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.² Many documents from the Syrian period were saved by being sent...
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. 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. This hospice apparently had no endowments but relied on support from the merchants and Benedictines of Amafiti, so that before 1099 it probably had little or no need for any archive of its own. With a few minor exceptions, the records of Sancta Maria Latina were lost. There were many registers and other chancery materials kept on Cyprus and
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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. 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. 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.

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. 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, though the Order evidently employed notaries and scribes, and presumably kept its documents, in its central writing office and treasury. 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. 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

1 Some early datings once advanced for Hospitaller texts have subsequently been rejected: e.g., Cartulaire, 1.1 n. 1; 4.311.
3 Cartulaire, nos. 20, 25, 29, etc.
5 Cartulaire, no. 77; J. Delaville le Roulx, Les Hospitaliers en Terre Sainte et a Chypre, 1100-1310 (Paris, 1904), p. 347. After 1126, the title of Chancellor lapsed until the early fourteenth century.
7 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 Hospital 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. One remarkable reliquary
remained in Jerusalem, buried in the crypt of the Hospital's church.

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. 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. The need to conserve records was inescapable and a statute
at Mount Tabor in 1262 decreed that every prior in the West should keep a register listing his
priory’s rents and properties. 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. 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, and the bulk of the

documents from Acre could have been lost with the Rule, in 1291,22 also lost
in the remainder of the Hospital of Rhodes and their Mediterranean World
(Aldebaran, 1992), Study XVIII, p. 9; Addenda, p. 3.

20 Fr. Guglielmo of Santo Stefano: of these documents being either at
21 Cartulaire, no. 4496, the ‘other
22 Infra, p. 149.
23 Luttrell, Hospitallers of Rhodes, infra, p. 149.
24 L. Delisle, ‘Maître Jean d’Antiochien hospitaller’, Histoire littéraire de la
25 The best appraisal is Riley-Smith K. Klement, ‘Alcune osservazioni su
first codes to probably 1278/1283. Cartulaire and elsewhere; in addition ti
The city were able to brethren who were still people who then left the city brethren of the Hospital a year in order to tend One remarkable reliquary hospital’s church. In one of the Hospital’s le to the chapter general at acts of copying documents and diffusion of charters in certain Western houses, a Convent was established an important archive; after Labor also passed to the scapular and a statute of keep a register listing his fe fall of Acre in 1291, an ity. These documents were held in an inventory. What grandeur, presumably the the box with many precious 183, and the bulk of the 1187 (Cambridge, 1995), pp. diplomatic details and textual s XVIII, p. 9; Addenda, p. 3. 139 documents from Acre could have been sent there at about that time, possibly in more than one consignment. Other texts, including Lucius III’s confirmation of the Rule with his bull, were lost at Acre ‘cum aliis rebus non mox diecici’ in 1291; also lost were the copy of the 1206 statutes sealed by Master Alfonso of Portugal and the Hospital’s holy relics.

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. 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.

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. Cartulaire, no. 4496; the ‘other things’ were not necessarily all writings. infra, p. 149.


L. 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, ‘Maitre 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. 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 grand chartire and those of 1270 to 1278 in a petite chartire; and, in a new hand, those of 1287. Next came an ordenement concerning the Jerusalem hospital 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 scrittorium 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 leden bulls, one of which was the treatise entitled Sanavius which had been compiled on Cyprus in September 1296, and (fol. 217) that the other items in that codex were 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 Simon le Rat was named Commander in November 1303: Cartulaire, nos. 4464, 4620.


Lucien 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.

Fr. Guglielmo’s second codex described more fully the documents he had seen in Acre, probably in about 1282.

Ci testimoigne le compillegal de ceste liere que il uit cestes choses bulles soute la bale de Lucius pape et de maistre Anfons. Et deuze aucunes coutumes et assistances qui fuient iointes par aucun leuc de regle au Margat.


Cestes choses ay ci dit por ce que la dite regle que estoit bullee de la bulle de lapostoly, et les autres choses que estoient soute la bulle de Maistre Anfons furent perdues ala perto d’Acre, si que au jor que cest liere fut compile nous non aucuns regle bullee douo pope ne les choses desus escrites recordees et confermentez au Margat, non aucuns non sous nule bulle. Et por ce que elles ne fussent mise en obli par negligent, ou que autre error non fust por aucuns escris descordables des escris qui les freres ont, ay Je dit la ou la verite seroit trouee. Et qui Je eusse la

---


20 Possibly meaning a copy of the Latin text in Latin.

21 Ms: ‘Et ce lierie .’. 

22 Ms: ‘auoe’. 

23 Probably to read ‘lauoe’; Delaville illogically amended to ‘l’aloje’(t). 

24 Ms: ‘lor’ (or ‘iort’).
regle cont[descrite sous la bulle dou pape et les ordenemens desus dis bulles sou
la bulle de Maistre Aufons, Je trais a testimoingne frere B[jr]n[39], qui estoit Tre-
sourier au jour, et auoit la dite regle et escrit fait au Margat en sa garde qui les
presta por faire contrescrire.

de ce meisme.

Melomnes as diz escrits fais au Margat conte[n]oit la regle la qual regle et tous les
escrit desus ditz estoient en vne chartre bullee souz la bulle de plomb au nom dou
dit Maistre Aufons.

de ce meisme.

Aucunes choses ajosteront lois a la droite escripture de la regle laquel ajostance
tient leu solemt destabiment non pais de regle. Et non aunon pas juste vser de
Tout selone celes ajostances Car ou la regle parole de iij. choses que len doit
prometre ajostance par la main dou prestre et por liability mais huysance si est que le
bailli ou autre des freres qui face aucun frere tiernge en ses mains le liure sur
lequel cil qui doient estrre frere prometent. Et puis le porte sur lauter et le reporte
au bailli se il le feit freire ou a autr des freres que laur fait freire ...

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
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 liure 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

38 Or 'B[er]n'. Riley-Smith, Knights, p. 273, proposes Fr. Bernard of Chemin, Treasurer in
1299: Cartulaire, no. 4469. Delavallo, 'Statuts de l'orde', pp. 350, 351 n. 2, reads
'Bern' and gives him as alive in 1204(1).
39 Three followed (folb 241v-242r) further examples of changes to the Rule.
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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 ordernement 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 1310.43 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.44 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,45 there followed the hospital ordernement 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 Provengal fragment was lost.46 Further variant forms of these same texts also followed the ordernement concerning the hospital in the French translation which was given in Fr. Guglielmo’s first codex but not in the second.47 Thus, even after 1291, there survived traces of texts and information which had possibly been removed

40 Several of these items are similar to those apparently confirmed in 1206: Cartulaire, no. 1193/2.36-7).
41 Cf. Cartulaire, no. 2213 #121-2, 1247.
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 Hospitalier 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 1181/2. 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. These statutes, at one point headed ‘Rygerus’ 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 gesetzt ze Aker’ , 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 hospiters—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. 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,}

---

**Anon. Luttrell**

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,
differed from what were to themselves derived from Fr.

... Rule in the amended form of the various customs of 1181, and of Master Roger of Moulins, were roughly at one point (...)

There were passed before 1262, the auberges -- at Jaffa, Acre 1287 and subsequently ascribed chapters down to 1287. These were used by Fr. Guglielmo, since规矩 Revel which were not in any subsequent corpus, while 46 Munich: Cln 4620, summarily analysed in G. Glauche, Katalog der lateinischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München Cln 4501-4665, rev. edn (Wiesbaden, 1994), pp. 210-14. Lagleder, Die Ordenregel, 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: Cln 4620, fol. 10v, gives 1286, but Cartulaire, no. 4022, prefers 1288, as given in later manuscripts. The Latin of the auberges 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 auberges there are variations between the versions given in Fr. Guglielmo's two codices, in that of Fr. Daniele of Santo Stefano (BN: ms. fr. 1357, 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: Cln 4620, fol. 112'.

45 This version of the Legends, published in RHC, Oc., 5.xxv, 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: Cln 4620, fol. 112'.

46 Munich: Cln 4620, summarily analysed in G. Glauche, Katalog der lateinischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München Cln 4501-4665, rev. edn (Wiesbaden, 1994), pp. 210-14. Lagleder, Die Ordenregel, 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: Cln 4620, fol. 10v, gives 1286, but Cartulaire, no. 4022, prefers 1288, as given in later manuscripts. The Latin of the auberges 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 auberges 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: Cln 4620, fol. 112'.

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

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. 44

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 escorts 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. 45

44 Marseilles: 56 H 4055 no. 1; e.g., where Fr. Guglielmo (Cartulaire, no. 4259 #1) gives Denunciamus, the Marseilles manuscript hasRI TSTVVSCHIE. The suppressed statutes are not in Cartulaire, nos. 4194, 4234, 4259; one is published in Luttrell ‘Gli Ospitalieri’, p. 81 n. 31.
45 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. 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*, 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 Pay. The formal written Rule was established by Raymond of Pay, perhaps in the 1130s; and, according to Lucius III in 1184, it was confirmed by Eugenius III, pope from 1145 to 1153. 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; only the confirmation of 22 August 1185, as given in

---

52 Folda, *Crusader Manuscript Illumination*, p. 45, claims that he was a lawyer; Riley-Smith, *Knights*, p. 32, that he was a knight.
55 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 il 77 milita di San Giovanni Gerolosolitano*, 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.
I 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 Statutes and Customs of the Hospitaller, gives the Klement, 'Le prime tre redazioni', pp. 254-9, also analyses these changes. (Rome, 1781), Appendix, pp. vii-xxxi.

Paoli, privilege from Vat. Lat. 4852, with the Rule, Rule alongside the Latin copy of 1253 which has various additions. The complete text of Lucius's gloss. Light on Early Hospitaller Practices, including the text in his privilege; the Lucius III confirming a written text of Roger of Moulin's hospital on the French province. That copy survived, as did a similar thirteenth-century copy 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.

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


58 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, ratio and subscriptions all in French, is in P.A. Paoli, Dell'origine ed istituuto del sacro militar ordine di S. Giovambattista Geronomilitano (Rome, 1781), Appendix pp. xviii-xlii. Cartulaire, no. 70, ignores the gloss, but Lagleder, Die Ordenregeln, pp. 89-115, gives it in text and facsimile. The Hospitallers' Rule', 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.

59 Cartulaire, no. 2653; supra, p. 1.

60 Supra, pp. 141, 144, 146, 148.

61 Cartulaire, no. 4496.

62 G. Schlumberger, Sigillographic

63 However, Klement, 'Le prime tre a Rule with Raymond's seal which c. Guglielmo did not then see it at Acre, seal nor did he mention the Latin c. on the documents left in Lombard collation of all the texts might clarif; 70, concludes: 'il non es't eure'; Fr. t it cèr paine seiffir que blure deur.
it, perhaps because only then did the clause preceding themy and copied at Acre a version of the Rule and appended extra clauses, perhaps because only then did the clause preceding them survive only in the French version. The Rule was translated from Latin into various elaborations and versions of the later customs of the hospital, as amended in 1206 but in Latin and without the seal of Master Alfonso of Châteauneuf sent a transcript of his copy, which included changes there made. He noted: Je glose en ce livre tant comme la selone quel ytient a son escritment que [est] en lescrit fait contained the Rule as amended. Châteauneuf shows how lists variations given in the thirteenth-century copy of the Rule, 'preceptor Alamanie', any other text being used in the translation of the 1185 text of the Rule, explicitly in view of this loss of apostolicas litteras, regule vestre seriem continentem', and 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.

In 1300, explicitly in view of this loss of apostolicas litteras, regule vestre seriem continentem, 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'. Raymond of Puy did have a seal, 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, presumably 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.

59 Cartulaire, no. 2653; supra, p. 143 n. 39.
60 Supra, pp. 141, 144, 146, 148.
61 Cartulaire, no. 4496.
63 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 pai ne seutf[r] que lautre deurot soufrir se la chose fust prou[e]r'. The 1253 copy reads:

at Strasbourg. 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.

In 1300, explicitly in view of this loss of apostolicas litteras, regule vestre seriem continentem, 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'. Raymond of Puy did have a seal, 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, presumably 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.
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63 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 pai ne seutf[r] que lautre deurot soufrir se la chose fust prou[e]r'. The 1253 copy reads:

at Strasbourg. 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.

In 1300, explicitly in view of this loss of apostolicas litteras, regule vestre seriem continentem, 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'. Raymond of Puy did have a seal, 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, presumably 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.
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63 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 pai ne seutf[r] que lautre deurot soufrir 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, and partly because scribes continually introduced errors, misunderstandings or variations. By 1206 almost nothing, apart from the oldest surviving texts, remained. The Latin version of Lucius III’s privilege of 22 August 1185 given in Bosio, Corpus juris canonici, pp. 730, 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 Hospitalles’ ‘Rula’, pp. 70-4.

The Hospitalles’ first attempt to assemble 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, and partly because scribes continually introduced errors, misunderstandings or variations. By 1206 almost nothing, apart from the oldest surviving texts, remained. The Latin version of Lucius III’s privilege of 22 August 1185 given in Bosio, Corpus juris canonici, pp. 730, 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 Hospitalles’ ‘Rula’, pp. 70-4.
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any date. It is evident from their form that many of the so-called esquets
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 sug-
ggested.' The first twenty esquets are datable before 1239 at latest and
a good many may have been earlier than 1206. 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, the so-called esquets 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, 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. The 1262 chapter general
produced a new partial codification contained in a bulle cartulaire 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.

[46] Cartulaire, no. 2213.
[47] 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.
[50] Cartulaire, no. 2213/2.536 n. 1.
[52] Cartulaire, no. 3039. The Hospital had a ‘vigne neuve’ outside Acre in 1261: BHC, 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 1181/2, 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. 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 Hospital's origin. 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 after 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. Though the Rhodian chancery was at first organized in very rudimentary form, magistral bulls and other documents were registered and by 1365/6 the chancery had an extremely detailed formulary which included

- **The Hospital**

    a Latin version of the *Miracula* could have been lost on Rhodes been destroyed, possibly together mandery, at any time before or even later.

    Subsequent statutes were ad confusion. French was the Hospital's own archives for the Hospital's own archives for the period probably remained on Cyprus, probably being able to have been lost at Acre thereafter, or Temple documents (<sup>19</sup>)

**References and some texts in Luttrell, The Hospitallers in Rhodes, Study IV.**

**19** Barcelona, Arxiu de la Corona d'Artau, Archives of the Order of the Temple, `Manuscrits des Templiers'); `The Miracula of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem in the Order of the Temple' (Catalan, 1st ed. Madrid, 1921).
a Latin version of the \textit{Miracula}. 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. Subsequent statutes were added to the corpus, but with considerable further confusion. French was the Hospital's official language. 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 \textit{exsagfas} and \textit{assonces} 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.

\begin{enumerate}
\item Delaville, \textit{De primo origine, pp. glo-Noeman Miracles'; A. Calvet, de-Jerusalem', France latina 116 John and the Carmelites Elian Coss Cultural Convergences in the his Sixty-Fifth Birthday, ed. M.}
\item \textit{a of Rhodes, Study IV.}
\item \textit{or of St. John of Jerusalem in the Cypress, Rhodes, Greece and the West, letters at Rhodes, 1437-1462', Revue}
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{88} Barcelona, Arxiu de la Corona d'Aragó, Gran Priorato de Catalunya: Armari 24, vol. 13.

\textsuperscript{89} The \textit{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, 4404, 4045, 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. Hietland, "Zum Problem des Templierzentralarchives", \textit{Archivwiss. 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, \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{90} Luttrel, \textit{The Hospitallers in Cyprus}, Study XVII, p. 2, wrongly gives Provençal as the official language.

\textsuperscript{91} Text of 1335 in R. Valentin, 'Redazioni italiane quattrocenteschi de statuti della religione Giornitina', \textit{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 59v-65. Scholars frequently fail to appreciate that the Latin texts of the statutes published alongside the French version in the \textit{Cartulaire} are not the originals but a late, and sometimes anachronistic, translation from the French.
there were other translations into Catalan and Italian. 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. 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. 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 Giacono Bosio in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth
century still survives. 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.

---

82 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.
83 Valetta, National Library of Malta, Archives of the Order of St John [hereafter Malta]: Cod. 359, fol. 96 (kindly communicated by Jörgen Samowsk y).
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