HADRIANUS BARLANDUS AND A CATALOG OF THE COUNTS AND COUNTESSES OF HOLLAND PUBLISHED AT AMSTERDAM BY DOEN PIETERSZ

1. Introduction

In 1997 W. van Anrooij edited and published the results of a large collaborative, interdisciplinary study on the ‘Counts-and-Countesses-of-Holland’ series of portraits which at one time hung in the cloistered gallery of the Benedictine monastery at Egmond. The portraits, painted on wooden panels, were moved in 1578 in order to protect them probably from the effects of the weather, and since then they have hung in the city hall at Haarlem. The Middle Dutch rhymed texts included in the panels underneath the portraits are discussed at length by Van Anrooij, as are other related texts still extant in manuscript form.¹

In addition to the Middle Dutch texts on the painted wooden panels and in manuscripts, Van Anrooij also discussed woodcuts and engravings representing the counts and countesses of Holland, made by a number of artists. One of the earliest series of woodcuts was by the artist Jacob Cornelisz van Oostzanen, published by Doen Pietersz of Amsterdam at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Editions are known which are accompanied by texts in Latin and in French. A number of these woodcuts are preserved at the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam.² Another series of

¹ W. van Anrooij in W. van Anrooij (ed.), De Haarlemse gravenportretten: Hollandse geschiedenis in woord en beeld (Hilversum: Verloren, 1997), pp. 7-45. In the first three chapters Van Anrooij discusses the creation of the series of portraits, their history and the history of the accompanying texts.

² Parts of these woodcuts are sometimes used to illustrate books and articles in learned journals. The practice generally is that the texts are not included; see e.g. Petra J. E. M. van Dam, Vissen in veenmeren: De sluisvisserij bij de Spaarndamse dijk en de ecologische transformatie in Rijnland 1440-1530 (Hilversum: Verloren, 1998), p. 193; Dick E. H. de Boer – Erich H. P. Cordfunke, Graven van Holland: Portretten in woord en beeld (Zutphen: Walburg Press, 1995), p. 106; E. Pluijmen, ‘Jacoba van Beieren als Vorstin’, Spiegel Historiael, 20 (1985), 321-325 (p. 322). For a different, late 16th-century series of
the woodcuts by Jacob Cornelisz, but with French rhymed texts, is preserved at Karlsruhe, Germany. An important fact is that the French language series contains portraits of the counts of Holland from Dirk I, the traditional starting point in the tenth century, to Charles V in the sixteenth. There are nine sheets in all.\(^3\)

However, the same woodcuts by Jacob Cornelisz representing the counts and countesses of Holland but with Latin texts are mentioned only briefly by a number of authors, including Van Anrooij.\(^4\) It is this series of woodcuts made by Jacob Cornelisz van Oostzanen, accompanied by texts in Latin, and published by Doen Pietersz of Amsterdam early in the sixteenth century which is the subject of the present publication.\(^5\)

How many original sixteenth-century prints of the counts and countesses of Holland are still extant is not known, but the number is probably small. Wouter Nijhoff collected and then re-published in their original sizes a large number of sixteenth-century woodcuts, including a considerable number by Jacob Cornelisz. The Print Room at the University of Leiden library has eight of Nijhoff’s reproductions, made in the 1930’s from Jacob Cornelisz’s woodcuts.\(^6\) Four of these reproductions have Latin prose texts underneath the principal figures.\(^7\) The last prints of the counts and countesses of Holland which are accompanied by Middle Dutch texts see R. Groen, ‘Vergissing of vervalsing? Een vergelijking tussen de Haarlemse gravenportretten en de prenten van Hendrick Goltzius’, *Skript. Historisch Tijdschrift*, 26-3 (March 2004), 5-18.


\(^4\) Van Anrooij wrote that the series of prints with Latin texts is reasonably well known (‘redelijk bekend’), and he refers to Kurt Steinbart, *Das Holzschnittwerk des Jakob Cornelisz van Amsterdam* (Burg bei Magdeburg: Hopfer, 1937). Steinbart’s book (in essence a catalog) contains many reproductions of woodcuts, but the author only mentions briefly the ‘Counts of Holland’ series with texts in Latin; p. 72. Similarly, Marijke Carasso-Kok (ed.), *Geschiedenis van Amsterdam tot 1578: Een stad uit het niets* (Amsterdam: SUN, 2004), p. 416.

\(^5\) I thank Prof. Dr. C. L. Heesakkers for his generous help during the preparation of the Latin texts and their translation, and for his advice and counsel. Any shortcomings that may be found are my responsibility. An earlier part of this study is in James P. Ward, ‘A selection of letters, 1507-1516, from the Guelders war’, *Lias*, 29 (2002), 125-151.

\(^6\) Wouter Nijhoff, *Nederlandsche Houtsneden 1500-1550* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1931-1939); with texts by Wouter Nijhoff in co-operation with H. Nijhoff-Seldorff and Max D. Henkel, 2 volumes and 3 large folders with reproductions; Nijhoff, ‘De Graven van Holland’ (with respect to the Latin texts, p. 52).

\(^7\) Leiden, University Library, Prentenkabinet/Print Room, ref. 84-n-xvi; 1931 nijh. (1-3), numbers 297, 225, 226 and 227. I thank the University Library authorities and staff for providing me with copies of the four prints.
print in the series is a reproduction of four regal figures, Mary, duchess of Burgundy, her husband Emperor Maximilian I, their son Philip I of Spain, and his son Charles (V). In this reproduction what remains legible of the texts is a line of print containing their names only. The impression may be gained that in the original sixteenth-century print from which the reproduction was made the texts which had been present have been cut away at some time. A possible explanation for this will be offered below. However, the same plate reproduced by E. S. Jacobowitz and S. L. Stepanek from an original in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, does contain four Latin texts, one for each of the principals. These were transcribed and provided earlier with translations into English. A detail which may be significant for dating the woodcut is that Maximilian is shown wearing the imperial crown, but that Charles V is depicted with a king’s crown. In other words, perhaps, the Catalogus appeared before Charles’ election to emperor in 1519. At the time of Charles’ majority in January 1515 he was referred to in official announcements and correspondence as ‘Prince of Spain’, and in 1516 similar letters referred to him as ‘King of Castille, Leon and Grenada’. The names of counts and countesses of Holland, thirty-two persons in all, who figure in the eight woodcuts, are given in the table.

8 Ellen S. Jacobowitz – Stephanie L. Stepanek, The prints of Lucas van Leyden and his contemporaries (Washington: Nat. Gallery of Art, 1983), pp. 272-273. Inquiries revealed that the print published by Jacobowitz and Stepanek is the only one of the series in the possession of the Metropolitan Museum, New York. I thank Dr Nadine Orenstein, Metropolitan Museum, New York, for this information. In Steinbart, Holzschnittwerk, Table X, No. 42, the same woodcut with Emperor Maximilian and his family is reproduced in a small format (ca. 5 X 3 cm.) The Latin texts have been excised but the names are still legible.

9 Ward, ‘A selection’. Correction: the words ‘per deum’ there on p. 132, line 3 should read ‘pridem’. Therefore, the words ‘by God’s grace’ on p. 132, line 15, should read ‘long since’.


11 By comparison with the French language version (Nijhoff, ‘De Graven van Holland’) ‘Ger…’ is Gertruid, the widow of Floris I, and she is considered to be his successor. ‘Ro…’ is Robert the Frisian, son of the count of Flanders, whom she then married. He is followed by Godefried (‘met de Bult’; ‘Geoffrey with the Hump’), duke of Lorraine; cf.
In total, therefore, twenty biographies or histories are known with certainty, consisting of the Latin texts accompanying the woodcuts. This is despite the fact that the other three prints which are devoid of texts did have sufficient space available for similar biographies.

Questions which are addressed here are: who was the author of the Latin texts, what were his sources, how accurate are the histories of the counts and countesses of Holland described in the Latin texts, and how are they to be evaluated as examples of sixteenth-century historiography. It will be shown here that Hadrianus Barlandus was the author and, briefly, that his main source was probably the so-called ‘Divisiekroniek’ of Cornelius Aurelius (c. 1460-1531). The accuracy of the texts is tested against present day knowledge of primary sources for some of the events described in them, and what early sixteenth-century readers might have hoped to derive from them.

H. P. H. Jansen, Prisma Kalendarium. Geschiedenis van de Lage Landen in Jaargetallen (Utrecht: Spectrum, 1988), pp. 34, 35, 38, 39, 43, and 253-254, where none of these persons is listed in the table of counts and countesses of Holland.

12 These are numbers given to the plates by Nijhoff (n. 3 above). To date, no first plate with Latin text is known which might correspond with the first plate in the series with French texts; hence a hiatus, and difficulties of identification. The second number (297 etc.) is the number which they were given when they were printed and placed in the sequence of several hundred prints which Nijhoff collected and had reprinted in the 1930’s; cf. note 6 above.


14 Following the untimely death of Philip I in Spain, Emperor Maximilian was appointed guardian of his grandson Charles V, and Protector (ruwaard) of the Burgundian-Habsburg dominions. He appointed his daughter, Margaret of Austria, as regent in the Low Countries.
## Table

A Catalog of Woodcuts of the Counts and Countesses of Holland by Jacob Cornelisz van Oostzanen, printed and published by Doen Pietersz at Amsterdam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>No. in folder</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Persons portrayed</th>
<th>Date of reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Arnulph</td>
<td>988-993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Dirk III</td>
<td>993-1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Dirk IV</td>
<td>1039-1049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Florence I</td>
<td>1049-1061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Ger... [sic]</td>
<td>Ro... [sic]</td>
<td>Dirk V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Godefried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>Florence II</td>
<td>Dirk VI</td>
<td>1091-1121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Florence III</td>
<td>1121-1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dirk VII</td>
<td>1157-1190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1190-1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>1203-1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>William I</td>
<td>1203-1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Florence IV</td>
<td>1222-1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>William II</td>
<td>1234-1256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Florence V</td>
<td>John I</td>
<td>1256-1296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John II</td>
<td>1296-1299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William III</td>
<td>1299-1304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1304-1337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>William IV</td>
<td>1337-1345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>1345-1354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>William V</td>
<td>1349-1358(89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>1358(89)-1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>William VI</td>
<td>1404-1417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Jacoba of Bavaria</td>
<td>1417-1433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Philip of Burgundy</td>
<td>1433-1467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Charles of Burgundy</td>
<td>1467-1477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Mary of Burgundy</td>
<td>1477-1482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Maximilian I</td>
<td>1477-1482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Philip I</td>
<td>1482-1506^14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Charles V</td>
<td>1515-1555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final text in the series was devoted to Charles of Habsburg (1500-1558), later Emperor Charles V, who was then still a young man, and there the word ‘Catalogus’ was used to describe the whole series which was dedicated to the prince. This series of woodcuts with Latin texts is referred to in the present publication as the Catalogus comitum Hollandiae to distinguish it from other books by Barlandus which have the same or similar contents (De Hollandiae Principibus), or similar titles (Catalogus Episcoporum Traiectensium).

The main arguments of the texts are the succession of one count or countess of Holland by the next, and the opposition which they encountered, or provoked, in their drive to extend their authority within and beyond Holland’s borders. For the period from the later Middle Ages onwards (1299-1555), J. G. Smit published a detailed study of the problems which successive counts met at their installation (huldiging) in ensuring their personal acceptance, inauguration, and swearing of fealty by their subjects. His study included a glance back to the beginning of the thirteenth century when the succession was disputed between Ada, countess of Holland and her uncle, the later count William I. Smit then moved on to periods in which primary sources become more and more plentiful. A second useful guide to identifying and dating events described in the Latin texts is R. de Graaf’s study of wars in and for Holland in the period 1000 to 1375. For the period throughout the Middle Ages, therefore, many of the events recorded in the Latin texts can be identified and dated accurately with the help of these two authors.15

2. The author of the Catalogus comitum Hollandiae

At first, circumstantial evidence pointed to Alardus of Amsterdam (1491-1544) as author of the Latin prose texts.16 Alardus and the artist Jacob Cornelisz collaborated in the production of a devotional book, published by Doen Pietersz at Amsterdam in 1523, on the Passion of Christ which


16 For an informative and copiously illustrated series of articles on Alardus and his contemporaries see J. F. M. Sterck, ‘Onder Amsterdamsche Humanisten’. Het Boek, 6 (1917), 4-18; 89-107; 165-179; 282-296, and for an introductory article, J. F. M. Sterck, ‘Verzen van Alardus Aemstelredamus op Joan van Scorel’, Het Boek, 3 (1914), 17-22.
contained texts by the former and woodcuts by the latter. This fact led Nijhoff in the 1930’s to propose that Alardus might have been the author of the Latin texts in the ‘Counts of Holland’ series of woodcuts which Nijhoff had in his collection. A. J. Kölker referred to Nijhoff’s supposition, but he was unable to find any evidence for the series itself, or that Alardus was the author of the alleged Latin texts. However, Kölker offered the thought that if they did exist then they should probably be dated to 1523, not 1518, the date usually assigned to them. His reasoning, perhaps, was that ‘The Passion of Christ’ appeared in that year. Kölker also referred to a book with the title, *Libelli III principum Hollandiae*, published by Barlandus at Antwerp in January 1520, but he did not recognize that this might be the same as the *Catalogus comitum Hollandiae* (since he had not seen it), which was supposed by Nijhoff to have been written by Alardus.

The author of the texts, however, was Hadrianus Barlandus (1487-1539), and the *Catalogus comitum Hollandiae* was published perhaps late in 1518 or otherwise early in 1519 (see below). Firstly, the same texts were published under the title *Hollandiae Comitum historia*, with Barlandus as author. Secondly, the texts in the *Catalogus comitum Hollandiae* correspond almost exactly with the passages quoted from it *in toto* by Petrus Scriverius (1576-1660) in the course of his own book and attributed by Scriverius to Barlandus. Scriverius refers, *passim*, expressly to the *Catalogus comitum Hollandiae* by Barlandus.

17 The *Passio Domini nostri* was published on 2 April 1523; Bob De Graaf, *Alardus Amstelredamus (1491-1544): His life and works, with a bibliography* (Amsterdam: Herzberger, 1958), p. 25.


20 For an earlier biography and a list of Barlandus’ then known publications: E. H. J. Reusens, *Biographie Nationale de Belgique*, I (Bruxelles, 1866), coll. 718-722.

21 The following works by Barlandus are in one volume in the University of Leiden library: Hadrianus Barlandus, *Hadriani Barlandi Hollandiae comitum historia et icones: cum selectis scholiis ad Lectoris lucem. Eiusdem Barlandi Caroli Burgundiae Ducis Vita. Item Ultraictensium Episcoporum Catalogus et res gestae. Eiusdem argumenti libellus Gerardo Noviomaco auctore* (Frankfurt: Sigmund Feierabend, 1585); cf. Petrus Scriverius,
In 1938 E. Daxhelet published a study of Hadrianus Barlandus, his life, his work and his personality, which contained a bibliography and discussion of Barlandus’ known publications. Daxhelet described as Barlandus’ ‘premier ouvrage sur l’histoire de nos provinces’ a book entitled *De Hollandiae Principibus*, published at Antwerp in July 1519. In a more recent (2004) assessment of Barlandus as historiographer S. Bijker and R. Stein listed nine of his works, the second of which is *De Hollandiae principibus*, published in July 1519.\(^22\) Daxhelet described the book’s contents in some detail, including the hypothesis that it relied for its information on Cornelius Aurelius’ history of Holland, the *Divisiekroniek*, and that it was reprinted both then and later in the sixteenth century.\(^23\)

Barlandus’ book of July 1519 was dedicated to members of the Egmond family\(^24\), and we recall that the *Catalogus comitum Hollandiae* consisting of woodcuts and texts was dedicated to the young Charles (V) of Habsburg. Furthermore, the *Catalogus comitum Hollandiae* was published in Amsterdam, ostensibly while Emperor Maximilian, who died on 12 January 1519, was still alive (see below). The *Catalogus comitum Hollandiae* and the *De Hollandiae Principibus*, although their contents are largely (but by no means entirely) the same, are two separate publications. It may be, therefore, that the *Catalogus comitum Hollandiae* was the earliest publication containing texts by Hadrianus Barlandus relating to the history of the Low Countries. The presence in the *Catalogus comitum Hollandiae* of the woodcuts by Jacob Cornelisz is its main distinguishing

---


24 The letter of dedication, dated from Louvain on 21 April 1519, contains the phrase ‘quod opusculum in lucem emissurus’, which indicates that the author intended to publish the book, but that it had yet to appear. This was the edition of July 1519; Daxhelet, *Barlandus*, pp. 270-271.
feature. Comparison of the dedicatory texts to Charles V, which are readily available, illustrates some of the similarities and differences between the two publications.25

3. The edition by Petrus Scriverius (Haarlem 1650)

Scriverius in his history of the counts and countesses of Holland quoted extensively from the sources which were available to him.26 One of his sources was the Catalogus comitum Hollandiae, and the quotations which Scriverius used from it are entire; that is to say, he transcribed Barlandus’ Latin passages from the Catalogus comitum Hollandiae complete. Obvious later differences appear to be editorial in nature. They consist in the use of an italic instead of a gothic font in the Frankfurt edition of Barlandus (1585) and a roman font in Scriverius’ book of 1650, normalisation of spelling, changes in capitalisation and spelling of proper names, and with marginal notes by Scriverius providing comment or correction. Some examples will be given below in the transcriptions and in the English translations accompanying the Latin texts.

The three text variations which have been identified in the present investigation differ one from another in detail. It appears that Barlandus or Scriverius, or another editor or editors, augmented some of the Latin texts with material from a book or books by Barlandus which are referred to as Historia comitum Hollandiae and Chronica Ducum, i.e. the chronicle of the dukes of Brabant (see n. 22). The edition of 1585, published at Frankfurt under Barlandus’ name with the title Hollandiae comitum Historia contains words, phrases, entire passages and commentaries in addition to what appeared in the Catalogus comitum Hollandiae. However, it is an easy matter to find the original passages of the earlier version both in the Frankfurt edition of 1585 and Scriverius’ edition of 1650. The various texts await a critical examination and comparison which goes beyond the scope of the present publication.

There is, however, another point to be made from a reading of Scriverius’ histories of the counts and countesses of Holland. It was remarked above that a number of Jacob Cornelisz’ woodcut prints are

25 Ward, ‘A selection’, p. 132; Daxhelet, Barlandus, pp. 271-272, where a longer version of the dedication to Charles which appeared in De Hollandiae Principibus (Frankfurt, 1585) is reprinted.
26 Scriverius, Principes Hollandiae, passim.
devoid of Latin texts even although there was sufficient space provided on the sheets (see Table). Nonetheless, most of the ‘missing’ counts and countesses were duly described by Barlandus in his later books, and the relevant passages are in Scriverius’ book also. A peculiarity, however, is that they are attributed there to Barlandus’ Catalogus comitum Hollandiae! Assuming that this attribution is correct, it implies obviously that there are, or were, copies of the woodcuts complete with Latin texts for all the counts and countesses of Holland, and that Scriverius either possessed or had access to them.

A second point is that in the Frankfurt edition of 1585 Barlandus’ series of counts and countesses begins ostensibly with Dirk I who is named in the first chapter heading. This is the traditional starting point for the counts of Holland, and in the series of woodcuts with French texts Dirk I and Dirk II are indeed the two earliest counts illustrated by Jacob Cornelisz. In fact, however, Barlandus begins the first paragraphs by introducing Charles the Bald (823-877), emperor of the West. Scriverius, referring expressly to the Catalogus comitum Hollandiae by Barlandus, also begins with Charles the Bald. This raises the possibility that in addition to the missing plate no. 1 (see Table) in Nijhoff’s series of woodcuts by Jacob Cornelisz, with portraits of Dirk I and Dirk II and Latin texts, there may be a plate, as yet unrecognized, representing Charles the Bald.

4. Barlandus’ sources

It would be impracticable in the present publication to examine every detail of the Catalogus comitum Hollandiae for clues to Barlandus’ sources, but a few remarks can be made to indicate lines of investigation. In the description of Florence I of Holland, there is the phrase ‘Habent annales’, the annals relate. References to the burials of Arnulph, Dirk III and Dirk IV at Egmond make it appear that the author of the Latin texts

27 For example, in Scriverius’ edition of Principes Hollandiae (Haarlem, 1650): Gertruid, p. 29; Godefried, p. 32; Dirk V, p. 35; Florence II, p. 39; Dirk VI, p. 43; Florence III, p. 45; Dirk VII, p. 49; Florence V, p. 65; John (Jan) I, p. 69; and John (Jan) II, p. 73. In the later sources all the texts can be read conveniently, if desired, without having recourse to medieval contractions used in the Catalogus comitum Hollandiae.


29 Scriverius, Principes Hollandiae, p. 4. For Charles the Bald cf. Jansen, Kalenderium, p. 28.
had access to, or knowledge of the annals of the oldest monastery in Holland, or that he had access to a work which itself reflected the annals of Egmond. There is evidence that the author, emulating the classical historians, had a critical spirit. Examples are when he writes ‘it is believed…’, ‘the annals relate…’, ‘I did not discover the cause…’, ‘even this however is not enough to explain…’, and once he allows himself a personal opinion in describing the opposition which Count Adelbert met: ‘the better party won from the larger’. But did Barlandus search the annals for the earlier period himself or was he quoting from another more readily available source, Aurelius’ history of Holland called the ‘Divisiekroniek’? This may in fact have been the case; ‘… il [Barlandus] avait trop de bon sens pour prétendre qu’il offrait des informations de toute première main. S’il ne l’a pas déclaré formellement dans ses écrits, c’est que l’indication de références n’était pas de rigueur à son époque, où tout le monde, d’ailleurs, connaissait la fameuse ‘Cronycke’ de Hollande’. However, there is evidence from other sources indicating that Barlandus had direct access to historical information in Holland, if he so wished, through his association and friendship with Alardus of Amsterdam and Meinardus Man, abbot at Egmond (see below).

Dates in the Latin texts of the woodcuts are, for the most part, concordant with those in the annals and chronicles of Egmond, and with those

---

30 Editions of the Divisiekroniek which I have examined are: Cornelius Aurelius, Die Cronijcke van Hollandt, Zeelant ende Vrieslant, Antwerp 1530, and the edition published by Aelbrecht Heydricxsz at Delft in 1591. The Delft (post-Reformation) edition of 1591 has a preface in the form of ‘A warning to the Christian Reader’ that the original contains naive and superstitious stories, but that nonetheless the current edition has been printed ‘volgende met alder trouwe van woorde te woorde dat alder corecste vande oude exemplaren dat wy hebben weten te becomen’. For a detailed study of the Divisiekroniek see Karin Tilmans, Historiography and Humanism in Holland in the Age of Erasmus: Aurelius and the Divisiekroniek of 1517 (Nieuwkoop: De Graaf, 1992); translated from Karin Tilmans, Aurelius en de Divisiekroniek van 1517: Historiografie en humanisme in Holland in de tijd van Erasmus (Hilversum: Verloren, 1988).

31 Daxhelet, Barlandus, pp. 99, 125, especially p. 128.

now accepted. The year of Dirk IV’s death and funeral, given as 1048, is the accepted date (1049) if allowance is made for counting the years from Easter, together with the fact that Dirk IV died on 13 January. It is stated in the text that the victory of Florence I over the archbishop of Cologne was in the year 1062, and that it was followed shortly afterwards by Florence’s death. The year of Florence I’s death is now given as 1061. Easter in 1061 fell on 16 April. Florence I died on 28 June, but that was reckoned by the chronist as 1062. Count William II’s death is dated to 28 January [1256], and this corresponds with the date in the Egmond annals.  

Finally, if there were any doubts about the correctness of the data, there is some corroborative evidence from an independent source for the comet seen in Holland in 1018 during the reign of Dirk III. As a guide to individual persons and events footnotes have been added below to some of the English translations as a brief commentary or as an indication for further investigations.

A comparison of the Catalogus comitum Hollandiae with the Divisie-kroniek supports the view that it was the latter which provided Barlandus with much of his information. Two examples from many may suffice to illustrate that. As a first example the status of the countess Ada, surviving daughter of count Dirk VII, has been disputed by historians. Some historians include her as a countess of Holland in her own right, some deny her this status, others hesitate. But Aurelius in the Divisiekroniek did accord Ada the status of countess of Holland, ‘although she ruled for only one year and left no children’. Similarly, Barlandus in his Catalogus comitum Hollandiae included Ada as countess of Holland, although

34 This may have been the large comet which Chinese astronomers sighted on 4 August 1018 and which remained visible for 37 days; John Williams, Observations of comets from B.C. 611 to A.D. 1640: Extracted from the Chinese annals (London: Strangeways and Walden, 1871), p. xxxii (Table) and p. 56. But elsewhere we read: ‘Anno MXVII cometes in modum trabis apparuit per IIII menses’; Otto Oppermann (ed.), Annales Egmundenses (Utrecht: Kemink, 1933), p. 27. Scriverius corrected some of Barlandus’ errors of chronology.
35 Jansen includes Ada as countess of Holland with her husband Louis of Loon, but refers to the contested succession; Kalendariuim, Table on p. 253. See Smit: ‘Ada… weliswaar… gravin… maar…’ in Smit, Vorst en Onderdaan, pp. 93-94; cf. also the ambiguous phrase: ‘overeenkomstig haar status’ (‘in accord with her status’) which was used for after she was imprisoned by her uncle William I; De Graaf, Oorlog om Holland, section ‘De Loonse Oorlog’, pp. 312-321; especially pp. 314-315.
36 Tilmans, Historiography and Humanism, p. 129, n. 41; Tilmans, Aurelius en de Divisiekroniek, p. 83, n. 41.
his description is also short and refers only to the war of succession. Nevertheless, her status was clear because her marriage to the count of Loon meant ‘tantum coniugium’ (‘so great a marriage’) for him that it excited the envy of his rivals.

But on one point at least Barlandus was wrong, and this provides another pointer to the Divisiekroniek as source. Count William I of Holland is described in the Divisiekroniek, incorrectly, as having claimed the crown of Scotland on the death of his uncle William the Lyon of Scotland in 1214. The assertion appears also in the Catalogus comitum Hollandiae. Scrivierius later corrected Barlandus on this point. The background to this story is that in 1162 count Dirk III of Holland married Ada (called Ada of Scotland), a sister of king Malcolm IV of Scotland. This is corroborated by chronicles in Holland and in Scotland. J. A. Kossmann-Putto has commented on the anomaly that the marriage did not fit into the normal pattern of the dynasty of Holland, where the counts as a rule took their brides from the Empire. Malcolm IV died without issue, and count Florence V of Holland asserted later that the right of succession had passed to Ada’s issue. There can be no doubt then that in 1291 Florence V claimed the Scottish crown on those grounds. His claim was taken seriously at that time.


40 In 1291 the three main contenders for the Scottish crown were John Baliol (1249-1315), Robert Bruce (1274-1329) and Florence V of Holland (died 1296). Historians agree that Baliol had the best claim, and indeed with the backing of king Edward I of England he won the legal argument. But Edward in 1296 deposed Baliol after the latter adopted a pro-French policy. This opened the way for Bruce who finally won Scotland’s war of independence. At the time of the succession dispute, in a move which suggests that neither of them was sure of his legal cause, Bruce and Florence V made a written agreement to share the spoils in the event of either of them winning; Grant G. Simpson, ‘The Claim of Florence, Count of Holland, to the Scottish Throne, 1291-2’, The Scottish Historical
One can only speculate on why this story of count William I of Holland having claimed the Scottish crown had credence in Holland at the beginning of the sixteenth century and later. How did it originate, where and when? We need, probably, look no further than courtly circles round count Florence V himself. Significantly, his chronicle writer Melis Stoke did not refer to William I’s claim in the *Rijmkroniek van Holland* written about the beginning of the fourteenth century, but he did express deep resentment towards unnamed advisors of Florence V, following the subsequent failure of the enterprise. It appears to have passed into the national consciousness of a historically interested readership in Holland at a time of incipient nation founding, and it was taken up by Aurelius and Barlandus in the early sixteenth century.

A contributing factor may have been that for a long time there was uncertainty, especially for the earlier years, about events and dates of count William I’s life and reign. But Van Hemert’s remark in the eighteenth century, when he appealed to logic, struck a critical note similar to Scriverius’: ‘Likewise, we do not hesitate to say that everything our chronicles prattle (*beuzelen*) about William being a contender for the kingdom of Scotland are simply illusions’. Van Hemert pointed out that the problem of the succession in Scotland did not exist until it came unexpectedly to a climax towards the end of the thirteenth century in the time of Florence V. By the eighteenth century Holland had made its place in the world and had no need of earlier myths and fables. 

---


42 Van Anrooij, *De Haarlemse gravenportretten*, p. 139, commentary on verses 210-211; cf. ‘Toch is het niet duidelijk of Willem bij de aanvallen in Holland persoonlijk aanwezig was...’, De Graaf, *Oorlog om Holland*, p. 315.


44 But the story of Florence V lives on. A play in English blank verse entitled *Floris, Count of Holland: A play in five acts* (Amsterdam: Polak & Van Gennep, 1976), was published under the name of Niels Kobet, a pseudonym for Frits Bolkestein, from 1999...
5. Barlandus and early sixteenth-century historiography

Apart from this lapse about William I, the standard of accuracy in the Latin texts accompanying Jacob Cornelisz’ woodcuts is as high as that of its sources. By omitting to identify his sources Barlandus does not immediately come up to the level of later sixteenth-century historical writing and criticism, e.g. of Dousa\(^45\), but in any case that was hardly to be expected at that time, and in a publication of that kind.

Nonetheless, the *Catalogus comitum Hollandiae*, with the woodcuts of the counts and countesses and their biographies, provides an attractive and easy entry into the history of Holland, suitable for the tastes and requirements of many readers. In the limited amount of textual space available Barlandus provided in a narrative style a good amount of detailed and adventuresome information and hard fact which was aimed at pleasing and instructing. It may very well have appealed to the readership whom he, and no doubt the printer Doen Pietersz of Amsterdam, envisaged. The words *ad lectoris lucem* in the title of one of Barlandus’ publications (n. 21 above) expressed clearly his educational intentions.

The combination of the texts with the woodcuts still has an appeal which may be likened to that of any number of present day, good popular illustrated history books for young and old. The Latin narrative texts in a clear and direct style might still be read profitably by younger readers and students as adjuncts to learning Latin and to the history of Holland.\(^46\) For older readers they may also have the charm and human interest of *belles-lettres* or even of a novel; see e.g. the story of Floris IV,

---


and how he met his end. The classical style and content of the Latin prose texts in the *Catalogus comitum Hollandiae* should be compared with the rustic style and more limited information contained in the related rhymed Middle Dutch texts, and in the terse French texts which were also accompanied by the woodcuts of Jacob Cornelisz. As Van Anrooij pointed out, the anonymous authors of the Middle Dutch texts had to use valuable space with ‘filler’ lines (‘stoplappen’) in order to maintain the rhyme and rhythm of their stories.\(^47\)

The texts of the *Catalogus comitum Hollandiae* are replete with features and with sentiments which reflect Barlandus’ didactic aims, his preferences and his prejudices. There is, first of all, the subject matter coupled with the choice of a narrative prose style of Latin which underlines the author’s didactic aims. Secondly, there is his remarkable description of Louvain. He was fullsome in his praise of the university, although duke John (Jan) IV of Brabant, Jacoba of Bavaria’s second husband and founder of the university, is not mentioned by name. It can scarcely be doubted that this passage was included purposefully, among other things, to strike a chord of remembrance in those readers who had studied at Louvain, and perhaps to underline that the writer himself was a ‘Louvain’ man. Barlandus wrote a similar eulogy in praise of Louvain and its university in another of his books about that time.\(^48\)

6. Publication date of the *Catalogus comitum Hollandiae*

In an attempt to establish its date of publication attention was directed to the text in the *Catalogus comitum Hollandiae* which describes Emperor Maximilian who, apparently, was still alive when it was written. Maximilian had waged war almost continuously since 1477 when he took on the task of conserving his wife’s inheritance, following her fatal accident, and winning back where he could Burgundian territories which had been lost to France. He had been largely successful in restoring the

\(^47\) Van Anrooij, *De Haarlemse Gravenportretten*, p. 36. Examples in Middle-Netherlands are (p. 38): ‘soo ick bevroeden can’; ‘soo ick versta’, etc.

position of the ruling house in the Low Countries. The events of Maximilian’s regency periods, and his hard-handed suppression of revolts in Flanders and in Holland are alluded to in veiled terms in the Latin text which accompanies his effigy, and this may conceal one of Barlandus’ prejudices against the nobility. After stating that ‘it is neither customary to write of these things, nor whether I should write of all the other things’, the author of the texts continued: ‘for our people do not want anything put into writing, unless very succinctly, concerning those who live by force’. But despite the author’s caution, how remarkable is his closing wish for Maximilian in the Catalogus comitum Hollandiae: that he should live a Tithonian lifetime! With the effigy of Maximilian I as emperor and the representation of Charles V crowned as king, this implies that Maximilian, who died on 12 January 1519, was still living when those lines were first written. It is from this that the publication date of the Catalogus comitum Hollandiae is usually given as 1518.

Bömer described Barlandus as having ‘an Erasmian tendency to satirical expression’, and ‘an irreconcilable hatred of the nobility and of profligate clergy’. Was the Tithonus remark a joke on Barlandus’ part? If it was a joke, then it was a rather dangerous one. Lese-majesty was a capital crime which received the full attention of the imperial jurist Philip Wielant (1441-1520) in the early sixteenth century. Emperor Maximilian


51 Ward, ‘A selection’, 131 and note 14 there. Zeus granted Tithonus, prince of Troy, eternal life at the wish of the goddess Eos whose lover Tithonus was. They both recognized too late that she had wanted him to have eternal youth. Immortal although he now was, he grew older and older. Eos finally out of pity for him, and because of his gnarled limbs, turned him into a grasshopper; see H. C. Ackermann (ed.), Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae, VIII (Zürich – Düsseldorf, 1997), pp. 34-36; Pauly – Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, 2nd Ser., 6 (Stuttgart, 1937), coll. 1512-1519; W. H. Roscher (ed.), Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie, V (Leipzig, 1916-1924), coll. 1021-1029.

52 Bömer, Die lateinischen Schülergespräche, pp. 126-127. In the French text the wish for a long life for Maximilian is expressed more conventionally: ‘Quil poeult longuement vivre… en bonne sante’; Van Anrooij, De Haarlemse gravenportretten, p. 195.

53 Philip Wielant (1441-1520) was a privy councillor and vice-president of the Grote Raad (High Court) at Mechelen; E. Strubbe, ‘Wielant, Philippe’, Biographie nationale,
would no doubt have been happy with a reference to Troy, from whose
dynasty the princes of Europe were only too glad to claim descent. But then
perhaps to Hector or Priamus rather than Tithonus. It will be recalled that
the woodcut with Emperor Maximilian and his family in Nijhoff’s collec-
tion (above) had been mutilated by having the texts cut off. While many
possible reasons could be adduced for removal of the texts, possession of
the print with those jibes directed against Maximilian might have been
regarded as subversive, and that could be the reason why the sixteenth-cen-
tury print was mutilated. In editions of the *Hollandiae comitum Historia*
which appeared in 1585 and 1620 the reference to Maximilian’s use of
force and bloodshed was omitted, and the whole passage much softened.  

7. Epilog

A number of other questions might be asked concerning the sources from
which the *Catalogus* was compiled, and about how and when it came to
be published, but they are only alluded to here. What was the relation-
ship between Alardus of Amsterdam and Hadrianus Barlandus? Kölker
described Barlandus as a protector of Alardus, and that Alardus called

---

54 In the edition of the *Hollandiae comitum Historia* published at Frankfurt in 1585,
p. 275, the remark about Tithonus and the sentiment expressed in n. 50 had been changed
to: ‘Haec tum ab eo adhuc Comite gesta, quae postea gesserit Imperator adeo multa sunt
et varia, ut separatim volumen requirant. Illud solum adjiciam, huius morte Principis nihil
accidere potuisse luctuosius rebus humanis, et utinam sine sanguine huic successorem
inveniat orbis’. Clearly, these words were written after Maximilian’s death, i.e. after
12 Jan. 1519. The author felt a whole book would be needed to describe Maximilian’s
deeds, and he hoped that the world would find a successor to him who was free of blood-
shed. Afterwards, with experience of Charles V, Barlandus softened his opinion of Emperor
Maximilian further when he remarked that the bitterness of the times which followed the
death of Maximilian caused his loss to be felt even more keenly; Michiel Verweij,
‘Geschiedenis van de daden van de hertogen van Brabant door Adrianus Barlandus’ in
Bijsterveld et al. (eds.), *Kroniek van de Hertogen van Brabant*, p. 208. But for the earlier,
Barlandus an experienced historian.\textsuperscript{55} It has been shown elsewhere that Alardus was a frequent visitor to the monastery at Egmond where the abbot, Meinardus Man, was a kinsman of his. Alardus was interested in and well informed about the archives of the monastery and the art treasures there, including the painted portraits of the counts and countesses of Holland.\textsuperscript{56} Barlandus praised Meinardus Man in one of his works.\textsuperscript{57} Did Alardus or Man provide Barlandus with some of the information which is included in the \textit{Catalogus comitum Hollandiae} and the \textit{Historia}, or influence him in his choice?

What was the relationship, if any, between Barlandus and Doen Pietersz, the Amsterdam printer? When we recall that in the same years of the early sixteenth century Doen Pietersz and Alardus of Amsterdam worked together on the production of the ‘Passion of Christ’, was the publication of Barlandus’ texts by Doen Pietersz at Amsterdam an initiative undertaken or supervised by Alardus? Despite prolonged search in contemporary correspondences, histories and travelogues, these questions remain unanswered.

Why, when the initial letters of Gertruid and of Robert the Frisian had been set by the printer (see Table), were these and ten other woodcut portraits of the counts of Holland published without the biographies? Was Doen Pietersz perhaps in haste to get his product onto the market? A possible scenario is that when news of Emperor Maximilian’s death in January 1519 reached Brabant and Holland, Barlandus, or perhaps even Alardus, revised some of the passages in the book which Barlandus was then working on, reducing them in size in order to make them fit the space available under Jacob Cornelisz’ woodcuts. This would provide an explanation for some of the rather abrupt transitions in the texts of the \textit{Catalogus comitum Hollandiae}.\textsuperscript{58} That would then place the publication date of the \textit{Catalogus comitum Hollandiae} in January 1519, or soon thereafter.\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{55} Kölker, \textit{Alardus}, p. 45. In a letter to John Valladolid (Valeolaetus) from Louvain dated 5 Jan. 1520 Alardus wrote ‘Hadrianum Barlandum, virum non minus integrum, quam literatum, in quo nullam consummati historici laudem desideres’; Daxhelet, \textit{Barlandus}, letter no. 35, pp. 277-281; p. 278.

\textsuperscript{56} For Alardus of Amsterdam and his relationship to the monastery at Egmond see De Graaf, \textit{Alardus}, pp. 13-14, 19, 30-31 and 34; Kölker, \textit{Alardus}, pp. 11 and 20.

\textsuperscript{57} Daxhelet, \textit{Barlandus}, p. 99; cf. p. 277.

\textsuperscript{58} Examples of abrupt transitions are the item on Jacoba of Bavaria in which her husband duke John (Jan) IV of Brabant is not named directly, and the item on Philip the Good into which the Dauphin is introduced without prior explanation.

\textsuperscript{59} Following 12 Jan. 1519, Emperor Maximilian’s body was displayed on public for two days, and news of his death spread quickly to Venice, Rome and Paris; Wiesflecker,
Finally, it seems remarkable that Scriverius in his own book of 1650 refers to and quotes from the ‘Catalogus comitum Hollandiae’ rather than to subsequent editions with similar titles published at Antwerp in 1519 and at Frankfurt in 1585. This may be a reflection of the value which he and others still placed on the ‘Catalogus’, with its impressive complement of woodcuts by Jacob Cornelisz. A closer reading of the various texts and a possible future discovery of the still missing first plate with Dirk I and Dirk II of Holland (cf. Table and n. 12) may some day help to resolve these questions.

In conclusion, the authorship of the texts in the Catalogus comitum Hollandiae is known with certainty. As Petrus Scriverius and others knew formerly, it is the work of Hadrianus Barlandus (1487-1539). The Catalogus together with woodcuts by Jacob Cornelisz van Oostzanen was printed and published at Amsterdam by Doen Pietersz, perhaps before the publication of Barlandus’ similar book Hollandiae comitum Historia at Antwerp in July 1519.

8. Texts by Hadrianus Barlandus in a Catalog of the Counts and Countesses of Holland, with woodcuts by Jacob Cornelisz van Oostzanen, and published by Doen Pietersz at Amsterdam

Punctuation has been added. Contractions have been resolved using accepted spellings. Spelling variants which occur in the texts are given without change or comment (c/t, pre/prae, fel/foe, fl/ph, e for ae in genitives, datives and plurals). Original printing errors have been corrected and they are referred to in footnotes. Additional references to Aurelius and the Divisiekroniek, and information about persons and events identified is included in footnotes accompanying the translations. 

Kaiser Maximilian I, IV, 430-432. Guillaume Budé, writing from Paris to Erasmus at Louvain in a letter dated 1 Feb. 1519 remarked briefly on effects which the emperor’s death was already having in France; R. A. B. Mynors – D. F. S. Thomson – Peter G. Bietenholz (eds.), The Correspondence of Erasmus: Collected Works of Erasmus (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1982), VI, 236.

Count Arnulph: Arnulph, the third count of Holland, succeeded his father Dirk [II]. Almost all his life he waged war against the Frisians. At the very end he was killed when overcome by them in a serious battle in an area of West Friesland. This caused very great sorrow among his followers who, when he had been carried lifeless to Egmond, placed him in the tomb of his forefathers. He reigned for only five years, but with the greatest honour, although he was overwhelmed by continuous storms of wars and unsettled by the secret treacheries of his enemies.\textsuperscript{61}

\textit{De Arnulpho comite}: Arnulphus tertius Hollandie comes Theodrico patri successit, qui cum tota fere vita cum Phrisiis bella gessisset, ad postremum etiam gravi proelio in quodam Westphrisie agro ab iisdem superatus occiditur, non sine maximo dolore suorum, a quibus et ipse Haecmondam examinis deportatus in maiorum conditoris reponitur. Quinquennio tantum prefuit sed summo cum honore, sed perpetuis bellorum procellis obrutus, sed clanculariis inimicorum insidiis exagitatus.

Dirk III: Following the death of his father Arnulph, Dirk, the third of this name, ruled Holland. During his sovereignty a comet shone in that region for many days. It was followed by the Utrecht war [1018] in which


\textsuperscript{62} Text: ‘filii’.
many prominent leading men were killed on both sides. Even Adelbold, the bishop of the place, was captured and taken to Holland. There at the command of the count he remained in close custody for a long time because he rejected the conditions which were offered to him. It is believed that the chief cause of that war was because the Frisians, with Adelbold urging them on, had rebelled. Afterwards, in order to avenge his father’s violent death, Dirk marched against them with very large forces, burnt their farm houses, laid waste their fields far and wide, and in a short time made the whole region subject to himself. And after he had placed his younger son Florence in command of those conquered in the war, he himself led his victorious army back to Holland. Afterwards he also went to Jerusalem so that he might visit the Holy Sepulchre as he had vowed. He died on the return journey and his body was placed in the tomb of his forefathers at Egmond. He governed for forty-six years.

De Theodrico quarto: Post defunctum patrem Theodericus quartus comes fuit qui Leodii, quo ludorum gratia cum multis aliis variarum regionum principibus venerat, homicidio perpetrato trepidus urbem relinquere coactus est. Nec sic quidem tutus. Nam alii principes, qui cedem nobilis viri cupiebant vindicare, cum ingenti armatorum manu fugientem usque in Hollandiam sunt insequiti. Dordraci, quam urbem per prodigionem occupaverant, cruento certamine dimicatum, occisis una nocte quadringentis nobilibus. Defunctus ea pugna, Theodricus mane post solis ortum animo satis ocioso deambulaturus, telo in femore ictus ab hostibus, qui nocte superiore effugerant, biduo tantum supervixit. Haecmunde sepultus anno mxlviii.

Dirk IV: After the death of his father, Dirk IV was count of Holland. At Liege, where he had gone together with many other noblemen from several countries for the sake of the tournaments, after he killed a man there he was forced to leave the city in a state of nervousness. But he was not safe even then. For with a large armed force the other princes, who wanted to avenge the murder of the nobleman, followed the fugitive right into Holland. At Dordrecht they seized the city by treachery and a bloody battle was fought, when in a single night four hundred nobles were killed. When Dirk had finished the battle, early in the morning just after sunrise

63 See also De Graaf, *Oorlog om Holland*, pp. 96-103.
64 De Graaf, *Oorlog om Holland*, pp. 73 and 97.
65 Dirk III reigned as count of Holland from 993-1039. He was succeeded by his two sons, first Dirk IV and then the younger son Florence I; articles on Dirk I to Dirk VI incl. in *NNBW*, I, 718-720; Jansen, *Kalendarium*, p. 35.
66 Text: ‘affugerant’.
he was about to take a walk, quite at his ease, when he was struck in the thigh by a missile from his enemies who the previous night had fled, and he survived only two days more. He was buried at Egmond, anno 1048.

De Florentio comite: Cum Theodricus sine prole decessisset, frater eius Florentius ex Phrisia in Hollandiam accersitus rei publice gubernacula suscepit. Huius successibus externi principes aliquot, archiepiscopus Coloniensis, antistes Leodinus et Lambertus comes Lovaniensis, invidentes contraxerunt exercitum, quo novum comitem principatu deturbarent. Quod ubi ad Florentium permanasset, statim ex consilio senis cuiusdam qua hostem venturum credebatur factas clam noctu ingentes foveas, ut, quo intendebat dolus, procederet, feno et stramine operuit; in quas egressi hostes cum incidissent, accurrit sine mora Florentius qui magna prius edita cede multos abduxit captivos, inter quos erat comes Lovaniensis, quem postea grandi pecunia redemptum dimisit incolumem. Haec victoria comitis tantum abfuit ut archiepiscopum Coloniensem deterruerit ut non multis indeannis interiectis cum universo exercitu in Hollandiam redierit, cui effuse vastanti occurrit cum non penitenda suorum manu Florentius leviQue pugna hostem fundit. Multi in eo proelio cecidere; reliqui capti qui etate aut alia re impediti fugere non potuerunt. Fuit annus ille quo Florentius eam victoriam adeptus est humane salutis secundus et sexagesimus superius millesimum. Habent annales hunc eundem principem non multo post superatum archiepiscopum sub arbore quadam, currendo an pugnando dubium est, defessum sedisse ibique interemptum ab his qui superiore proelio salutem fuga quesierant. Praefuit vero Hollandie annis xiii.

Count Florence [I]: When Dirk [IV] had died without offspring, his brother Florence who was summoned to Holland from Friesland undertook the government of the state. His successes aroused the envy of several foreign princes, the archbishop of Cologne, the bishop of Liege and Lambert, count of Louvain. They assembled an army with which they might deprive the new count of his sovereignty. When Florence received this news he at once took advice from a certain old man about which route the enemy was believed about to take. Then secretly in the night he dug very large ditches which were intended as a trap, and covered them with hay and straw. The enemy, when they arrived, fell into them. Florence hurried there without delay. When he had first carried out great

67 ‘geschoten door zijn dye’, Aurelius, Divisiekroniek, Delft 1591, p. 70; Roefs, De Egmondsche Abtenkroniek, p. 127; Jansen, Kalendarium, p. 35, gives anno 1049. The date of Easter in 1049 was 26 March, and the date of Dirk IV’s death was 13 January, which by the reckoning of the time was 1048. See also De Graaf, Oorlog om Holland, p. 104. Dirk IV’s skeleton has not been found at Egmond; Dijkstra, Stamboom in been, pp. 99, 107, 137.
slaughter he led away many captives, among whom was the count of Louvain. Afterwards Florence sent the count back again unharmed after a large ransom had been paid for him. This victory of count Florence was not enough to deter the archbishop of Cologne from returning to Holland not many years later with a whole army. Florence, and his army which welcomed the chance, hastened to meet the archbishop who was plundering far and wide, and they vanquished him in an easy battle. Many were killed in that battle. The others were captured, who because of age or from some other cause were hindered and unable to flee. Florence won that victory in the year of salvation one thousand and sixty two. The annals relate how this same prince, not long after he had overcome the archbishop, was sitting tired under a tree. It is not known whether he had been running or fighting. He was killed there by those who in the previous battle had sought their safety in flight. He governed Holland for fourteen years.68

De Ada. Ada superioris Theodrici filia mortuo patre nupsit illustri viro Lodovico comiti Loonensi cui cum tantum coniugium a finitimis quibusdam principibus invideretur, magni bellorum motus in Hollandia orti vix tandem post multam cedem resederunt.

Ada: When Ada, daughter of the above Dirk [VII]69, her father having died, married the nobleman Louis, count of Loon, such a great marriage was envied by some neighbouring leading men, and great warlike seditions which arose in Holland only subsided at last after much slaughter.70

68 ‘Ende door raet ende ingeven eens ouden Edellen… graven ende putten… delven’, Aurelius, Divisiekroniek, Delft 1591, fol. 71-71v. The tree under which Florence sat was a willow, and the year 1061; ‘dormiens… sub umbra salicis…’, Roefs, De Egmondsche Abtenkroniek, p. 128; ‘fessus ex itinere sub umbra arboris saligne…’, Oppermann, Annales Egmundenses, p. 29; ‘heeft hi hem terneder gestelt te leggen rusten des middages onder enen willigen boom…’, Aurelius, Divisiekroniek, Antwerp 1530, p. 114. Accepted dates for Florence I’s government are 1049 to 1061, thirteen years if counted inclusively. The discrepancy is caused by the practice of dating years from Easter. Dirk IV was killed on 13 Jan. 1049, which was 1048 by the reckoning of the times. Forensic evidence for the violent deaths of Arnulph, Florence I, Florence IV, Florence V and William II is given by Dijkstra, Stamboom in been, passim. For Florence I see Dijkstra, Stamboom in been, pp. 112-113.

69 There is no text accompanying the woodcut of Dirk VII in the Nijhoff copy at the University of Leiden. But from this remark it is clear that it was intended that there should be one.

70 NNBW, I, 10; Cordfunke, Gravinnen van Holland, p. 71; Jansen, Geschiedenis Middeleeuwen, pp. 295-296; Jansen, Kalendarium, p. 44; Smit, Vorst en Onderdaan, pp. 93-94; De Graaf, Oorlog om Holland, pp. 312-321.

William [I], the brother of Dirk VII: William, count of East Friesland, took over the government from his niece Ada. He destroyed several of the enemy’s fortresses, and Dordrecht in his own county was burnt by the people of Utrecht. I did not discover the motive for that destruction.\textsuperscript{73} Peace was agreed at last between the Hollanders and the people of Utrecht, such that count William who had afflicted them at first with much greater misfortune paid one thousand talents of silver to the bishop. When William heard of the death of his uncle Malcolm [IV], king of Scots, whereby he thought that the kingdom rightfully reverted to him, he assembled a fleet with which, when he entered Scotland, he destroyed many fortresses. But when he received news that count Louis of Loon was ravaging Holland by fire and sword, lest he [William] might lose a certain and already won county for an uncertain kingdom, he led his victorious ships back home. He attacked Louis who was marauding without hinder through the regions of Holland, and he vanquished him with much slaughter. He died in the nineteenth year of his rule in Holland and the twenty-sixth in Friesland.\textsuperscript{74}


\textsuperscript{72} ‘Undevigesimo’ in Scriverius’ edition where a number of other barbarisms have been corrected; Scriverius, Principes Hollandiae, p. 53.

\textsuperscript{73} The use here of the first person (‘non invenio’) need not refer to Barlandus, because Aurelius in the Divisiekroniek also used the first person (‘ik’) whenever he wished.

\textsuperscript{74} Articles on William I to William VI of Holland in NNBW, X, 1210-1214. Dates given for William I’s government in Holland are 1203 to 1222; see also De Graaf, Oorlog
Florence IV: His son Florence, the fourth of that name, became count from that time. He was second to none of the previous princes in his skill at fighting. The wife of the count of Claremont became aroused by the greatness of his deeds, and so she wore her husband down on purpose with requests to organize a tournament, thinking the result would be that Florence because of his keenness to fight would come with his supporters. A day was fixed for the contest, and on that day when Florence came, for whose sake alone that splendour had been organized, the joyful woman went up to the higher part of the residence so that from an upper floor window she might view the count of Holland in combat. When she then spoke repeatedly in his praise, her suspecting husband, when the betrayer of his marriage bed was paraded before his eyes, went down to the place of the tournament after armed men had been secretly assembled, and he slew Florence who was unaware of everything.\textsuperscript{76}
William II: When Florence [IV] was killed his son William was not yet ripe for the administration. Although he was only six years old the county of Holland remained safe for him, until he was more mature, in the guardianship of his uncle Otto, bishop of Utrecht. This William was much more devoted to the study of weapons than to wealth. Still beardless and while scarcely twenty years old he was elected King of the Romans. When he was conveyed to Liege by his blood relative the bishop of that place, the whole of the clergy came out of the city in procession to pay him honour. At about the same time he stayed several days with the archbishop of Trier and then afterwards he returned to Holland. He arranged for an assembly not far from Delft at which Hollanders and Zeelanders could report their affairs. The place is called The Hague. Meanwhile, when he was informed that the peace of Holland was being disturbed by a rebellion of the Frisians he returned with a large force of soldiers and fought them twice; once immediately on his arrival, and here the Frisian army was beaten by the royal forces. Likewise, shortly afterwards on 28 January [1256] when the daily frost had made all the ways passable

77 This may be a reference to efforts which William II made to free himself from his feudal lord, the count of Flanders in matters pertaining to Zeeland. The period may have been about 1253 when on 4 July William II’s brother won a battle for him at West-Kapelle; cf. M. de Waha – J. Dugnoille, ‘De Avesnes en Holland vóór 1299’ in Dick E. H. De Boer et al. (eds), 1299: Een Graaf, Drie Graafschappen. De vereniging van Holland, Zeeland en Henegouwen (Hilversum: Verloren, 2000), pp. 23-35; especially pp. 26-28; Jansen, Kalendarium, p. 45.
he entered Friesland again and was killed before the beginning of the battle, having completed twenty-nine years in administering the state.\textsuperscript{78}

\textit{De Guilielmo quarto}: Guilielmus accepto a patre comitatu statim cum delecta armatorum manu in Hispaniam transgressus, ut regem assidua cum Turcis Saracenisque bella gerentem auxiliis adiuverat, pugnando obiectandoque se periculis in tantam brevi claritudinem evasit, ut Hispanis eque ac militi suo gratissimus esset. Postea reversus in Hollandiam ut commodius Phrisiam subigeret. Traiectum oppugnare adortus nobilium, quos apud se habebat, rogatu, civibus has breves et duntaxat paucorum mensium pacis redimende conditiones dedit, ut nudatis plantis adapertisque capitibus egressi quingenti ad comitis pedes humiliter prostrati veniam poscerent. Quod cum ita factum esset, movit inde in Phrisios comes, ubi, dum nimia fines imperii propagandi cupiditate fortius dimicat, occiditur.

William IV: William when he had received the sovereignty from his father went to Spain with a chosen band of soldiers in order to help the king who was fighting constantly with the Turks and Saracens. By fighting and exposing himself to danger he rose in a short time to such renown that he was equally pleasing to the Spaniards and to his own men. Afterwards, when he returned to Holland, in order more easily to restrain the Frisians, he attacked Utrecht at the request of the nobles whom he had with him. To the citizens he offered these short conditions, granted only for a peace of a few months: that five hundred of them should come out, lay themselves at the count’s feet and humbly beg for pardon. When that had been done, the count marched from there against the Frisians where he fought strongly because of his exaggerated desire to extend the limits of his command, and he was killed.\textsuperscript{79}

\textsuperscript{78} For William II’s accession while still ‘een kint van zes iaren’: Aurelius, \textit{Divisiekroniek}, Delft 1591, fol. 96. William II reigned in Holland from 1234 to 1256. He was elected King of the Romans in 1247 and crowned at Aachen in 1258. The date of his death is given here as 28 Jan. (‘quinto [ante] calendas Februarias’) in agreement with the Egmond chronicle; Roefs (ed.), \textit{De Egmondsche Abtenkroniek}, p. 164. For details of the final battle see De Graaf, \textit{Oorlog om Holland}, pp. 229-235, and for the examination of William II’s remains found at Middelburg, Dijkstra, \textit{Stamboom in been}, pp. 131-134.

\textsuperscript{79} William IV was count of Holland from 1337 to 1345; \textit{NNBW}, X, 1213. That he fought at Granada in Spain in 1338 is in Aurelius, \textit{Divisiekroniek}, Delft 1591, fol. 119v. William IV went to Prussia on the so-called ‘winter journey’ crusading against the Lithuanians in 1336-7, 1343-4 and 1344-5; Werner Paravicini, \textit{Die Preussenreisen des europäischen Adels} (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1989), I, 56-57, with references to documentary sources; Norman Housley, \textit{The later crusades, 1274-1580: From Lyons to Alcazar} (Oxford: OUP, 1992), pp. 342 and 347. William IV also went to the Holy Land in 1343-44 (\textit{NNBW}). He besieged Utrecht in June and July 1345, and he was killed in Friesland in
De Margareta: Postquam in humanis esse desiisset Guilielmus, neque proles, que patri mortuo succederet, superesset, devolutus est comitatus ad sororem eius Margaretam, Lodovici Romanorum imperatoris coniugem, que exquisitissimo apparatu in Hollandiam descendens, filio suo Guilielmo hac conditione tradit eam gubernandam ut quotannis ille matri certam pecunie quantitatem dependeret. Quae Phrisii per id tempus habebant bona in Hollandia, ut fratris Guilielmi cedem uliscerezetur, Margareta publice vendidit. Traiectensibus aliquot mensium inducicie date; his rebus transactis rediit in Bavariam Ludovici coniunx. Nec interea Traiectenses quieverunt, exacto indiciarum tempore praeter omnium expectationem cum exercitu Hollandiam ingressi. Sed hunc tumultum statim compresserunt nove belli ferie. Post hec reverse ex Bavaria matri Margarete Guilielmus comitatum restituit, quam rerum mutationem exceptit bellum quod cum Traiectensibus Hollandi ut coetera pleraque foeliciter admodum gessere.

Margaret: When William died without leaving offspring to succeed him, the sovereignty passed to his sister, the wife of Louis, the Holy Roman Emperor. She came to Holland with a most splendid retinue [1346], and transferred the government of Holland to her son William [1349] on condition that he should pay his mother a certain sum of money annually. In order to avenge her brother William’s violent death, Margaret sold by public auction the possessions of Frisians who at that time had goods in Holland. After a truce of several months had been given to the people of Utrecht, Louis’ wife returned to Bavaria when those affairs had been completed. Meanwhile, however, the people of Utrecht were not quiescent when the truce expired, because unexpected by everyone they entered Holland with an army. But new truces supressed this uprising at once. After this Margaret came back from Bavaria, and William returned control to her [in March 1350]. War with the people of Utrecht followed on this change in the situation, which the Hollanders as on numerous other occasions waged very successfully.⁸⁰

⁸⁰‘heeft doen confisqueren ende toeslaen alle de goeden, landen ende renten der Vriesen’, Aurelius, Divisiekroniek, Delft 1591, fol. 123; NNBW, I, 1299. Margaret’s reign lasted from 1345 till 1354. The quarrels between her and her son William were important for the political future of Holland. His supporters assumed the name ‘Codfish’ (‘Kabeljauwen’), perhaps from the fish-like design of white and blue fields in his coat-of-arms, and her supporters, to complete the imagery, took the name ‘Hooks’ (‘Hoeken’); see William’s coat-of-arms in Illustrations 3 and 4. In succeeding generations these parties, with the city elites generally supporting the ‘Codfish’ and the nobility supporting the
De Guilielmo quinto: Guilielmus, defuncta matre, inivit Hollandie administrationem. Hic principes\textsuperscript{81} Traiectensium agros ingressus, omnia circa urbem hostiliter populi adortus, qua re irritatus antistes cum ingenti exercitu veniens non multo post in Hollandiam opida duo vi capta incendit; Guilielmi huius principatu urbis Harleimensis bona pars deflagravit. Sed nec hoc quidem satis constat, unde tam ingens sit conflatum incendium. Incidit Guilielmus cum annis septem preuisset in frenesim, quo morbo implicitus, cum hominem etiam sua manu interfecisset, vinctus in custodiam datur.

William V: William, after the death of his mother [23 June 1356] entered into the government of Holland. He invaded the most important territories of Utrecht and aggressively attacked and ruined everything around the city. Because of this the bishop was aroused, and coming into Holland with a very large army not long afterwards he set fire to two towns in Holland which he had taken by force.\textsuperscript{82} A good part of the city of Haarlem burnt down during William’s government. But not even this, however, is clear enough to explain how such a huge conflagration arose. When William had governed for seven years he became mad, and confused by his sickness, when he had killed a man with his own hands, he was restrained and kept in captivity.\textsuperscript{83}

De Adelberto: Resuscitata deinde contentio, iis ut frenetici comitis uxor, aliis ut Guilielmi ex utroque parente frater Adelbertus succedaret adnientibus. Vicit, quod rarum est, melior pars maiorem, et missi qui evestigio Adelbertum, qui tunc aberat in Bavaria, adirent, rogarentque ut, quando frater mentis compos esse desiisset, ipse descenderebat administraturus rem publicam. Audita legatione, Adelbertus in Hollandiam transgressus a suis officiosissime excipitur. Qui postea a Delfensibus illatam sue maiestati iniuriam vindicaturus, cum aliquamdiu eorum urbem infestis armis circumsedisset, ibi rogatus, ut, priusquam scalas muro admovearet, obessorum animos tentaret, qua erat clementia, respondit se nihil facturum hostile si abiectis armis supplices
veniam peterent. Quo facto, edicit continuo suis Adelbertus ut suppli-
cibus parcerent; urbis tamen muri nihilo secius diruti sunt, ne deinceps
unquam rebellarent. Egressus inde comes in Gheldriam laccessitus,
prede et populationis omnia complevit.

Adelbert: When the dispute [about the succession] was revived, some
people were pressing for the wife of the demented count to succeed him,
and others for Adelbert, William’s full brother. Then something rare hap-
pened; the better party won from the larger. People were sent to track
down Adelbert who was in Bavaria, and to ask him to accept the govern-
ment because his brother [William V] had ceased to be rational. When
he had heard the embassy, Adelbert crossed into Holland and was recei-
ved most ceremoniously by his supporters. Afterwards, when he was
about to avenge an insult done to his dignity by the people of Delft he
besieged their city for a considerable time with an attacking army.54 He
was entreated there to test the minds of the besieged citizens before
moving ladders to the wall, and with the clemency that was his own he
replied that he would do nothing inimical if they threw down their arms
and as suppliants begged for pardon. When this had been done he orde-
red his people immediately to spare the suppliants. Nonetheless, howe-
ver, the walls of the city were broken down lest they should rebel anot-
her time. When the count after he was provoked marched from there into
Gelderland he plundered and destroyed everything.

De Guilielmo sexto: Patri Adelberto Guilielmus filius substituitur, qui
Gheldriam semel et iterum tumultuose ingressus fede eam populatus
est, sed mutatis rebus tantus hic fuit postea Reinaldi Ghelrie ducis
amicus quantus antea fuerat hostis. Biennio post Phrisones Hollandie
agrum ut sepe alias hostiliter invaserunt, cuius ultionem inuiure
Guilielmus maioribus curis tunc occupatus in aliu tempus distulit. Hic
dem concilio indicto, ad quod multi Hollandie principes sunt profecti,
egit in eo de surroganda sibi post mortem unica filia. Quod cum omni-
bus placuisset, statim confecte sunt super ea re publice littere. Eodem
anno comes in morbum incidit quo in dies magis invalescente acer-
siri iubet sacerdotem; cui cum de contractis tota vita noxii christiano
ritu confessus esset medio dolore consumptus est, anno sue guberna-
tionis tertio decimo.

54 NNBW, V, 25. The inauguration of Albert (Adelbert) was disputed at Delft, and the
siege of Delft described here lasted several months; Aurelius, Divisiekroniek, Antwerp
1530, fol. 222v; Delft 1591, fol. 131v; De Graaf, Oorlog om Holland, pp. 327-331. See
Smit, Vorst en Onderdaan, p. 132, n. 223, where there is a line from a chronicle by an ano-
nymous writer, ‘Die van Delf, die zeider tieghen’.
William VI: Adelbert’s son William succeeded him. He invaded Gelderland again and again violently, and shamefully laid it waste. But things changed, and afterwards he became as much the friend of Reinald, duke of Gelderland, as he had been his enemy before. Two years later the Frisians aggressively invaded the territory of Holland as so often at other times, but William, who was preoccupied by other worries at that moment, put off avenging the insult to another day. He convened an assembly to which many of the leading men of Holland came, and there he negotiated that his only daughter should succeed him after his death. When this proved agreeable to everyone, letters of state about the agreement were immediately drawn up [15 August 1416]. That same year the count fell ill, and daily growing weaker he ordered a priest to be summoned, to whom, following the Christian rite, he confessed the sins he had committed throughout his lifetime. Then consumed by pain he died in the thirteenth year of his reign [31 May 1417].


86 Text: ‘Brerodororum’. The family Brederode claimed to be descended from count Arnulph of Holland, the founder of the dynasty.

87 Text: ‘mutulm’.
Jacoba: Jacoba assumed the government on the death of her father. When she heard that Gorinchem, a stronghold in Holland, had been seized by William of Arkel she immediately ordered the nobleman Walraf of Brederode to go there with a readily armed force in order to suppress the uprising at once on his arrival. A little afterwards there was fierce fighting within the walls, and both the leaders were killed [Dec. 1417].

Shortly after when the duke of Brabant too was delighted, I think, by the pleasantness of Louvain, he founded a school of learning in that city, where the liberal arts were taught for the public good. Furthermore, this so distinguished Academy (and up to this moment I do not know of any similar institution whatsoever more busily attended and, not to say more than that, surely in any (as they call it) faculty you may like) grew large in the course of time and still continues to grow more than could be believed possible. Many men devote themselves here actively to the study of law and medicine, and more of them to the study of sacred theology. Eloquence and literatur are the concern of many others who are convinced that higher disciplines beyond eloquence and literature can no less be approached successfully and learned precisely. Jacoba, because she had no offspring, transferred authority of Holland to Philip of Burgundy, her maternal cousin.

De Philippo comite: Philippus, accepto a nepte comitatu Hollandie, cum esset ob quasdam res infenso in regem Anglorum animo Calisiam in Flandrorum finibus sitam urbem tanta armatorum manu obsedisse dicitur, ut soli aurige qui bellica instrumenta aliaque ad miliciam necessaria eo adixerant sufficeri potuerint ad urbem expugnandum. Philippus postea in Haga comitis primus Aurei Velleris habuit comitia. Filium suum, cui Davidi nomen, manibus ac pedibus reluctantibus gementibusque atque invitis Traiectensibus, etsi universo Hollandie milite multum maxime tamen exercitatissimis Amstredamorum copiis non instrenue adiutus, antistitem urbis fecit. Hoc etiam adnitenre Lodovicus Delphinus Gallie principatum est adeptus. Et Philippus cum per hac aliaque virtutis opera quatuor et triginta annos comes Hollandie fuisse, Brugis morbo gravi affectus vita decessit.

88 See article ‘Walraven van Brederode’ in NNBW, X, 136.
89 A bracket of parenthesis is missing, and so one has been added here.
90 Jacoba and Philip the Good were full cousins, grandchildren of Philip the Bold, duke of Burgundy; NNBW, VI, 841; Smit, Vorst en Onderdaan, p. 174; Jansen, Kalendarium, pp. 55, 59, 60; Geschiedenis Middeleeuwen, pp. 479-480. Elsewhere, Jacoba of Bavaria is called Jacqueline of Holland. Her second husband John (Jan) IV was installed as duke of Brabant in 1425.
Count Philip: Philip, when he received the county of Holland from his cousin, was hostile towards the king of England for some reason. It is said that he besieged Calais [1436], a city situated in the territory of Flanders, with such a large force that the wagon drivers alone who transported weapons and supplies to the military there would have been enough to conquer the city.\footnote{‘dat alleene die waghenaers…’, Aurelius, *Divisiekroniek*, Delft 1591, fol. 169v. In 1435 Philip the Good of Burgundy revoked his treaty of alliance with the English king Henry VI after king Charles VII of France atoned by the treaty of Arras/Atrecht for the murder of Philip’s father, John the Fearless. The English retaliated with a trade embargo, and hence Philip’s (abortive) attack on Calais in 1436. For another description of the siege of Calais by Barlandus see Verweij’s translation in Bijsterveld et al. (eds.), *Kroniek van de hertogen van Brabant*, p. 143. See also Richard Vaughan, *Philip the Good: The Apogee of Burgundy* (London: Longman, 1970), pp. 75-82. For the Knights of the Golden Fleece ‘inden Haghe vergadert wesende’: Aurelius, *Divisiekroniek*, Delft 1591, fol. 177.} Philip afterwards was the first count to convene the Order of the Golden Fleece at The Hague. He made his son, whose name was David, bishop of Utrecht where the people resisted with tooth and nail, moaning and unwilling.\footnote{Verweij, *Kroniek van de hertogen van Brabant*, pp. 147-148.} However, he was helped greatly in this by the whole of the military of Holland, and especially by the exertions of the very well trained forces of Amsterdam. Louis, the crown prince of France, acquired sovereignty of France due to his [Philip’s] help.\footnote{Note the change of subject. The kings of France were Burgundy’s feudal overlords. In 1456, fleeing from his father Charles VII of France, the Dauphin Louis sought refuge at the court of Philip of Burgundy. Later (1461) Philip attended his coronation as Louis XI at Reims; Verweij, *Kroniek van de hertogen van Brabant*, pp. 148-149; Jansen, *Kalendarium*, p. 61.} When Philip on account of these and other deeds of valour had reigned for thirty-four years as count of Holland he died of a serious illness at Bruges.\footnote{NNBW, X, 721; Jansen, *Kalendarium*, pp. 60-63.}

Charles, son of Philip: Philip was followed by his son Charles Martin. He was called this because he was born [10 Nov. 1433] the day before St Martin in the Winter. He was greater than his father in the magnitude of the deeds he performed, and just as Philip’s plans were more prudent so
Charles’ spirit was more magnificent. When he had been inaugurated as count of Holland, he assembled not much later a large army and marched into the territory of Liege because his close relative Louis of Bourbon, the bishop, had been imprisoned. Charles stormed their city in a bitter war, plundered and then destroyed it [1468].

Correction added following publication:
In footnote 40, above, I have confused Robert Bruce (1210-1295), the grandfather, with Robert Bruce (1274-1329), his grandson. The former contested the crown of Scotland with John Baliol and Florence V of Holland in 1290-1291. It was the younger Robert Bruce who as King Robert I won the war of independence and English recognition of Scotland’s independence by the Treaty of Northampton in 1328.