This paper argues that the conflict between the Teutonic Order in Livonia and the archbishops of Riga was to a large extent a conflict of memory. The stark differences in how the early history of Livonia was remembered by these two competing powers are seen as the main cause for their almost permanent disputes and disagreements. The detailed study of their conflicting remembrance of the early history of Livonia during the 15th century is followed by a discussion of the causes behind the emergence of two such strikingly contrasting visions of history. On the one hand, these two versions of history were definitely shaped by the centuries of long-standing conflict. It seems that both sides merged their remembrance of the beginnings of their respective institutions with their political claims resulting in not only two competing narratives on the early history of Livonia, but also in two conflicting visions of how the relations of power should ‘rightfully’ be. On the other hand, the memorial practices of these two institutions seem to have had a strong impact on the emergence of these narratives. Each group was focused on the remembrance of their own members and their deeds only, largely forgetting about the achievements of the other, which again led to the development of two very narrow historical memories at odds with each other. In other words, their approaches to remembering history not only gave rise to their disagreements, but also made finding a lasting solution to their differences almost impossible.
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The history of Medieval Livonia is characterized by an almost permanent conflict between the Livonian Branch of the Teutonic Order and the Archbishopric of Riga, which often gave rise to lengthy judicial proceedings at the papal curia, alliances with foreign kings and princes, and occasional small scale warfare. Historians usually consider it a clash between the strongest military power of Livonia (the Order) and the highest dignity in the region (the archbishop), where the former was trying to subjugate all the bishoprics of Livonia1 to its domination, and where the latter stood out as its strongest opponent.2 Although historians have taken an interest in the remembrance of history by these two competing parties, these studies have focused on the use of history by the conflicting parties to advance their claims and justify their actions.3 By contrast, this paper studies the effect of conflicting historical memories on these two opposing parties. It seems that a major

1 The territorial lords of medieval Livonia were the archbishop of Riga, the bishops of Tartu (Dorpat), Osilia and Curonia, and the Livonian Branch of the Teutonic Order. The bishop of Tallinn (Reval) did not possess territorial lordship.


reason for the permanence of their disputes lay in the stark differences in their approaches to remembering the early history of Livonia. For both sides merged their remembrance of the beginnings of their respective institutions with their vision of how the relations of power should ‘rightfully’ be in their own times. In other words, what they perceived as the ‘original’ constitution of these power-relations, they also thought of as the only rightful one, and since their views on these matters were completely incompatible, it made finding a lasting solution to their differences impossible.

The study of historical memory, also known as mnemohistory, aims at researching how and why the past is remembered. As Jan Assmann puts it: ‘the past is not simply “received” by the present. The Present is “haunted” by the past and the past is modelled, invented, reinvented and reconstructed by the present’. According to Assmann, the dominant version of history is often challenged by a counter-history, a remembrance of what was forgotten in the dominant version. It is rather difficult to say which of the two conflicting historical narratives of Medieval Livonia was the dominant one since they were kept by two separate institutions. So we will begin with an analysis of the historical narratives of the Church of Riga and of the Livonian Branch of the Teutonic Order as they existed in the 15th century, whereafter we can move back in time to seek out when and how these two conflicting visions of history came into being.

At the beginning of July 1454, as negotiations were held between the archbishop of Riga, the Teutonic Order and the city of Riga, a historical narrative describing the conflict between the archbishopric and the Order was read out aloud upon the request of Archbishop Silvester Stodewescher (1449–1479). This text, composed by the provost of the cathedral chapter of Riga, Dietrich Nagel, begins with a concise narrative of the origins of Livonia, which also serves as the basis for its legal demands:

‘Dear honourable sirs and friends. In order to comprehend and to understand more clearly and deeply the concern of the church, as it now is constituted, it is necessary to recount in short words how and when this land came to the christian faith. So I want you to know that in the year of Christ one thousand one hundred ninety-one, or thereabouts, during the time of Pope Celestine the third, the venerable father Meinhard bishop of Livonia began to preach in this land and to promulgate the christian faith to the Livs in Uexküll and Dolen, and was supported by the merchants, who used to sail to this land from Visby. After him came the venerable father Berthold, who was slain by the Livs on the Santberge in front of Riga in his second year. After that aforementioned Berthold came the venerable father Albert von Buexhoeveden, who attained at the Council of Lateran in Rome during the time of Pope Innocent the third an indulgence from all sins to those,
who helped to bring this land to the faith; and he preached that grace in the German lands, so that he with many noble lords, knights and squires and many merchants brought this land to the faith of Christ. And thereafter Emperor Heinrich enfeoffed him with this land as a principedom, to make use of it as a prince of the Holy [Roman. — M. M.] Empire, especially to found and erect the city of Riga, as it is clearly expressed in the charter made thereupon. And immediately he founded the city of Riga and provided all who wanted to live within it with terps [to build houses upon. — M. M.] and endowed them with the law and many other privileges, justice and freedom. This aforementioned Albert, so that the faith of Christ be protected and the service of God propagated, established in this land the order, erstwhile named the Knightly Brothers of Christ or commonly called the Swordbrothers, and affixed to them the third part of the temporal demesne of the Church of Riga, for which they ought to defend him and his church, and the master of the Order, whoever is currently in office ought to be obedient and trustworthy to the same bishop, as it clearly stands written out in the bull of Pope Innocent the third. As thereafter most parts of these lands were through God's deeds brought to the faith of Christ and yet these christian lands all the same suffered from many attacks by the heathens, so that the master of these Swordbrothers was slain with fifty brothers, so it happened in the year 1237 or thereabouts, that upon assiduous pleas form the bishops of Riga, Dorpat and Osilia, Pope Gregory the ninth merged the Swordbrothers with the German Hospital of the Holy Virgin Mary, and specifically set and ordained, that the brothers of the German Hospital, who would be there at any given time, ought to stand under the jurisdiction of the prelates; as the bulls issued on this matter clearly express.

Nagel goes on by describing how the Teutonic Order later turned against the Church of Riga and has since then failed to uphold its main obligations: to defend the church and to obey the bishops. Considering the importance Nagel gives to the early history of Livonia in explaining the predicament of the Church of Riga during his own times, one comes to the impression that his story is no mere justification of the claims of the archbishop and the cathedral chapter. Rather, he presents a reactionary view of history, or even a political program advocating a return to an imagined earlier state, which he claims has been lost due to the unjust actions of the Order.

Nagel seems to have based his polemical narrative on the historical memory of the cathedral chapter of Riga, employing of course only those parts which highlighted the relations of the church with the Teutonic Order and the city of Riga. Therefore, when seeking further elements of this foundational narrative, as it existed in the middle of the 15th Century, one has to use additional sources. Firstly, it is necessary to consider an earlier overview of the conflict between the Church of Riga and the Teutonic Order written by Dietrich Nagel in 1434. It was meant to be used in judicial proceedings at the Church-council of Basle, and as such it is not really a narrative, but rather a sequence

---

10 A military religious order, which existed between the years 1202–1237.
13 An overview of the conflict between the Church of Riga and the Teutonic Order // Die Bibliothek des Geistlichen Ministeriums in Dom St. Nikolai, Greifswald, manuscript No. 23 C VI, fol. 113r–122v. The Manuscript is also available online. URL: http://www.digitale-bibliothek-mv.de/viewer/image/PPNDom-BibHGWWkanonistische_SammelHS_C_23_VI/1/LOG_0000/ (accessed: 07.06.2019). — See also: Liv-, Est-
of references and quotations from relevant charters and documents, along with glosses on the availability of transcripts of these documents in Basle.\(^{14}\) Secondly, two documents from the year 1452 issued by Archbishop Silvester and dealing with the legal rights of the Church of Riga for lordship over the city of Riga should be taken into account. The first of those, from July 1452 is addressed to the master of the Livonian Branch of the Order\(^ {15}\), and the second one, from November 1452 — to the city of Riga.\(^ {16}\)

As we have seen, the foundational narrative of the Church of Riga was centred on the activities of its first three bishops — Meinhard, Berthold and Albert — who were remembered as bishops of Livonia. Medieval bishoprics were traditionally called by the name of the city where the seat of the bishop was situated. Meinhard had established his seat at a settlement of the Livs which bore the name of Uexküll. It was only in the year 1201 that Albert moved the seat of the bishopric to Riga\(^ {17}\). Now, Meinhard, Berthold and Albert were often referred to as bishops of Uexküll resp. Riga in charters issued during their own lifetime.\(^ {18}\) This practice was nevertheless not consistent, and so we have several charters from that period, where they are instead called bishops of Livonia\(^ {19}\). The same practice of using both the title of bishop of Livonia and bishop of Uexküll or Riga is also common for the Chronicle of Henry of Livonia, written ca. 1224–1227.\(^ {20}\) At that time, Livonia meant the territory inhabited by the Livs, but during the 13th century it gradually became to signify the whole region known to historians as Medieval Livonia\(^ {21}\). So for a person of the 15th century Livonia would first foremost have meant the region as a whole and not just the area inhabited by the Livs.

It must have been a deliberate choice to forget about Uexküll\(^ {22}\) as the initial seat of the bishopric and to remember Meinhard, Berthold and Albert as bishops of Livonia. It certainly contributed to the argument of the primacy of the Church of Riga. Not only were these three bishops presented as the ones who christianised the indigenous peoples of the region, one among them, namely Bishop Albert, was also depicted as the legitimate ruler of the whole of Livonia. It is interesting to note that Archbishop Silvester actually referred to himself as a prince of the Holy Roman Empire and prince of Livonia in 1473\(^ {23}\). Although this was rather an exception, it nevertheless points towards a possibility that he may have considered himself as a kind of overlord of Livonia. One can see the similari-
ties between the statement of the archbishop in 1473 and Nagel’s narrative quoted above, where Bishop Albert was depicted as an imperial prince, whose principedom encompassed the whole of Livonia. It is worth pointing out that the Emperor Heinrich mentioned by Nagel was in fact Heinrich (VII), King of the Romans (1220–1234), son and co-ruler of Emperor Friedrich II (1212–1250). It remains unclear why Nagel chose to title him emperor, for the other three sources title him correctly as king of the Romans.

The claim that Albert was the legitimate ruler of the whole of Livonia served as the legal justification for his status as the founder, donator and therefore overlord of not only the city of Riga and the Order of the Swordbrothers, but also of the Bishoprics of Tartu and Osilia, as is clearly stated in the document written by Nagel in 1434. Unfortunately, the sources at my disposal do not elaborate if the Church of Riga therefore believed to hold any particular rights over the Bishoprics of Tartu and Osilia beyond the limits of its archiepiscopal authority. Regarding the Swordbrothers, Nagel’s narrative quite clearly emphasizes that they had accepted their status as subject to the bishop, and that the pope had in 1237 compelled the Teutonic Knights in Livonia to remain in the same subordinate status.

The main focus of Nagel’s narrative from 1454 lay in proving that the city of Riga should rightfully be under the lordship of the archbishop. The question of who the rightful lord of Riga was remained one of the major points of dispute between the archbishop and the Order. Although the city was founded by Bishop Albert in 1201, it was conquered and subjugated by the Teutonic Knights in 1330, after a longer period of conflicts between the Order, the city and the archbishop. The archbishops could never fully accept the loss of the city and vehemently demanded it back. In 1452, Archbishop Silvester and the master of the Order ended this dispute with a compromise and established a joint lordship over Riga. This proved most unpopular with the city council of Riga, which had rather benefitted from the dispute. So in 1454, Riga sought to end the joint lordship and return to the lordship of either the Order or the archbishop under better conditions than before. In the summer of 1454, the supporters of the archbishop were gaining influence among the members of city council, and Dietrich Nagel’s historical narrative, read aloud during tripartite negotiations at the beginning of July 1454, was clearly aimed at convincing the members of the city council to accept the archbishop as their rightful overlord.

Teutonic Order had probably not expected to be confronted with such a narrative during these negotiations and therefore had to give their answer orally. Actually, the Knights were often not very keen on elaborating their point of view with the help of a historical narrative of the distant past. Nevertheless, we can find their version of the origins of Livonia in a polemical text written approximately thirty years earlier. In February 1424 the General Proctor of the Teutonic Order at the papal curia, Johann Tiergart, presented a justification of the claims of the Order to the cardinals commissioned by the pope.

24 An overview of the conflict between the Church of Riga and the Teutonic Order fol. 113v; AR 1. No.543, 549.
25 An overview of the conflict between the Church of Riga and the Teutonic Order fol. 113v-113r.
to investigate an issue between Order and the Church of Riga. The matter at hand was that the pope had allowed the canons of the cathedral chapter of Riga to take off the robes of the Teutonic Order and to revert back to the Order of the Canons Regular of Saint Augustine\(^\text{29}\). Johann Tiergart aimed at convincing the cardinals and the pope to revoke that decision\(^\text{30}\). He argued that the canons of Riga should remain priest-brothers of the Teutonic Order because it was the only way to keep them from harassing the Knights with unjust claims and false accusations. In order to prove his point, he gave a historical overview of their conflicting relations, beginning with the origins of Livonia:

“Since truly, as chronicles written about it attest, at a time when Livonia was yet astray in pagan errors, merchants from Germany acquired from infidel Livs a settlement on the shores of the Duna river, where now the city of Riga stands, and fortified it to keep themselves and their goods safe from invasion; successive merchants enlarged the settlement and because of their interaction and familiarity with Livs they converted a large number of these Livs to Christianity and baptized them; as a cathedral-church was erected in this settlement, Pope Innocent III placed a certain priest with the name of Meinhard as its bishop, with the title bishop of Livonia. And since not only the spiritual sword should be used to enlarge christianity and to defend the converted, the aforementioned Innocent added the temporal sword, namely the Brothers of the Knighthood of Christ. And as the borders and boundaries of the said Livonian church had widened as far as was sufficient for a bishopric, the aforementioned Innocent bestowed the third part of the whole bishopric to the aforementioned brothers and sent a certain legate to these parts, who — as the number of faithful had increased — divided these lands between the bishop and the brothers and assigned each with their part, as it is evident from the charters prepared about it and confirmed by the Apostolic See. And because the city of Riga was erected there, the bishop, who had previously been called bishop of Livonia, was from then on called bishop of Riga after the name of the city and he was subject to the Church of Bremen as his metropolitan; and the same bishop chose to live in this city of Riga together with the Brothers of the Knighthood, next to the habitation of these brothers; he did not possess any jurisdiction over the burghers and inhabitants of the city, on the contrary, the burghers governed and judged themselves and ruled the worldly affairs of the city and fortified its walls and towers with their own costs and expenses. These aforementioned Brothers of the Knighthood of Christ did indeed advance strenuously and faithfully the business of the faith, for which they had been sent there, through many wars with the aid of crusaders and cooperation from God they subordinated to the church and to christian worship not only the whole of Livonia, but also other neighbouring provinces, where other cathedral-churches were erected, namely Osilia and Tartu. Then, however, after many such wars, several of the aforementioned brothers were killed and finally Pope Gregory IX, upon request of the

\(^{29}\) Although founded as canons of Saint Augustine, the cathedral chapter switched to the Order of Canons Regular of Prémontré in 1209, then back to Order of Saint Augustine in 1373–1374, was in 1394–1397 compelled by the Teutonic Knights to become priest brothers of the Teutonic Order, switched back to the Order of Saint Augustine in 1428 and finally returned to the Teutonic Order in 1451. See: Glauer M. Die Bindung des Domkapitels von Riga an die Regel des Deutschen Ordens // Die Domkapitel des Deutschen Ordens in Preußen und Livland / eds R. Biskup, M. Glauer. Münster, 2004. S. 269–316.

bishops of Livonia, united those of them, who had remained with all of their property and possessions with the brothers of the Teutonic Order of Blessed Mary; from which it becomes evident that the brothers of Saint Mary do not hold their possessions in the diocese of Riga as a donation from the bishop, nor have they gained them with gold and silver, but obtained them from the first division of such lands and have foremost purchased them with the shedding of their own blood and that of their predecessors\textsuperscript{31}.

Similarly to Dietrich Nagel, Johann Tiergart envisages the early history of Livonia as a time of co-operation between the Order of the Swordbrothers resp. the Teutonic Order and the Church of Riga, contrasting it to the later period of conflict. Tiergart leaves the bishops and the clergy without any active participation in the events that led to the formation of Medieval Livonia. The christianisation of the indigenous populace of the region is shown to have been solely accomplished by the Swordbrothers and the Teutonic Knights with the aid of crusaders. Even the earliest efforts at evangelization are depicted as deeds of the merchants from Germany without any reference to priests or missionaries. He thus emphasizes that not only the Church of Riga but also the other bishoprics of Livonia owe their very existence to the activities of the military religious orders, whereas the Teutonic Knights, on the other hand, owe nothing to the bishops.

Tiergart is undoubtedly debating with a vision of history rather similar to the one envisaged by Dietrich Nagel thirty years later, or in other words, with the basic outline of the historical memory of the Church of Riga. At the same time, he bases his overview of the early history of Livonia entirely on the Chronicle of Hermann of Wartberge, written ca. 1380 by a chaplain of the master of the Livonian Branch of the Teutonic Order\textsuperscript{32}. This chronicle is a highly polemical version of the Order’s vision of the past, clearly aimed against the Church of Riga\textsuperscript{33}.

The main issue of debate — who was regarded as the one who christianized Livonia — was primarily rooted in the way these two corporations approached their own past and preserved the memory of their deceased members. Bishops Meinhard, Berthold and especially Albert were undoubtedly the leading figures of missionary and crusading activities in Livonia between ca 1180 and 1229, and it is obvious that the Church of Riga would preserve their memory. The remembrance of Meinhard and Berthold was strengthened probably in the 1370s or 1380s when their remains were transferred from the church of Uexküll to the cathedral of Riga, and there seems to have been a failed attempt at instituting a saints’ cult for them\textsuperscript{34}. Albert was remembered as ‘the founder’ by the cathedral chapter of Riga already in the middle of the 13th century\textsuperscript{35}. What the Church of Riga did not remember was the role the Swordbrothers and their successor the Teutonic Order had played in the christianization, for it lay outside its own institutional memory. The same can be said regarding the Livonian Branch of the Teutonic Order, who considered them-

\textsuperscript{31} LUB 7. No. 78. P. 60–61. The author’s translation from an original in Latin.
\textsuperscript{35} Levans A. Die lebendigen Toten. P. 18.
selves, along with their predecessors the Swordbrothers, the conquerors and therefore true christianisers of Livonia. Both their memorial practices, which kept the memory of their fallen brothers alive\textsuperscript{36}, and their history writing were geared towards remembering their military feats against the pagans. The role played by the bishops in christianization simply had no place in these memories\textsuperscript{37}. Evidently, both the Church of Riga and the Teutonic Order had rather narrow vision of history, centred on the activities of their own predecessors and fallen members, and largely forgetful about the achievements of others.

The discrepancies in the remembrance of the exact nature of power relations between the Order and the Church of Riga were influenced by early changes in these relations. As a small regional religious military order, the Swordbrothers had stood under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the local bishops. The papal bull which incorporated them into the Teutonic Knights decreed that the Livonian Branch of the Teutonic Order must also stand under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the bishops, despite the fact that the papal privileges of the Order freed it from the authority of archbishops and bishops and subjected it directly to the pope in ecclesiastical matters. This soon led to a situation when the master of the Order refused to swear obedience to the bishops of Riga, Tartu and Osilia as to his ecclesiastical superiors\textsuperscript{38}. Probably during the second half of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century the Livonian Branch of the Order achieved factual independence from the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the bishops of Livonia. As the Teutonic Knights had succeeded in changing the power relations they had inherited from the Swordbrothers, they may have sought to cement their achievement by changes in memory, i.e. by believing that the Swordbrothers had also been directly subject to the pope and free from the authority of local bishops.

So it was Pope Innocent III, whom the Teutonic Knights remembered as the founder of the Swordbrothers. The Swordbrothers had actually been founded in the year 1202 by a Cistercian monk named Theodoric, an influential missionary in the circle of Bishop Albert, most probably acting at least with the latter’s consent. Two years later, in 1204, Pope Innocent III confirmed the establishment of this new military-religious order\textsuperscript{39}. So the Teutonic Knights, following their narrative scheme, emphasized the papal confirmation as the actual act of founding, whereas the Church of Riga, which attempted to regain its lost authority, replaced Theodoric with Bishop Albert as the founder of the Swordbrothers to find additional support to its claims. The actual founder was left out of both narratives because he did not fit into either scheme.


The same can be seen regarding the issue of how the Swordbrothers got the territory they ruled. In the year 1207, Bishop Albert relinquished temporal power over a part of his diocese to the Swordbrothers. Later on, as the Bishoprics of Tartu and Osilia were founded, these bishops did the same. Although these acts were most probably agreements between the respective bishop and the Swordbrothers, they were usually documented in the form of charters issued by the bishop. Charters wherein the bishops acted as the ones who granted lands and rights to the Swordbrothers who were obliged to defend the bishoprics from hostile incursions and stand under their clerical jurisdiction. The archbishops of Riga, the bishops of Tartu and Osilia, and the canons of their cathedral chapters not only kept the memory of those acts alive but actually developed it further. They began to claim that the Swordbrothers had in fact been liegemen of the bishops and demanded that the master of the Livonian Branch of the Order ought to do homage to them.

These claims of the bishops were completely incompatible with the historical memory of the Teutonic Knights, who considered themselves the conquerors of the whole region and therefore simply could not accept the notion that they had received the territory under their lordship as grants, let alone as fiefs, from the hands of the bishops. As we have seen, Tiergart put forth the notion that it had actually been the pope and his legate who divided the newly Christianised lands between the Swordbrothers and the bishops and assigned each to their part. There is much truth to this matter for several disputes on the division of lands and the details of their power relations arose between the bishops and the Swordbrothers already during the first decades of the 13th century. The settlement of these disputes often involved the pope or his legates. Tiergart seems to refer to exactly these acts, especially an early settlement by Innocent III from the year 1210 and the activities of William, bishop of Modena (1222–1234) and cardinal of Sabina (1244–1251), papal legate to Livonia and Prussia 1225–1230 and 1234–1243. Nevertheless, the Order had not completely forgotten about the episcopal charters mentioned above. For example, they appear in the Chronicle of Hermann of Wartberge, but as agreements between the Order and the bishops, not as episcopal grants of land.

The third major issue in these conflicting narratives is the dispute on the lordship over the city of Riga which had actually begun as early as in the first decades of the 13th century. For already the Swordbrothers sought to attain at least a share of the lordship over the city, but their demands were dismissed by papal legate William, who decided in 1225, that the city stood under the lordship of the bishop of Riga. The archiepiscopal stance in this matter was rather straightforward: the Teutonic Order had no rights of lordship over the city and must return it to the archbishop. Similarly to the other issues on debate, the Order tried to invalidate these claims by simply stating that the bishops and archbishops...
of Riga had never held any secular authority over the city, and its burghers and therefore their claims were void. Therefore, Tiergart stated that the original settlement on the site of Riga had been founded by the merchants from Germany. Interestingly enough, he avoided any elaboration on how and by whose authority this settlement became a city. Furthermore, he seems to have depicted Riga as a free city governed by its burghers prior to 1330 when it was subjugated by the Knights. Tiergart source, Hermann of Wartberge, on the other hand stated, that the city of Riga was built by the Swordbrothers and the crusaders, and that the former originally held lordship over one third of it. These claims by Hermann of Wartberge may therefore have reflected a historical memory inherited from the Swordbrothers.

It is not entirely clear why Tiergart chose to deviate from his source and avoid any claims of the order's partial lordship over the city prior to 1330. It may have been just for the sake of brevity, although it is more plausible that in this way he sought to substantiate the Order's claims to lordship over the whole of the city and not just over a third of it. Tiergart, as well as Hermann of Wartberge, justified the Order's conquest of Riga in 1330 as a just war with a religious background. Riga had allied itself with Grand Duke Gediminas of Lithuania (1316–1341), a heathen ruler, who had sent a garrison there. This enabled the polemicists of the Order to claim that their conquest of the city was in fact its liberation from the hands of the heathen Lithuanians and therefore a rightful subjugation.

Let us now look at how these two narratives came into being. The history writing of the Teutonic Order more or less begins with the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle, a Middle High German verse chronicle written ca. 1290 by an anonymous author, who was most probably a knightly brother of the Order. It is a history of the Livonian Branch of the Order with a focus on their military actions against the heathen. Interestingly, the Rhymed Chronicle hushes up any conflicts or disagreements between the Teutonic Order and the bishops, giving instead a picture of a united front under the leadership of the Order standing against the enemies of the faith. Although it has no polemical stance against the Church of Riga, and it doesn't even clearly define the power relations between the various actors in Livonia, the chronicle nevertheless contains at least some of the key elements later found in Hermann of Wartberge's and Johann Tiergart's narratives on early history of Livonia.

First of all, it presents the Teutonic Order as the one who christianised medieval Livonia and more or less owns it through right of conquest. The missionary and crusading activities under the leadership of the bishops Meinhard and Berthold are shown as ending in failure when Berthold was killed in battle by the heathens. The Order of the Sword Brothers, which is said to have been founded directly thereafter, immediately took over the
fight against the heathens. Although Berthold’s successor Albert is highly praised by the author of the chronicle, he actually appears in the text only two times: firstly, in connection to the foundation of the Swordbrothers, and then, as ‘the second hand of the brothers’ preaching the Livonian crusade in Germany. Subsequent bishops and archbishops of Riga are not even mentioned by name. So, from the moment of the Order’s foundation, as the narrative goes, it was the master of the Order who organized the campaigns against the heathens, commanding not only his own troops, but also seasonal crusaders and the troops of the Christianised native peoples of Livonia. Furthermore, the chronicle states that it was a custom for the bishops of Livonia, the burgurers of Riga and troops led by the Danish viceroy of Northern Estonia to take part in the campaigns organized by Order. Evidently, the chronicle perpetuates the memory of Teutonic Knights as the leading force in Livonia, justifies their dominance with their military efforts and successes, and shows the bishops as being subordinate to the master of the Order.

Moreover, the chronicle ascribes the initiative for the foundation of the Swordbrothers to Pope Innocent III who also prescribed that the Order must possess one third of the Christianized lands and forever stand under the protection of the Apostolic See. Bishop Albert is nevertheless shown as the one who carried this papal decision out. The author of the chronicle clearly states that the Christianized lands were divided between the Order and the bishoprics in accordance with the aforementioned papal decision. No mention is made of the Order’s subordination to the bishops. In other words, the power relations between the Order and the bishops are depicted here in more or less the same way as in the aforementioned texts of the 14th and 15th centuries.

Regarding the city of Riga, the Rhymed Chronicle, on the one hand, presents Bishop Berthold as its founder and secular lord, but keeps complete silence on the legal relations of the city thereafter. On the other hand, Riga appears strongly connected to the Order in the chronicle, as the seat of its master and as the starting and ending point of nearly every one of his military campaigns. Furthermore, when a new master of the Order arrives in Riga, the burgurers are shown going out to meet him and accompanying him on his way to the castle of the Knights inside the city, where celebrations are held. A description remarkably similar to the ceremony of the acceptance of the ruler of a city by its burgurers on his first visit. Therefore, the Rhymed Chronicle may be easily read as demonstrating the master of the Order as the ruler of Riga, even if it is not directly stated. At the very least, someone who had heard the chronicle recited, or read it himself, would have had little reason to believe that the archbishop of Riga is the lord of the city.

The main features of the Teutonic Order’s version of the early history of Livonia had therefore already been formed by the end of the 13th century. During the next century,
this narrative became truly polemical and clearly pointed against the Church of Riga. The major impetus for such developments came from a number of judicial processes initiated by the archbishops of Riga at the papal court between the years 1298 and ca. 1375. For example, at the beginning of the year 1310, procurators of the Teutonic Order at the papal curia composed a lengthy answer to the accusations of the archbishops of Riga, which already contained more or less the same claims as those made by Johann Tiergart, with the exception of anything related to the city of Riga. Finally, in the 1370s and 1380s, Hermann of Warthergave a narrative form to this vision of history shaped by the lengthy judicial proceedings.

The only major change to this narrative thereafter lay in the addition of an emphasis to the Teutonic Knights’ early imperial privileges, as can be seen from the example of documents from the years 1452 and 1556, as well as from the ‘Schöne historie’, a pamphlet for the year 1508 written to promote a papal indulgence campaign for the support of the Livonian Branch of the Teutonic Order. Furthermore, at least a simplified version of this narrative must have been common knowledge among the members of the Livonian Branch of the Order, as is attested by a bet made in 1523 by a knightly brother who claimed that the bishops had played no part in the christianisation of Livonia which had been carried out by the Swordbrothers instead.

As we have seen, the foundational narrative of the Livonian Branch of the Order can be traced back as far as to the end of the 13th century and was most probably known in at least a simplified form to their members until the end of its existence in 1562.

The archiepiscopal version of the early history of Livonia comes to fore during the 14th century in documents related to the judicial proceedings against the Teutonic Order at the papal court. The assertion that the Knights of the Livonian Branch had received the territory under their lordship from the hands of the bishops, and that they are subordinate to the ecclesiastical authority of the bishops appears already in the year 1300. By 1310, the archbishop had already began to claim that the Order held its lands in Livonia as fiefs from the hands of the bishops and was therefore their vassal. This vision of history ap-

---

63 AR 1. No. 550.
peared in the form of a historical narrative in the 1340s, when Archbishop Engelbert von Dolen (1341–1347) recounted the story in front of the papal consistory of Clement VI (1342–1352)\(^7\). Some adjustments were made to the narrative in the 15th century, such as the addition of references to the enfeoffment of Bishop Albert by Henry (VII), king of the Romans, but the main elements remained the same from the first half of the 14th century on. This foundational narrative of the Church of Riga was still actual in the 16th century, as can be seen from the example of a document from the year 1536\(^7\) and from Johann Lohmüller’s ‘Warhaftig Histori’, a polemical history of Livonia favouring the archbishop of Riga, written in 1558 in the court of Duke Albrecht of Prussia, whose younger brother Wilhelm was archbishop of Riga at the time\(^7\).

The more or less permanent conflict between the Church of Riga and the Teutonic Knights may have played a role in keeping the archiepiscopal vision of history alive by spurring the canons to read charters and documents composed during earlier phases of the conflict, as well as the originals from the first half of the 13th century. Then again it could also have been preserved via an oral tradition among the canons of the cathedral chapter, most probably in connection with their memorial practices. Although the extremely sparse list of the bishops and archbishops of Riga known as ‘The Rigan episcopal Chronicle’ — whose earlier parts date back to the 14th century, and which was definitely composed with respect to the memorial practices of the cathedral chapter — does not contain any claims regarding the Swordbrothers, it does present the early bishops of Riga as Christianisers and founders of Riga\(^7\). Furthermore, there is some information from the 18th century about a chronicle written by Dietrich Nagel, which, unfortunately, has not been found, and there are some doubts of it having ever existed.\(^7\) Nonetheless, even if Nagel’s chronicle had not existed, the cathedral chapter of Riga evidently would have still managed to keep their foundational narrative alive, probably through a mixture of both oral and written memory.

In conclusion, it suffices to say that the stark differences in how the early history of Livonia was remembered by the Teutonic Order and by the Church of Riga can be explained, on the one hand, by the memorial practices and selective memory of brotherhoods and corporations in general, and on the other hand, by a long-standing confrontation between

these two in particular: for it is precisely during times of confrontation when one chooses to bring forth only those past events or their aspects which help to further one's political aims and supress everything which may hinder it. So, although the Church of Riga lost its early position of superiority in Livonia, its ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the Order and finally even its lordship over the city of Riga, it nevertheless retained the memory of these positions of power, demanded them back, and gradually began to claim to have originally held a much stronger position of power than it had actually had in the first place. The Teutonic Knights, on the other hand, were obviously reluctant to give up their successes in the field of political power relations, and transferred these successes back in time, to the period of the early history of Livonia.

Nevertheless, the main point of disagreement between these two, namely, which party was remembered as the Christianiser of the native peoples, cannot be considered to have been a result of their conflict. It seems to have formed because both the Knights and the archbishopric facilitated the remembrance of only their own members and predecessors forgetting about the deeds of others. Although both in a sense remembered the same events — the Christianization of the heathens and the establishment of ‘structures’ of Medieval Livonia — the differences in the details, especially in who was remembered as the active party, had already become so stark by the year 1300 that there were in fact two competing visions of history and therefore also of the ‘rightful order of things’. And this may have precisely been the main reason why both sides could never find a lasting resolution to their differences.
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