

## MONARCHY IN TURMOIL

### RULERS, COURTS AND POLITICS IN THE NETHERLANDS AND GERMANY, C.1780 – C.1820

#### 1. Main Applicant

Prof.dr. J.F.J. Duindam, professor of Modern History at Leiden University (UL)

#### 2. Title

Monarchy in Turmoil: Rulers, Courts and Politics in the Netherlands and Germany, c.1780 – c.1820

#### 3. Summary

Between c.1780 and c.1820, revolutions and wars transformed the political geography of Europe. By the end of this turbulent phase, a new power balance had taken shape. The majority of smaller players was now side-lined, whereas others achieved great power status. At the same time, notions of political power and the role of the monarch were upturned. Princes were forced to adapt their rule to these transitions; yet their efforts have never been studied in detail. Our project traces princely adaptations and innovations in the Low Countries and adjacent German territories, where a sequence of traditional, Napoleonic and restoration rulers faced particularly far-reaching changes in terms of territory, government, sovereignty and legitimacy.

Traditionally, the princely court had been the focal point of representation and government. Courts gradually lost this position in the nineteenth century, but it remains unclear to what extent this process occurred during the transition period. We examine this question in two domains: court styles and decision-making. Princes in these challenging times were forced to choose between different styles of court life, but needed to carefully consider the impact of their choices on elites and the population. In addition, they were keen to use the strengthened and rationalized state apparatus introduced by the revolution, although this forced them to reconsider their personal role and the role of their household in decision-making.

**► *How did rulers in the Netherlands and in adjacent smaller German territories adapt their regimes to ongoing change in legitimacy and decision-making during the transition period 1780-1820?***

#### 4. NWO Research Fields

Main-discipline: History

- Sub-discipline 1: 27.40.00 (Modern and Contemporary History)

- Sub-discipline 2: 27.70.00 (Comparative Political History)

## 5. Infrastructural Component

No

## 6. Previous and Future Submissions

A previous version of this research proposal was submitted to NWO Free Competition Humanities on 21 December 2014, with file number PR-14-83.

## 7. Institutional Setting

- Leiden University, Institute for History (UL)
- Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands (H-ING)

## 8. Period of Funding

- Proposed starting date: 1 July 2017
- Total period of funding: 1 July 2017 – 30 June 2021

## 9. Composition of the Research Team

Name	Affiliation	Function in the project	Supervisors
Prof.dr. J.F.J. Duindam	UL	Main applicant	
Prof.dr. I.J.A. Nijenhuis	RUN / H-ING	Co-applicant	
Dr. A.J.C.M. Gabriëls	H-ING	Postdoc (sub-project 2)	
n.n.	UL	PhD 1 (sub-project 1)	Prof.dr. J.F.J. Duindam Prof.dr. I.J.A. Nijenhuis
n.n.	UL	PhD 2 (sub-project 3)	Prof.dr. J.F.J. Duindam Dr. A.J.C.M. Gabriëls
Prof.dr. M.C. 't Hart	VU; H-ING	} Advisory Board	
Prof.dr. H. te Velde	UL		
Prof.dr. O. Mörke	Universität Kiel		
Prof.dr. G. Deneckere	Universiteit Gent		
Dr. S. Freyer	Universität Osnabrück		

## 10. Structure of the Proposed Research

Titles sub-projects	Type appointment	Institution
---------------------	------------------	-------------

1	<b>Two Late Ancien Régime ‘Monarchies’:</b> <i>Tradition in the Face of Reform and Revolution</i>	PhD Supervisors: Prof. Duindam & Prof. Nijenhuis	H-ING
2	<b>Two Napoleonic Monarchies:</b> <i>An Amalgam of Revolutionary Government and Resuscitated Kingship</i>	Postdoc dr. Gabriëls	H-ING
3	<b>Two Early Restoration Monarchies:</b> <i>The Bricolage of Modernization and Tradition</i>	PhD Supervisors: Prof. Duindam & dr. Gabriëls	H-ING

## 11. Description of the Proposed Research

### ***Research Question and Basic Objectives***

This project examines the changing positions of rulers throughout the decades between c.1780 and c.1820 by comparing patterns of legitimization and decision-making at six smaller princely courts in the Netherlands and Germany. Traditionally, the court had shaped the representation of royalty and formed the locus of power; yet is it unclear to what extent courts maintained this dual role during this turbulent period. By analysing the responses of six princes operating in diverse but corresponding circumstances, we will provide a differentiated view of continuity and change in the format of monarchical power. We define two major challenges that arose for monarchs in the ‘political laboratory’ between c.1780 and c.1820.

1. *Changing forms of legitimacy: court styles and the economy of honour* After the American and French revolutions, no monarch could embark on his rule without considering how to persuade himself, his elites, his subjects and his fellow-monarchs of his legitimate entitlement to the throne. Even monarchs who had not been threatened directly by revolution or war needed to redefine their position. Did they choose to maintain a court establishment in grand style, or did they adapt to new standards by reducing their court? In the latter case, how did they replace the ‘economy of honour’ (Pecar 2003) effectively attaching elites to the royal household through preferment and honorary distinction? The bricolage of invention and tradition (Hobsbawm & Ranger 1983; Lévi-Strauss 1962) that was adopted by individual rulers in the fashioning of their courts forms the first component of our comparison.
2. *A shifting locus of power? Rulers, elites and decision-making*. Our second theme likewise is a logical offshoot of this period of change. The revolutionary drive towards the reform and rationalization of state institutions brought about a forward leap in state power. Instruments for maintaining order and extracting resources became far more

effective. Liberals and autocrats alike rising to power during and after this period were keen to use these instruments. However, the growth and professionalization of bureaucracies also brought fixed procedures and an increasing separation between the private world of the prince and his public role as sovereign. Did the segregation between the ruler's domestic circle and his expanding administrative apparatus become irrevocable during this phase of profound institutional and ideological change?

For each of the three phases listed in the table below, a variant of the following central research question will be answered:

► **How did rulers in the Netherlands and in adjacent smaller German territories adapt their regimes to ongoing change in legitimacy and decision-making during the transition period 1780-1820?**

Phases	The Northern Netherlands	The Holy Roman Empire – German territories
1. Late <i>Ancien Régime</i>	William V Hereditary Stadtholder of the United Provinces [c.1780-1795]	William IX Landgrave of Hesse-Kassel (1785-1803)
2. Napoleonic Period	Louis Napoleon King of Holland (1806-1810)	Jerome Napoleon King of Westphalia (1807-1813)
3. Early Restoration	William I Sovereign Prince/King of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands [1813/1815 - c.1820]	Frederick William III King of Prussia [1810 - c.1820]

### ***Time and Place: Selection of Cases***

Deficits caused by the Seven Years' War (1756-1763) forced governments throughout Europe to introduce fiscal reforms. Change initiated by monarchs strained the compact with elites as well as the acquiescence of subjects, and triggered popular rebellion – in Britain's American colonies, in the Low Countries, and finally in France. Following the execution of Louis XVI and the creation of the French Republic, French armies imposed the revolutionary formula on Europe. Once in power, Napoleon gradually adopted monarchical habits, finally installing himself as emperor and several of his relatives as princes of vassal states. The Napoleonic *rois parvenus* used courtly splendour to strengthen their dubious legitimacy; yet, simultaneously, they initiated a French-style modernization of the state apparatus that enhanced the government's power while reducing the ruler's personal grip on decision-

making. At the time of the Congress of Vienna, Restoration monarchy was reconstructed out of traditional, Napoleonic and new elements.

All European polities underwent change in these decades. However, monarchy had to be refashioned more fundamentally in the selected Dutch and German polities than in most other European states:

1. *Territorial discontinuity*. These polities experienced greater territorial discontinuity than the larger European monarchies. Political reorientations were accompanied by major shifts in territory and population. After the Holy Roman Empire came to an end in 1806, the map of Germany was redrawn, first by Napoleon, and then by the Restoration powers. Holland, meanwhile, was initially annexed by France and then resurfaced as the United Kingdom of the Northern and Southern Netherlands in 1815.
2. *Limited sovereignty*. Princely power in the Netherlands and in the Empire had never entirely reflected the ideal of indivisible sovereignty. Dutch Stadtholders were nominally the servants of the sovereign provincial estate assemblies, whereas German princes enjoyed a form of sovereignty (*Landeshoheit*) that was limited by the imperial context. For German princes, the hierarchy of the Holy Roman Empire was the primary sphere of political competition.
3. *Strong external influences*. In this period European powers exercised a high degree of influence in both the Low Countries and in the selected German states. During William IX's reign, Hesse-Kassel provided troops to Great Britain and relied heavily on Prussian support. British and French diplomatic interests competed in the Dutch Republic and Prussia intervened militarily in this once powerful state. Napoleon towered over the kingdoms ruled by his brothers Louis in Holland and Jerome in Westphalia; and after the defeat of the French emperor, Britain and Russia dominated in the United Kingdom of the Netherlands and Prussia, respectively.
4. *Entangled histories*. These polities were connected through dynastic alliances and political ties. They shared a similar religious-cultural background and were likely to consider the same options in their refashioning of monarchy. This allows us to chart 'cultural transfers'.

Specific reasons plead for the selection of Hesse-Kassel, Westphalia, and Prussia. William IX of Hesse-Kassel and the Dutch Stadtholder William V displayed semi-monarchical ambitions. Moreover, Hesse-Kassel was to be absorbed into Westphalia, the kingdom that clearly invites comparison with Napoleonic Holland. Early Restoration Germany leaves only few plausible candidates for comparison. Saxony emerged much weakened from the revolutionary fray; Hannover was tied to Great Britain in a personal union. Prussia, linked by marriage to the last Stadtholder and the first Orange King, appears a plausible candidate for comparison. Having barely survived the onslaught of Napoleonic France, Prussia was

accepted among the Great Powers at the Vienna Congress only as the junior partner. When in 1815 the Northern and Southern Netherlands were welded together as the United Kingdom of the Netherlands, this new power was not as inferior to Prussia as might seem with the benefit of hindsight.

### ***Methods, Models and Implementation***

Systematic comparison of these cases promises a number of important outcomes. The diachronic comparison allows a careful assessment of the innovations and changes characterizing the three phases. It will reveal where the Restoration monarchy reverted to *Ancien Régime* models, where it followed Napoleonic innovation, and where it charted a new course. By neutralizing specific national-regional contexts, the synchronic comparison, in turn, will highlight the common difficulties experienced by princes attempting to refashion their monarchies. Finally, this range of cases makes possible a careful assessment of personality, intentions, the influence of others, political contingency, and structural change. The Dutch example will form a consistent element, while the selected German cases will be examined symmetrically on the basis of equivalent literature and primary sources (cf. Duindam 2011: p.7).

Our institutional approach follows the concentric circles of power moving outward from the ruler in the two domains of personal service and state service. The royal household formed the core of a more loosely organized outer court or court society, based on honorific distinctions rather than actual offices or presence. The household and the wider court society integrated social elites and helped to provide the prince with a clientele of loyal followers. This typical instrument of monarchy was first abolished and then re-established in the course of the transition period. In each of the sub-projects we will trace redefinitions and change of the court society. Our expectation is that the household and royal ceremonies were gradually marginalised, whereas military pageantry and royal rewards and distinctions were used more systematically in this period than before. This hypothesis will be tested by examining court reforms and representative practices in the selected cases.

Did the centre of power shift from the ruler's inner circle to professionalized bureaucrats? We will test this time-honoured assumption by drawing on concepts from political anthropology. At the heart of the monarchical system, the political arena included both individual agency (manipulative strategies, manoeuvring) and groups (networks, factions). Decision-making, however, was never restricted to this arena alone: in both modern and pre-modern polities, a wider political field needs to be taken into account, including more distant power groups and external influences (i.a. Turner 1974; Lewellen 1992). The protracted debate on state formation and decision-making in the vicinity of the ruler (i.a. Elton 1988;

Starkey 1988) has established beyond doubt the political relevance of access and confidence in addition to bureaucratic institutions. Nevertheless, proximity never guaranteed political power. Our differentiated approach will incorporate the household, the cabinet and specialized councils, as well as an outer ring of ministries, the military and the *corps diplomatique*.

The institutional framework provides a starting point only for our detailed analysis of these groups and their attempts to determine policies or share in the spoils of the state (cf. Reinhard 2011; Engels 2014). Two additional steps are essential. First, the prosopographical method will be used to outline the groups related to the process of decision-making. Recent work in court studies (e.g. Horowski 2012; Freyer 2013) shows the potential of prosopography for the study of networks, factions, and their impact at court. Fully aware, however, of its time-consuming character, we will use Namier-style prosopography not as an end in itself, but only in the restricted context of selected cases of decision-making. In each of the sub-projects, two cases will be singled out for in-depth research: army reform and the impact of foreign diplomacy. The consistent examination of these domestic and international themes will help us to assess the impact of various groups and the personal role of the monarch.

### ***An innovative research design***

Our synchronic juxtapositioning of Napoleonic satellite kingdoms of Holland and Westphalia consciously oversteps the common boundaries between *Ancien Régime*, Revolution, and Restoration.

To the analysis of changing court styles and their impact on legitimacy we add a selective study of decision-making processes underpinned by a prosopography of leading circles. In this way, we bring together the research agendas of cultural and political historians. The integration of these two equally valid perspectives enables us to test a variety of assumptions about long-term overall change of monarchy, in detail and during a crucial yet under-researched period.

The redefinitions of sovereignty and the major territorial reshuffling made constant adaptation inevitable in the Low Countries and the Holy Roman Empire. What was to be the future of the newly defined principalities? We resolutely shift focus from the familiar success story of the major powers dominating the Vienna Congress to the mid-level competitors whose future was still unsettled in 1815. Nevertheless, the outcomes of our comparison will be related to simultaneous developments in Europe's leading monarchies.

In short: our project effectively deals with four persistent obstacles for historical research: national boundaries, period markers, compartmentalized disciplines, and the concentration on *ex post facto* success.

### ***Research Team, Organization and Embedding of the Programme***

The research team comprises three senior researchers, two PhD candidates, and an advisory board. The main applicant, prof. Duindam, is a leading authority on the early modern court and an experienced comparative historian. The co-applicant, prof. Nijenhuis, adds expertise on representation and decision-making in early modern political regimes and has a specific knowledge of sources related to decision-making practice. The senior researcher, dr Gabriëls, who acts as postdoc, combines extensive research experience on the Dutch Stadtholderate in the late eighteenth century with detailed knowledge of Napoleonic France and its sister regimes. He will be able to effectively support the two PhD candidates. The research team has invited leading specialists on monarchy and politics in the early modern age as well as in the nineteenth century to join the advisory board.

This project stems from ongoing co-operation between researchers at the Leiden Institute for History and the Huygens ING in The Hague. Both institutions have particularly strong profiles in political history. Huygens ING coordinates the Research School for Political History. The Leiden Institute, in turn, hosts a number of researchers on state formation and decision-making, and forms part of an interdisciplinary multi-faculty research group on 'political legitimacy: institutions and identities', which includes other relevant projects. The NWO-Horizon 'Eurasian Empires' programme, headed by prof. Duindam, considers related questions in a global context. Our project complements and broadens the NWO Free Competition Humanities project (started in 2015) on 'The persistence of civic identities in the Netherlands, 1747-1848' led by prof. Te Velde and prof. Pollmann. Our researchers will form part of both communities and training programmes. Relevant institutions and specialists in Germany have been contacted and will be included in our initiative, including the (Hessian) Universities of Kassel, Marburg and Gießen.

### ***Knowledge Utilization***

Our project will provide a corrective to the Dutch bicentennial celebration of monarchy in 2013-2015, by highlighting the degree of historical continuity (with the Stadtholders and Louis Napoleon) and by relocating the Dutch monarchy in its German Hinterland. Our deliverables will include an attractive booklet of c.80 pages outlining these points. It will be richly illustrated and the text will be in both Dutch and German. We will also present our research results to a wide audience by providing continuing education for teachers and by

organizing courses for senior citizens (Hoger Onderwijs voor Ouderen) and lectures for the general public (Studium Generale at Leiden University). Furthermore, all of the relevant data collected by the project will be added to an existing section of the Huygens Institute website (*Repertorium van Ambtsdragers en Ambtenaren*), making the data accessible to all. Finally, our intention to organise an exhibition on ‘Monarchen in rep en roer: Nederlandse en Duitse vorsten in het Revolutietijdperk’ at the National Museum Paleis het Loo in Apeldoorn proved to be impossible within the project’s timetable. Due to extensive renovation works, Paleis het Loo will be closed from January 2018 until the middle of 2021. Our proposal for an exhibition cannot, therefore, be fitted within the confines of our project, which will end in 2021. Nevertheless, we will contact our colleagues at the museum with a proposal for an exhibition to be planned as a corollary of our project – an initiative we hope to extend to Kassel and/or Berlin.

### ***Programmatic Structure and Synthesis***

The research project includes three sub-projects and a synthesis. Each sub-project follows the same layout and work programme, moving from court styles and the ‘economy of honour’ to the prosopography of leading circles and selected cases of decision-making.

#### **Sub-project 1 (by a PhD student):**

#### ***Two Late Ancien Régime ‘Monarchies’: Tradition in the Face of Reform and Revolution***

Phase	The Northern Netherlands	The Holy Roman Empire
Late <i>Ancien Régime</i>	William V Hereditary Stadtholder of the United Provinces [c.1780-1795]	William IX Landgrave of Hesse-Kassel (1785-1803)

► **Introduction:** William V (1748-1806) was Stadtholder of the United Provinces between 1766 and 1795. Formally, he was the highest official serving the sovereign States of the seven provinces together forming the Dutch Republic. As Hereditary Stadtholder and supreme commander of the state’s armed forces, however, he possessed quasi-monarchical power. The position of William V during the last fifteen years of his rule will be compared with that of his first cousin William IX (1743-1821), who, as Landgrave of Hesse-Kassel from 1785 to 1803, was a near-sovereign prince in the Holy Roman Empire.

William V and William IX share several characteristics. These Protestant princes had small courts – at the end of the 1780s consisting of around 250-275 people – characterized by modest representation and ceremonial (Gabriëls 1990; Von Stieglitz 2000). Both monarchs attempted to strengthen their status: the Hessian Landgrave hoped to obtain the prestigious electoral dignity within the Holy Roman Empire, whereas the Dutch Stadtholder gave his position a monarchical air. Nonetheless, from the 1780s, both monarchs were dependent on the governments in London and Berlin. William V and William IX viewed the revolutionary ideas propagated from France after 1789 with abhorrence. How would they determine their role as monarchs in the Age of Revolution?

The position of the princely court in the two countries was dissimilar. William V held court not by virtue of his high official duties, but as a member of the European high nobility: as a Prince of Orange and Prince of Nassau-Dietz. The court in The Hague was simultaneously a dynastic institution apart from the state, and a 'public institution' that formed part of the political order (Asch & Birke 1991: pp. 476-477). Formally, however, the household and the state apparatus were kept separate. In Kassel, by contrast, both were concentrated in the immediate vicinity of the sovereign and subject to the prince's personal authority. Moreover the Hessian *Landstände* in no way matched the remarkable prominence of the Dutch estates assemblies. These striking differences, however, do not mean there were no similarities in the praxis of politics. It remains to be seen whether the court was the main locus of power in both polities.

► **Sub-question 1: How did the revolution-plagued Dutch Stadtholder and Hessian Landgrave try to enhance their (quasi-)monarchical legitimacy and their political freedom of action, in a context of rising domestic opposition and growing foreign interference?**

► **Execution**: First, the Stadtholder's and the Landgrave's households will be reconstructed. Comparing the households and court styles enables us to test the hypothesis that the Orangist court imitated German examples (Mörke 1997: p. 92 ff). Were these two princes able to attach members of the elite to their courts through the distribution of honours and distinctions? And what was, in this respect, the ratio of native courtiers to those of foreign descent? Moving to the second theme the governing style of both 'monarchs' will be analysed: which groups were involved in decision-making? Did they try to further their ambition by seeking access to the inert prince or his energetic Prussian wife Wilhelmina in the Dutch Republic and to the autocratic ruler in Hesse? How did the relations between the court and other politically relevant state institutions take shape? Studying the surrounding political field will reveal whether other centres effectively competed with the court. Two cases of decision-making will be studied in depth, one related to domestic issues and one to international politics. For all sub-projects, army reform will provide the domestic case. As far

as external involvement in decision-making is concerned, this sub-project will consider the Prussian military intervention in the Dutch Republic in 1787 and Prussia's thwarting of the Hessian annexation of Schaumburg-Lippe in 1787.

The research on the Dutch Republic can build on existing literature, in particular the dissertation by Gabriëls on the Stadtholder's patronage system (1990). For the highest court dignitaries and the most senior office-holders in the state institutions, the digital data files at Huygens ING (*Repertorium van Ambtsdragers an Ambtenaren* and *BioPort*) can be used. With regard to Hesse, relevant information can be accessed online via *Landesgeschichtliches Informationssystem Hessen* (LAGIS). In order to reconstruct the personnel of the court in Kassel, the researchers will co-operate with staff at the University of Kassel and the Hesse State Archives in Marburg, as well as with other German researchers who have already conducted prosopographical research in this area (Stefanie Freyer, Osnabrück University). Biographical outlines on Stadtholder William V are already available (i.a. Gabriëls 1990). There is only an outdated biography of Landgrave William IX (Losch 1923), but his published *Lebenserinnerungen* are available.

### **Sub-project 2 (by Postdoc Gabriëls):**

#### ***Two Napoleonic Monarchies: An Amalgam of Revolutionary Government and Resuscitated Kingship***

Phase	The Northern Netherlands	German territories
Napoleonic Period	Louis Napoleon King of Holland (1806-1810)	Jerome Napoleon King of Westphalia (1807-1813)

► **Introduction:** The French emperor Napoleon put his younger brothers Louis Bonaparte (1778-1846) and Jerome Bonaparte (1784-1860) on the thrones of the newly created kingdoms of Holland and Westphalia. In both satellite states, the introduction of a monarchical form of government was accompanied by an intensified process of modernization: the establishment of an (authoritarian) constitution and a (subservient) parliament, based on the French model, and the bureaucratization and professionalization of the state administration, justice system and finances. Hence, at first sight, similarities between the Napoleonic *royaumes frères* of Holland (1806-1810) and Westphalia (1807-1813) strike the eye. In terms of legitimacy, however, the two countries were in very different positions. In terms of territory the Kingdom of Holland could pose as the successor-state to the Dutch Republic, but its principles clashed with long-established practices of republican decision-making. Westphalia, on the other hand, was a *Kunststaat* without a clear basis in

previous political entities and traditions. The problem here was the absence of any coherence, rather than the controversial legacy of a previous political constellation.

The introduction of monarchy led to the establishment of royal courts in The Hague/Amsterdam and in Kassel. The staff of these courts consisted largely of new nominees. These kings could not easily use their courts to bind indigenous elites. There had been no royal court in Holland since 1795, and the traditional Orangist landed nobles were hesitant to serve as the new king's court dignitaries. In Westphalia, the same held true for the nobility of the various *Vorläuferstaaten*. The solution for both monarchs was to form a new national nobility by elevating indigenous commoners and *roturiers* from France. In both countries, the social composition of the highly-professionalized state apparatus (ministers and bureaucrats) was more heterogeneous than it had been under the *Ancien Régime*. Westphalia distinguished itself from Holland in that key posts in the state apparatus were held by ministers and senior bureaucrats from France (Berding 1995; Clemens 2009; Todorov 2011). Thus not only did these new monarchies face different problems of legitimacy, but they were also served by different types of elites.

**► Sub-question 2: How did the Napoleonic kings of Holland and Westphalia try to acquire legitimacy for their newly created monarchies, and how did they retain some discretionary power in the face of a highly efficient state bureaucracy and the incessant interventions by the French emperor?**

**► Execution:** The new monarchies of Louis and Jerome Bonaparte needed to integrate the legacy of the revolution with monarchical authority. This makes them the pivot of this comparative program and the *trait d'union* with the other sub-projects. The reconstruction of personnel and activities of the royal courts in The Hague/Amsterdam and in Kassel will clarify the extent to which both sovereigns attempted to gratify their subjects by building upon existing traditions, or whether they preferred to imitate the imperial French model. Particular attention will be paid to royal attempts to bind elites to the court by means of noble titles, decorations and endowments in these satellite monarchies.

This sub-project will also consider the extent to which the immediate vicinity of the kings in Holland and in Westphalia formed a locus of power; in addition, the surrounding political field will be charted. Two questions are relevant here. Did the rise of a separate state apparatus manned by well-trained and self-confident experts create a parallel centre of power? And did Napoleon allow his *rois préfets* some political power, or was the emperor the actual locus of power? For this pivotal sub-project, the two key cases on decision-making that we have selected are those of the army reforms stipulated by France, which encountered much internal resistance, and the position of French ambassadors as Napoleon's personal deputies at the courts in The Hague/Amsterdam and in Kassel.

The research on Holland and Westphalia can build on recent literature. In the Netherlands, the bicentenary of 2006 led to various publications, and the same was true of Germany in 2007. There is research on the administrative organization of Jerome Napoleon's regime in Westphalia (i.a. Todorov 2011), yet there has been no systematic study of his household and court society. For the prosopographical research on the court dignitaries at Louis Napoleon's court and the most senior office-holders in his state institutions, use can be made of various printed surveys (i.a. Christiaans 1995) and of the digital data files at the Huygens ING (*Repertorium van Ambtsdragers en Ambtenaren* and *BioPort*). Various biographies of Jerome Napoleon are available, including a recent academic biography (Boudon 2008). There is an older biography of Louis Napoleon (Labarre de Raillicourt 1963) and there are recent biographical sketches (i.a. Jourdan 2006; Koolhaas-Grosfeld 2007).

**Sub-project 3 (by a PhD student):**

***Two Early Restoration Monarchies: The Bricolage of Modernization and Tradition***

Phase	The Netherlands	German territories
Early Restoration	William I Sovereign Prince/King of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands [1813/1815 - c.1820]	Frederick William III  King of Prussia  [1810 - c.1820]

► *Introduction:* After fleeing the Dutch Republic in 1795, William Frederick (1773-1843) spent eighteen years in exile, mainly in Berlin as a guest of the Prussian King Frederick William III (1770-1840), his first cousin and brother-in-law. In 1815 he ruled the United Kingdom of the Netherlands, a medium-sized power within the British sphere of influence. His Hohenzollern cousin and brother-in-law ruled Prussia, weakened by war and initially dependent upon Russian protection. This sub-project focuses on the challenges encountered by these kings during the first decade of their reconstituted monarchy, a formative period that provided the foundation for consolidated royal power after 1820. For Prussia, we start in 1810, when after years of internal exile in East Prussia Frederick William III rebuilt his household (Stamm-Kuhlmann 1990). For the United Kingdom of the Netherlands, we start with the advent of William I and likewise end around 1820. (Lok 2009: p. 68).

There are remarkable similarities in the ways in which William I and Frederick William III ran their courts. Both monarchs valued Protestant austerity and a bourgeois way of life (Koch 2013; Hammer 1985). The ostentation of the court remained limited to strictly necessary state ceremonies. William I was constitutionally obliged to alternate his residence

between The Hague and Brussels, maintaining separate households in the two capitals, a practice unnecessary in Prussia.

Both kingdoms featured a bureaucratized state apparatus. In the Netherlands this was largely composed of officials and army officers taken over from the French regime. In Prussia, by contrast, the state apparatus had been created as a consequence of the administrative reforms undertaken after the crushing defeat of 1806. These reforms certainly gave Frederick William III more power, but they simultaneously put him under the control of an efficient state bureaucracy, led by a *Staatskanzler*. In the Netherlands, William I did not allow his power to be curtailed in such a way; here, the king made decisions autonomously (Koch 2013: pp. 369-370).

► **Sub-question 3: After two decades of revolution and war, how did the Dutch and Prussian Restoration kings define their reinstated monarchical power between traditional legitimacy and the strengthened state bureaucracy, within a changed and volatile international context?**

► **Execution:** The bricolage of *Ancien Régime* and Napoleonic elements at the Dutch and Prussian Restoration courts will be charted in terms of their personnel, organisation, and style. Was this conscious ‘invention of tradition’ or did the rulers try to follow earlier models? Diachronic and synchronic cultural transfer will be considered: what did the Prince of Orange take from his Bonaparte predecessor, and in what respects was he inspired by Prussian examples? This sub-project will test the common but untested assumption that the court was no longer the prime locus of power. The modest character of both Restoration courts and the increasing size of the state apparatus, seems to indicate that the political arena shifted from the palace corridors to ministerial offices. However, this can be established conclusively only by charting the surrounding political field. With regard to Prussia, the literature suggests that the highest court dignitaries continued to exercise important influence over the king (Stamm-Kuhlmann 1990). How did these kings cultivate their relations with the elites? The Protestant kings William I and Frederick William III ruled over substantial new territories with Roman Catholic subjects: Belgium and the Rhineland. Did they seek to integrate the elites from these regions into their courts and central bureaucracies? In the case of the Netherlands, it will be necessary to juxtapose William I’s policy towards two very different groups: the ancient nobility in the South and the largely patrician aristocracy in the North. In both kingdoms, the proportions of local nobles families, foreign nobles, and ennobled *roturiers* in the ‘economy of honour’ centred on the court needs to be established.

This sub-project will investigate the process of decision-making with reference to two case studies. In line with the other two sub-projects, army reform will be singled out for further scrutiny. The second case considers Great Britain’s and Russia’s ideas about

European reconstruction in 1813/1815, and their impact on policymaking in respectively The Hague/Brussels and Berlin.

The research on Prussia can build on publications by Simms (1997), Straubel (1998) and Stamm-Kuhlmann (1990). As yet, there has been no study of the dual court of William I in The Hague and Brussels. For the prosopographical research on the highest court dignitaries in both households and the most senior office-holders in the state apparatus, the digital data at the Huygens ING (*Repertorium van Ambtsdragers en Ambtenaren* and *BioPort*) can be used. Academic biographies are available of both William I and Frederick William II (Koch 2013; Stamm-Kuhlmann 1992).

### ***Synthesis: Monarchy in Turmoil***

Key results from the three case studies will be presented at an international conference organised by the project. Leading international researchers will be invited to contribute papers on courtly representation or decision-making between c.1780 and c.1820. Since our project focuses on the smaller princely courts in the transition period, it will be particularly worthwhile to compare the outcomes of our research with the way the major European courts dealt with the challenges of this tumultuous era. Hence, researchers in France (Thibaut Trétout) Great Britain (Clarissa Campbell Orr) and Austria (Martin Scheutz) have been contacted to contribute their specialised knowledge on the courts in Paris, London and Vienna. The conference will broadcast project results to the most relevant academic audiences. Results will be published in a thematic issue of a relevant journal (e.g. *European History Quarterly*, *Beiheft* of the *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung*). Nijenhuis and Gabriëls will contribute an introduction; in addition Nijenhuis will contribute an essay on the prosopographical method and decision-making. Gabriëls and the two other project researchers will select principal outcomes of their research that exemplify this transition period and highlight the added value of comparison. Duindam will write a conclusion on court styles and decision-making in the transition period. In a separate article to be submitted to *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, moreover, he will integrate project results with recent work on France, Britain, and Austria. All key publications will be made available through open access.

## **12. Word Count**

- Number of words 11 – General description: 2452
- Number of words 11 – Subprojects and synthesis: 2702
- Total number of words 11: 5154

### 13. Summary in Key Words

Transition Period – Monarchy – Royal Court – Decision-making – Legitimacy.

### 14. Work Programme

#### *Preliminary remarks*

1. The postdoc and the two PhD students will be hosted at Huygens ING in Amsterdam.
2. During the first three months of the project, the applicants and the project researchers will hold work meetings every fortnight. After this initial period, progress meetings will be held on a monthly basis.
3. In the ninth month after the start of the project (March 2018), both PhD students will be evaluated on the basis of these progress meetings and on the basis of provisional introduction and detailed project planning. The outcome of this assessment will determine whether their temporary contract will be converted into a four-year contract.
4. Both PhD students will participate in the trainings programme of the Research School for Political History, that is coordinated at Huygens ING (*pro memoria*).
5. Both PhD students will participate in introductory courses of the Institute for History at Leiden University (*pro memoria*).
6. Both PhD dissertations and the monograph by the postdoc will have the same layout:
  - Introduction
  - Chapter 1: Legitimacy – Court Styles
  - Chapter 2: Legitimacy – The Economy of Honour
  - Chapter 3: Decision-making – Prosopography
  - Chapter 4: Decision-making – Case Studies
  - Conclusion

	<b>2017</b> July – December	<b>2018</b> January – December	<b>2019</b> January – December	<b>2020</b> January – December	<b>2021</b> January – June
<b>PhD 1 &amp; PhD 2</b>	<b>6 months:</b> Introductory reading and first visits to Dutch archives	<b>7 months:</b> research Dutch court;  <b>2 months:</b> research stay Germany	<b>2 months</b> research Dutch court;  <b>5 months</b> research German court, including 2 months research stay Germany;	<b>8 months:</b> writing chapters 2 (partly), 3 and 4;  <b>3 months:</b> writing paper for conference (later article)	<b>2 months:</b> writing conclusion  <b>4 months:</b> rewriting earlier chapters and finishing the manuscript;

		<p><b>2 month:</b> course Research School and writing provisional introduction plus project planning for evaluation;</p> <p><b>1 month:</b> holiday</p>	<p><b>4 months</b> writing chapter 1 and 2 (partly);</p> <p><b>1 month:</b> holiday</p>	<p><b>1 month:</b> holiday</p>	
<b>Postdoc</b>	<p><b>1 month:</b> guiding introductory reading PhDs;</p> <p><b>5 months:</b> research courts in long-term perspective</p>	<p><b>7 months:</b> research Dutch court;</p> <p><b>2 months:</b> research stay in Germany;</p> <p><b>2 months:</b> writing provisional introduction;</p> <p><b>1 month:</b> holiday</p>	<p><b>2 months:</b> research Dutch court;</p> <p><b>6 months:</b> research German court, including 2 months research stay in Germany and France;</p> <p><b>3 months:</b> writing chapters 1 and 2</p> <p><b>1 month:</b> holiday</p>	<p><b>7 months:</b> writing chapters 3 and 4;</p> <p><b>2 months:</b> writing paper (later article);</p> <p><b>2 months:</b> preparation international conference;</p> <p><b>1 month:</b> holiday</p>	<p><b>1 month:</b> writing conclusion;</p> <p><b>2 months:</b> rewriting previous chapters and finishing the manuscript;</p> <p><b>1 month:</b> preparing international conference</p> <p><b>2 months:</b> co-contributing introduction to synthesis;</p>
<b>Applicants</b>		<p>March 2018: evaluation PhD students 1 &amp; 2 on the basis of provisional introduction and detailed project planning.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bilingual booklet for general public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• International conference;</li> <li>• Making database accessible;</li> <li>• Contributing and editing the volume of edited articles (synthesis);</li> <li>• Writing 1 article submitted to <i>Comparative Studies in Society and History</i>;</li> <li>• After June 2021: Exhibition in Paleis het Loo.</li> </ul>

## 15. Planned Deliverables

	<b>Applicants and researchers</b>	<b>Deliverables</b>	<b>Year</b>
<b>Sub-project 1</b>	PhD student 1	1 paper presented at an international conference	2020
		1 article in a refereed journal *	2020/2021
		PhD dissertation	2021
<b>Sub-project 2</b>	Postdoc Gabriëls	1 paper presented at an international conference	2020
		1 article in a refereed journal *	2020/2021

		Monograph	2021
<b>Sub-project 3</b>	PhD student 2	1 paper presented at an international conference	2020
		1 article in a refereed journal *	2020/2021
		PhD dissertation	2021
<b>Synthesis</b>	Main applicant Duindam	Conclusion in volume of edited articles (synthesis); 1 article to be submitted to <i>Comparative Studies in Society and History</i>	2021
	Co-applicant Nijenhuis	Introduction and 1 article in a volume of edited articles (synthesis); co-editing this volume	2021
	Postdoc Gabriëls	Introduction and 1 article in a volume of edited articles (synthesis);	2021
	PhD student 1	1 article in a volume of edited articles (synthesis)	2021
	PhD student 2	1 article in a volume of edited articles (synthesis)	2021
<b>Dissemination</b>	Co-applicant Nijenhuis	Prosopographical data made accessible via website Huygens ING	2021
	All applicants and researchers	Presentation of papers at the international conference organized by the project staff	2021
<b>Knowledge Utilization</b>	Co-applicant	Bilingual booklet for the general public	2020
	Main applicant and postdoc	Courses and lectures for the elderly (HOVO) and for the general public (Studium Generale)	2020/2021
	Both applicants and postdoc	Exhibition at National Museum Paleis het Loo / German Museum	2021

\* Refereed journals to which the articles will be submitted:

- *Comparative Studies in Society and History*
- *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis / [Dutch] Journal of History*
- *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung*
- *European History Quarterly*
- *The Journal of Modern History*

## 16. Short Curriculum Vitae of the Applicants

### a. Main Applicant: Prof.dr. J.F.J. Duindam (1962)

- Education: Utrecht University (history major, anthropology minor) MA 1988; PhD (history) 1992.

- Career: 1991-2004 assistant professor; 2004-08 associate professor (UU); 2008-10 professor of Early Modern History, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen; 2010- professor of Modern History (Algemene Geschiedenis), Leiden University.
- Recent applications and fellowships: 2014 NIAS fellowship; 2011-2017 Principal Applicant NWO-G grant application 'Eurasian Empires'
- Supervision. Dissertations: Cumhur Bekar, Kim Ragetli, Beatriz Santiago Belmonte, Leonor Álvarez Francés. Finished: David Onnekink (2003) External candidates: Sebastiaan Derks, Bert Thissen. Habilitation (HDR): Fanny Cosandey (Paris-Est 27 September 2014); Cédric Michon (Sorbonne 13 December 2014).
- Research evaluation: ERC, DFG, FWF (Austria) NWO, FWO (Flanders). ERC advanced grant panel 2014.
- Editorial board: *European History Quarterly*; *Journal of World History*; editor: Brill Series Rulers & Elites/rule

#### **b. Co-applicant: Prof.dr. I.J.A. Nijenhuis (1955)**

- Education: Groningen University (history) MA 1982; PhD 1992
- Career: assistant professor Leiden University (1983-1986) and Utrecht University (1989-1990); lecturer The Hague University of Applied Sciences (1986-1998); senior-researcher H-ING; 2009- professor of Source Criticism and Source Access, Radboud University Nijmegen.
- Recent fellowship: research fellowship Duke University (2016).
- Co-Supervision dissertations: Current: Erik Jacobs (University of Amsterdam); Lauren Lauret (Leiden University). Finished: Karin van Leeuwen (2013, Radboud University); Marijke van Faassen (2014, Groningen University).
- Committees, boards: Member NWO-VENI-committee 2012 and 2013. President of the Board of the Research School for Political History (2011-)

### **17. Key Publications of the Applicants:**

#### **a. Main Applicant: Prof.dr. J.F.J. Duindam**

1. *Dynasties. A Global History of Power, 1300-1800* (Cambridge 2015).
2. 'Royal Courts', in: *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern European History. 1350-1750. Volume II: Cultures and Power*. Hamish Scott ed. (Oxford 2015) 440-477.
3. 'Early Modern Europe: beyond the strictures of modernization and national historiography', *European History Quarterly*, 40-4 (2010) 606-623.

4. 'Tussen tafellaken en servet. Het Stadhoudelijk hof in dynastiek Europa', *Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden* 124 (2009) 536-538.
5. *Vienna and Versailles. The Courts of Europe's Dynastic Rivals, 1550-1780* (Cambridge 2003).

**b. Co-applicant: Prof.dr. I.J.A. Nijenhuis**

1. 'Representation by Numbers: how Attendance and Experience helped Holland to control the Dutch States General (1626-1630)', in: *Political Representation: Communities, Ideas and Institutions in Europe (c.1200 – c.1650)*. Mario Damen, Jelle Haemers, Alastair Mann eds. (Leiden 2016) [forthcoming].
2. *De leeuw met de zeven pijlen. Het gewest in het landelijk bestuur*. Ida Nijenhuis, Joke Roelevink en Ronald Sluijter eds. (The Hague 2010).
3. 'Republikanische Repräsentation? Ansehen und Rang in der zeremoniellen und diplomatischen Praxis der Generalstaaten im 17. Jahrhundert', in: *Zelebrieren und Verhandeln. Zur Praxis ständischer Institutionen im frühneuzeitlichen Europa*. Tim Neu, Michael Sikora, Thomas Weller eds. (Münster 2009) 145-160.
4. 'Representation and Governance in the Netherlands, 1250-1983: Materials for a comprehensive History of Politics', *Parliaments, Estates & Representation* 29 (2009) 3-15 [co-authored with Jan Burgers, Eef Dijkhof, Karin van Leeuwen and Marijke van Faassen].
5. 'The Republic and its Constitution' in: Claudia Melica ed., *Hemsterhuis: a European Philosopher Rediscovered* (Naples 2005) 283-298.

**18. Public Summary and Title:**

***Monarchieën in beroering!***

Tussen 1780 en 1820 stond de wereld op zijn kop. Koningen werden weggestuurd door het volk, maar andere vorsten namen spoedig hun plaats in. Hoe kreeg in deze woelingen het vorstelijk hof gestalte tussen oude en nieuwe voorbeelden? Hoe verschoof de positie van Nederlandse en Duitse heersers in de besluitvorming?

**19. Summary for Non-Specialists:**

***De monarchie in beroering: vorst, hof en politiek in de Nederlanden en Duitsland, ca. 1780 – ca. 1820***

De veertig jaren tussen circa 1780 en circa 1820 zijn wel aangeduid als 'een politiek laboratorium', of zelfs als de 'geboorte van de politiek'. Alle staten in Europa werden geconfronteerd met een lange reeks revoluties en oorlogen. George III werd afgezworen

door zijn Amerikaanse onderdanen; Lodewijk XVI moest zijn jaren als koning met de dood bekopen. De vanzelfsprekendheid van het koningschap was verdwenen: de reflex van trouw en respect van onderdanen was geen gegeven meer. Ook monarchen in landen waarin het bestel nooit in gevaar kwam, moesten hun positie in binnen- en buitenland opnieuw uitvinden.

In deze periode van revolutionaire verandering en grootschalige oorlogvoering groeiden tegelijkertijd de machtsmiddelen van de staat. Het langlopende proces van staatsversterking en bestuurlijke rationalisatie raakte in een stroomversnelling. Universele rechten en regels beëindigden de wirwar van bijzondere privileges van groepen en regio's. Burgers kregen scherper omschreven plichten jegens de staat opgelegd. Bureaucratisering en professionalisering deden de omvang en reikwijdte van het bestuurs- en ordehandhavingsapparaat in deze woelige decennia veel sneller groeien dan voorheen. Zowel behoudzuchtige als vooruitstrevende vorsten maakten daarvan gretig gebruik. Maar pasten het koninklijke hof en de persoonlijk-monarchale regeerstijl nog wel binnen deze bestuursstructuren?

De veranderende contouren van monarchaal gezag vormden een uitdaging voor alle heersers. Hun opgave was echter extra moeilijk in die gebieden die ook ingrijpend verschoven in territorium en tradities. Het Heilige Roomse Rijk, het hart van Europa vanaf de Hoge Middeleeuwen, verdween van de kaart. Duitsland stond niet langer onder een eenhoofdig keizerlijk gezag, maar zocht tastend naar nieuwe overkoepelende politieke en economische bindingen. Ook al was het wegvallen van het Rijk voor de ene Duitse vorst een buitenkansje en voor de ander een domper, voor allen was het politieke landschap nieuw. De Noordelijke Nederlanden ondergingen eveneens een gedaanteverwisseling. In de Republiek der Verenigde Nederlanden waren de provinciale Statenvergaderingen soeverein geweest, terwijl de stadhouder een quasi-monarchaal gezag uitoefende. Na opeenvolgende perioden als vazalstaat en geannexeerd grondgebied van Frankrijk werden de Noordelijke Nederlanden samengevoegd met België tot één Verenigd Koninkrijk. De contouren van het gezag veranderden hier drastischer dan in de grote Europese monarchieën, die in 1815 veelal hun oude vorm behielden of herkregen. In het 'politiek laboratorium' waren het Heilige Roomse Rijk en de Lage Landen een speciaal geval: zowel de staatsgrenzen als de vorstelijke soevereiniteit waren hier veranderlijk, zoals de verwickelingen in navolgende decennia zouden bevestigen.

Dit project onderzoekt herdefiniëring van het vorstelijk hof in de Nederlanden en in Duitse staten gedurende deze turbulente overgangperiode. Hoe gaven vorsten vanaf het late *Ancien Regime*, via de Napoleontische periode, tot de vroege Restauratie gestalte aan hun hof? Hoe trachtten deze heersers zichzelf, hun elites, onderdanen en medemonarchen over de grens te overtuigen van de legitimiteit van hun verworven positie? Hoe pasten zij

zelf binnen het gemoderniseerde staatsbestel, dat hun persoonlijke machtsaanspraak zowel ondersteunde als beperkte? Was de monarch met zijn hof eigenlijk nog wel het hart van het politieke bestel, of verdween hij geleidelijk naar de marge van de geoliede staatsmachinerie? Waar kwamen besluiten tot stand en welke groepen trachtten de besluitvorming te beïnvloeden? Kortom: hoe verschoven in de verschillende fasen van de overgangperiode ca. 1780 – ca. 1820 de legitimizeitsaanspraken en de praktische politieke besluitvorming in de nabijheid van de monarchen in de Nederlanden en in de Duitse staten?

De periode ca. 1780 – ca. 1820 wordt meestal als begin- of eindpunt gebruikt in de studie van monarchie en vorstenhoven. De opeenvolgende fasen binnen deze periode zelf zijn zelden onderwerp geweest van onderzoek, en zo hiervan al sprake was, dan, stonden meestal de grote monarchieën centraal. Bovendien zijn de vragen nooit gesteld in een vergelijkend perspectief: de balans tussen structurele verschuivingen en de betekenis van persoonlijkheden op en rond de troon bleef daarom onzichtbaar. Dit project onderzoekt de vormgeving van monarchaal gezag zowel diachroon in één gebied als synchroon in nabijgelegen gebieden binnen een zestal cases in de Nederlanden en het (voormalige) Rijk. Steeds worden daarbij dezelfde vragen gesteld over de veranderingen in legitimering en de verschuivingen in de besluitvorming nabij de troon.

De laatste stadhouder van de Nederlandse Republiek Willem V wordt vergeleken met Wilhelm IX, landgraaf van Hessen-Kassel. De twee jongere broers van Napoleon, Louis en Jérôme, die regeerden in respectievelijk de koninkrijken Holland en Westfalen, zijn gekozen als nauwverwante voorbeelden in de tweede fase. Ten slotte zal Willem I als koning van een hersteld en uitgebreid Verenigd Koninkrijk worden vergeleken met Friedrich Wilhelm III, koning van het door de oorlog en bezetting zwaar beproefde Pruisen, dat, als kleinste onder de groten, kon aanschuiven aan de Wener conferentietafel van gekroonde hoofden. De gestructureerde thematische vergelijking van deze voorbeelden geeft inzicht in het functioneren van heersers, hof en politiek in een van de turbulentste perioden in de Europese geschiedenis.

<b>Drie fasen</b>	<b>Noordelijke Nederlanden</b>	<b>Heilige Roomse Rijk – Duitse gebieden</b>
1. Late Ancien Régime	Willem V Erfstadhouder van de Verenigde Nederlanden [c.1780-1795]	Wilhelm IX Landgraaf van Hessen-Kassel (1785-1803)
2. Napoleontische Periode	Lodewijk Napoleon Koning van Holland (1806-1810)	Jérôme Napoleon Koning van Westfalen (1807-1813)

3. Vroege Restauratie	Willem I Soeverein Vorst / Koning van het Verenigd Koninkrijk der Nederlanden [1813/1815 - c.1820]	Friedrich Wilhelm III  Koning van Pruisen  [1810 - c.1820]
-----------------------	--	--

## 20. Research Budget

Please see the adjoining Excel-document.

## Attachment

### Sources

Archival research will be undertaken in The Hague (Nationaal Archief, Koninklijk Huisarchief en Centraal Bureau voor Genealogie), Darmstadt (Hessisches Staatsarchiv), Marburg (Hessisches Staatsarchiv), Berlin (Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz) and Paris (Archives nationales).

The following types of documents will be used:

- Correspondences of princes, court dignitaries, high state officials and foreign diplomats.
- Other personal documents as diaries and memoirs of the political actors concerned.
- All archival sources concerning the formal structure and its personnel, court and state ceremonial and court finances.
- Printed *Almanacs de la Cour*, *Herenboekjes* and *Hofkalender*.

### Literature References

- Asch**, R. & A.M. Birke (ed.), *Princes, patronage, and the nobility. The court at the beginning of the modern age* (Oxford 1991).
- Becquet**, H. & B. Frederking (eds.), *La dignité de roi. Regards sur la royauté au premier XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Rennes 2009).
- Berding**, H., 'Loyalitätskonflikte unter napoleonischer Herrschaft. Die Situation der Staatsdiener im Königreich Westfalen', in: D. Albrecht et al. (eds.), *Europa im Umbruch, 1750-1850* (Munich 1995) 241-256.
- Boudon**, J.O., *Le roi Jérôme, frère prodigue de Napoléon* (Paris 2008).
- Brakensiek**, S., *Fürstendiener – Staatsbeamte – Bürger. Amtsführung und Lebenswelt der Ortsbeamten in niederhessischen Kleinstädten (1750-1830)* (Göttingen 1999).
- Branda**, P., *Napoléon et ses hommes. La Maison de l'Empereur, 1804-1815* (Paris 2011).
- Burg**, M.J. van der, *Nederland onder Franse invloed. Cultuurtransfer en staatsvorming in de Napoleontische tijd, 1799-1813* (Amsterdam 2009).
- Carl**, H., 'Erinnerungsbruch als Bedingung der Moderne? Tradition und bewusste Neuorientierung bei Hof und Zeremoniell nach 1800', in: A. Klinger et al., (eds.), *Das Jahr 1806 im europäischen Kontext. Balance, Hegemonie und politische Kulturen* (Cologne 2008) 169-184.
- Christiaans**, P.A., 'In dienst des Konings. De hofhouding van koning Lodewijk Napoleon', in: L.A.F. Barjesteh van Waalwijk van Doorn & F.J. van Rooijen (eds.), *Tussen vrijheidsboom en oranjewimpel*. (Rotterdam 1995) 511-534.
- Clemens**, G.B., 'Fürstendiener – Kollaborateure? Die Beamten im Königreich Westphalen', in: J. Flemming & D. Krause-Vilmar (eds.), *Fremdherrschaft und Freiheit. Das Königreich Westphalen als napoleonischer Modellstaat* (Kassel 2009) 117-132.
- Daniel**, U., 'Höfe und Aufklärung in Deutschland. Plädoyer für eine Begegnung der dritten Art', in: M. Ventzke (ed.), *Hofkultur und aufklärerische Reformen in Thüringen* (Cologne [etc.] 2002) 11-31.
- Duindam**, J., 'Tussen tafellaken en servet. Het Stadhoudelijk hof in dynastiek Europa', *Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden* 124 (2009) 536-538.
- Duindam**, J., *Vergelijking als maatstaf. Heerschappij in de vroegmoderne wereld* [Inaugural lecture] (Leiden 2011).
- Duindam**, J., *Vienna and Versailles. The Courts of Europe's dynastic Rivals, 1550-1780* (Cambridge [etc.] 2003).
- Eissenhauer**, M., *König Lustik!? Jerome Bonaparte und der Modellstaat Königreich Westphalen* (Munich 2008).
- Elton**, G.R., 'Tudor government', *The Historical Journal* 31 (1988) 425-434.
- Engels**, J.I., *Geschichte der Korruption von der frühen Neuzeit bis ins 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt am Main 2014).
- Freyer**, S., *Der Weimarer Hof um 1800. Eine Sozialgeschichte jenseits des Mythos* (Munich 2013).
- Gabriëls**, A.J.C.M., 'Een militair op de troon? Koning Lodewijk en de strijdkrachten', in: A. Jourdan (ed.), *Het Koninkrijk Holland (1806-1810)*. Special issue of: *De Negentiende Eeuw* 30 (2006) 230-241.
- Gabriëls**, A.J.C.M., 'Het hof dat geen hof mocht heten. De monarchisering van de Franse Republiek tijdens het Consulaat van Napoleon Bonaparte, 1799-1804', *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* 123 (2010) 354-369.
- Gabriëls**, A.J.C.M., 'Het hof van prins Willem V in 1768. Een momentopname', *Jaarboek Oranje-Nassau Museum* 1995 (Rotterdam 1996) 94-128.
- Gabriëls**, A.J.C.M., *De heren als dienaren en de dienaar als heer. Het stadhoudelijk stelsel in de tweede helft van de achttiende eeuw* (The Hague 1990).
- Haan**, I. de, *Politieke reconstructie. Een nieuw begin in de politieke geschiedenis* [Inaugural lecture] (Utrecht 2004).

- Hammer, K.**, 'Die Preußischen Könige und Königinnen im 19. Jahrhundert und ihr Hof', in: K.F. Werner (ed.), *Hof, Kultur und Politik im 19. Jahrhundert* (Bonn 1985) 87-99.
- Hobsbawm, E. & T. Ranger**, *The invention of tradition* (Cambridge [etc.] 1983).
- Horowski, L.**, *Die Belagerung des Thrones. Machtstrukturen und Karrieremechanismen am Hof von Frankreich 1661-1789* (Ostfildern 2012).
- Jourdan, A.** (ed.), Het Koninkrijk Holland (1806-1810). Special issue of: *De Negentiende Eeuw* 30 (2006).
- Knauer, M.**, 'Politik mit und gegen die Tradition. Staatskult und Königtum in Westphalen (1807-1813)', in: V. Veltzke (ed.), *Napoleon. Trikolore und Kaiseradler über Rhein und Weser* (Cologne [etc.] 2007) 341-358.
- Koch, J.**, *Koning Willem I, 1772-1843* (Amsterdam 2013).
- Koolhaas-Grosfeld, E.**, (ed.), Lodewijk Napoleon en de kunsten in het Koninkrijk Holland. Themanummer van: *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek 2005/2006* (Zwolle 2007).
- Labarre de Raillicourt, D.**, *Louis Bonaparte (1778-1846), roi de Hollande. Frère et père d'empereurs* (Paris 1963).
- Leuschner, V.**, 'Playing the field. Dealing with interpersonal relationships in the political arena', in: B. Descharmes [e.a.] (ed.), *Varieties of friendship. Interdisciplinary perspectives on social relationships* (Göttingen 2011) 205-222.
- Lévi-Strauss, C.**, *La pensée sauvage* (Paris 1962).
- Lewellen, T.C.**, *Political anthropology. An introduction* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; Westport [etc.] 1992).
- Lok, M.**, *Windvanen. Napoleontische bestuurders in de Nederlandse en Franse Restauratie (1813-1820)* (Amsterdam 2009).
- Losch, Ph.**, *Kurfürst Wilhelm I., Landgraf von Hessen. Ein Fürstenbild aus der Zopfzeit* (Marburg 1923).
- Mansel, Ph.**, *The eagle in splendour. Napoleon I and his court* (London 1987).
- Mörke, O.**, 'Stadtholder' oder 'Staetholder'? *Die Funktion des Hauses Oranien und seines Hofes in der politischen Kultur der Republik der Vereinigten Niederlande im 17. Jahrhundert* (Münster [etc.] 1997).
- Nijenhuis, I.J.A.**, 'The Republic and its Constitution', in: Claudia Melica (ed.), *Hemsterhuis: a European Philosopher Rediscovered* (Naples 2005) 283-298.
- Nijenhuis, I.J.A.**, 'Republikanische Repräsentation? Ansehen und Rang in der zeremoniellen und diplomatischen Praxis der Generalstaaten im 17. Jahrhundert', in: Tim Neu, Michael Sikora & Thomas Weller (eds.), *Zelebrieren und Verhandeln. Zur Praxis ständischer Institutionen im frühneuzeitlichen Europa* (Münster 2009) 145-160.
- Paulmann, J.**, *Pomp und Politik. Monarchenbegegnungen in Europa zwischen Ancien Régime und Erstem Weltkrieg* (Paderborn [etc.] 2000).
- Pečar, A.**, *Die Ökonomie der Ehre. Höfischer Adel am Kaiserhof Karls VI. (1711-1740)* (Darmstadt 2003).
- Rem, P. & G. Sanders** (ed.), *Lodewijk Napoleon. Aan het hof van onze eerste koning, 1806-1810* (Zutphen 2006).
- Reinhard, W.**, 'Die Nase der Kleopatra. Geschichte Im Lichte mikropolitischer Forschung. Ein Versuch', *Historische Zeitschrift* 293 (2011) 631-666.
- Sas, N.C.F. van**, *De metamorfose van Nederland. Van oude orde naar moderniteit* (Amsterdam 2005).
- Schmitt, C.**, *Gespräch über die Macht und den Zugang zum Machthaber* (Pfullingen 1954).
- Sellin, V.**, *Gewalt und Legitimität. Die europäische Monarchie im Zeitalter der Revolutionen* (Munich 2011).
- Simms, B.**, *The impact of Napoleon. Prussian high politics, foreign policy and the crisis of the executive, 1797-1806* (Cambridge [etc.] 1997).
- Stamm-Kuhlmann, Th.**, 'Der Hof König Friedrich Wilhelms III. von Preußen (1797-1840)', in: K. Möckl (ed.), *Hof und Hofgesellschaft in den deutschen Staaten im 19. und beginnenden 20. Jahrhundert* (Boppard am Rhein 1990) 275-319.
- Stamm-Kuhlmann, Th.**, *König in Preußens großer Zeit. Friedrich Wilhelm III., der Melancholiker auf dem Thron* (Berlin 1992).
- Starkey, D.**, 'A reply. Tudor government: the facts?', *The Historical Journal* 31 (1988) 921-931.
- Stieglitz, A.** von, 'Hof und Hofgesellschaft in der Residenz Kassel in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts', in: H. Wunder [e.a.] (ed.), *Kassel im 18. Jahrhundert. Residenz und Stadt* (Kassel 2000) 321-349.
- Straubel, R.**, *Beamte und Personalpolitik im altpreußischen Staat* (Potsdam 1998).
- Todorov, N.P.**, *L'administration du royaume de Westphalie de 1807 à 1813* (Saarbrücken 2011).
- Turner, V.W.**, *Dramas, fields and metaphors. Symbolic action in human society* (New York 1974).
- Westerburg, J.**, "'Sardanapalische Pracht" und die reformstaatliche Modernisierung? Der Hof des Königreichs Westphalen in Kassel', in: J. Flemming & D. Krause-Vilmar (ed.), *Fremdherrschaft und Freiheit. Das Königreich Westphalen als napoleonischer Modellstaat* (Kassel 2009) 191-206.
- Zanten, J. van**, 'Schielijk, Winzucht, Zwaarhoofd en Bedaard'. *Politieke discussie en oppositievorming in Nederland, 1813-1840* (Amsterdam 2004).