielmo's first codex, but a Latin version of the *Miracula* was in the German codex of c. 1287. Fr. Guglielmo's second codex contained two versions of the Chronology, apparently in their earliest surviving forms; two versions of the *Miracula*; and Fr. Guglielmo's account rejecting the legendary stories of the *Miracula* and giving his own more scientific interpretation of the Hospital's origins. His materials thus constituted a body of records, some of which were of practical value and all of which he had translated and rearranged to create a continuous history of the Hospital in French.

Fr. Guglielmo's first codex of c. 1283 preserved parts of those legislative records lost at Acre in 1291. His second codex added other items, some concerned with events later than 1291. Some of the pre-1291 texts were also available in the West, in the materials surviving in Germany and Provence for example. Meanwhile administrative materials must have been accumulating, first in Cyprus between 1291 and about 1310 and thereafter on Rhodes. The Cyprus archives were lost and so were almost all subsequent chancery materials from Rhodes down to about 1381, except for one register of the chapters general from 1330 to 1344, five magistral registers and other miscellaneous materials.<sup>75</sup> Though the Rhodian chancery was at first organized in very rudimentary form,<sup>76</sup> magistral bulls and other documents<sup>77</sup> and by 1365/6 the chancery had an extremely detailed formulary which included

---

<sup>73</sup> *The Hospitallers' 'Riwle'*, pp. xlv-xlvi; other texts in Delaville, *De prima origine*, pp. 97-128, and *RHC, Oc.*, 5.405-35. See also Sinclair, 'Anglo-Norman Miracles'; A. Calvet, 'Légendes d'Oc de la fondation de l'Hôpital de Saint-Jean-de-Jérusalem', *France latine* 116 (1994); S. Schein, 'The *Miracula* of the Hospital of St. John and the Carmelite Elianic Tradition – Two Medieval Myths of Foundation?', in *Cross Cultural Convergences in the Crusader Period: Essays Presented to Aryeh Grabois on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. M. Goodich, S. Menache and S. Schein (New York, 1995).

<sup>74</sup> References and some texts in Luttrell, *The Hospitallers of Rhodes*, Study IV.

<sup>75</sup> J. Mizzi et al., *Catalogue of the Records of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem in the Royal Malta Library*, vols 1- (Malta, 1964- ).

<sup>76</sup> Preliminary study in A. Luttrell, *The Hospitallers in Cyprus, Rhodes, Greece and the West, 1291-1440* (London, 1978), Study XV.

<sup>77</sup> E.g., S. Fiorini and A. Luttrell, 'The Italian Hospitallers at Rhodes, 1437-1462', *Revue Mabillon* 68 (1996), pp. 220-2.



a Latin version of the *Miracula*.<sup>78</sup> The archival materials from 1291 to 1310 could have been lost on Rhodes, or they may have remained on Cyprus and been destroyed, possibly together with the archives of the Cypriot commandery, at any time before or during the Ottoman conquest of Cyprus in 1571 or even later.<sup>79</sup>

Subsequent statutes were added to the corpus, but with considerable further confusion. French was the Hospital's official language.<sup>80</sup> Unlike the Rule, the statutes were not approved by the pope and so did not need to be in Latin. Fr. Guglielmo saw the 1206 statutes in Latin, and they were also in Latin, as were parts of the so-called *esgarts* and *usances* which possibly dated before 1206, in the Munich codex and in the mutilated Provençal fragment. With one minor exception, all other known versions of the statutes were in French or in the *langue d'Oc* until 1357, when the statutes were officially translated into Latin because brethren in the Priory of Lombardy could not understand French;<sup>81</sup>

<sup>78</sup> Barcelona, Arxiu de la Corona d'Aragó, Gran Priorato de Catalunya: Armari 24, vol. 13.

<sup>79</sup> The *Cartulaire* shows that at Malta there are, or were, for the years 1278 to 1291 only ten original documents or contemporary copies, all of them papal letters except for two magistral bulls (nos. 3750, 3792, 4012-13, 4030, 4032, 4044, 4050, 4060, 4118), and these were not necessarily ever on Rhodes; and that for 1292 to 1307 there is, excluding papal bulls, only one original, a magistral bull of 1295 addressed to the Prior of Saint-Gilles in Provence (no. 4276) which is quite likely to have reached Malta from Provence rather than from Rhodes. It cannot be said whether the Hospital took pre-1308 documents from Cyprus to Rhodes. Furthermore, there are very few surviving originals for decades following 1308. R. Hiestand, 'Zum Problem des Templerzentralarchivs', *Archivalische Zeitschrift* 76 (1980), considers that the Templars' central archive on Cyprus, whatever it may have contained, passed to the Hospital in 1313 and remained on Cyprus, probably being destroyed in the Ottoman conquest of 1571. The Templar archive could have been lost at Acre in 1291, though other documents would have accumulated thereafter, or Templar documents could have gone to Rhodes and been lost there, as were the Hospital's own archives for the period from 1291 to 1346. It seems unlikely that they would have survived for long without being used or mentioned; very few Templar texts from the East can be shown to have been available after 1307. M. Barber, *The New Knighthood: A History of the Order of the Temple* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 310-13, also assumes that the central archive disappeared only after 1312, claiming that Templar documents, which he says are conserved in the Hospital's Western archives, are proof of it.

<sup>80</sup> Luttrell, *The Hospitallers in Cyprus*, Study XVII, p. 2, wrongly gives Provençal as the official language.

<sup>81</sup> Text of 1357 in R. Valentini, 'Redazioni italiane quattrocentesche di statuti della religione Gioannita', *Archivum Melitense* 9 (1933), pp. 80-1. The statutes of 1320 are known only in one text which is in Latin: BN: ms. fr. 13,531, fols 59<sup>v</sup>-65. Scholars frequently fail to appreciate that the Latin texts of the statutes published alongside the French version in the *Cartulaire* are not the originals but a late, and sometimes anachronistic, translation from the French.

there were other translations into Catalan and Italian.<sup>82</sup> On Rhodes, the registers were kept in the chancery where an inventory of 1447 counted 102 books or registers plus six other books of 'diversarum rerum', 24 'libri veteres' of 'diversarum rerum', and two new registers and a 'formularium foris'. That made at least 135 volumes, about one a year calculating from 1310.<sup>83</sup> Parts of the archive may well have been destroyed before the loss of Rhodes in 1522 and some items were certainly lost in the final siege.<sup>84</sup> A small portion of the original Rhodian archives left Rhodes when it fell and reached Malta in 1530. At Viterbo in Italy in 1527 there were 96 magistral and other registers and 18 registers of council acts, which is almost the number still surviving in Malta. Little was lost thereafter; in fact, almost everything used by the Hospital's official historian Giacomo Bosio in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century still survives.<sup>85</sup> Bosio did not have access to the Syrian materials sent to safety from Acre to the West shortly before 1291, for these did not reach Malta from Provence until after his death. Only in Bosio's time did the Order begin to arrange effectively for the chronicling of its own history and much still remains to be done. Those early written records which have survived are particularly valuable in defining the Hospital's past and ensuring the continuity of its present activities.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> Delaville, 'Statuts de l'ordre', lists most manuscripts of the statutes; there seems to be no source for his claim (p. 345) that the ordinances of 1206 prescribed their own translation.

<sup>83</sup> Valletta, National Library of Malta, Archives of the Order of St John [hereafter Malta]: Cod. 359, fol. 96<sup>v</sup> (kindly communicated by Jürgen Sarnowsky).

<sup>84</sup> E.g., Malta: Cod. 287, fol. 38; cf. Hiestand, *Templer und Johanniter*, 1.19-23.

<sup>85</sup> A. Luttrell, *Latin Greece, the Hospitallers and the Crusades: 1291-1440* (London, 1982), Study III, pp. 65-7.

<sup>86</sup> Various texts cited here require publication and collation, following which the present hypotheses will need revision. The many registers at Malta and the forthcoming inventory of the pre-1291 documents from Acre await study, while the European priories have preserved numerous unexplored texts. The habitual reliance on the sometimes misleading *Cartulaire* should be abandoned and account taken of new materials. To give just one example, the redating of many statutes should lead to the revision of accepted chronologies for the evolution of knight-brethren and sergeants within the Hospital.