

Abstracts

'Montferland' and its repercussions. *Alpertus of Metz' early castles.*

S.A.J.J. Aarts

The cleric Alpertus of Metz has provided us with a lively account of a fierce struggle for power (ca. 995 – 1021 AD) in the present-day Dutch-German border area (Alpertus Mettensis, *De diversitate temporum*, ca. 1023-1024). His work is perhaps even more important for the detailed description of several early castles and the construction thereof. The recently published re-interpretation by P. Schut (2003) of the 1960 excavation of the exceptionally large motte of Montferland ('s-Heerenberg) justifies the attribution of this hybrid motte-ringwork of ca. 1000 to the couple Balderik and Adela, the main protagonists of Alpertus' story. The archaeological data, in addition to the contemporary description of the construction of this earthwork (the Upladium, or principal fortress of Balderik and Adela), increase our knowledge of the initial phases of motte-building in the Meuse-Rhine delta. The findings at Montferland moreover provide an enhanced understanding of Alpertus' description of other earthwork castles in the same region (Aspel-Rees; Munna-Kalkar; 'Meuse-fortress'-Boxmeer). In conjunction with research of several other earthwork strongholds associated with Balderik and Adela, such as Duno-Oosterbeek (ringwork) and Mergelpe-Beek/Ubbergen (motte barrage with connected bailey banks plus motte avancée), it is now possible to gain a clearer insight into our first earthwork castles and their evolutionary steps from ringworks to the more 'classic' motte (with separated bailey) dating to the second half of the 11th century. Finally, the results at Montferland in juxtaposition with Alpertus' castle descriptions, may contribute significantly to the understanding of the development of 10th and early 11th century motte castles for a wider Western European region.

The castle of Geertruidenberg (1323-1547). *Historical and archeological research.*

B. Zijlmans

In 2002, part of the castle of Geertruidenberg was excavated. The information emerging from this investigation, combined with the results of historical research carried out in the last decade of the 20th century, made it possible to determine the exact location of the castle in the city of Geertruidenberg. The castle used to be situated there where nowadays the Wilhelminaplein, Julianastraat and the Zuidwal can be

found. It is evident that the castle of Geertruidenberg used to be a real stronghold. It was strategically built on the border of the territory of the count of Holland, who was involved in a power struggle with the Duke of Brabant, who challenged the count's supremacy in the area immediately surrounding Geertruidenberg, in the first half of the 14th century. In 1323, Count Willem III of Holland (1304-1337) made Willem van Duvenvoorde schout of the city Geertruidenberg and ordered him to build a strong castle nearby. Willem van Duvenvoorde, affluent enough to complete this task successfully, built a square castle near the southeast corner of the city with walls approximately 50m in length. The castle, with a square groundplan, was in all probability adorned with a tower on each corner. The entire complex was surrounded by two moats. According to the charters the castle of Geertruidenberg was to be used as a so-called open huis; i.e. the count was free to stay at the castle whenever he wanted to and could use it as an operating base in the case of war. Regardless of the strength of the castle of Geertruidenberg, it was damaged during two sieges in the course of the conflict between 'de Hoeken' en 'de Kabeljauwen' in the 14th and 15th centuries. Both times the castle was repaired and re-equipped as a centre from where administrative and military matters were organised. In the course of the 15th century, however, the castle was abandoned and fell into disrepair. Between 1525 en 1547, the former stronghold was demolished, with local townsmen using the stones to strengthen the city gates and walls. Following the recent excavation, the exact location of the castle of Geertruidenberg, its ground plan, and its function as an administrative centre in a border region, are finally known. Both historical and archaeological records testify to the strength of the castle, however, reliable sources allowing the reconstruction of the castle as a whole, are still to be found. In short, more research is essential in order to be able to paint a more complete picture of both the castle and its history.

The castle of Coevorden. *15th and 16th century inventories as a source of knowledge as regards the building history.*

H.L. Janssen

Castle inventories with a pre-16th century date are extremely rare. Only in the highest echelons of society, in the case of castles in the possession of kings and territorial princes, administered by appointed officials, did they occur regularly. Gradually, it became part of the administrative routine, when transferring the castle with its unmovable and movable goods to the next official, to list which possessions belonged to the overlord and which changes had occurred herein, and why, since the last inventory was made. In the case of Coevorden six inventories, and one 15th century list, summing up the artillery present in the castle, have been preserved. Four

inventories can be dated between 1413 and 1450, while two are dated to 1547. These documentary sources provide important information about the building history of the castle at Coevorden. The present article compares the information from these inventories with the information known from the archaeological and other written sources. The castle of Coevorden was one of the most important castles of the bishop of Utrecht in the eastern part of his territory. It was founded during the 12th century, when the bishop positioned one of his loyal servants at Coevorden as a hereditary castle ward to control and administrate, on behalf of the bishopric, the district of Drente and the travelling routes to and from Utrecht and Groningen. Excavations in 1958 and 1968 have shown this 12th century castle to have consisted of a large motte with a diameter of ca 40 m at its base. At the end of the 14th century the bishop deposed the castellan of Coevorden, who had developed into a virtual independent dynast, and brought him on his knees by besieging, conquering and rebuilding the castle. The excavations have shown the motte at that stage was lowered, enlarged and provided with elaborate wooden camp shedding and palisades. A round tower, added to the structure, was excavated.

The inventories, dated to the first half of the 15th century are virtually the only sources to shed some light on the general appearance of the castle at that period. It shows the castle to have possessed a square or rectangular ground plan with a (probably round) tower on each of the four corners. Adjacent to one of the towers, probably the one excavated, a large hall was located. Next to the hall the representative chambers of the castellan and bailiff of the district of Drente, were to be found. The hall, chambers and towers were provided with cellars, lofts and store-rooms. A number of service buildings containing a prison, kitchen, bakery, brewery, wine- and beer cellars and lofts for the storage of grain, rye and peat, could be identified. Weapons and artillery were stored everywhere, but especially in the towers and the hall. The inventories also account for the existence of a bailey.

Comparing this information with the evidence from the two 16th century inventories and the surviving accounts it is evident that severe alterations were made before 1547. It seems the castle decreased in size. The four towers are gone. Only one of them has been maintained under the name of "Blue Tower", but may have been cut down in height. Probably the other three towers were demolished because they were thought to be too vulnerable vis-à-vis the destructive power of the long range early-modern artillery. In order to hold the new ordnance at bay, the castle was surrounded by two large earth-and-timber ramparts, provided with timber gate houses, gun-platforms and provisions for small artillery. This rebuilding was executed by the occupational forces of Charles, duke of Guelders, who occupied the castle between 1522 and 1536. The main buildings inside the castle, already known during the 15th

century such as the hall and kitchen remained intact. Some of the smaller added-on buildings, however, underwent regular changes. After the castle was reoccupied by Burgundian forces in 1536, no major changes were carried out. The only exception concerned the earthen ramparts, which were demolished in 1551-1552.

Castle Heenvliet.

Function and meaning of the 13th century tower as an example of representative architecture.

E.D. Orsel en L.J. Smals

Heenvliet was built around 1230 by Hugo I van Heenvliet, the second son of Dirk van Voorne. The lords of Voorne were powerful magnates and allies of the count of Holland. As lord of Voorne, Dirk was preceded by his elder brother Hugo. For a brief period, this Hugo played a significant role in the international political arena. In imitation of the count of Holland he became a vassal of King John I of England in 1213. Consequently, he fought at Bouvines (1214) and may well have died on the battlefield or later in captivity. It was Dirk who then succeeded his brother as lord of Voorne. Dirk had two sons, of whom the eldest Hendrik inherited Voorne. Dirk's second son Hugo inherited the lordship Heenvliet with the rights of both high and low justice. This lordship, which comprised the settlement Heenvliet and an additional piece of land, was situated along the eastern border of Voorne. Over the years it expanded by means of land reclamation.

As lord of his newly acquired lordship, Hugo was in need of a building that would represent his authority, as well as a private house where he would be able to entertain and administer his lordship. This resulted in the construction of an oblong brick tower with round corner turrets, a plan that is seldom seen outside 13th century France. Rectangular towers with semi round or round corner turrets like Niort, Mez-le-Maréchal and Nemours were built in France around the last quarter of the 12th century. Great towers with similar layouts outside France are: Thun (Switzerland, 1190), Carlow (Ireland, possible early 13th century), the Ypres tower (England, first quarter to mid-13th century), Heenvliet (the Netherlands, ca. 1230) and Grevenburg (Germany, ca. 1350). As yet, Heenvliet is the only surviving example in the Netherlands. Heenvliet's exterior measurements are ca 14.2 m x 10.8 m, with walls up to 2.30 m thick. It used to have a barrel vaulted ground-floor of 59 m² and a first floor of 79 m², including three turret chambers. A ceiling constructed of wooden beams supported the attic. The single tower was surrounded by a moat. Archaeological research has so far produced no evidence for a bailey. A manuscript drawing from the 17th century by Van Deventer equally does not support the possibility for a bailey, since the castle is depicted without one. Contrary to common practice, the

entrance was located on ground floor level. It is likely that the decision for a ground floor entrance was informed by the wish to dispose of a ground floor that could be used for private and administrative, rather than solely for utilitarian (storage), purposes. The layout of the ground-floor seems to suggest such a private as well as an administrative room use. This hypothesis is further supported by the representative entrance, which is interestingly guarded by a portcullis. The second floor, evidently the main residential level, provided private quarters and could be used for receptions on a modest scale.

Heenvliet is the only surviving residential tower in the Netherlands with evidence of a portcullis. Research in collaboration with experts abroad has shown that also in other countries, in the Middle Ages great towers only rarely possessed a portcullis. Initially designed for gatehouses, the portcullis is less suitable for a residential tower; its presence here should probably be explained as a social statement. Heenvliet has emerged from this study as a remarkable tower, in some respects of international standing and allure. It is remarkable that Hugo I van Heenvliet, who could not exactly boast of a high noble birth, was able to build a tower like this.

Perhaps an explanation can be found in Hugo's bond with the count of Holland and the lord of Voorne. This bond, which lasted a few generations, was beneficial for both the count of Holland and the lord of Voorne since it enhanced both men's power. In addition to this favourable relationship to the lord of Voorne the former's possession of the castle further enabled Hugo to behave as a grand 'seigneur'.

Huis Hatert.

Towerhouse or a remnant of a larger castle complex?

R.J.W.M. Gruben

Until recently very little was known about the building history of Huis Hatert near Nijmegen. According to local history the tower was extremely old. In 1995 research into the building history of Huis Hatert, was carried out. Following from this research the question whether the tower was either a tower house or a remnant of a larger castle complex could finally be answered.

The tower was probably built in the second half of the 14th century. The west and south sides of the building show signs of walls that were once attached to the tower, which makes it likely that the tower used to form a part of a greater complex and that it served as a gate tower located on one of the corners of a larger castle. Its relatively thin walls and small size also hint at this. In later times the tower underwent great changes. Floor heights were changed, openings were blocked and new wings were attached to the tower after the former walls had been torn down. It is evident that one of the cellars of Huis Hatert dates back to the 16th century and one of the

wings to the 18th century. In the 19th century a new gable was placed in front of the 18th century wing and tower to create a more uniform appearance.

Thanks to the 1995 research new evidence has come to light, however, additional information remains hidden in the building. At the moment, it is still impossible to provide an exact reconstruction of the 14th century and 16th century phases of the castle, yet it is apparent that in the Middle Ages the tower formed part of a multiphase, moated castle complex. Huis Hatert – notwithstanding its many unsolved mysteries – forms an integral part of local history, as it is the only physical reminder of the former village of Hatert.

Groesbeek.

The morphological development of a modest towerhouse.

R.J.W.M. Gruben, J.R. Mooren en S.A.L. Peters

In 1990 the remains of a castle were found in Groesbeek near Nijmegen. When, in 2004, buildings were scheduled in the same area, it was decided that more comprehensive archaeological research needed to be carried out. In 2005, part of the site was excavated by Bureau BAAC and evidence for three building phases of the castle was found. In 1265, a square wooden tower house was erected in the marshy valley of a river called the Groesbeek. To the west of the tower a, probably moated, farm was built. In 1990, on that very spot, the remains were found of a tuff stone building. It is likely that this latter building functioned as the administrative centre of a so-called rijkshof, from where, in the 10th and 11th centuries, a royal domain was ruled. In the 12th century this building was demolished; in the 13th and 14th centuries, this location was used for farming and as a residential area. The wooden tower was moated; the castle site was protected by a palisade. A 13th century wooden tower might seem remarkable, however, it is well possible that there existed more wooden towers in The Netherlands at the time, which have not come to light yet. Possibly the lords of Groesbeek lacked the financial means to build a stone castle, satisfying themselves with a cheaper building material: wood.

In 1301, this first wooden tower house was replaced by a second one. It is not easy to explain the use of wood as late as the 14th century. Unfortunately, this second building phase of Groesbeek brings up more questions than answers, given the third building phase in stone in 1343, at which time the second wooden tower was almost completely erased.

The stone tower used to be surrounded by a stone wall, yet again an almost unique feature in the Netherlands. Until the excavations in Groesbeek in 2005, only two towers were known to have had surrounding walls (Castle Haamstede and the Swormertower). Around 1457 the stone tower was demolished, for reasons that remain unknown. In the 16th century a new castle was built to the west of the former castle site, which most likely entailed a renovation project of the

old farmstead that used to belong to the tower of Groesbeek. Valuable remains of the medieval tower of Groesbeek still remain in situ. The relatively late building dates of the first and second wooden towers make Groesbeek unique; it might just be the missing link in the Dutch castle typology.

Castle Loon op Zand.
The refurbishing of a 14th century tower house into apartments in 1663.

D.B.M. Hermans en E.D. Orsel

Between 1383 and 1387 the knight Pauwels van Haestrecht built the castle Loon op Zand in the village Loon op Zand near Tilburg. Over the years, several articles have been written about this castle, yet only recently, after more thorough research, various questions were solved. It was for instance unclear how many storeys the medieval castle carried and how much of the original medieval castle still remains. Initially, the castle was a square tower house built of stone, of which only the ground plan could be reconstructed. Ostensibly the castle was extended around the 1430s with a rectangular wing on the eastside of the tower. A bailey was located on the southeast side of the castle. Remarkably, it was connected to the main castle by means of a covered walkway in the 16th century. In the Netherlands, covered walkways are otherwise only known from Castle Rosendaal near Arnhem. 17th century administrative records make it possible to reconstruct the state of the 14th century tower house and the renovation project carried out two centuries later. It is apparent that in the 16th century the tower house functioned more or less as a guesthouse, with apartments and a more convenient staircase in a newly built tower attached to the original medieval tower. The main functions of the castle became concentrated in the bailey. In the 18th century the castle's renovation was more radical. The tower house was reduced with one storey, the entrance to the building was replaced from the south side to the north side, the spatial organisation of the tower was altered and the bailey on the south side of the castle was demolished. In addition, a new forecourt was realised on the north side of the castle with economic buildings built of bricks from the former bailey. Also in the 19th and 20th century the castle was subjected to several building campaigns. Research into the building history and 17th century records considering the building programme brought to light that much more of the original medieval stonework has been preserved throughout the centuries than building historians had previously suspected. Especially the building phases of the 16th and 17th centuries are of high interest. At that time, the original medieval castle was created into a building with luxury apartments providing room for important guests. Seemingly, the Lord of Loon op Zand wished to show his status and his old lineage by re-using the medieval tower house as a part of a renovated castle complex.

Castle Tongelaar.
An imposing late 14th century gate-tower of a rebuilt castle.

D.B.M. Hermans en E.D. Orsel

The tower of castle Tongelaar has been very well preserved. It is a good example of a habitable tower house in the period around 1400. It formed the entrance to the castle Tongelaar and gave access to the bailey. The bailey, on its turn, gave access to the main castle.

The rich architecture of the tower, with for instance a double round arch freeze, alternating sorts of stone and bricks in two colours, tells us a lot about the building traditions in those days and can be understood as a way to express power and status by the new owners of the castle. The gate tower also has defensive qualities and the tower therefore forms an important feature in controlling access to the castle in that period. The tower's crenellated wall walk provides a view over the surroundings and the carefully planned loopholes could provide flanking fire in defending the main castle and the bailey. The tower provides us with important insights considering the use of gate towers in general. It was in this case not only a defensive structure, as it was also built for habitation. Elements like window openings, a toilet and a fireplace all point in that direction. It is possible the tower was inhabited by a castle ward or gate keeper.

'Stone Houses' around Zwolle.
An archaeological and historical study of Werkeren and Kranenburg.

M.D.J. Klomp

In the direct vicinity of Zwolle, in the province of Overijssel, relatively many country houses have stood the test of time. Most of these houses can be dated (on the basis of research carried out by building historians) to the 16th century and later, however, archival records and historical sources are testimony to an older, often medieval, date. Despite these various sources of information it remains difficult to form a concrete image of the shape of these medieval castles located around Zwolle. Recently, the medieval building remains of two early modern houses near Zwolle, Werkeren and Kranenburg, have been excavated. On the basis of the excavated foundations of Werkeren it can be concluded that it once consisted of a rectangular stone tower house (ca. 10,20 x 25,8 m) surrounded by a moat built - most likely by the influential family Van Voorst - in the period 1366-1400. On the same location traces have been found of a wooden structure dating back to the 12th century, however, little can be said about the actual size of this building. Kranenburg castle in its first building phase took the form of a rectangular wooden structure measuring 20 meters in breadth and 11 meters in width. The building must have

had three isles and a projecting entrance on the south side. The complex was surrounded by two moats. It seems likely that this building formed part of a curtilage. Eventually the wooden building was rebuilt in stone of which building phase traces have been found in the shape of a polygonal wall surrounding the castle. Kranenburg was probably demolished at least before 1580. Despite an increased knowledge as regards this castle, the exact dating of various parts of Kranenburg forms a problem. It is evident that a wooden structure consisted of the first phase of the castle, which was followed by a rectangular stone building. The precise date of the first structure is not clear; its stone successor may have been built in the 15th century. Following the here presented research, a little more is known about the medieval appearances of at least a number of castles in the vicinity of Zwolle, however, many questions remain.

The architectural and cultural-historical meaning of date and name stones on 16th century houses.

H. Ronnes en T. Vanderhoeven

Compared to gable stones in an urban context, 'date and initial stones' incorporated into castles and country houses have so far suffered from scholarly neglect. This neglect is surprising considering the sudden proliferation of the phenomenon in a wide geographical context covering the larger part of Europe. It is surprising also given the significant art- and cultural-historical references embedded in these 'messages in stone'. With this article the authors hope to provide a preliminary study into the origins and meanings of date and initial stones in a castle context.

Castles with a message. *Castles, communication and chastity in Dutch medieval literature.*

W. Landewé

In the Middle Ages castles and women used to be connected on several levels. In the reality of daily life the castle was the residence of a lord and his household, in which the lord's wife played an important role. She did not only function as a wife and a mother but was expected to step in - in terms of her husband's authority - when he was away from home. In medieval literature and art women were also seen as living in the castle in still another way. That is, the castle was valued as a symbol of female chastity and virginity, a literary tradition developed from the bible and writings of ancient poets. English, French or German documents and works of art referring to women defending their 'castle of love' are fairly well known, however Dutch can also be provided. We

know of two Middle Netherlandish literary works from the 14th century, *Van der borch heet vaste hoede* and *De borch van vrouwenrijc*, that present the castle as a female bulwark of virginity. When taking into account the social conditions of women at that time and the do's and don'ts in the field of love and sexuality, it is reasonable to suggest that these two works have an educative purpose. Both works probably reminded women to behave as virtuous and dutiful ladies of standing: a woman's first concern ought to have been to produce a legitimate heir able, in time, to take over and possibly enlarge the family's estates. Women were thus warned not to damage the reputation of the family by getting mixed up in reckless sexual affairs. It is highly probable that the two poems used to be recited during banquets and feasts. This facilitated the communication of an important message geared at a specific audience that formed part of a European upper class who shared the same social values and who pursued more or less the same goal in life: to secure a successful future for their noble family.

