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ABSTRACT

Memoria or the medieval remembrance of the dead is integral to our understanding of medieval society. However, memoria was not just a liturgical practice intended to lessen purgatorial suffering, but a ‘total social phenomenon’ that impacted every aspect of life. This thesis follows in the tradition of the German Memoriaforschung school, especially the concepts formulated by Otto Gerhard Oexle. These concepts are here particularly applied to memoria as a group phenomenon. A particular contention of this thesis is that memoria was socially constitutive and thus not only a vehicle to remember the past but a means to create and maintain social groups. Therefore this thesis takes the form of series of case studies drawn from late medieval Livonia (present day Latvia and Estonia) c. 1400-1525. The groups chosen –associations of the urban elites, non-elite brotherhoods, the clergy and the Livonian branch of the Teutonic Order – reflect both the strength of the surviving source material and the particular characteristics of the region.

Each case study is considered through a series of research questions. How did memoria constitute and shape social relationships? How did memoria create and sustain groups? In what ways was memoria used for political purposes? How did groups use their past to maintain their identities in the present? What role did charity and the poor play?

In addition to exploring the above themes, this thesis particularly argues that memoria was used to legitimize power by urban governments and by the Teutonic Order and the archbishops of Riga. This thesis also shows that memoria created the cultural memory of the Teutonic Order and the Rigan church. Memoria sustained the identities of urban elite groups and was essential to creating relationships between the urban elites and non-elite groups.
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INTRODUCTION

‘How muche therfore are princes, gouernoures and noble menne bounde to theim whiche haue so liuely set furth the liues and actes of their parentes, that all though thei bee ded by mortall death, yet thei by writyng and Fame liue and bee continually present. (. . ) Thus, writyng is the keye to enduce vertue, and represse vice. Thus memorie maketh menne ded many a thousande yere still to liue as though thei were present.’

 Edward Hall (c. 1498–1547)

‘Memoria (ist) die Überwindung des Todes und des Vergessens durch Gedächtnis und Erinnerung (.)’

(Memoria is the overcoming of death and oblivion by means of memory and remembrance (. . ))

 Otto Gerhard Oexle

Mourning and commemoration of the dead is a fundamental part of the human experience and can be found in every society and culture. Often bounding with religious beliefs, it has been a basic form of collective memory throughout human history; in ancient Egypt, for example, the commemoration of the dead was one of the cores of the collective memory. Memoria – commemoration of the dead – played an essential role in medieval and early modern European society. Commemorative practices remain relevant in contemporary societies: the memorial tattoos of the grieving colleagues, friends and family of the New York fire-fighters who died on 9/11 are a poignant example of the many forms memory of the dead can take.

Memory studies are an interdisciplinary field in the humanities and social sciences, and range over cultures and periods. Studies of collective memory in the humanities and social sciences have been a trend over the last three decades which can be described as a

---

‘memory boom’. In 2008 the American sociologist Jeffry K. Ollick wrote that the number of studies on collective memory have increased to such an extent in a decade that a year of purchasing books on this topic ‘now would likely bankrupt even the best paid scholar.’

The field of collective memory, which now attracts the interest of many scholars, has been shaped by three dominant figures: French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs, German Egyptologist Jan Assmann, and French historian Pierre Nora. Their approaches to collective memory are complex and multi-faceted, and I shall discuss here those of particular relevance for this dissertation. Maurice Halbwachs is the founding father of collective memory studies, who formulated his concept of collective memory in the book *Social Frameworks of Memory (Les Cadres sociaux de la mémoire)* published in 1925. Yet Halbwachs’ concept was only rediscovered late in the twentieth century. Halbwachs reminds us that collective memory is shaped by individual memories, whose influence on collective memory differ in their effect. In his view ‘it is individuals as group members who remember. While these remembrances are mutually supportive of each other and common to all, individual members still vary in the intensity with which they experience them.’ However, Halbwachs also argues that memories of individuals are socially mediated, exposed to the collective memory of groups, and this enables individuals to ‘remember’ events they have never experienced. According to Halbwachs, even our most intimate memories – which are not shared – are bound to collective memory. Thus, on the one hand, collective memory is created by individual memories, while on the other, the ‘social frame’ influences individual memories, even those that are not held collectively. Halbwachs also notes that the collective memory does not exceed the boundaries of the group.

---

11 Halbwachs demonstrates these shared memories and experiences using an example of a family, see Idem., *On Collective Memory*, pp. 52-83; Jeffrey K. Olick, ‘Collective Memory. The Two Cultures,’ in *Sociological Theory* 17:3 (1999): pp. 333-348, at p. 335.
clearly distinguish collective memory from history, as interdependent phenomena that on occasion exist in opposition to each other.\(^{14}\)

Jan Assmann, who published *The Cultural Memory* (*Das kulturelle Gedächtnis*) in 1992, developed Halbwachs’ concept of collective memory further.\(^{15}\) Assmann based his approach on the study of ancient Egyptian, Babylonian, Greek, and Jewish cultures through their means of preserving the past. In Assmann’s view collective memory consists of several components that include: a communicative memory sustained by language and communication, and cultural memory, which uses written and visual carriers of information.\(^{16}\) Communicative memory is based on everyday communications; it is not organized, refers to recent events, and lasts for three to four generations, a century at most.\(^{17}\) Because eyewitnesses die, communicative memory has to be transformed into cultural memory to survive longer than forty to eighty years after an event.\(^{18}\) Cultural memory is set apart from the everyday, it is codified and organized, refers to the more distant past, and is transformed into myth.\(^{19}\) Cultural memory is constructed and maintained by a wide range of media: texts, monuments, images, rituals, and feasts.\(^{20}\) Although Assmann’s analysis is based on ancient cultures, he emphasises the universality of communicative and cultural memory. In his view, ‘the concept of cultural memory comprises that body of reusable texts, images, and rituals specific to each society in each epoch, whose ‘cultivation’ serves to stabilise and convey that society’s self-image.’\(^{21}\)

Pierre Nora did not develop a new theory about collective memory, but rather conceptualized the historical memory of modern French society. Nora formulated two concepts: *lieux de mémoire* – sites (realms) of memory – and *milieux de mémoire* – environments of memory.\(^{22}\) *Lieux de mémoire* directly refer to the ancient mnemotechnics and *loci memoriae*, which are not real spaces, but imaginary ones, which ‘exist because *milieux de mémoire* have disappeared and are essentially fictional,


\(^{15}\) Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis*, pp. 34-48.

\(^{16}\) Ibid., pp. 20-21.


\(^{18}\) Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis*, p. 51; Assmann, ‘Collective Memory,’ p. 128.

\(^{19}\) Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis*, pp. 52-56.

\(^{20}\) Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis*, pp. 52-56; Assmann, ‘Collective Memory,’ p. 129.

\(^{21}\) Assmann, ‘Collective Memory,’ p. 132.

\(^{22}\) Nora, ‘Between Memory and History,’ pp. 7-24.
mediated and relative’. Describing French sites of memory, Nora and his colleagues in the monumental work *Realms of Memory* have defined numerous events, institutions, spaces, notions and processes as the sites of memory, for example, Jean d’Arc, the Eiffel Tower, Vichy regime, *La Marseillaise* and others. Although the notions of *lieux de mémoire* and *milieux de mémoire* have been predominantly studied in modern nation states, they can also be fruitfully applied to medieval societies.

Collective memory can be broadly defined as ‘the means by which information is transmitted among individuals and groups and from one generation to another’. Collective memory is not just the flow of information about the past, it ‘involves sets of practices like commemoration and monument building and general forms like tradition, myth, or identity.’ It is not the ‘truth’ about the past; as historian Wulf Kansteiner argues, it ‘can take hold of historically and socially remote events but it often privileges the interests of the contemporary.’ Sociologist Barry Schwartz has similarly observed that ‘collective memory reflects reality by interpreting the past in terms of images appropriate and relevant to the present; it shapes reality by providing people with a programme in terms of which their present lines of conduct can be formulated and enacted.’ Thus, collective memory not only reflects the past, but also shapes the present. In my opinion, the study of collective memory illustrates practices of remembering the past, but equally demonstrates how societies and groups perceive the past, perform and enact it, and how they structure the information they wish to pass on to succeeding generations.

The ‘memory boom’ has also influenced medieval studies. The early scholarship on memory in the Middle Ages was led by Frances Yates, and more recently by Mary Carruthers. These studies, however, focus on the ‘art of memory’ (*ars memorativa*) and the techniques of remembering as part of medieval intellectual culture. This thesis

---

27 Ollick and Robbins, ‘Social Memory Studies,’ p. 106.
follows a very different path, and although it also employs the term *memoria* used by scholars of historical mnemotechnics to address medieval memory, here *memoria* reflects not memory, but commemoration and collective remembering.

Collective memory has come to the attention of medieval historians too. Yet, medievalists have – intentionally or unintentionally – avoided using the term ‘collective memory’. This may be due to the fact that the sources they work with do not easily lend themselves to that kind of approach, or perhaps they have made only limited use of concepts developed primarily for other periods. Nonetheless, some forms of collective memory have been studied in depth and benefit from a strong research tradition. Since the late 1960s German medievalists have worked on the remembrance of the dead in the Middle Ages, known as *memoria*. *Memoriaforschung*, which started as a positivistic prosopographical analysis of name-lists found in confraternity books (*libri vitae* and *libri memoriales*) of the early medieval monastic communities, has developed over the last four decades into a diverse and rich research topic for medievalists and early modernists. During this period of dynamic development, scholars of *Memoriaforschung* have formulated not only new approaches and methodologies, but also important theoretical concepts, which now can be described as ‘classical’.

Joachim Wollasch and Karl Schmid led with their work on memorial sources, and commemorational and charitable practices in the early medieval monasteries provided an initial research framework. But a new vibrancy was brought by Otto Gerhard

31 Because Assmann’s work has great influence on German medievalists, they have recently begun using the term *Errinnerungskulturen* to describe cultures of remembering in different social groups, for example, within the nobility. See *Adelige und bürgerliche Erinnerungskulturen des Spätmittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Werner Rösener, Göttingen, 2000.
Oexle, who has laid down theoretical foundations of *Memoriaforschung* since the 1970s.

*Memoria* is a form, a manifestation of collective memory. Oexle has defined *memoria* as ‘the overcoming of death and oblivion by means of memory and remembrance’.

According to Assmann, the commemoration of the dead stands between communicative and cultural memory, because it utilises both. *Memoria* is ‘communicative’ in its ‘human form’ of everyday secular and religious practices of mourning and remembering, and ‘cultural’ in its forms of transmission, e.g. texts and images, monuments and rituals, historical and literary writings, and institutions.

Medieval *memoria* was not just memory of the past, but also a social practice which bound together the living and the dead; it created a community. In Oexle’s view *memoria* combines ways of thinking and practice, and involves both individuals and groups. *Memoria* has to be seen as a form of memory that was also cultural practice, arising from remembering the past.

This dissertation builds on several key concepts developed by Oexle and his colleagues: the presence of the dead in the present, *memoria’s* socially constitutive character, *memoria* as a ‘total social phenomenon’, and *memoria* as gift-exchange. One of Oexle’s key contentions is that by commemorating the person by name, the physically absent living and dead were made present during the liturgy and other commemorative events. Oexle further claims that the dead are invoked as individuals in the act of speaking their names. This appeals to his argument that the dead in the Middle Ages retained their legal rights and continued to be subjects of social relationships. Thanks to commemoration the dead never left the community and

---

42 Oexle, ‘Gegenwart der Toten,’ p. 31; Halbwachs also refers to naming of the name as an important element of remembering. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, p. 71.
43 Ibid., p. 22.
memoria could be defined as ‘the creation of community by making the absent present in a non-physical way.’

Making the dead present during the liturgy was a focal point of memoria, but it was not the only way in which the presence of the dead was realised. Liturgical remembrance was just one of the forms of memoria. Oexle recognises historical and social memoria alongside liturgical memoria. Memoria has also frequently been divided into liturgical and non-liturgical remembrance. Non-liturgical forms of memoria, like commemoration of the dead during communal meals, however, have received less attention from scholars working on memoria.

Oexle makes use of Mauss’ concept of gift-giving, when he claims that memoria was a ‘total social phenomenon’. According to this interpretation memoria influenced all spheres of life: religion, economy, everyday life, philosophy, law, art, literature, historiography, social relationships, social behaviours and social practices. Yet, this claim of ‘totality’ cannot be perceived as the reduction of every medieval phenomenon to the remembering of the dead. The ‘totality’ of memoria was linked to a variety of practices and manifestations of memoria.

Memoria’s ‘totality’ meant that it was manifested through a wide range of media. Memoria was created by and reflected in written texts: necrologies, last wills, foundation charters, legal documents, account books of different institutions, liturgical manuscripts, and historiographical, hagiographical, and literary works as well.

---

Likewise, objects played a crucial role in the creation of *memoria*. Tombstones, altars and altarpieces, statues, murals, liturgical vessels, church buildings and chapels enhanced memorial practice and served as media of *memoria*.

*Memoria* was a socially constitutive phenomenon, which helped create and maintain medieval groups, and shaped their identities. The scholars of *Memoriaforschung* have formulated remembrance of the dead as ‘memory that creates a community’ (*Gedächtnis das Gemeinschaft stifet*) that united the living and also the living with the dead. In Oexle’s view remembrance of the dead was particularly important for the existence of noble families and kin groups: ‘without *memoria* there exists no “nobility” (*Adel*) and therefore also no legitimation for noble power.’ *Memoria* demonstrated not only the longevity of the bloodline and the line of succession but also its origins. As Assmann famously expressed it, ‘power needs origin’ or ‘*Herrschaft braucht Herkunft*’. The concept of *memoria* as a socially constitutive phenomenon is equally applicable to groups other than nobility. Oexle demonstrates *memoria’s* constitutive character with the example of medieval urban guilds and brotherhoods, for whom *memoria* was essential, because it provided a feeling of security for its members and thus assurance of the guild’s abilities to provide not only social, but also spiritual support. *Memoria* also created a sense of the group’s continuity and an awareness of its history; by remembering dead individuals, groups remembered their pasts. Therefore, memorial sources reflect not only religious or social practices, but also the historical self-

---


55 Oexle, ‘*Memoria als Kultur,*’ p. 38.

56 Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis*, p. 71.

57 Oexle, ‘Liturgische Memoria,’ p. 335.

consciousness. For medieval groups it was important to remember their dead founders because, as part of the founding myth (Ursprungsmythos), they shaped group identities in the present.

Memoria created groups, but it also created and reflected social relationships. Most frequently those were relationships between founders or donors, who made material contributions, and commemorators, who prayed for those benefactors. This relationship can be described as a spiritual ‘gift economy’. Motivated by memoria, material gifts in the form of real property, money and valuables were exchanged for immaterial goods, such as prayers, as a counter-gift. This gift-exchange ‘created and preserved the memory of the dead’ and during the early Middle Ages involved the nobility and monastic communities as partners in exchange of spiritual goods. Thus, the foundation, a material bequest directed for a specific purpose, was one of the elements that created memoria, granted it financial resources and ensured its longevity. Equally, charity was a practice of memoria, in which the rich exchanged their alms – food and clothing – for the prayers of the poor. Food and drink were part of medieval memoria, because monastic communities and urban associations commemorated their deceased members during festive communal meals.

Although Oexle’s perception of memoria is widely accepted, some scholars have challenged it, and have emphasized the limited temporal nature of memoria. The French historian Jean-Claude Schmitt controversially argues that memoria ‘as a form of

60 Assmann, Das kulturelle Gedächtnis, p. 76; Althoff, ‘Geschichtsbewusstsein,’ p. 86.
61 Oexle, ‘Memoria und Memorialüberlieferung,’ p. 95.
64 Patrick J Geary, Phantoms of Remembrance. Memory and Oblivion at the end of the First Millenium, Princeton, 1994, p. 77.
collective memory was a social technique of forgetting.’ Schmitt claims that the function of memoria was to “cool off” the memory under the guise of maintaining it, to soothe the painful memory of the deceased until their memory became indistinct.’ In Schmitt’s view memoria served to shorten the stay of the dead ‘in purgatorial punishment (or in purgatory), and finally, to enable the living to forget the deceased.’

This understanding of memoria clashes with the tradition of Memoriaforschung. Ralf Lusiardi counters Schmitt, describing memoria rather as ‘a social technique of mourning’, which helped individuals to deal with the deaths of those who meant a great deal to them.69 Memoria had no temporal boundaries, medieval people wanted to be commemorated in perpetuity, but memoria could fade if it was not properly maintained, as could any other form of collective memory.

Belief in the existence of purgatory and fear of purgatorial punishment were essential motivations for late medieval remembrance, but memoria was not dependent on them. Practices of memoria predated the ideas of purgation after the death and the high Middle Ages, when according to Jacques Le Goff, purgatory ‘was born’.70 By the eighth and ninth centuries monastic communities were commemorating dead members and sustained the memoria of their secular founders.71 The relationship between memoria and purgatory can be explicitly seen during the Reformation. Liturgical remembrance and the theological justification for it were abolished, but memoria continued to exist in Protestant culture, albeit in a changed form.72 According to Oexle, the real period of change was the eighteenth century, when social and legal attitudes towards the dead changed radically.73

Medieval remembrance of the dead embodied at one and the same time religious aspirations for a future in the uncertain afterlife, and the collective memory of the dead

---

that shaped identities and created communities, uniting individuals across the past, present and future.\textsuperscript{74} Here religious beliefs and collective memory combined. Memorial prayers and masses offered spiritual benefits, but were also a ritualized form of remembering which bonded groups together.

\emph{Memoria} has been extensively researched by several generations of scholars. As mentioned, during the initial stages of the \emph{Memoriaforschung} researchers – mainly of the universities of Freiburg and Münster – focused on the remembrance of early medieval monastic communities and aristocratic families.\textsuperscript{75} During this early stage \emph{memoria} was approached from theological and liturgical perspectives.\textsuperscript{76} From the mid-1980s the approach broadened out and became more interdisciplinary, although still dominated by the German scholars. In addition to the study of the textual memorial sources, \emph{memoria} scholarship now embraced the artistic and architectural manifestations of remembrance.\textsuperscript{77} The geographical scope of \emph{memoria} studies also expanded and \emph{memoria} in southern Europe and in Orthodox Russia was studied alongside research on commemoration in northern and western Europe.\textsuperscript{78}

During the 1990s the scholarship of \emph{memoria} moved outside the confines of the German research tradition. Although even now \emph{memoria} is not a widely known phenomenon in the scholarship of the English-speaking world, some influential American and English scholars have used approaches developed by the

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{73} Oexle, ‘Gegenwart der Toten,’ pp. 21, 71-72. \\
\textsuperscript{74} Schilp, ‘Totengedenken des Mittelalters,’ p. 24. \\
\textsuperscript{75} Joachim Wollasch, ‘Die mittelalterliche Lebensform der Verbrüderung,’ in \emph{Memoria. Der geschichtliche Zeugniswert}, pp. 215-232; Gerd Althoff was active in the research into the Ludophian and Ottonian \emph{memoria} from the 1970s, see his \emph{Adels- und Königsfamilien im Spiegel ihrer Memorialüberlieferung. Studien zum Totengedenken der Billunger und Ottonen}, Munich, 1984; Idem., \emph{Amicitiae und Pacta. Bündnis, Einung, Politik und Gebetsgedenken im beginnenden 10. Jahrhundert}, Hannover, 1992. \\
\textsuperscript{78} On \emph{memoria} in Italy, see Thomas Frank, \emph{Studien zu italienischen Memorialzeugnissen des XI und XII Jahrhunderts}, Berlin, 1991; Idem., ‘Bruderschaften, Memoria und Recht im spätmittelalterlichen Italien,’ in \emph{Memoria. Ricordare}, pp. 327-346; on the late medieval and early modern Russian Orthodox \emph{memoria},}
Memoriaforschung. Patrick Geary has researched early medieval remembering and forgetting, and worked on the relationship between the living and the dead during that period. 79 David D’Avray’s work on memorial sermons for royal personages showed that they ‘were intrinsically linked to liturgical memoria’. 80 In the last two decades Dutch scholars have also contributed greatly to the scholarship of memoria by developing innovative digital projects, such as the online database MeMO. 81

The remembrance of the dead has also been studied by scholars from outwith the theoretical and methodological framework developed by the Memoriaforschung. French historians have been active in this field, with the research of Jacques Chiffoleau on commemoration of the dead in late medieval Avignon and Jean-Claude Schmitt on ghosts – the appearances of the dead to the living – in the Middle Ages. 82 The American medievalist Megan McLaughlin studied commemoration of the dead in early medieval France. 83 British historians have also approached the topic of death and commemoration in late medieval and early modern England. 84 Clive Burgess has extensively studied remembrance of the dead in the late medieval English city parish, and a section of works on commemoration in England is represented in a recent volume edited by him and Caroline Barron. 85 Nigel Saul has led the way in work on gentry families and the artistic forms which expressed their desire to commemorate kin. 86 The work of Paul


81 Care for the Here and the Hereafter. Memoria, Art and Ritual in the Middle Ages, eds. Truus van Bueren and Andree van Leerdam, Turnhout, 2005; Truus van Bueren and Wilhelmina C. M. Wüstefeld, Leven na de dood. Gedenken in de late Middeleeuwen, Turnhout, 1999; MeMO database on memoria in the Netherlands at http://memo.hum.uu.nl/
Binski on artistic depictions of death has also contributed greatly to our understanding of commemoration.\(^{87}\)

Research has focused not only on the liturgical dimension of *memoria*, but also on its social aspects, for example the relationship between gift-giving and *memoria*.\(^{88}\) The memorial cultures of the late medieval aristocracy have also attracted the attention of historians.\(^{89}\) Urban commemoration in late medieval northern European cities has, however, dominated the field, in particularly the memorial aspects of testamentary bequests through the analysis of wills.\(^{90}\) Studies of wills have enabled analyses of the memorial practices and collective identities of specific urban groups, for example, political elites.\(^{91}\) The commemorative practices of a single European merchant family, the Fuggers, have been evaluated thanks to a vast deposit of documentation.\(^{92}\) These
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\(^{91}\) Olivier Richard has analysed wills of the urban patriciate in late medieval Regensburg, see his, *Mémoires bourgeoises. Memoria et identité urbaine a Ratisbonne à la fin du Moyen Âge*, Rennes, 2009; Christian Speer has studied piety and *memoria* of the town’s elites in Görlitz, see his *Frömmigkeit und Politik. Städtische Eliten in Görlitz zwischen 1300 und 1550*, Berlin, 2011.

studies have not been restricted to the *memoria* of elite groups, but have included commemoration within artisan brotherhoods and the poor.93

One of the most extensively studied topics has been the commemoration of the dead in the Hanseatic cities. Numerous studies of the political elites in the Hanseatic cities show how important *memoria* was for legitimation of political power and self-representation of elite groups.94 In addition, attention has been paid to *memoria* of the elite brotherhoods and merchant families in the largest Hanseatic cities, as well as of memorial foundations in smaller Hanseatic cities.95 *Memoria* of Hanseatic merchants has been considered not only within the Hansa itself, but also outside it, in the territories and cities where Hansa merchants were active – Flanders and Bruges.96

With this intensive research into medieval *memoria* in recent decades it may seem as if that new perspectives and approaches would be hard to find. Yet thus far the main focus has been on individuals or particular groups, with few regional studies of *memoria* in its many forms. Also most scholars have worked on *memoria* as a religious phenomenon and it has rarely been approached as a form of collective memory and a social practice. This dissertation will approach *memoria* differently, presenting it as both a form in which the past was recollected and a social practice that shaped present and future. This dissertation puts particular emphasis on the role of *memoria* in creating


and sustaining of medieval groups, their identities, and relationships. In order to achieve that, it will offer a regional study of *memoria*, revealing the memorial practices of a range of social groups who lived side by side in the Livonian space.

Livonia (Ger. Livland, Latv. Livonija, Est. Liivimaa) (see Map 1) was at the periphery of Europe, and yet numerous influences converged there. Until the late twelfth century Livonia was a pagan domain, inhabited by the Baltic Semigallians, Couronians, and Latgalians (later Latvians), Finno-Ugric Livonians (Livs) and Estonians. In the 1180s a peaceful Christian mission from northern Germany arrived in the region led by the Augustinian canon Meinhard, who in 1186 became the first Livonian bishop. The missionaries baptised pagan Livonians in the lower stretches of the river Düna (Latv. Daugava) and established a missionary centre in Üxküll (Latv. Ikšķile) (from 1186 to 1201 seat of a bishop). By the end of the century, after Meinhard’s death, the mission turned violent. The Baltic crusades began in 1198, attracting knights, and drawing attention and resources from many European regions; this area was soon joined by the military orders. Alongside missionaries and crusaders from northern Germany, the Baltic mission also involved Danes, who controlled the north of Livonia. The crusades lasted for almost a century until, after numerous setbacks, the Christian forces, led by the Teutonic Order, finally defeated the resistance of the Semigallians in 1290.

The immigration which accompanied the process of Christianisation caused long-term spatial and social transformations in Livonia. Most of the political, ecclesiastical, and economic elites, together with their related social and political structures, were brought to Livonia from western Europe. From the thirteenth century Livonia experienced intensive immigration from the north German cities, the Rhineland,


Westphalia, Frisia, other territories of the Holy German Empire, and Scandinavia. The ranks of the clergy, urban elites and military orders were dominated by immigrants, who spoke Middle Low German. This created antagonism between the locals and immigrants, because the locals were partially marginalized and excluded from the majority of social, political, and economic structures. Despite this political and social dominance, immigrants always remained a small minority of the entire Livonian population, perhaps 5-10%.

Livonia’s political system differed from that of many other European regions. It consisted of territories ruled by ecclesiastical overlords, with the exception of northern Livonia (Estonia), which was held by the kings of Denmark until 1346. Livonia was divided into five bishoprics, and four of its bishops also held secular power, the largest and most politically influential was the archbishopric of Riga (founded in 1201, promoted to archbishopric in 1253). Alongside the bishoprics, extensive territories were held by the military orders. The Order of the Sword Brethren (Fratres militiae Christi Livoniae), founded in 1202, was initially the main military power in Livonia, but after its defeat at the battle of Saule (1236) by the Lithuanians and Semigallians, the remnants of the Sword Brethren were incorporated into the Teutonic Order in 1237 (Ordo fratrum domus Sanctae Mariae Teutonicorum Ierosolimitanorum). The Teutonic Order established its Livonian branch, an autonomous structure with its own Master. It inherited the territories of the Sword Brethren and further added to them by

---


subsequent conquests, becoming the largest territorial power in Livonia. The Teutonic Knights arrived when the political structures were already in place, and in consequence they were under the authority of the bishop, later archbishop of Riga. The Order’s aspirations for political dominance, similar to that they held in neighbouring Prussia, caused constant tensions between them and other parties, especially the archbishops of Riga.\footnote{108}

Its strategic location was one of the key reasons why the Christianisation of Livonia was attempted from the start. Essential trading routes ran through the Eastern Baltic, connecting western European markets with Russia and Lithuania; German merchants had been using these routes since the twelfth century. Commercial settlements were established after the beginning of the mission, which later developed into strong ‘colonial towns’.\footnote{109} In 1201, bishop Albert founded Riga (see Map 2) on the banks of Düna, near where it meets the sea, and it became the largest Livonian city and an important political actor; decades later Reval (Est. Tallinn) (see Map 3) and Dorpat (Est. Tartu) were established.\footnote{110} In these cities Rhenish wine met Russian furs, Flemish cloths met Lithuanian flax and wax. Riga, Reval, and Dorpat experienced rapid growth and their success was enhanced by their participation in the Hansa.\footnote{111} The Hansa was not solely a merchant network, but also a cultural framework that influenced the lives of its member cities. The seaports, Riga and Reval, were two large cities, with approximately eight and six thousand inhabitants respectively during the later Middle Ages.\footnote{112} These cities were governed by German merchant elites, but between a half and a third of their population was composed of local non-Germans (Latvians, Livonians, and Estonians), Russians, and Scandinavians.\footnote{113}

\footnote{108} On the conflicts in Livonia, see Eva Eihmane, Rigas arhibīskapa un Vācu ordeņa ciņas par varu viduslaiku Livonijā, [The Struggles for a Power in Livonia Between the Archbishop of Riga and the Teutonic Order] Riga, 2012.
\footnote{110} Benninghoven, Rigas Entstehung; Riga und der Ostseeraum. Von der Gründung 1201 bis in die Frühe Neuzeit, eds. Ilgvars Misāns and Horst Wernicke, Marburg, 2005; Johansen and von zur Mühlen, Deutsch und Undeutsch; Alfred Ritscher, Reval an der Schwelle zur Neuzeit, Teil I. Vom Vorabend der Reformation bis zum Tode Wolters von Plettenberg (1510–1535), Bonn 1998.
\footnote{113} Johansen and von zur Mühlen, Deutsch und Undeutsch, p. 124; Benninghoven, Rigas Entstehung, pp. 98-99.
Livonia was a set of political territories established during the crusading phase in the thirteenth century with a common aim of Christian mission, and later was kept together by these bonds. Livonia had a territorial, but not a common political identity. Livonian political actors frequently shared common interests, but had different political aims, and so conflicts were unavoidable. Livonia ceased to exist as a territorial entity after the Reformation (in the mid-1520s), in 1561, when the Livonian branch of the Teutonic Order was dissolved.

There has been to date only limited consideration of social life in Livonia and of memoria in particular. There are as yet no broad-based analyses of memorial practices. So this dissertation takes the form of a series of case studies, which illustrate the memorial practices within Livonian social groups. The selection of the case studies has been influenced by the strengths and weaknesses of surviving documentation, and by the specific characteristics of the region. Thus I have chosen the following groups: the urban elites in Riga and Reval; urban non-elite groups in Riga; the Teutonic Order in Livonia; the Livonian clergy (particularly the archbishops of Riga and their chapter) and religious communities. Memoria of each group will be discussed in a separate chapter. Although this dissertation does not focus solely on elite memoria, peasants and urban artisan groups cannot be extensively considered due to the lack of source material. I have chosen not to examine the memorial practices of the nobility, since Livonia did not have courts with memorial culture, such as existed elsewhere in Europe. Only a dozen noble testaments and few foundation charters survive from
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114 Although Livonia is frequently described as a ‘confederation’, it is not the right term. See Thumser, ‘Baltikum,’ p. 19, 26.
medieval Livonia, and detailed group analysis is not possible.\textsuperscript{116} Where possible, aristocratic participation in the efforts of other groups has been considered.

Livonian sources from the Middle Ages are scarce in comparison with other parts of Europe. Most sacred art and liturgical artefacts – altarpieces, altars, murals, statues, and tombstones – were destroyed during the Reformation or in the numerous wars of later centuries.\textsuperscript{117} Only a small number of documents have survived from the former archives of the archbishopric of Riga and the Livonian branch of the Teutonic Order, the remnants of which were taken to Poland and Sweden respectively during the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{118} Likewise, the medieval city archive of Dorpat, the third largest Livonian city, was completely destroyed during the sixteenth century.

The evidence on which this dissertation is based is drawn primarily from the city archives of Riga and Reval, and from the records of the brotherhoods.\textsuperscript{119} For the urban groups, the most frequently used sources are testaments, account books and ledgers of the urban governments and brotherhoods, confraternity members’ lists, and foundation charters, as well as some visual sources in the case of the elite brotherhoods. For the clergy and the Teutonic Order in Livonia sources are scarce, yet more diverse: chronicles and other historiographical texts, statutes, liturgical manuscripts, charters, legal documents, political treaties, tombstones, and for the Teutonic Order, necrologies from outside Livonia. The scarcity of sources has shaped my research, but has also motivated me to link them through comparative study, based on wide ranging reading and also focus on symbolical manifestations of remembrance.

The time-frame of this dissertation is late medieval, focusing on case studies from the early fifteenth to the early sixteenth centuries, but it also uses evidence from the earlier period where available and from across the Reformation in the mid-1520s. From the early fifteenth century onwards source material is continuous and rich, and it allows us to conduct the analysis of group memoria. Although memoria continued to exist after


\textsuperscript{119} Most of the written sources used here are in Middle Low German.
the Reformation, its significance is a subject for a separate – perhaps future – investigation.

This study focuses not only on the practice of remembering, but on the impact of memoria on groups and their relationships. Why the focus on group memoria? Memoria is used here as a tool to study memorial practices and social history. In my view memoria both constitutes and reflects social relations. Moreover, in memoria individual practices become collective. Memoria reveals individuality, but this is cast in a collective framework. Memoria is a group phenomenon, a cyclical process which creates groups, as groups create memoria. The repetition of names, rituals, and regular invocation of events contributed to a collective memory. The practice of memoria can also be a sign of affiliation to a group. Memoria creates and sustains relationships between individuals and groups. The regularity of practice and repetition of memoria builds, reinforces and renews the coherence and sense of identity in groups, while involvement in memorial activities further reinforces the individual participant’s sense of self, of belonging.

This dissertation approaches the analysis of group memoria with a number of questions in mind. Some of these are generic to the study of remembrance in late medieval European society, while others are more directly linked to the socio-political particularities of Livonia. How did political elites use memoria for self-legitimation and the maintenance of power? What impact did memoria have on the relationships between the groups that exercised power in Livonia, particularly during periods of conflict? In what ways did memoria operate to form groups and shape the dynamics of the relationship between individuals and groups and between groups? How was individual memoria integrated into the collective memoria of large groups? How did groups use their past to maintain their identities in the present? How did participation in joint memorial practices influence the relationships between the German urban elites and the local non-elites folk? How was memoria of various groups dissolved during the Reformation and what impact the dissolving had on them? The guiding principle of this dissertation is that the study of memoria should not be limited to its liturgical manifestations, but that it be considered – as Oexle has put it – as a ‘total social phenomenon’, whose importance was not restricted to the elites, but had relevance at all social levels.
Map 1: Medieval Livonia

CHAPTER 1: COMMEMORATING THE ELITE: MEMORIA OF URBAN GUILDS AND BROTHERHOODS IN RIGA AND REVAL

'I call all and everyone to this dance:
pope, emperor, and all creatures
poor, rich, big, or small.
Step forward, mourning won’t help now!
Remember though at all times
to bring good deeds with you
and to repent your sins
for you must dance to my pipe.'¹

Totentanz of Reval

On 23 August 1468 Lübeck’s city council issued a letter to its counterpart in Reval, requesting the transfer of the properties of a Reval cleric, Diderik Notken, to Bernt Notke, painter and burgher of Lübeck. According to this letter, Diderik had bequeathed all his real property in Reval for the wellbeing of his soul, and for his relatives (to salicheid ziner zelen vnde behuff syner angeborenen vrund).² It was the same Bernt Notke (c. 1440–1508) who around 1468 in Lübeck painted a cycle of Dance of Death (Totentanz) in the chapel of St Matthew under the belfry of St Nicholas church in Reval.³ In the absence of other documentation of its commission this letter has been used as evidence that Diderik Notken’s donation for his soul was spent on the production of the Reval Totentanz.⁴

---

⁴ Eimer, Bernt Notke, pp. 43-45.
Danse Macabre was a frequently occurring motif in medieval art.\(^5\) The fragment of Reval’s Totentanz reflects the main characteristics of the genre. It depicts Death, playing bagpipes, a preacher in a pulpit who alerts the audience, and several figures – a pope, a cardinal, an emperor, an empress and a king – who are led into the dance by cadavers.\(^6\) The other fragments of the Reval Totentanz have been lost. The Lübeck Totentanz painted by Bernt Notke in 1463 contains more numerous characters: 24 pairs of the living and the dead from all social classes, both secular and religious, including townspeople such as a burgomaster, a craftsman, and a merchant.\(^7\) Both works have a familiar urban landscape as their background; the backdrop to the Lübeck Totentanz is recognisably the city, while in Reval the background is a more stereotypical Hanseatic scene. Along with the life-sized and life-like figures this served to reinforce a ‘sense of actuality’ for viewers.\(^8\)

Both works were created during or directly after plague that had visited both cities; it broke out in Lübeck in 1463/64 and reached Reval in 1464/65.\(^9\) The Reval Totentanz was placed in the public space – in the parish church – near the place where the dead were buried.\(^10\) In the Totentanz the images interplayed with the text written under the figures to convey a clear message: memento mori, death is inevitable.\(^11\) Most members of the urban elite belonged to the parish of St Nicholas, where the altars of the elite guilds and brotherhoods were located.\(^12\) The Totentanz reminded them to care for the afterlife and about their commemoration. In the Totentanz, Death directly addresses

---


\(^8\) Also in the Reval’s Totentanz Lübeck’s landmarks are present. Gertsman, ‘Dance of Death in Reval,’ pp. 148-149; Eadem., *Dance of Death in the Middle Ages*, pp. 105-106.


\(^10\) The chapel of St Matthew also hosted tombs. Warda, *Memento mori*, p. 57; Gertsman, ‘Dance of Death in Reval,’ p. 144.


both the painted figures and the parishioners of St Nicholas: ‘[..] you must follow me and become what I am.’\(^{13}\) The message of Reval’s \textit{Totentanz} was directed towards the elite, to remind it of the temporary nature of its own power and wealth. And so members of the late medieval urban elite were well aware of that and they used their power and wealth to ensure the well-being of their souls through institutions by making extensive provisions for \textit{memoria}, both individually and collectively.

This chapter focuses on the memorial practices of the urban elites of Reval and Riga. Merchant elites, including their family members, accounted for between a tenth and a fifth of the urban population in the late medieval Hanseatic cities.\(^{14}\) In late medieval Riga and Reval, with approximately 6-8000 and 5-6000 inhabitants respectively, the merchant elites numbered several hundred individuals.\(^{15}\) The elite in Riga was comprised of around 100-120 long-distance merchants who belonged to the Great Guild, plus their family members. They lived alongside an approximately 100 strong group of apprentices and foreign merchants.\(^{16}\) According to Benninghoven 10\% of all townspeople in Riga belonged to the elite.\(^{17}\) In late-fifteenth century Reval around 540 townspeople belonged to the elite long-distance merchant families, which were represented in the merchant guild and the other elite brotherhoods.\(^{18}\)

Since the late-thirteenth century merchant controlled the urban government of all Hanseatic cities, and excluded artisans from political power.\(^{19}\) In Riga and Reval the city councils were controlled by the exclusive merchant Great Guilds, and only their members were allowed to join the council.\(^{20}\) Membership in the Great Guild was usually combined with activities in the charitable Table Guild; before proceeding to the Great Guild, young merchants in Riga and Reval usually belonged to the brotherhood of Black Heads.\(^{21}\) The merchants who were bound together socially by membership of

\(^{14}\) Brandt, ‘Gesellschaftliche Struktur,’ p. 212.
\(^{17}\) Benninghoven, \textit{Rigas Entstehung}, p. 100.
\(^{18}\) Kaplinski, ‘Einwohnerzahl,’ pp. 138-139.
\(^{19}\) Brandt, ‘Gesellschaftliche Struktur,’ p. 211.
\(^{21}\) On Livonian Table Guilds see Anu Mänd, ‘Hospitals and Tables for the Poor in Medieval Livonia,’ in \textit{Mitteilungen des Instituts Österreichische Geschichtsforschung} 115, 3-4 (2007); pp. 234-270; on the Black Heads, see Herbert Spliet, \textit{Geschichte des rigischen Neuen Hauses des später sogen. König Artus.
these associations ‘formed the summit of the urban elite’, and controlled the economic, political, social and religious life of these cities. Memorial activities of these elite groups will be in focus of this chapter.

Until recently research into late medieval urban memoria has been primarily concentrated on individual remembrance and memorial foundations of townspeople. Previous studies of group memoria have also focused on large groups, such as a patriciate, but less on the commemorative practices of brotherhoods, guilds, and city councils. Anu Mänd has recently begun to explore the collective memoria of the elite associations of Reval and Riga. Her work, however, has largely focused on memoria as a religious phenomenon and has not considered the social, political and representational functions of memoria. I shall aim, therefore, to show how memoria was used for social purposes, both to create and strengthen the identities of different elite groups, and to explore the role memoria played within urban politics in the late medieval Riga and Reval. My analysis will progress from the genesis and development of group memoria, up to its dissolution during the Reformation.

1.1: Memoria in the merchant guilds of Riga and Reval

A scribe of the Rigan kumpanie van den kopluden – company of merchants – later known as the Great Guild, described the reason for recording the guild’s statutes in 1354, as ‘human memory is weak, so it has to be secured with documents and written text’. This fragility of the human memory endangered not only memory of the past, but also that of deceased predecessors. Groups had to ‘record’ the dead, noting their
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22 Mänd, Urban Carnival, p. 31; Nottbeck, Schragen, p. 13.
23 Noodt, Religion und Familie; Lusiardi, Stiftung.
25 Mänd, ‘Church art,’ pp. 3-30.
names in the account books; they had to imprint them in collective memory, through liturgical and social practices of *memoria*. Late medieval urban elite associations considered the memory of their own historical past and their deceased colleagues to be of great importance as closely related practices.²⁷

The elites in Riga and Reval met in exclusive associations, the merchant Great Guilds. As merchants they were involved in wholesale and long-distance trade and from these guilds all political leaders – the city councillors – arose.²⁸ In this respect Riga and Reval were not unique. In the Hanseatic metropolis Lübeck most of the city councillors were also members of the elite *Zirkelgesellschaft*, the oldest and most prestigious of its three merchant guilds.²⁹ These elite associations in Riga and Reval developed during the fourteenth century, and both were turned by the following century into the Great Guilds.³⁰ In Riga the merchant *kumpanie van den kophuden* was first mentioned in 1354, in Reval the *kindergilde*, in 1363.³¹ The emergence of these merchant associations was part of a larger structural change in Livonian cities, through which guilds combining broad professional groups were abolished and new professionally distinct associations were established.³² The 1354 statues of the Rigan *kumpanie* demonstrate these developments by excluding several professional and ethnic groups from the membership in the guild: artisans, priests and indigenous non-Germans.³³ This process of transformation was completed during the early fifteenth century when the associations for foreign and young unmarried merchants – the brotherhoods of the Black Heads – were separated from the *kumpanie* and *kindergilde*.³⁴ After this

²⁷ On *memoria* in the Hanseatic elite groups, see Dünnebeil, *Lübecker Zirkel-Gesellschaft*, pp. 51-75.
separation the Great Guilds became even more exclusive, and both political and economic power laid in their hands.

In contrast to other urban guilds and brotherhoods that received their statutes from the city council, the Great Guild was autonomous and self-governing.\(^{35}\) *Memoria* within it played an even greater role than in other urban groups. Urban elite groups created, maintained, legitimated and represented their power and status by remembering their past and predecessors.\(^{36}\) This *memoria* was not only aimed at its members, it also reached out to external audiences, thus presenting its power and status to other townspeople. To attain these aims the elite urban associations invested considerable resources in elaborate memorial services, and in the founding of chapels, the provision of liturgical utensils, the commissioning of altarpieces and the arrangement of commemoration during the communal meals.

The importance of *memoria* for elite associations can be observed, for example, within the Lübeck’s *Zirkelgesellschaft* which assembled representatives of the city’s most influential families. Directly after its foundation in 1379, the *Zirkelgesellschaft* requested *memoria* for its members from the Franciscans in St Catherine’s church, and invested significant resources in the acquisition of the chapel there, where the brethren were later buried.\(^{37}\) Even before the establishment of this association, its founders provided wine for future commemoration performed by its members. The brethren later made further numerous substantial memorial endowments for the *Zirkelgesellschaft*, thus supporting its collective *memoria*.\(^{38}\) During the fifteenth century *memoria* gradually lost its importance within the *Zirkelgesellschaft*, as it turned from spiritual brotherhood into professional association, but in its initial stages *memoria* had constituted and consolidated this elite group.\(^{39}\)

In Riga and Reval collective *memoria* was ‘a constitutive element’ that formed the merchant guilds as social groups.\(^{40}\) In contrast to the *Zirkelgesellschaft*, however, the *memoria* of the elite groups in Riga and Reval was not performed in the Great Guilds alone. The statutes of both Great Guilds describe only very briefly the commemorative activities of these groups, and it is evident that some of these were delegated to
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40 Oexle, ‘Gegenwart der Lebenden,’ p. 75.
charitable sub-organizations, known as Table Guilds (tafelgilde). In their statutes the Great Guilds still promised their members basic commemorative services, with greater pomp than those organized by other urban associations.

The first statutes of the Rigan kumpanie, issued in 1354, decreed that on the day after the drunke (drinking feast) the guild’s brethren in remembrance of all the guild’s dead had to spread a pall (coffin cover) in the church, light four candles and then sing a vigil; five memorial masses followed on the next morning. In Reval the statutes ordained that memorial services – a vigil and three memorial masses sung the next morning – were to be performed at the death of every brother in the presence of a pall and lights. In Riga each deceased member of the Great Guild was commemorated with one memorial mass in the parish churches of St Peter or in St Jacob, like ‘every poor man’. In addition, the guild was committed to the organization of ten memorial masses a year to be celebrated after All Souls, for the consolation and salvation of all souls. These two obligations of the guild, which were later – probably after the Reformation – annotated on the margin as being no longer valid (dit is dot), demonstrate the guild’s investment in both individual and collective memorial services.

The statutes of the Rigan kumpanie motivated all brethren to take part in the memorial services, not only by imposing fines for absence, but by encouraging brethren to treat ‘our predecessors’ as they would like to be treated after their death. This obligation reveals the prospective character of the guild’s memoria; it implied that those who commemorated would be commemorated in turn. This reciprocity was essential, as it transmitted memoria from generation to generation. The Great Guilds also took responsibility for memoria of their impoverished members by granting them funerals with a pall and lights. This followed lifetime provision whereby poor members were offered free participation in all the feasts (drunke), as was the case in the Reval Great Guild.

As a result of the ample resources at their disposal, the Great Guilds were able to organise memorial services not only during their annual assemblies, but throughout the
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41 Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, p. 318-319, § 52-53; Nottbeck, Schragen, p. 43, §26-31; Mänd, Urban Carnival, pp. 39-40; Eadem., ‘Church art,’ pp. 7-9; on memoria of the Table Guilds see the subchapter 1.2.
42 Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, p. 318, § 52.
44 Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, p. 318, § 53.
45 Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, p. 318, § 53; Mänd, ‘Church art,’ p. 7.
46 Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, p. 318, § 52.
47 Assmann, Das kulturelle Gedächtnis, p. 61.
48 Nottbeck, Schragen, p. 43, § 28.
The statutes of the Reval Great Guild stated that the guild had to pay one *ferding* to the priests of St Nicholas church on Shrovetide, for monthly remembrance. The guild had two altars, dedicated to St Blaise and St Christopher respectively, in St Nicholas church, and at these priests celebrated the memorial services. In addition to the priests of St Nicholas, the Great Guild also involved other institutions in remembrance of their deceased members: the parish church of St Olaf, in the church of Holy Spirit, and the Dominican church of St Catherine, by regularly paying them fees for memorial services. The greater the number of commemorating institutions involved, the more prestige and influence was attained by the guild.

As a merchant guild, the Great Guild in Reval also provided *memoria* for those brethren who had died abroad by organising a vigil and memorial mass. The statutes also ordained that if a brother died abroad in poverty, the brethren who were closest to his place of death would cover the costs of a funeral, and be reimbursed by the Great Guild. In addition, the brethren of the Riga and Reval merchant guilds, who were also members of the charitable Table Guilds and died outside Livonia, were commemorated with special services by these sub-organizations of the Great Guilds. The Great Guilds adjusted to the dynamic lifestyle of the merchants, and acted as custodians of the group memory of deceased brethren who died on business trips away from home.

No records of the performance of commemorative activities have survived. Nor is there much information about donations and endowments made by the merchants to the Great Guild. A copy of one endowment document that shows a relationship motivated by *memoria* between the Reval Great Guild, its officials, and a priest, has survived. In 1456, a priest of Reval’s Holy Spirit church, Ludeke Karwel, made an endowment of 500 Riga marks to the Great Guild for the salvation of his own and souls of his relatives.

---

56 LUB 11, no. 524; Mänd ‘Church art,’ p. 7.
its priest. His relationship with the Great Guild was determined by the fact that the Holy Spirit church, located next to the Great Guild’s guildhall, was the memorial and charitable centre of the Great Guild and its Table Guild. Ludeke Karwel died fourteen years after the endowment, and at Easter 1470 he was commemorated (began) by the members of the Table Guild.

The main objective of Karwel’s endowment was to support the institutions of the Great Guild: the guild’s altar of St Blaise in St Nicholas church and the Table Guild. The annuity rent from part of Karwel’s endowment (300 marks) had to support a priest who would serve at the altar of St Blaise; Karwel even chose two young men, who when ordained, could become the chantry priests. The money provided for the Table Guild was to spent on alms (gifte) distributed on a feast of Holy Cross. The guild’s warden was to give six ferdings four times a year to individual recipients at the Hospital of Holy Spirit. The charter stated that all payments for these activities had to be made after Ludeke’s death.

In his charter Ludeke Karwel expressed his desire to be commemorated by the Great Guild by a perpetual soul mass that was to be celebrated in the Holy Spirit church. An annuity rent of 12 marks was also to be paid to Karwel’s mother during her lifetime, a sum which after her death was to be used to maintain this memoria. Although the aim of the endowment was the commemoration of himself and his relatives, Karwel integrated his remembrance within the collective memoria of the Great Guild. During the memorial masses celebrated on days chosen by a chantry priest and particularly on Easter, Pentecost, and Christmas, the souls of all deceased brothers and sisters of the Great Guild were also to be remembered.

Memoria was essential to the life of the Reval and Rigan Great Guilds. The statutes of the Riga Great Guild stated that the commemoration of their predecessors was as important as remembrance of the current members after their death. Memoria not only ensured salvation, but helped merchant groups to develop their distinctiveness, to legitimize their economic and political leadership, and to maintain their status. Equally,
the Great Guilds had rich resources at their disposal to invest in their collective memory with splendour that demonstrated their status. Yet, sources about their commemorative activities are scarce, perhaps because the Great Guilds delegated part of their memory to the Table Guilds, their sub-organizations.

1.2: Merchant Table Guilds in Riga and Reval: between poor-relief, memoria, and social capital

In Lent 1425 all members of the Great Guild of Riga gathered with the consent of the city council – and for sake of the Lord, the Virgin Mary, all the saints, and the poor (nottroftigen armen) – to found a ‘table guild’ (tafelgilde).\(^{66}\) The foundation was justified by reference to the Gospel: ‘to the one who will give a gulp of water (de enen drunk waters ghevet) to the needy poor (den nottroftigen armen) in my name, I will give in return twice as much in the eternal life.’\(^{67}\) The preamble to the statutes stated that the guild would distribute nineteen alms on every Sunday in the belfry of St Peter’s church (under deme clokthorne), for the benefit of the souls of the Table Guild’s founders (begynner) and its future benefactors (hulpere).\(^{68}\) The statutes made the aims of tafelgilde clear: devotion to the Lord and His saints, care of the poor, and commemoration of those who provided the alms. These objectives of the tafelgilde were inseparable and interlinked as poor-relief was both a pious act and a commemorative one.\(^{69}\)

Poor-tables, charitable associations created for the distribution of alms, clothing and food were established in numerous European regions; they are to be found in the cities of the Low Countries, the Empire, France and the Iberian peninsula.\(^{70}\) As elsewhere in late medieval northern Europe, in Riga and Reval the guild was named after the table – tafel – set up in the churches and at which food and clothing were handed out on
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\(^{65}\) LUB 11, no. 524, p. 418.
\(^{66}\) Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, p. 660, no. 123
\(^{67}\) Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, pp. 660-661; Matthew 10:42
\(^{68}\) Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, p. 661.
\(^{69}\) Torsten Derrik implies that possibly the tafelgilde of Reval in its initial stages focused more on poor relief, than on memoria, because memoria does not appear in the first statutes (1363), see his, Bruderbuch, p. 16.
Sundays and certain feasts. The Table Guilds also had other functions besides poor-relief. Their charity, piety and memoria were instruments of social and political communication, legitimation, and community building. Moreover, the Table Guilds were institutions for which memoria was not only a social practice, but one of the purposes for their existence.  

The Table Guilds of the Great Guilds in Reval and Riga were not occupational groupings, and most members joined them voluntarily. They were founded in 1363 and 1425 respectively and were both exclusive associations formed by the local prosperous and influential townspeople. Most of the Table Guild’s members belonged to the Great Guild, yet they had separate leadership and meetings. Among the members were the city councillors, and so the Table Guilds were also informal political meeting places. Many burgomasters and city councillors were leaders of the tafelgilde; of the three thousand names of the brethren of the Reval’s Table Guild recorded between 1364 and 1549, at least two hundred were city councillors. The Table Guilds drew members from consecutive generations of the councillors’ families. Alongside the local elites the Table Guilds hosted also rich merchants and city councillors from other Livonian and Hanseatic cities. High status clergymen were admitted to the tafelgilde too. The first list of the Reval tafelgilde members, of 1364, opened with the name of the bishop of Reval Ludwig von Münster (1352-1389). As Torsten Derrik’s study of the Reval tafelgilde shows, the size of the guild fluctuated between 250 and 700 with more numerous membership during the fifteenth century.
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71 In Riga and Reval also there were other associations named Table Guilds, organized by the artisan guilds and parishes, about which little is known. Here I exclusively refer to tafelgilde of the Great Guilds. Mänd, ‘Hospitals,’ p. 257; Eadem., Urban Carnival, pp. 39-40.
72 Derrik, Bruderbuch, p. 23.
73 Derrik, Bruderbuch, p. 39; Leimus, Tallinna Suurgild; Derrik, Bruderbuch, p. 17.
75 Ibid., p. 63.
76 For biographies of the city councillors members of the Reval tafelgilde, see Derrik, Bruderbuch, p. 44, pp. 48-327.
77 At least 22 Reval families had numerous representatives in tafelgilde, see Derrik, Bruderbuch, pp. 32-36; Roman Czaja, ‘Das Patriziat in den livländischen und preußischen Städten. Eine vergleichende Analyse,’ in Riga und der Ostseeraum, pp. 211-222, at pp. 215-216.
78 In Reval’s tafelgilde there were members from Lübeck’s Zirkel-Gesellschaft and also city councillors from Dorpat, Narva, Fellin, Pernau, Riga, Visby and Danzig. Individuals from other cities composed around 5% of all guild members. Derrik, Bruderbuch, pp. 24-25, 28-30.
79 TLA, f. 191, l. 2, s. no. 1, fol. 1r; Klaus Neitmann, ‘Ludwig von Münster,’ in Bischöfe des Reiches, p. 640.
80 The Reval Table Guild in the early and late-fifteenth century had between 200 and 300 members, but between 1424 and 1460 the guild enjoyed largest number of members- around 400, reaching maximum in
Poor relief and *memoria* organized by the Table Guilds helped local elites to gain ‘reward from God’ (*lon vor Gode*), while securing their social standing. This was done by the accumulation of social capital out of bonds created between the powerful rich and powerless poor.\(^8^1\) Social capital is created by interpersonal networks; therefore elites had to join others in conduct of material and symbolic exchanges.\(^8^2\) Poor-relief and *memoria* offered such forms of reciprocal material and symbolic exchanges.\(^8^3\) Elite members initiated these exchanges by providing resources for almsgiving and distributing them to the poor; as a counter-gift the poor offered *memoria*.\(^8^4\) The elites converted the social capital accumulated during this exchange with the ‘poor’ into their exclusive status.

The elites of Riga and Reval, like the ruling groups of other Hanseatic cities, were aware that poor-relief had political significance. During the 1420s the political elite of Riga gained in self-assurance and aimed to abolish the Teutonic Order’s over-lordship, and to gain the status of a free city.\(^8^5\) Thomas Brück argues that the establishing of the *tafelgilde* manifested the city’s elite’s care for the poor without the involvement of the archbishop or the Teutonic Order.\(^8^6\) Their ability to provide poor-relief on their own was a sign of autonomy and freedom.\(^8^7\) It helped to demonstrate their good rule and legitimize it.\(^8^8\)

The high social status of the Table Guild was also manifested during the mid-fifteenth century *Corpus Christi* procession in Reval, where its members marched directly before a priest carrying the Eucharist.\(^8^9\) The exclusivity of these guilds was reflected in their statutes. In Riga they instructed that ‘one who wants to enter this brotherhood’ had to be a ‘brother of the Great Guild before’.\(^9^0\) Similarly, the Reval *tafelgilde* only accepted members of the Great Guild.\(^9^1\) In Riga prospective members paid 6 ores as admission fee, and were encouraged to give more in charity (*meer gudes* 1442—787 members. In the late-fifteenth and early sixteenth century the guild experienced a decrease of members. See Derrik, *Bruderbuch*, p. 24.
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89 Mänd, Urban Carnival, p. 166; on hierarchies in *Corpus Christi* processions, see Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi. The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture*, Cambridge, 1991, p. 248.
90 Stieda and Mettig, *Schrägen*, p. 661, § 3.
to don), which would be rewarded richly in the afterlife. In Riga ‘honourable women’ – wives or widows of the Great Guild members – could also join the tafelgilde. In contrast to Riga, the statutes of Reval tafelgilde mention only brothers and the members’ lists include only few women.

Memoria of deceased members was equally important to the Reval and Rigan Table Guilds. Poor-relief and memoria were interconnected, yet commemorative activities of the annual assemblies did not involve the ‘poor’ as commemorators. The memoria of the tafelgilde performed at their annual assemblies was self-centred and its performance was intended to strengthen group identity and communal bonds. This emphasis on remembering its past and dead members is very clearly expressed in the guilds’ statutes; the Table Guilds were founded particularly to foster memoria of elite members by elite members. Although they were not independent guilds, the Table Guilds in Riga and Reval granted burial and commemoration to all their members, most of whom were also brethren of the Great Guilds. The statutes of both guilds precisely laid out when and how the members were to be commemorated, combining both liturgical (memorial masses and prayers) and social (communal meals) practices of memoria.

Like most late medieval associations, the Table Guilds sought two types of commemorative events: funerals and anniversaries of individual deceased members, and vigils and masses for remembrance of ‘all who had died in this brotherhood’ (alle dejenne, de ute desser broderschop vorstorven sin). The latter took place during the general assemblies, and the statutes laid down the exact time, place and form for such events. In Riga and Reval the Table Guilds organized their memoria in the churches where they managed their charitable activities. In Riga the dead were commemorated in St Peter’s, where the guild distributed its alms on Sundays in the belfry. In Reval the memorial space of the tafelgilde – the Holy Spirit Church – served the same purpose. In Riga the tafelgilde organized a vigil on the second Sunday after Michaelmas and a
memorial mass on the morning. In Reval, the *tafelgilde* gathered for the commemoration of all dead brethren twice a year; vigils and memorial masses were celebrated on the second Saturday and Sunday after Easter and after Christmas, when following the election of a new warden, his predecessor in the office organized commemorative services. The costs of these services were covered by income from membership fees; in the Riga *tafelgilde* each brother and sister had to donate two *artigs* for the annual vigil and memorial mass.

The annual commemorations of *tafelgilde* were preceded by bell-ringing. In Riga, guild wardens provided ringing of the ‘large’ church bells on the vigil. In both Riga and Reval, the guild’s pall (*gildestoven boldeke*), a bier (*bare*), and candles (*lichten*) were set up in the church. The following morning memorial masses were celebrated. In Reval, for the annual memorial mass, priests of the Holy Spirit church were employed for half a mark, with additional five shillings for expenses.

During the commemoration of the dead hierarchy and political power were manifested too. The statutes of the Riga *tafelgilde* regulated the ceremony of offertory (offer) – donation of liturgical gifts and money at the altar – during the annual memorial mass on Monday two weeks after Michaelmas. During the offertory first the wives of the guild wardens carried a memorial candle each, and then the other sisters followed and made the offering. The burgomasters and the city council, the alderman of the Great Guild, the wardens of *tafelgilde* followed, and finally the common brethren made their offer. This ceremony created a public image of the guild and its contribution to the city’s wellbeing.

Following the liturgical *memoria* the deceased were also remembered during the communal meal. The statutes of the Riga *tafelgilde* instructed that the communal meal
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should consist of three courses and ‘good beer’. Following the meal a bell was rung to inform the guild members of brothers and sisters who had died during the last year.

Similarly, in Reval the tafelgilde remembered the dead during the communal meal celebrated at an annual assembly two weeks after Easter. The instruction of the guild’s annual assembly (1514) stated that during a meal, after eating and drinking the chant ‘Christ is risen’ (krystes vpgestanden) had to be sung; as in Riga a servant had to ring a bell and then the guild’s warden named the dead brothers.

This naming of the brothers and sisters who had died within the past year was a commemorative act, and the meal was a continuation of the Eucharist with a commemoration. The subsequent almsgiving or distribution of the food leftovers by Reval’s tafelgilde further extended this commemorative work. Liturgical and social forms of memoria merged during the meal.

At the communal meals the Table Guilds recorded the names of their deceased members for liturgical and non-liturgical commemoration. Between 1448 and 1549 the Reval tafelgilde recorded the names of the dead brethren alongside those of newly admitted ones three times annually, at Shrovetide, Easter and Christmas. The records of the Reval tafelgilde show that during periods of great mortality the guild’s ability to provide such memoria was tested. In 1464/1465, a year of devastating plague, 50 guild members died over four months and several consecutive leaders of the Great Guild and tafelgilde died too. According to the members’ lists, such periods of great mortality were experienced in Reval also in 1474, 1481/82, 1495, 1503/04, and 1520/21. During the Reformation the recording of the names was interrupted, with the last deceased member recorded in 1521, and then a few more during the 1530s. Liturgical memoria was abolished in 1523/24. The interruption of the recording shows the close relationship between it and the liturgical practices. Remarkably, in 1547 guild
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wardens sought to reconstruct the lists of the dead for the missing years, but this was no longer possible. The lists of deceased brethren reveal the inner hierarchy in the Reval tafelgilde with the names of the city councillors recorded at the top of the lists.

The group’s history was also remembered during the communal meal of the tafelgilde. The fifteenth-century ordinance for the annual assembly in Reval stipulated that during the communal meal the guild’s five youngest members read an account describing: the foundation of the ‘poor-table’, where the alms should be distributed, and why the assembly took place on this day. In this way the communal meal reaffirmed the group’s identity, making the guild’s members aware of its origins, history, their predecessors, and the purpose of the guild’s existence.

Alongside the collective memoria of deceased members the Table Guilds also organized the funerals and individual commemorative services of their brothers and sisters. The statutes of the Reval tafelgilde stipulated that every dead brother had to be carried to the grave by his fellow brethren. The guild expected that all brothers present in the city at the time would take part in the funeral procession of each deceased guild member. A fine was imposed on those who failed to do so.

In addition to presence at funerals of fellow brothers and sisters, members also covered the costs of individual memorial services celebrated after burial. When a brother or sister of the Riga tafelgilde died, guild wardens collected one artig from each member for memorial masses. In Reval every brother of the tafelgilde had to arrange a memorial mass for each dead member, and to make donations for the poor table as part of these commemorative actions. Tafelgilde offered memoria even for impoverished members who could not afford a proper burial. In Riga the Table Guild granted to its members burials to the value of two Rhenish gulden. In addition, both guilds took care to remember those brothers and sisters who died abroad and were buried outside Riga and Reval.
Memoria of benefactors within late-medieval urban associations played a role similar to that in medieval monastic communities.\textsuperscript{134} Urban associations prayed for their benefactors just as monastic ones did and this fostered memory not only of benefactors but also of the group’s past.\textsuperscript{135} For elite associations such memoria was also an important political exercise; commemoration of the benefactors was widespread in elite institutions of the Hanseatic cities.\textsuperscript{136} Internal charitable gift-giving formed part of the Ratsmemoria, and served to present the group to the world as much as to itself.\textsuperscript{137} In contrast to monastic communities most benefactors of urban elite associations were themselves members of these groups. Since the merchant groups were also internally diversified, these associations maintained inner hierarchy too.\textsuperscript{138}

As for the poor tables in Flemish cities, the administration of the benefactors’ memoria in Riga and Reval was as important as almsgiving.\textsuperscript{139} The statutes of the Riga tafelgilde state that it was expected that the brethren would ‘do good deeds’, and donate money for the poor.\textsuperscript{140} ‘All those who have died in this guild’ were promised an annual vigil and requiem mass, but the statutes stated that those who had ‘done something good’, or at least had such an intention to do so were to be particularly commemorated.\textsuperscript{141} Praise of benefactors in the Rigan tafelgilde was practiced every Sunday when in a church – most likely St Peter’s – a priest prayed for brothers and sisters of the guild, and for those who were benefactors and also for those, who would do good in the future.\textsuperscript{142} From the pulpit the priest called out the names of all living members and benefactors as well as the dead. These prayers involved not only members, but also the parish community gathered there for Sunday mass.\textsuperscript{143}

Commemoration of living and dead guild members, and benefactors in the parish church of St Peter’s became an act of a self-representation of the elites to the urban community.

Who were the benefactors of tafelgilde? Individual wills and account books show that in Riga and Reval gifts of money were bequeathed to the guilds by city councillors,
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\textsuperscript{141} Ibid., p. 661, § 6.
\textsuperscript{142} Ibid., p. 663, § 15.
\textsuperscript{143} For a public commemoration of elite benefactors, see Speer, Frömmigkeit und Politik, pp. 287-288; Poeck, ‘Rat und Memoria,’ p. 319.
wardens of the Great Guild and tafelgilde, and wealthy merchants. Most of the benefactors came from a small group of members.

The few surviving sources on endowments made to the Table Guilds indicate the existence of memorial expectations. The Bock der Breve of the Riga tafelgilde contains copies of three charters that reveal the memorial wishes of the benefactors, most of whom were city councillors or their family members. In 1494 the Riga city councillor Hinrik Krivitz and his wife Margrete made a generous endowment to the tafelgilde, bequeathing 710 Riga marks, for the welfare of their souls and the glory of God. The endowment was secured by six properties yielding a rent of 43 marks annually, and it secured almsgiving by the Table Guild under the belfry of St Peter’s church; two portions of food (schottele), three pieces of Rostockian cloth for the poor, and an unspecified number of shoes were to be distributed on regular occasions. The distribution of the alms was to begin after the death of one spouse, and to operate in full after the death of the other.

Two endowments were made by the widows of Riga city councillors, who may have been guild members. Margaret, widow of the city councillor Johan Scheding, bequeathed 300 Riga marks for the Table Guild in 1502. Like Hinrik and Margrete Krivitz, Margaret Scheding identified the welfare of her soul and that of her husband’s and their descendants as the purpose for the endowment. Yet, the charter provides little detail on the activities foreseen. Anna, widow of the councillor Cord Visch junior, in

144 In Reval between 1414 and 1524 10 testators made bequests for tafelgilde: brother Hans Lyndenbeke (1414), brother Gert van Lynden (1442), warden Evert van der Lynden (1455), warden Dethart Helpyn (1465), warden Gerwin Borneman (1480), city councillor Hinrik Schelewent (1490), brother Gerd Strobuck (1497), brother Hans van Epen (1511), (not in the members list) Hans Bouwer (1519), city councillor Johann Viant (1524); LUB 5, no. 1965; LUB 9, no. 911; LUB 11, no. 385; LUB 12, no. 303; LUB 2/1, no. 545; Revaler Regesten. Testamente Revaler Bürger und Einwohner aus den Jahren 1369 bis 1851, ed. Roland Seeberg-Elverfeldt, Göttingen, 1975, no.104, 118, 127; Derrik, Bruderbuch, pp. 40, 342, 345, 290, 256, 267, 181, 385, 396, 222; Friedrich Georg Bunge, Die Revaler Rathslinie, Reval, 1874, pp. 128, 94; Mänd, ‘Hospitals,’ p. 261; in Riga the city councillor Cord Visch (1425); LUB 7, no. 372; Heinrich J. Böthführ, Die Rigische Rathslinie von 1226 bis 1876, Riga, 1877, no. 236.
145 In the Reval tafelgilde between 1363 and 1549, the local and foreign city councillors constituted around 10 percent of all brethren, but among the known benefactors their ratio was greater. Derrik, Bruderbuch, pp. 44-45.
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1496 made an endowment of 200 marks for the Table Guild, for distribution of alms in the belfry of St Peter’s in remembrance of her husband and his family.\textsuperscript{152}

Widows of city councillors or guild officials of Reval also made charitable endowments as part of elite \textit{memoria}. In 1488 the widow of the Reval city councillor Ewert Smed endowed 200 marks for one portion of alms.\textsuperscript{153} In 1475 the widow of Gise Voss, once alderman of the Great Guild and warden of \textit{tafelgilde}, endowed 50 marks for the distribution of food on the feast of St Blaise.\textsuperscript{154} Likewise, in the Reval \textit{tafelgilde} city councillors supported the guild with endowments; city councillor Johan Super in the late-fifteenth century increased the number of prebends distributed by \textit{tafelgilde}, by endowing it with 150 Riga marks.\textsuperscript{155}

These examples of city councillors and their widows providing considerable resources for almsgiving and \textit{memoria} in the Riga and Reval \textit{tafelgilde} demonstrates the essential role of political leaders as civic benefactors. The endowments intended for feeding and clothing the poor were part of the urban government’s political \textit{memoria}.\textsuperscript{156}

As already stated, the poor played an important role in the commemoration of benefactors. The existing source material – account books and testaments – is deceptive in showing the poor as objects of the elite’s charity. For, as Dietrich Poeck observes, the poor were also active participants, who had to deliver a counter-gift in a form of prayers.\textsuperscript{157} Feeding poor was a memorial practice, in which the poor were perceived as representatives of the dead.\textsuperscript{158} Moreover, the relationship between the benefactors and the recipients of the gifts was not anonymous; benefactors frequently stated that alms were to be given to each recipient individually, and with the knowledge of who the giver was.\textsuperscript{159} This was a process of a communication between dead benefactors and living poor.

The recipients of alms in the Livonian \textit{tafelgilde} were not an anonymous group. As was the case with the poor tables in Bruges, the Table Guilds of Riga and Reval selected the recipients of alms, as ‘a select group of a select group’.\textsuperscript{160} Like most late medieval

\textsuperscript{152} LVVA 223 f., 1 apr., 369 l., fol. 44r; Cordt Visch was the warden of \textit{tafelgilde} (1477), the councillor (1448-1473), and a burgomaster (in the 1470s). His father, Cord Visch senior also had donated to the \textit{tafelgilde} (1425). Böthführ, \textit{Rathslinie}, no. 236, 334; Brück, ‘Tafelgilde,’ p. 85; LUB 7, no. 372.
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charitable associations, the Reval tafelgilde supported the house poor (armen husarme).\textsuperscript{161} the ‘shamefaced poor’, who had a residence and were not beggars.\textsuperscript{162} Additionally the statutes of the Riga tafelgilde stated that the wardens had to distribute alms to the ‘poorest’ individuals they knew.\textsuperscript{163} As elsewhere in medieval Europe, the Riga tafelgilde distributed lead tokens (teken van blye) to the poor for the reception of alms (see Image 2).\textsuperscript{164} An example of one of these tokens on which the initials of a benefactor were inscribed has survived from post-Reformation Reval.\textsuperscript{165} The tokens enabled the Table Guild to control who received alms, as well as to inform recipients who their benefactors were.

Image 2: Token of the house-poor at St Olaf’s church in Reval, 1556. Estonian History Museum, Tallinn.

Brethren of the guild who had fallen on hard times also received alms from tafelgilde. Impoverished tafelgilde members in Riga and Reval were granted alms, sometimes even a double portion.\textsuperscript{166} Many townspeople lived under the constant threat of poverty, due to fluctuating food prices and periods of economic downturn.\textsuperscript{167}

\textsuperscript{161} Nottbeck, Schragen, p. 96, § 5.
\textsuperscript{163} Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, p. 661, § 3.
\textsuperscript{164} Mänd, ‘Hospitals,’ p. 263; Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, p. 661, § 4;
\textsuperscript{165} Mänd, ‘Hospitals,’ p. 263.
\textsuperscript{166} Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, p. 661, § 4; Nottbeck, Schragen, p. 97, § 7.
Although the Table Guilds were elite associations, they were socially diverse: alongside wealthy merchants there were skippers, and even some servants.\textsuperscript{168} The dynamic Hanseatic economy posed risks even to wealthy Riga and Reval merchants, who could lose all and ‘cease living according to the standards of (their) status’; to such members some support was directed by the \textit{tafelgilde}.\textsuperscript{169} The existence of the ‘poor’ within \textit{tafelgilde} meant that the commemorators could be readily found within the group.

The distribution of alms was a demanding process. In Reval there were almost 100 occasions in every year when the \textit{tafelgilde} distributed portions of food, usually bread, but also fresh meat, fish, and peas.\textsuperscript{170} It has been estimated that the Reval \textit{tafelgilde} regularly fed approximately 160 people.\textsuperscript{171} In Reval the distributions of alms took place in the morning ‘before the High Mass is sung’, in the belfry of the Holy Spirit church, where \textit{tafelgilde} commemorated their dead members and benefactors.\textsuperscript{172} This church was both a charitable and a memorial space. A prayer in the church for the benefactor was a fitting return from the ‘poor’ for food and clothing distributed in the belfry.

The \textit{tafelgilde} was a sub-organization of the Great Guild, which functioned as a charitable association, but it had a complex set of aims. In the \textit{tafelgilde} charity and \textit{memoria} were intertwined. As the statutes of the Table Guilds show, commemorative practices took place with regularity and were strictly regulated, involving all the guild members and investing considerable resources. The liturgical commemoration performed during the Table Guilds’ annual assemblies was complemented by individual memorial services organized by the guilds, and social \textit{memoria} of the dead members at the communal meals. Although these were sub-organizations of the Great Guilds, their memorial policies were independent from those of their ‘mother’ associations.

The charitable activities of the Table Guilds demanded significant resources, accumulated from the gifts of rich merchants and their families. These guilds granted additional commemoration to their benefactors, offering praise and thanks not only within the guild, but also in parish churches. Most of the benefactors were local political leaders and their family members, thus charity was part of political \textit{Ratsmemoria} too. The benefactors were commemorated not only by their fellow guild members, but also by the poor, who received food and clothing each week in the belfries of the churches where the Table Guilds commemorated their dead.

\textsuperscript{168} Derrik, \textit{Bruderbuch}, pp. 36-38.
\textsuperscript{169} Mând, ‘Hospitals,’ p. 262.
\textsuperscript{170} Mând, ‘Hospitals,’ p. 261; Derrik, \textit{Bruderbuch}, pp. 42-43.
\textsuperscript{171} Mând, ‘Hospitals,’ p. 261.
\textsuperscript{172} Nottbeck, \textit{Schrägen}, p. 96, § 5.
1.3: The remembrance of rich men: the brotherhoods of the Black Heads in Riga and Reval

From their foundation in the thirteenth century Livonian cities welcomed travelling tradesmen alongside their population of settled merchants. As merchants from other Hanseatic cities passed through Riga, Dorpat, and Reval, it became clear that they and also young local merchants had to be distinguished from the rest of the merchant population in terms of political rights and commercial privileges. From the late-fourteenth century young, unmarried, and foreign merchants interacted in the brotherhoods of the Black Heads in the three largest Livonian cities.¹⁷³

The brotherhoods of the Black Heads emerged in Riga and Reval at the same time. The Black Heads are first mentioned in Reval in 1400; in Riga the account book of the brotherhood’s Shrovetide warden (Fastnachtschafferbuch) was created in 1413, although the first statutes were issued in 1416.¹⁷⁴ Yet the brotherhoods must have existed prior to these first references. These were a Livonian phenomenon similar to the exclusive Prussian urban associations, the Arthur’s Courts (Arthushöfe).¹⁷⁵ In contrast to the Arthur’s Courts, and other Hanseatic urban elite associations, which welcomed ‘sisters’ – wives or widows of the brethren – the Black Heads were exclusively male groups.¹⁷⁶

Although the Black Heads were excluded from urban government, they still formed part of the urban elite.¹⁷⁷ Young merchants, future urban economic and political leaders, were trained, gained business contacts, and engaged in religious and social activities within these brotherhoods.¹⁷⁸ Entitled swarten hovede,¹⁷⁹ these groups had as their

¹⁷³ In the early scholarship the origins of the Black Heads have been related to the fourteenth century group known as Stable Brethren (Stallbrüder), the servants and guards of the Teutonic Order in Livonia. However, the urban Black Heads and the associations of Stallbrüder were different groups. Spliet, Geschichte, pp. 2-6; Idem, ‘Die Schwarzhäupter in ihrem Verhältnis zur deutschen kolonialen Ständegeschichte in Livland,’ in Zeitschrift für Ostforschung 3 (1954): pp. 233-247, at p. 234, 244-246.; Mänd, Urban Carnival, pp. 32-33.

¹⁷⁴ LUB 4, no. 1503; Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, pp. 549-544; Dokumentesammlung des Herder-Instituts in Marburg Lahn 120 Schwarzhäupter Riga [hereafter DSHI 120], no. 64. fol. 2.


¹⁷⁶ Selzer, Artushöfe, p. 115.


¹⁷⁹ Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, p. 549; LUB 9, no. 695;
The prestige of these brotherhoods was manifested by the locations of their guildhalls. In Riga, the house of the Black Heads, also known as ‘the New House’, was located on the marketplace, opposite the city hall. This house has been erected before the establishment of the brotherhood and, for a time after 1413/1416, was shared with the Great Guild (see Map 2). The brotherhood also rented a house in a central location in Reval – on Long Street – where the guildhalls of all major associations were located (see Map 3); during the sixteenth century they acquired their own house there. Additionally, both in Riga and in Reval the Black Heads established altars and also chapels in the churches of St Catherine (of Alexandria); in Riga this was the Franciscan, but in Reval the Dominican church. Both institutions became religious centres for the brotherhoods and they received generous support from the Black Heads.

Although they commanded resources and established great pomp, these brotherhoods were smaller in size than the senior Great Guilds. From small groups with only a few dozen members in the early-fifteenth century, the Black Heads nonetheless grew into associations which numbered around a hundred brethren by mid century. During one of the first known drunkes of the Riga brotherhood in 1413, 41 Black Heads paid a membership fee of 10 ore. The number of the Black Heads in Riga clearly fluctuated: 63 brethren in 1416; 105 in 1417; 91 in 1419, and 90 in 1424. According to the lists of guests at their feasts between 1450 and 1557, the Black Heads in Reval had on average around one hundred members. Membership fluctuated, affected by outbreaks of plague and by the changing economic climate.

Most of the brotherhood members were the sons of merchants of the Great Guild, and they entered the Black Heads after turning eighteen; when a Black Head married, he took the burgher’s oath, and was then admitted to the Great Guild, thus leaving the

---

180 The brotherhoods in Riga and Reval had also other patron saints, see Spliet, Geschichte, pp. 6-7, 119-123; Kala, Kreem, and Mänd, ‘Bruderschaft,’ p. 62.
181 Benninghoven, Rigas Entstehung, p. 96.
182 Mänd, Urban Carnival, p. 257.
185 Mänd, Urban Carnival, pp. 91-92.
Black Heads brotherhood.186 The Black Heads also had members from the other Hanseatic cities (in Riga these accounted for at least half of all Black Heads), who after some time either left the city, or acquired burgher rights.187 Thus these brotherhoods can be considered as transitional groups, in which membership usually lasted no longer than a few years. An analysis of the members’ lists of the Reval Black Heads shows that merchants spent an average of five years in the association, before entering the Great Guild.188 There are few known merchants who stayed in the brotherhood longer and even fewer are known to have died as members of the group.189 Most of the Black Heads at some point left the brotherhood and ended their lives as members of the Great Guild, or in associations of other Hanseatic cities.

The remembrance of the Black Heads can be seen as part of the memoria of the urban elites, but it differed from the collective memoria of the other elite associations. Firstly, the connection between the individuals and the brotherhood was not life-long. Memoria in the urban associations was usually the extension of bonds created during a lifetime. Because no lists of the members commemorated have survived, it is unknown whether the brotherhoods remembered those members who died as brethren of the Great Guild or as burghers of other cities. The Black Heads certainly had their own dead, commemorated intensively even though membership of these brotherhoods was so short. Secondly, for the Black Heads, as for the Prussian Arthur’s Courts, memoria was a constitutive element, a vehicle for social prestige.190 Memoria was also an occasion for self-representation by the brotherhoods and which was manifested during the annual feasts, directed towards members themselves and also other groups.191

In the Riga and Reval Black Heads brotherhoods the genesis and development of commemoration allows us to witness how these merchant groups emerged, developed and changed. In general, memoria can be considered as one of the signs of a group’s existence; it created and constituted a group, and provided an identity that secured its

186 Some brethren remained in the brotherhood also after the marriage and in Riga not all brethren became members of the Great Guild, see Mänd, Urban Carnival, p. 36; Eadem., ‘Geselligkeit,’ pp. 48-51; Spliet, Geschichte, p. 57; Brück, ‘Bemerkungen,’ p. 117.
187 In Riga most of the foreign Black Heads were from Lübeck, Danzig and Reval, as well as Cologne and Dortmund. Brück, ‘Bemerkungen,’ p. 114, 116.
188 Mänd, ‘Geselligkeit,’ p. 49.
190 Selzer, Artushöfe, p. 121.
191 Mänd, Urban Carnival, pp. 55-159, 256-280.
existence.\textsuperscript{192} For the Rigan and Reval Black Heads we can observe not only the development of the collective memoria, but also its dissolution during the Reformation.

Because memoria was a tool which perpetuated a group’s continuity,\textsuperscript{193} it was practiced even at the initial stages of group’s formation when there were as yet no deceased members to commemorate. This projected the sustaining of a long-term identity. At that early stage it was essential to ensure members that a prospective memoria would be granted to them after their death.\textsuperscript{194} Although we do not know exactly when the brotherhoods of the Black Heads in Riga and Reval were established, the presence of liturgical memoria in the groups’ early activities shows that they were already active in imagining past and future. As communities in which foreigners dominated they needed secure spaces in which to fulfil their religious obligations, because most of them had no families or relatives in the cities.\textsuperscript{195} By the time they first appear in the records, the Black Heads had already chosen their memorial spaces, which remained unchanged until the Reformation.

The Reval Black Heads were mentioned for the first time in 1400, in a charter issued by the local Dominicans, confirming the brotherhood’s right to an altar of the Virgin Mary in St Catherine’s church.\textsuperscript{196} The leaders of the Black Heads agreed with the Dominicans that the vestments, books, altarpieces, chalices, and all other objects they would give to this church should remain in the brotherhood’s possession.\textsuperscript{197} Evidently, the Black Heads had begun – or intended to begin – liturgical services at the altar where the Dominicans promised to celebrate masses.\textsuperscript{198} The charter does not specifically identify the masses as memorial ones (selemisse), but presumably the dead were commemorated during every mass.

The link between the Black Heads and the mendicant orders recurs in Riga.\textsuperscript{199} There the brotherhood likewise founded its first chantry in 1421 in the mendicant church, at the Franciscan church of St Catherine.\textsuperscript{200} These choices were determined by numerous factors. The Black Heads as journeymen merchants were not burghers and did not

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
  \item Oexle, ‘Gegenwart der Lebenden,’ p. 75.
  \item Oexle, ‘Soziale Gruppen,’ p. 31.
  \item Assmann, Das kulturelle Gedächtnis, p. 61.
  \item Mänd and Randla, ‘Sacred space,’ p. 47.
  \item This altar devoted to the Virgin Mary, St Gertrude and St Dorothy was consecrated in 1403. LUB 4, no. 1503; LUB 6, no. 2958; Mänd and Randla, ‘Sacred space,’ p. 50.
  \item Later, in 1403 the brotherhood’s altar received an altarpiece of the Virgin Mary. LUB 4, no. 1503; LUB 6, no. 2958; Mänd and Randla, ‘Sacred space,’ p. 50.
  \item LUB 4, no. 1503.
  \item On the mendicants and the Black Heads in Riga and Reval, see Mänd and Randla, ‘Sacred space,’ pp. 43-80.
  \item LUB 9, no. 704.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
belong to the congregations of the parish churches, thus they could not found chapels there. As Anneli Randla and Annu Mänd point it out, at least for the Black Heads in Reval, St Catherine’s church ‘was a natural choice’; in Riga the proximity of the Franciscan friary to the house of the Great Guild may have played a role in the choice.

The Black Heads in both Riga and Reval may have imitated Lübeck, the city of origin of numerous Black Heads. In Lübeck St Catherine’s Franciscan church hosted memoria and religious activities of prestigious merchant groups, like Zirkelgesellschaft. Yet, St Catherine does not appear among the main patrons of either brotherhood.

The Reval Black Heads remained linked to the Dominicans for 125 years. In 1418 they founded another altar in St Catherine’s church, dedicated to the Holy Trinity. Since the early fifteenth century the Black Heads had a chapel of the Virgin Mary in St Catherine’s church. According to the brotherhood’s chantry account book for the period 1418-1517, the Black Heads endowed their altars lavishly: they commissioned altarpieces, liturgical vessels, utensils and garments, donated missals and candlesticks, in addition to annually supporting the Dominicans with payments and donations of food. According to an inventory prepared by the Dominicans in 1495, the Black Heads chantry possessed impressive quantities of liturgical vessels and vestments donated by the brethren. In the late-fifteenth century the Black Heads also had church pews in the parish church of St Nicholas, though the Dominican church remained their religious centre.

The relationship between the Black Heads and the Dominicans was a close one. The Black Heads were involved in the internal processes of the friary, such as its reform in 1474/1475. From this relationship – of which memoria formed a part – the

\[202\] Mänd and Randla, ‘Sacred space,’ pp. 47-49.
\[205\] Spliet, Geschichte, pp. 119-122; Kala, Kreem, and Mänd, ‘Bruderschaft,’ p. 62; LUB 2/1, no. 106, p. 84.
\[207\] Staatsarchiv der Freien und Hansestadt Hamburg [hereafter StAH], coll. 612-2/6, no. E 1, fol. 3.
\[208\] Mänd and Randla, ‘Sacred space,’ pp. 68-72.
\[209\] StAH, coll. 612-2/6, no. E 1, fols., 2-190; after the reform the friars no longer consumed meat and the Black Heads donated to them fish and peas. See Kala, Kreem, and Mänd, ‘Bruderschaft,’ p. 63; TLA, f 230, n 1, s Bk 3, fols. 11r, 22r, 77r.
\[210\] LUB 2/1, no. 106.
\[211\] Mänd, ‘Marienaltar,’ p. 233.
\[212\] TLA, f 230, n 1, s Bk 3, fol. 11r.
brotherhood benefited not only spiritually, but also in terms of social prestige. The Reval Black Heads received at least two charters from the highest officials of the Dominican Order securing prayers and *memoria*. In 1460 Ludolph, the Provincial of the Danish Dominican province to which the Reval friary belonged, issued a charter ensuring the participation of the Black Heads in the good deeds accumulated by the Dominicans of that province.\(^{213}\) In addition, the Provincial promised that all friaries of the province would pray for the souls of deceased Black Heads.\(^{214}\) Another charter was issued by Master General Leonardo Mansueti (1474–1480), in Rome in 1478, which praised the Black Heads’ piety and their support for the local friary, while promising prayers by all of the Order’s houses.\(^{215}\) These charters, which were kept in the brotherhood’s collection of its most important documents, established the spiritual confraternity between the two groups and helped to enhance the brotherhood’s status.\(^{216}\) Such charters were most likely bought, and all deceased Black Heads were likely not have been commemorated in all the friaries of the Danish province. Yet the promise of *memoria* was a gesture of partnership between the friars and the brotherhood. Thus the choice of location for their religious activities and commemoration affected the brotherhood’s status; the friars were not simply commemorators, but also long-term allies.

The records of the Riga Black Heads reveal how *memoria* was performed in practice, how the brotherhood’s memorial activities changed, and how their memorial chantries functioned. The Riga Black Heads had two memorial spaces from the very beginning: the Franciscan friary of St Catherine, and the parish church of St Peter.\(^{217}\) As in Reval, the Riga Black Heads used these memorial spaces until the Reformation, although their relative importance changed over time.

The Black Heads commemorated their dead in Riga, even before they were able to accumulate the substantial resources necessary to establish a chantry, an altar and regular liturgical services. Until the establishment of the chantry in St Catherine’s church in 1421, the Black Heads sustained *memoria* by requesting prayers from parish priests. Its earliest statutes of 1416 stipulated payment to the priests of St Peter’s church

\(^{213}\) LUB 12, no. 34.
\(^{214}\) Ibid.
\(^{215}\) The charter was a gratitude from the Master for the Black Heads’s involvement in reforming of the Dominican friary in 1474. TLA, f. 87, n. 1, no. 91; TLA f. 230, n. 1, s. Bk 3, fol. 11r; Kala, Kreem, and Mänd, ‘Bruderschaft,’ p. 64; Mänd and Randla, ‘Sacred space,’ p. 48.
\(^{216}\) Kala, Kreem, and Mänd, ‘Bruderschaft,’ p. 64; Spliet, *Geschichte*, p. 117.
\(^{217}\) Spliet, *Geschichte*, pp. 116-117, 125.
of four ores, for commemoration of the Black Heads every Sunday from the pulpit. In this respect the Black Heads followed the example of the Table Guild, where brothers and sisters were likewise remembered every Sunday in St Peter’s church. As in the case of the Table Guild, this commemoration of the deceased Black Heads was directed not only at group members, but also at the parish community present at Sunday services. Before the foundation of the chantry, these prayers were financed by the guild at a relatively low cost: the vigils at four ores, and priests received three ores for singing the vigils while the musicians – pipers (pyperen) and drummers (bungeren) – were paid 6 ores for their part in the liturgical services. These, however, were activities whose regularity cannot be traced and they probably did not continue in the long-term.

The foundation of an altar as a memorial space of the brotherhood added prestige to the Black Heads’ religious activities and helped sustain memoria in the long term. In 1421 the ‘whole brotherhood’ of the Black Heads, with the consent of the Great Guild’s brethren, founded a chantry and an altar in St Catherine’s church. The foundation was secured by an endowment of 47 marks provided by the brotherhood itself and the charter of foundation was kept in the brotherhood’s chest. In return for liturgical memoria the Franciscans received an annuity rent of 4 marks and, as in Reval, donations of food.

After the erection of the chapel and the altar, the chantry began receiving donations of useful objects from the brethren as well as from members of the Great Guild. According to the inventory, the chapel gained its grandeur gradually; by 1441 it had among others received mensa stones for the altar, altarpieces, liturgical books, chalices, liturgical vessels and utensils, candlesticks, and other items. Among these objects were those used in commemorative activities or created for commemoration of an individual. In 1422 the chapel acquired a silver chalice inscribed with the brotherhood’s coat of arms, which was a memorial donation of the Black Head Cord van der Heyde. A pall (boldyk), for use at funerals and commemorative services, was obtained in

---
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In the 1420s the brotherhood also acquired a tombstone, which was placed directly in front of the Black Heads altar in their chapel, and was possibly used as a collective tombstone for the brotherhood. A decade after the chantry’s establishment, the brotherhood obtained other objects which may have been used for commemorative purposes, namely the stained-glass windows and an altarpiece. Two stained-glass windows were commissioned for the brotherhood’s chapel in 1430 at a cost of 107 marks and, a year later, an altarpiece was received from Lübeck, valued at an impressive 74 Riga marks.

All objects were given by patrons who wished to be commemorated by the brotherhood. An early-fifteenth century Riga testament reveals how brotherhood members supported the group’s memoria and shaped its commemorative spaces by their donations and endowments. In 1420, Cord van der Heyde, a Black Head (eyn koepgeselle), named the brotherhood and the churches where it had its religious activities as beneficiaries in his will. Van der Heyde may have belonged to a family of the city councillors, and himself was alderman when the brotherhood’s first statues were issued in 1416. He donated three marks to the construction of St Peter’s church, where the brotherhood prayed for their dead, and asked to be commemorated in return. Likewise, he donated five marks to the Franciscans of St Catherine’s church, where a year later the Black Heads chantry was established. Cord van der Heyde chose to be buried there and requested prayers for his soul.

Van der Heyde also donated to the brotherhood a silver chalice for the celebration of mass. He gave silver for its production on the condition that the chalice remained in the chantry in perpetuity. The chalice was to serve the eternal commemoration of the

---
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donor, and to ensure prayers in return. In 1441 it was recorded in the chantry inventory, when its donor’s name was given as well. Embossed with the brotherhood’s coat of arms, it was the sole chalice of the brotherhood’s altar. It was used in all masses celebrated at the brotherhood’s altar and in this way the donor was commemorated at every mass. Van der Heyde had created memoria in which space – his tombstone in the Franciscan church, an object – the chalice of the Black Heads, and prayers by the Franciscans combined effectively with the collective memoria of the brotherhood.

Memoria was maintained through objects. The Riga brotherhood had numerous altarpieces in St Catherine’s and St Peter’s churches, none of which survives. In Reval, however, the altarpiece of the Virgin Mary altar of the Black Heads in St Catherine’s church survived the Reformation. It is a triptych with two pairs of wings, produced by 1493, and depicts the Virgin Mary with the infant Jesus on the central panel, saints on its wings, as well as its patrons, the Black Heads. The altarpiece was produced in Bruges by the workshop of the master of the St Lucy Legend. Although scholars are not sure of the date of the commission and its arrival in Reval, naming 1481 or 1495 as possible dates of arrival, a record in the account book of the Great Guild notes that in 1493 a guild member Gosschalk Remmelinkrade acquired an altarpiece for an altar in the Dominican church. The members of the Great Guild took part in the acquisition, but the patrons of the altarpiece were the Black Heads, and it was placed at their altar in St Catherine’s church, where it remained until the Reformation.

---

239 Chalices for memorial purposes were donated also in other Hanseatic towns, see Lusiardi, Stiftung, p. 53.
240 LUB 9, no. 704.
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245 The altarpiece of St Mary now is part of the collection of the Art Museum of Estonia EKM 18760.
The altarpiece of the Virgin Mary was a memorial foundation commissioned to sustain the *memoria* of its patrons. The patrons aimed to remain perpetually present through the mediation of an image or an important object. The memorial image (*Memorialbild*) of a patron in an altarpiece supplemented liturgical commemoration performed at the altar, thus enhancing the presence of the patron and strengthening *memoria*. The patrons of the altarpiece, the Black Heads, were represented on two wings as a group of thirty young men, kneeling, hands together in prayer, fifteen at the feet of the Virgin Mary on one wing, and the rest in front of St John the Baptist on the other. The altarpiece with its wings could be used in three different positions according to the season and as appropriate for specific feast days. One might suggest that the wings which depicted the Black Heads were displayed during the memorial masses.

---

253 Mänd, ‘Church art,’ p. 10.
As usual for such group portraits, most individuals possess few distinguished features, yet Anu Mänd has suggested that the two men in the foreground of each panel are ‘depicted much more realistically and reveal deep individualism’; it has been suggested that at least one of them was altar-warden or alderman of the Black Heads.²⁵⁴ The Black Heads had two altar-warden’s and likely they were the two men in the foreground.²⁵⁵ In fact, the status of their altar-warden’s was different from that of other brotherhood’s officials. The altar-wardens of both the Reval and Riga Black Heads were already members of the Great Guild when elected, and remained in office for ten years on average, sometimes even becoming city councillors during their term of office.²⁵⁶ As a transitional group of young and foreign merchants, whose members spent only a few years and were mobile and somewhat inexperienced, the brotherhood required officials who could ensure institutional continuity.²⁵⁷ Although the altar-wardens were not members of the brotherhood, they were perceived as part of it. The two officials at the time of the altarpiece’s commission, who may have been portrayed, were: altar-warden Hans Kullert, elected to office in 1486, who served until 1496 and was also burgomaster; and Israhel van Mer, elected in 1484.²⁵⁸ If the altarpiece was commissioned before 1484 then one of the candidates may have been Evert van der Schuren, altar-warden between 1476 and 1486.²⁵⁹

If the men depicted in the foreground of the wings were the altar-wardens, this indicates their special role in the brotherhood’s work of memoria. In the Riga brotherhood the altar-wardens were also founders of individual and collective memorial services in the brotherhood’s chantry.²⁶⁰ The altar-wardens commissioned altarpieces for the Livonian Black Heads brotherhoods as did those of the fifteenth-century Italian confraternities.²⁶¹ They were acting as co-patrons of sorts and their preferences,

²⁵⁴ Because the Reval Black Heads did not have one alderman, but a group of leaders, the suggestion that one of the two men was an alderman can be doubted. Amelung and Wrangell, Geschichte, p. 20-21; Mänd, ‘Geselligkeit,’ p. 52; Eadem., ‘Altarpiece,’ p. 42.
²⁵⁶ Evert van der Schuren, the altar-warden of the Black Heads (1476-1486) was elected into the office after becoming a burgher in 1466, thus entering the Great Guild. Das Revaler Bürgerbuch 1409-1624, ed. Otto Greiffenhagen, Reval, 1932, p. 25; Mänd, ‘Altarpiece,’ pp. 43-44; Spliet, Geschichte, pp. 124-125, 138.
²⁵⁷ Mänd, ‘Geselligkeit,’ p. 49; Eadem., ‘Altarpiece,’ p. 44.
²⁵⁸ Mänd, ‘Altarpiece,’ p. 44; Bunge, Rathslinie, p. 89, 115.
²⁵⁹ Mänd, ‘Altarpiece,’ p. 44; Revaler Bürgerbuch, p. 25.
²⁶⁰ Spliet, Geschichte, p. 126.
including memorial ones, may have been considered in the commissioning of an altarpiece. However, the account books do not record the specific commemoration of the altar-wardens, but only that of the brotherhood’s leaders.\textsuperscript{262}

Image 4: Altarpiece of the Virgin Mary, a fragment

The wings of the Virgin Mary altar represent the collective \textit{memoria} of the Black Heads. Although, as Anu Mänd has argued, it cannot be ruled out that some Black Heads, who commissioned the altarpiece and went to Bruges, actually sat for the artist, the altarpiece most likely depicts a stereotypical group of young, rich, and handsome upper-class men.\textsuperscript{263} Within the context and location of the altarpiece it is a specifically designated group. Even if stereotypical, it portrays the Reval Black Heads: a youthful, pious, and wealthy merchant group destined for the elite, at prayer, and invites spectators to join in commemoration.\textsuperscript{264} As part of collective \textit{memoria} it reminded the living brethren attending memorial masses that they also belonged to this group and they should commemorate their dead predecessors.

All the objects created to assist \textit{memoria} and to create memorial images of their patrons were passively or actively used in commemorative practices. In the case of the

\textsuperscript{262} In 1450 the Reval Black Heads paid eight marks to commemorate deceased brotherhood’s leaders Reincke Grote and Hinrick Kothusen with sung memorial masses. StAH, coll. 612-2/6 no. D1, fol. 10v.

\textsuperscript{263} Gerhard Jaritz, “Young, rich, and beautiful.” The Visualization of Male Beauty in the Late Middle Ages,’ in \textit{The Man of Many Devices}, pp. 61-77; Mänd, ‘Altarpiece,’ p. 45.
Riga Black Heads these memorial practices can be at least partially reconstructed. Although by the end of the fifteenth century *memoria* of the brotherhood was performed on a regular basis, there were periods when such activities were intensive. The commemorative activities of the Riga Black Heads were described in the brotherhood’s statutes of 1416, and later ordinances add information, particularly about carnival, when the brotherhood annually celebrated its *dunke.* During the fifteenth century the carnival *dunke* began on Wednesday preceding Lent, and ended on the Sunday after Shrovetide. According to the carnival regulations of 1510, the *dunke* ended on the first Tuesday in Lent, after 8 days. Running to 216 paragraphs, the carnival regulations scrupulously describe each stage of the *dunke*; they reflect the brotherhood’s wish to sustain the identity and unity of the group in the long-term, just as *memoria* did.

Carnival was a busy time for the brotherhood’s members. Memorial rituals took place at the start and end of the *dunke* and between them the Black Heads and their guests drank, ate and danced. Two days into the *dunke*, on Friday the Riga brotherhood commemorated ‘the Black Heads, who are dead’ in St Catherine’s church with a vigil, memorial masses followed on the Saturday morning. The wardens of carnival prepared three candles and hired women to carry them during the memorial masses. The statutes stipulated that the commemoration at *dunke* continued into Lent. On Ash Wednesday the Riga Black Heads held a vigil, and on Thursday morning, memorial masses were celebrated in St Peter’s. The carnival regulations of 1510 laid down that on Thursday morning at 8 o’clock, all Black Heads take part in a memorial mass if they wished to be commemorated after their own death. Members gathered at the brotherhood’s house in the marketplace and processed led by an alderman in pairs to St Peter’s for the celebration of a memorial mass at the brotherhood’s altar. After the morning commemoration, the *dunke* continued with a meal, followed by another in the evening in the Black Heads house, to which the members of the Great Guild and their

---
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wives were invited. Drunke were lively events, so the wardens reminded the Black Heads that they must appear for the memorial mass on the next morning, as did the Reval brotherhood during the Christmas drinking feast.

These collective commemorations were important for the group, not least because during carnival new members were admitted and inducted. Thus new members were introduced to the group’s traditions, to its past and its dead. This was an intensive introduction; while other urban associations commemorated their dead with vigils and masses only once during drunke, the Black Heads, did so twice. During these intensive festivities of carnival and remembrance of the dead the Black Heads were constituted as a group.

Although funeral of members was a central obligation of all medieval confraternities, only limited information survives about the funerals of the Black Heads. Most of the Black Heads left the brotherhoods before their death, yet the brotherhood took care of the bodies and souls of those who died as members. The Black Heads in Riga and Reval possessed all that was required: biers, numerous palls, and in Riga, as we have seen, the brotherhood had a confraternity tombstone in its chapel. The palls, presumably decorated with associations’ emblems, reflected the brotherhoods’ urge for prestige and ceremony, and generated income for the group. In Reval, the Black Heads had a red pall donated by an Augustinian preacher, Tibursius, in addition to the brotherhood’s own pall decorated with gold. One pall of the Riga Black Heads was of blue and yellow woollen cloth, lined with fine blue linen; the other was completely blue; both palls and the bier were also rented to other individuals and associations. In addition, the Rigan Black Heads rented out torches (home) for funeral ceremonies, raising additional revenue in this manner.

The statutes of neither groups provide details about the forms of funerals, but in Reval the brotherhood encouraged its brethren to help bury deceased brothers.
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commemorative practices of the Black Heads were known to other townspeople too. In Riga in 1451 a female donor made donations to the Black Heads on condition that they bury her according to their customs, and commemorate her like the brethren, that is with vigils and memorial masses. The Rigan brotherhood also hired a grave-digger (doden greuer) in 1469, paying him 3 schillings for his work. Possession of palls, biers and tombstones and the rental of these objects shows that the Black Heads were well prepared for funerals of their brethren.

During the late-fifteenth century in Riga the focus of memorial activities shifted from the altar and chantry in St Catherine’s church to the main parish church, St Peter’s. This coincided with a period of intensified memoria. Although the Black Heads had used St Peter’s as their commemorational space since 1416, paid parish priests for commemorative prayers, and donated a stain-glass window in 1470, the chantry with its altar was established there only in 1481. The city council allocated a prestigious place in St Peter’s for the erection of the Black Heads altar, next to the altar of the Porters’ guild (losdreger altar), in the chapel on the south side of the church. The brotherhood clearly sought to be represented in the largest and most prestigious parish church, and probably as non-burghers the Black Heads required permission from the city government to do so. In order to secure the chantry and to enhance its status, the Black Heads acquired a confirmation charter from archbishop Michael Hildebrand in 1487. After the establishment of the new altar, an inflow of considerable resources for commemoration can be observed and it appears that the support exceeded that given to the chantry in St Catherine’s.

With access to the altar in St Peter’s the Black Heads intensified their collective liturgical memoria. In 1483, two years after the foundation of the altar, the brotherhood founded daily commemorative services there. The aldermen of the brotherhood recruited two priests to celebrate a daily mass or three weekly masses – requesting that it be a morning mass – with an annual wage of 40 marks. The probable reason for this two-year delay was Riga’s war with the Teutonic Order (1481-1491), which affected the
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activities of the urban associations, and the foundation took place during a short armistice.293

This commemorative service was supported by the foundation made by a brotherhood official in 1487. Hans Siveke, the warden of the Black Heads altar in St Peter’s between 1484 and 1511, founded a requiem – a daily vigil and memorial mass for the support of all Christian souls – which had to be perpetually celebrated at the altar of the brotherhood in St Peter’s.294 More specifically, Hans Siveke requested that the souls of his mother, himself and all Christians be commemorated at these services.295 Although Siveke’s aim was perpetual commemoration, there was a plan for five years, during which five priests had to celebrate the daily services and receive 20 marks annually each.296 The priests could be hired anew each year, and they were not to be substituted by choirboys (korscholer).297 The brotherhood was in charge of supporting these memorial services.298 The foundation was meant to augment the morning masses created in 1483 by adding daily vigils to them. It seems that the services were begun in 1487 and were performed at Hans Siveke’s death in 1511, as recorded in the chantry’s account book, and the brotherhood received on that occasion 300 Riga marks for the chantry.299

Siveke’s requiem reveals the schedule of daily memorial services for the brotherhood. The five priests of the chantry were expected to sing a memorial mass every morning ‘at six or seven’, and to offer a vigil in the afternoon at around one o’clock.300 For a time, the memorial mass of the brotherhood had to be celebrated at six, because the soul-mass founded by burgomaster Peter Hinriks was celebrated in St Peter’s church at seven.301 After Hinriks’ death the memorial mass of the Black Heads was again celebrated at seven o’clock.302 These memorial masses of the Black Heads were additionally supported by an annual payment of 6 marks.303 After Siveke’s death an additional 10 marks were given to the chantry’s priests.304 Siveke’s requiem shows
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how the memorial efforts of the brotherhood’s officials were blended into existing commemorative practices. The collective memoria of the Black Heads was also sustained by ‘the book of dead’, which presumably lay on the brotherhood’s altar and was used during the liturgy.\footnote{DSHI 120, no. 7, fols. 306.}

Intensive memoria demanded considerable resources and the chantry of the Black Heads in St Peter’s possessed such support. From its foundation until the Reformation there was a constant flow of funds for the chantry.\footnote{Ibid., p. 134.} In 1514 the chantry’s income from the annuity rents alone was an impressive 136 Riga marks; by the Reformation in 1525 this sum had risen to 208 marks.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 129-134.} Several houses owned by the chantry provided a regular income.\footnote{DSHI 120, no. 7, fols. 306-306a; Spliet, Geschichte, pp. 139-141.} The chantry also received non-monetary donations from individual Black Heads. By 1521, forty years after the chantry’s establishment, it had a rich collection of objects: liturgical books, altar cloths, small altarpieces, water and wine cruets, chalices and also some very valuable objects, such as a silver statue of St George worth 600 marks.\footnote{DSHI 120, no. 8, fol. 124.} In addition to rents the memorial donations of members provided financial resources for the chantry too. In 1491 the chantry received 50 marks from Hinrick Sarrenhagen for commemoration of a certain Hans Wulff and rents had to be spent on vigils and memorial masses in the Black Heads chantry, which continued for six years.\footnote{Arbusow, Einführung, p. 293.}

The Black Heads memoria both in Riga and Reval was impressive. Yet the lavishly decorated altars, furnished with liturgical objects, and embedded within a programme of memorial services, were abandoned at the Reformation. Moreover, during the Reformation the Black Heads eagerly supported religious change; indeed, the Riga Black Heads took part in the destruction of memorial sites created by their predecessors. The Black Heads were the first in Riga to destroy the brotherhood’s altars, altarpieces, statues and other liturgical utensils.\footnote{Hermann Heimpel, ‘Das Wesen des deutschen Spätmittelalters,’ in Archiv für Kulturgeschichte 35 (1954): pp. 29-51, at p. 50.} As elsewhere in northern Europe, so in Riga, ‘the commissioners of images were the image destroyers’ (\textit{die Bilderstürmer waren die Bilderstifter}).\footnote{Ibid., p. 134.} Likewise, the founders of the liturgical memoria, or rather their successors, abolished it as ineffectual.
According to Leonid Arbusow the Black Heads supported the Reformation because as young men and foreigners they were more exposed to the new reforming preaching. Yet the Black Heads in Riga as a group did not destroy their own memorial spaces. In early 1524 the brotherhood’s altar and chapel in the St Peter’s was still repaired, though on 10 March the Black Heads assembled in their house and agreed to cease payment for the altar and memorial services. They decided to take the altarpiece and the chantry’s objects to the Black Heads’ house in the marketplace. The decision, however, was not carried out.

What happened next can be reconstructed only in part. Most likely after the assembly some brethren, later described as ‘young brothers with dull and witless heads’ (junghe broders myt ene dulle unsynnygen koppe), went to St Peter’s, where they destroyed the Black Heads altar. As a result, the large altarpiece, the small ones, a missal, a corporal, chalices, candlesticks, and all the other objects belonging to the chantry perished. Although the destruction of the altarpiece was reported on 10 March, the brotherhood sold it and two smaller images for 236 marks after Michaelmas 1524, more than half of the amount paid for the large altarpiece in Lübeck in 1493.

Though the brotherhoods supported the Reformation, alderman Hinrick van dem Sande and his deputies, treasurers and the altar-wardens were opposed to the violence. They criticised the image-breakers and noted down in the account book that the chantry had existed for 44 years, ‘which is a very short time’. Despite the violence in St Peter’s, the hundred years old Black Heads chantry and altar in the Franciscan church was not ransacked and all its belongings were handed over to the brotherhood in 1525.

In contrast to the violent dissolution of the chantry in St Peter, the priests were treated better. This was a chantry of six priests, four of whom were paid their last wages by the brotherhood in November 1524, 26 Riga marks each. The same amount was
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now directed to the salaries of two Lutheran preachers and for ‘the box of the poor’ that accumulated resources from all abolished memorial chantries.\footnote{DSHI 120, no. 8, fol. 203; DSHI 120, no. 7, fol. 40; Arbusow, \textit{Einführung}, pp. 300-305.} The process of ending traditional rituals, \textit{memoria} among them, was concluded in June 1524, when the brotherhood finally demolished its altar, taking the altar-stones away and erecting the brotherhood’s pews in their place.\footnote{Spliet, \textit{Geschichte}, p. 148.}

Although the churches of Reval, including St Catherine’s, also suffered at the hand of iconoclasts, the Black Heads abolished their chantries and altars in a more organised manner. The Black Heads ceased supporting the memorial services in the Dominican church in 1524: on 1 August the brotherhood withdrew all endowments made to the two chantries in St Catherine’s church, thus ending 124 years of cooperation between the two groups.\footnote{Kala, Kreem, and Mänd, ‘Bruderschaft,’ p. 64; Amelung and Wrangell, \textit{Geschichte}, p. 53; Tiina Kala, ‘Das Dominikanerkloster von Reval/Tallinn und die lutherische Reformation,’ in \textit{Die Stadt im Europäischen Nordosten}, eds. Robert Schweitzer and Waltraud Basman-Bühner, Helsinki, 2001, pp. 83-93.} The brotherhood also removed the precious altarpiece of Virgin Mary to its house where it remained until the mid-twentieth century.\footnote{Reidna, \textit{Altar}, p. 7; Mänd, ‘Marienaltar,’ p. 228.}

\textit{Memoria} had immense importance for such a transitional group like the Black Heads, yet as the attitudes towards the prayers for the dead changed, the Black Heads themselves abolished the liturgical \textit{memoria} and objects supporting it. This, however, does not mean that the remembrance of the dead became irrelevant. Three decades after the abolition of liturgical \textit{memoria}, the remembrance of dead reappeared. In 1561, the Reval Black Heads commissioned an epitaph depicting ten brethren killed during the Livonian war (1558-1583), on their knees, hands in prayer, in front of the cross, similar to the way their fellow brethren were portrayed on the Virgin Mary altarpiece 65 years earlier.\footnote{Jüri Kivimäe, ‘Das Scharmützel hinter dem Jerusalemer Berg Anno 1560,’ in \textit{Die Revaler Schwarzenhäupter}, pp. 67-83, at pp. 79-81; Mänd, ‘Altarpiece,’ pp. 41-42.} Collective \textit{memoria} was not gone; it had been transformed, losing its liturgical character and developing instead its social forms.\footnote{On \textit{memoria} after the Reformation, see Oexle, ‘Memoria der Reformation,’ pp. 187-242; Koslofsky, \textit{Reformation of the Dead}; Idem., ‘From Presence to Remembrance,’ pp. 25-38; Schmidt, \textit{Wandelbare Traditionen}, pp. 72-84.}

The Black Heads in Riga and Reval nurtured their remembrance from the earliest days of their existence. \textit{Memoria} in these groups of young and foreign merchants is particularly interesting, since membership for most of the members was limited in time. \textit{Memoria} constituted the groups and helped maintain their traditions and identities in conditions when membership constantly changed. The Black Heads in Riga and Reval
enhanced *memoria* within local churches by commissioning memorial objects, including valuable altarpieces. In Reval the Virgin Mary altarpiece, which depicted the brethren, was a part of the Black Heads’ collective *memoria*.

Although the Black Heads valued their *memoria* highly, during the Reformation in 1524 they were the first of the urban associations in Riga and Reval to abolish the liturgical *memoria* and dissolve their altars. Moreover, some Black Heads took part in the destruction of the memorial sites. Yet, although the Black Heads in both Riga and Reval wished to dissolve their altars, they also sought to hold onto their memorial objects, and transformed *memoria* to other social forms after the Reformation.

### 1.4: *Ratsmemoria*: the commemoration of the political elites

On 5 September 1425 Lübeck’s city councillors sent a letter to their counterparts in Reval. They requested the restoration of the tombstone of their deceased fellow councillor Johann Lüneburg (*Johannis Luneborch*), who had died in Reval in 1373 while on a diplomatic mission, and who had been buried in the chancel of St Olaf’s parish church.330 The Lübeckians expressed the concern about the tombstone’s removal during reconstruction of the chancel and they ‘kindly asked’ Reval council to return it to Lüneburg’s tomb.331 In reality, Lübeck’s political leaders were concerned not about the tombstone alone, but about the fact that the absence of the tombstone meant the end of Lüneburg’s *memoria*.332

Johann Lüneburg died in a foreign city while trading to the ‘common good’ (*gemeynen besten*) of his community. He was still remembered by Lübeck’s city council fifty years after his death. This memory was part of the carefully preserved institutionalized *memoria* of Lübeck city council. The surviving name lists of deceased councillors contain hundreds of entries with dates of death recorded between the mid-fourteenth and mid-sixteenth centuries.333 From the 1350s the city clerk recorded these names; he also served as a priest of the council’s altar in the church of the Virgin Mary
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Marienkirche), and was thus actively involved in the commemoration of the deceased councillors whose names he listed.\textsuperscript{334}

Why was it important to preserve tombstones and to record names and death dates of dead city councillors? As Vincent Robijn has pointed out, ‘the care for the salvation of late medieval city governors’ served ‘both religious and social-political ends.’\textsuperscript{335} Jan Assmann has argued that every ‘power needs origin’, thus for the political institutions it is important to remember the past.\textsuperscript{336} The liturgical remembrance of city councillors – \textit{Ratsmemoria} – helped to legitimize their political power in the urban space, just as \textit{memoria} legitimated the power of the medieval aristocracy.\textsuperscript{337} For aristocrats kinship helped to build political \textit{memoria}, but within a city council’s \textit{memoria} two elements were important: kinship and membership in an institution. Thus \textit{Ratsmemoria} consisted of three equally essential components: \textit{memoria} of deceased city councillors kept by an institution; \textit{memoria} of a city councillor founded individually, but often also fostered institutionally, and \textit{memoria} sustained by a councillor’s family. These elements composed \textit{Ratsmemoria} and they often overlapped.\textsuperscript{338} \textit{Memoria} of city councillors’ families could also serve for representation of the power and status through pious deeds.\textsuperscript{339} This section focuses on two elements of Livonian \textit{Ratsmemoria}: the institutional forms it took and memorial efforts of families represented on the council in successive generations. Despite scarce sources, the \textit{Ratsmemoria} of specific individuals in Riga and Reval illustrates long-term continuity from the late-fourteenth or early fifteenth century which can be traced up until the Reformation.

The city councils in Riga and Reval emerged during the thirteenth century: in Riga in 1226 and in Reval soon after 1243.\textsuperscript{340} All city councillors were wealthy merchants and members of the Great Guilds, and refusal to serve on the council was a punishable offence.\textsuperscript{341} As in other towns of northern Europe, council membership in Livonian cities comprised different combinations of the symbolic number twelve.\textsuperscript{342} In Reval the city council had twenty-four to twenty-six councillors, including four to five burgomasters, until 1457 after which the city council was reduced to fourteen councillors and four
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In Riga the city council originally numbered twelve, which later rose to sixteen. During the fifteenth century the city councils were elected annually on Sunday at Michaelmas in Riga, and on St Thomas day in Reval. In Reval half the councillors were selected each year, leaving the other half of the ‘old’ council in office for one more year, thus enabling smooth change of power. In Riga twelve councillors were chosen before Michaelmas and the other four were selected some weeks later, from candidates who had not been on the council for the two previous years; together with the ‘old’ members, they elected the burgomaster. This system meant that new representatives regularly entered government; yet numerous councillors had political careers lasting decades.

Although access to political power was restricted to a small merchant group, the ruling elites of the Hanseatic cities were in a constant state of flux, as families both entered and left the ranks of the political elite. Both in Riga and Reval there was also significant social mobility among the families that served on the city council. Although there were periods during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries when both city councils became more exclusive and admitted a smaller number of new families, those represented by consecutive generations or numerous members were never the majority. Between 1360 and the late sixteenth century two-thirds of the city councillors were members of new families; during the same time period, around half of the families held seats on the council only once. This was a socially dynamic environment in which councillors’ families aimed to create continuity and to secure representation over consecutive generations. Some, like the Hunninghusens, succeeded in serving on Reval’s council from the early 1400s until the 1550s.

City councils maintained chapels and pews in local churches. The Ratskapelle was a place not only for religious activities, but for political and memorial ones too.
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Ratskapellen and the liturgical services celebrated there were part of urban politics and provided a ‘sacral legitimation’ of government.\textsuperscript{353} In their pews and chapels city councillors were physically separated from the other worshippers during services and thus fostered their distinct identity.\textsuperscript{354} There they gathered for the masses celebrated before or after their meetings in the city hall, and there they commemorated their deceased predecessors.\textsuperscript{355} Ratskapellen and pews were places where the past of a city and its government were remembered.\textsuperscript{356}

In Riga and Reval the city councils did not have a central chapel, but were present in numerous churches. In Reval the city council had pews (radestale) and altars in the Dominican church of St Catherine, in the churches of the Holy Spirit, and St Nicholas.\textsuperscript{357} They invested significant resources in the establishment of their pews and altars, which received regular financial support.\textsuperscript{358} In Reval the city council had a special relationship with the church of the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{359} They gathered there before elections and, after a mass in the council’s chapel, went in a procession to the nearby city hall.\textsuperscript{360} In 1483, the city council’s altar received a valuable carved altarpiece produced by Bernt Notke.\textsuperscript{361} Moreover, the Holy Spirit church also provided a burial ground for the councillors; in 1510 burgomaster Borchard Heerde was buried there.\textsuperscript{362}

Riga was exceptional among Hanseatic cities in this respect. The city council’s pews were located in all the major churches: in the parish churches of St Peter and St Jacob, in the cathedral of St Mary, the Dominican church of St John, and the Franciscan church of St Catherine.\textsuperscript{363} In St Peter’s, the council’s pews stood directly in front of their altar, dedicated to St Peter, the city’s patron.\textsuperscript{364} The city council had employed its own

\textsuperscript{353} Rößner, \textit{Hansische Memoria}, p. 221.
\textsuperscript{354} Czaja, ‘Patriziat,’ p. 218.
\textsuperscript{356} Rößner, \textit{Hansische Memoria}, p. 221.
\textsuperscript{357} Raeststole in St Catherine’s church was first mentioned in 1386, in Holy Spirit in 1420, in St Nicholas in 1459. LUB 5, no. 2502; Poeck, \textit{Rituale}, pp. 258, 263; Revaler Urkunden und Briefe von 1273 bis 1510, ed. Dieter Heckmann, Cologne, 1995, no. 44; Kämmereibuch der Stadt Reval 1432-1463, ed. Reinhard Vogelsang, Cologne, 1976, no. 1098.
\textsuperscript{359} Poeck, \textit{Rituale}, p. 263.
\textsuperscript{360} Ibid., p. 258.
\textsuperscript{362} Heerde was in the office between 1493 and 1510. TLA f. 230, n. 1, 107 Aa 7, fol. 198; Bunge, \textit{Rathslinie}, pp. 69, 101.
\textsuperscript{364} Bruiningk, \textit{Messe}, p. 521-524.
chantry priest there since the 1350s, and the chantry was named *vicaria civitatis*.\(^{365}\) In the fifteenth century the chantry employed priests coming from councillors’ families, like Johann Woynckhusen between 1405 and 1422.\(^{366}\) The city council in the 1460s paid for sung masses in the Franciscan church ‘for benefit of the city’ and also for such services in ‘all churches’ of Riga.\(^{367}\) Through their pews in every church and the communal masses celebrated there, the city council was able to involve the whole community in praying for them and their deceased predecessors.

In many Hanseatic cities *Ratsmemoria* was institutionalized, as councils made their own memorial foundations and liturgically commemorated city councillors in their chapels.\(^{368}\) In Reval the city council had its own liturgical service with memorial overtones. On 14 January 1386 the prior of Reval’s Dominican friary Johannes Vrolinck promised the city council that the friars would celebrate a daily mass at St Dominic’s altar in front of the city council’s pews in St Catherine’s church.\(^{369}\) Although *memoria* is not explicitly mentioned in the charter, the annual 6 marks needed for the daily masses came from the endowment of the deceased city councillor Herman van der Houe. He was an important local politician, who had been active in the city’s government since 1358, and served as the burgomaster in the 1360s and 1370s.\(^{370}\) It would appear that the endowment was intended to ensure the remembrance of Herman van der Houe and other deceased city councillors. Van der Houe was remembered by his successors in the long-term. Between 1415 and 1426 the city council paid annually two Riga marks from Herman van der Houe’s endowment for the chantry in front of its pews in the Dominican church, where the friars celebrated masses.\(^{371}\) The presence of van der Houe’s name in the payment records shows that the city council and the Dominicans were aware of the source of this bounty even forty years after it was given.

The city council supervised memorial endowments based on long-term annuity rents secured by property, and was also responsible for distributing the income to the chantries for memorial services. By controlling these finances the city council effectively controlled *memoria*.\(^{372}\) This financial control also affected the initial objectives of an endowment and to transform it. With the support of the city council the

---

\(^{365}\) *Kämmerei-Register*, pp. 28, 59, 60, 64; Czaja, ‘Patriziat,’ p. 219; in 1503


\(^{367}\) *Kämmerei-Register*, pp. 304, 312, 316, 325.

\(^{368}\) Poeck, ‘Rat und Memoria,’ pp. 320-324.

\(^{369}\) *Revaler Urkunden*, no. 44.


endowments of the city councillors survived longer than the endowments of other urban dwellers. This is evident in the cases of the city councillors Johann Bremen, Johann Gotland, and Bertold Hunninghusen.  

Rent income for an endowment made by the councillor Johann Bremen appears in the ledger of the Reval city council in the 1430s; Bremen, however, had died in 1346. Between 1436 and 1455 annual rent payments of six to seven marks for ‘Johann Bremen’s poor relatives in Dorpat were made. For ten years Bremen’s rent disappears from the city council’s ledger, only to reappear in the ledger on 26 April 1466, this time with a formulation that it is for Johann Bremen’s commemoration (memorien). The city council may have transformed this endowment from a charitable into a memorial one when, a century later, none of Bremen’s relatives remained in Dorpat. Not only did the use of the rent change, but the amount too; six marks were paid twice a year, thus doubling the original sum. This means that the city council itself must have reorganised the endowment.

Bremen’s memorien were performed in the church of Holy Spirit, where the city council had its altar. Rents were paid to an individual priest, and on some occasions to all the priests of the Holy Spirit church. The memorial payments were made until the early sixteenth century, with a short pause between 1482 and 1492. Judging by the 12 marks allocated to this purpose, these memorien must have been regular memorial services. Similar long-term memorial payments are recorded for another fourteenth-century Reval city councillor – Johann Gotland – who was also commemorated in the Holy Spirit church during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

The endowments of Bremen and Gotland were long-term foundations that survived into the fifteenth century, and were transformed over time, perhaps contradicting the founders’ original aims. They were created in the mid-fourteenth century, a period
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when social mobility in the Reval city council diminished and it became more exclusive.\textsuperscript{382} Large, long-term endowments show that the city councillors sought to strengthen the positions of their successors in this exclusive environment. In the fifteenth century, the city council transformed these endowments to support collective \textit{memoria} of the city council. Because the Holy Spirit church was the city council’s religious centre, it is plausible that the endowments of Bremen and Gotland supported memorial services at the council’s altar there.\textsuperscript{383}

The city council took charge of the individual \textit{memoria} of city councillors, even those from other Livonian towns. Rothger van Lare, a councillor from Fellin, founded a chantry in front of the chancel of St Olaf’s church in Reval.\textsuperscript{384} His testament executors were two Reval councillors and the council took over the chantry in perpetuity on 16 November 1475.\textsuperscript{385} This meant that the council would cover the costs of the chantry, and secured van Lare’s \textit{memoria} in the long-term.

The \textit{memoria} of Riga and Reval city councillors was institutionalized in the late Middle Ages. The councils organized and covered the costs of the burial and commemoration of their members and individuals with close associations. On four occasions between 1514 and 1516 Riga city council paid 4 marks for ‘commemoration’ (\textit{begencknyse}) and candles, presumably for the liturgical \textit{memoria} of its members.\textsuperscript{386} The costs of individual funerals were also covered by the city council. In 1515 the Riga council paid for the funeral of master Bernt Brand (\textit{meyster Bernt}), the council’s clerk.\textsuperscript{387} It paid for wax, the bier and candles, the commemorative ringing of the bells of the cathedral, St Peter and St Jacob, and also other funeral costs worth 20½ marks.\textsuperscript{388} In addition, it repaid 20 marks that Brand owed to a city councillor, and the 21 marks spent on Brand’s treatment and funeral to another two.\textsuperscript{389} This support for the clerk’s funeral can be explained by the fact that the city clerks (\textit{scryuer}) were usually salaried officials, men with university degrees (\textit{magister, meister}), who although not council members, were deeply involved in the council’s activities. They also played an important role in the creation of a communal memory. Hermann Helewegh (c.1420/30-1489), a clerk who

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{382} Czaja, ‘Patriziat,’ p. 216.
\textsuperscript{383} Poeck, \textit{Rituale}, p. 263.
\textsuperscript{384} TLA f. 230, n. 1, 107 Aa 7. fol. 198.
\textsuperscript{385} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{387} Ibid., pp. 57, 59, 215.
\textsuperscript{388} Ibid., p. 59.
\end{flushright}
later became a city councillor, wrote a chronicle in the 1480s at the behest of the council describing Riga’s struggle against the Teutonic Order.\textsuperscript{390}

*Ratsmemoria* was not only institutionalized, organized, and maintained by city councils, but likewise created and sustained by individual councillors and their families.\textsuperscript{391} Wills made by councillors reveal memorial strategies chosen with the aim of fostering individual and *Ratsmemoria*. Cord Visch’s last will drafted in 1425 is a good example with which to illustrate the intertwining of individual, family, and council memoria. Visch, who was dead by 1430, was a city councillor and burgomaster of Riga between 1391 and 1425, active in trade with Flanders, who served on various diplomatic missions.\textsuperscript{392} When he was drafting his will, he was the first representative of his family on the council and his two sons, Gottschalk and Cord, were approaching the age when they could also be members.\textsuperscript{393}

Cord Visch’s will focuses on the creation of *memoria* and pious donations, with only few bequests to family members and fellow merchants. His aim was to promote the salvation of his and his wife’s souls, by use of property ‘given and lent’ (*gegenven unde vorlenet*) to him by God.\textsuperscript{394} Visch involved in his *memoria* all the urban religious institutions and their members, and established numerous foundations in the main churches of the city. He donated to the fabric of all the Rigan churches, friaries and nunneries, even including the Russian Orthodox church: the largest amounts went to the parish church of St Peter 25 marks, to the cathedral 10 marks, while two marks were allocated each to the parish church of St Jacob, hospitals of St George, St John, and the hospital in *Ellerrbroke*, the Dominican and Franciscan friaries, the beguines of St Peter, and the Cistercian nuns.\textsuperscript{395} These donations to fabric were memorial in nature. Visch specified that the donation for the cathedral had to serve for perpetual commemoration.\textsuperscript{396} In the case of all hospitals, friaries and nunneries, each sick person,
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friar and nun received 3 ores and had to pray to God for the testator.\(^{397}\) This combining of donations for the construction of monastery or hospital churches with donations to individual inmates was practiced by city councillors and other testators elsewhere in the fifteenth-century Hanseatic region.\(^{398}\)

Visch also cared for the poor in his will; he left 25 marks for distribution of alms by the Table Guild, 50 marks for the clothing, and endowed 7½ marks for the ‘house poor’ (\textit{husarmen}), who were to receive an annual rent of half a mark.\(^{399}\) Among the recipients of these donations was the Bridgettine convent in Mariendal (Est. Pirita).\(^{400}\) By incorporating in his \textit{memoria} all churches and also all friars, nuns, hospital inmates, and the ‘house-poor’ of Riga, Cord Visch created a communal \textit{memoria} network involving the whole urban community in his remembrance.\(^{401}\) This was a common memorial practice among political leaders of Hanseatic cities.\(^{402}\)

The involvement of the whole community in prayer was not all Cord Visch did in search of \textit{memoria}. Visch supported memorial chantries and involved individuals in remembrance; he left his clothing to poor priests in return for prayers. Visch and his wife sought to send a good man, preferably a priest, on pilgrimage to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem (\textit{thee tho deme hilgen grave}).\(^{403}\) Visch also bequeathed 100 marks to his wife for his soul’s remembrance.\(^{404}\) His executors were charged with finding a priest who would be paid 5 marks for celebrating 52 masses in remembrance of Visch’s soul.\(^{405}\) All these acts not only expressed Visch’s individual piety, but were also evidence of his suitability for political office.\(^{406}\)

As one of his memorial chantries Visch chose an existing chantry that sustained the altar of St Anne.\(^{407}\) The objective of this chantry was not to commemorate Visch or his family, but to remember the souls of burgomaster Arnd Plagal, his wife Margrete and their children (\textit{vor heren Plagales zele, Margreten, syner husvruwen, unde erer kinder...})
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\(^{406}\) Rüther, \textit{Prestige und Herrschaft,} pp. 72-73.
\(^{407}\) Bruimingk, \textit{Messe,} p. 359.
zele).\textsuperscript{408} Plagal, who had presumably founded the chantry, was a contemporary of Visch on the city council during the early 1390s.\textsuperscript{409} This support for \textit{memoria} of a fellow city councillor has to be seen as part of a wider \textit{Ratsmemoria}. In order to pursue these aims Visch endowed 200 marks, in addition to allocating 10 Rhenish guldens in gold to a priest of this chantry.\textsuperscript{410} From his wage the priest also had to provide two candles; and if he did not do that, the relatives had to provide these, taking two guldens of a priest’s wage. The friendship of Visch and Plagal could have been a reason for this support, but links of service, business and experience may also explain this remarkable act.

With the consent of the city council Cord Visch founded his own memorial chantry too. He had an altar built for it in the chancel of the church, within a chapel on the south aisle of St Peter’s church.\textsuperscript{411} The charter does not reveal the patron saint of this altar, but later donations made by Visch’s successors show that it was dedicated to St Andrew.\textsuperscript{412} There the souls of Cord, his wife, their children, and all of their friends and relatives were to be commemorated.\textsuperscript{413} Visch endowed his chantry with 200 Riga marks – the same sum as Plagal’s chantry – in addition to providing all necessary liturgical vestments, books, vessels, palls and candlesticks. The chantry priest received an annual wage of 10 Rhenish guldens, and was expected to provide the required candles from it.\textsuperscript{414} Both chancies were secured by Visch’s real property until the time when his relatives would provide the two promised endowments of 200 marks each. Visch had founded for his remembrance an altar of St Andrew that was supported both by his relatives and by his successors in the council.

The two foundations were part of the long-term memorial strategy of the Visch family and they were sustained and supported by Cord Visch’s successors. According to the financial records of the city council between 1447 and 1474, a chantry of Arnd Plagal and Cord Visch in St Peter’s, with altars dedicated to St Anne and St Andrew, received 15 marks annually.\textsuperscript{415} For the first four years the rent was paid to Andreas Soppelbecke, and between 1451 and 1453 city councillor Gottschalk Visch, presumably
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Cord’s son, received money for the chantry.⁴¹⁶ For two decades after 1454, Cord Visch junior (†1486), also a city councillor, was the only contributor to the chantry.⁴¹⁷ Both Conrad’s sons also invested into the chantry supported by their father. In 1475, Cord junior and Gottschalk Visch each paid 18 marks for the altar of St Andrew ‘in the chapel, in the chancel’.⁴¹⁸ These payments continued after 1475 when the financial records of the city council end; the chantry of Plagel-Visch was dissolved in 1518 by the council, probably because the Visch family were no longer represented on it.⁴¹⁹

Family memoria was also fostered after the death of Cord junior and Gottschalk. In 1495 Drude Visch, Gottschalk’s widow, donated 18 marks to the altar of St Anne.⁴²⁰ A year later, in 1496, Anna, widow of Cord junior made an endowment of 200 marks for the Table Guild, for distribution of alms in the belfry of St Peter’s in remembrance of her husband and his family.⁴²¹ She requested that one portion of alms should be distributed for the poor every Sunday in the belfry of St Peter’s for her and her husband’s souls, as well as of their both families and friends.⁴²² These two donations by widows clearly indicate that memoria in St Peter’s church was a long-term strategy of the Ratsfamilie Visch.

Long-term memorial foundations such as these supported the political and social prestige of a Ratsfamilie. In Reval, the Hunninghusen family similarly supported memoria on the long-term. The testament of Reval city councillor Bertold Hunninghusen has not survived, but his chantry founded in the Dominican St Catherine’s church has left numerous records within the city’s ledger from the 1430s until the early sixteenth century.⁴²³ The Hunninghusens, like the Vischs, served on the city council for several consecutive generations between the early fifteenth century and the 1540s.⁴²⁴ Like Cord Visch, Bertold Hunninghusen was the first representative of his family on the city council. The Hunninghusens were one of the most significant merchant families in Reval; from the late fourteenth century until the 1530s at least ten Hunninghusens belonged to the elite Table Guild.⁴²⁵
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⁴²³ Bertold Hunninghusen became burgher in 1409, a councilor in 1413, in 1427 a burgomaster; he died between 1427 and 1437. Bunge, Rathslinie, p. 106.
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Bertold Hunninghusen died in 1433 or 1434. On 13 April 1433 200 Riga marks were endowed ‘for Bertold Hunninghusen’ according to his wish for the perpetual memorial mass celebrated at the altar of Virgin Mary ‘under the chancel’ (vnder deme kore) in St Catherine’s church.\footnote{Das Revaler Pergament Rentenbuch 1382–1518, ed. Arthur Plästerer, Tallinn, 1930, no. 868; this was the Black Heads’ altar. LUB 4, no. 1503; LUB 6, no. 2958.} Every Easter 12 marks were to be paid for the chantry annually: 8 marks to the friars for the services and 4 marks for the illumination of the altar.\footnote{Revaler Pergament Rentenbuch, no. 868.} From 1434 until 1523 payments were made to the Dominicans annually.\footnote{Kämmereibuch der Stadt Reval 1432–1463, p. 701; Kämmereibuch der Stadt Reval 1463-1507, p. 896; TLA f. 230, n. 1, A.d. 32. fols. 16, 27, 33, 39, 46, 58, 158.}

For almost the whole life of the chantry, from 1434 to the Reformation, Hunninghusens served on the city council, which was in charge of these payments; Bertold’s son Heinrich I (1456-1480), Gert (1473), and Heinrich II (1495-1514) were part of the city government.\footnote{Bunge, Rathslinie, p. 106.} From 1495 on, the payments for Hunninghusen’s chantry were made twice a year; 13 marks were paid after Easter and 13 marks after Michaelmas.\footnote{Kämmereibuch der Stadt Reval 1463-1507, no. 2289, p. 896.} This means that either Heinrich II Hunninghusen, in service from 1495, or the council itself had increased the endowment. The increase could be considered to be a re-foundation of the chantry, adding the memoria of other Hunninghusens. The presence of the family on the council was essential to this re-foundation.

Like many late medieval merchant families, the Vischs and Hunninghusens attempted to create a dynasty with the help of their long-term memoria and thus legitimize and sustain their status and power.\footnote{Richard, ‘Von der Distinktion,’ pp. 223-224.} Ancestry and continuity strengthened such families as they did the well-known Fuggers of Augsburg, who also used memoria to demonstrate their long familial history.\footnote{Oexle, ‘Adel, Memoria und kulturelles Gedächtnis,’ p. 340.} In the case of the Vischs and Hunninghusens, each generation fostered memoria of the previous one, thus maintaining political continuity. Most families with members on the city councils in Riga and Reval failed to sustain their place into the second-, third- or fourth generations.\footnote{Czaja, ‘Patriziat,’ pp. 221-222.} The memoria founded by Cord Visch and Bertold Hunninghusen influenced the political status of their successors long after their deaths.

The institutionalized Ratsmemoria survived until the spring of 1524 when, in both Riga and Reval, the memorial services were permanently halted and the chantries were
dissolved. The city councils played a crucial role in this process: they decided whether to appoint a Protestant preacher in the parish church or friary, and whether to restrict or remove priests and friars from the city. Likewise, city councils directly intervened in memorial affairs: in 1524 they disbanded the private and corporate chantries, and consolidated all resources into so-called gemeine Kasten, which were used for charitable purposes and the payment of Protestant preachers. The failure of the city councils to prevent iconoclastic violence in churches where lavish altars had been erected by generations of townspeople, benefited the cause of the new faith. Moreover, the city councils themselves abolished liturgical memoria by dissolving memorial chantries and sacking their commemorators, thus separating themselves from centuries old traditions and also their dead predecessors.

Even on the eve of the Reformation, some city councillors demonstrated their memorial choices in their wills. In Riga, the city council openly promoted the new faith, but in Reval, although the council allowed reformers to preach in 1524, numerous councillors remained Catholic. On 7 May 1524 Reval’s burgomaster Joan Viandt drafted a will in which he indicated his intention to make lavish donations to churches, friaries, monasteries and poor. He aimed to leave 200 marks for the Dominicans, 300 marks for the Bridgettines in Mariendal, and 100 marks to the parish church of St Olaf. These were followed by minor prospective donations of 20 marks for the churches of St Nicholas, St Gertrud, and the cathedral. He wished to endow 500 marks for the tafelgilde, for the ‘new hospital’ (nygen sekenhus), and for the hospital of Holy Spirit 400 marks. Institutions outside Reval were also among the recipients of his pious bounty: a hospital and church in Westphalian Schwerte, nuns and the Table Guild in Dorpat.
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It is remarkable that Joan Viandt, deeply involved in Reval politics and apparently tolerant of the new developments, expressed his wish to make large pious endowments for institutions which weeks later were reformed or disbanded by the city council’s representatives.\textsuperscript{444} It is possible that Viandt adhered to the traditional approach to testamentary bequests because he drafted his will while ill (\textit{kranck an mynem licham}), thus in case of potential death it was more secure to rely on well-known Catholic practices.\textsuperscript{445} Although this programme of pious and charitable endowments was impressive, it was never realised because Viandt died in 1529, when most of these institutions were already disbanded or reformed.\textsuperscript{446}

The testament of burgomaster Viandt shows how deeply rooted pious and memorial donations were in the religious and political culture of the region. Even during the early stages of the Reformation, memorial endowments and donations played an important role for political leaders, who apparently relied on old practices. This, however, did not prevent their active involvement in the Reformation that dissolved \textit{memoria} and transformed all private endowments into community property.

\textit{Ratsmemoria} was a form of \textit{memoria} in which institutional efforts to preserve the memory of their deceased members became intertwined with the efforts of families to remember previous generations. In Riga and Reval the city councils prayed for their deceased members during the services celebrated at their altars and chapels, which were located in the major urban churches. As in other Hanseatic cities, \textit{Ratsmemoria} helped to represent and legitimate the power held by a small group of individuals belonging to the merchant Great Guilds.

In Riga and Reval \textit{memoria} which survived over generations was a unique characteristic of the families belonging to the urban political elites. By help of \textit{memoria} these families, continuously present in the city council, legitimated their political status and, in turn, political status helped to foster \textit{memoria}. Yet, the same political elites played an active part in the abolition of \textit{memoria} during the Reformation. As a result they lost an effective instrument for the display and legitimation of their power and which reinforced links with their past and their predecessors.
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Memoria of urban elites was the remembrance of a minority which controlled power and resources. All male members of urban elites in Livonian cities were current or former brethren of the Black Heads brotherhoods, the Great Guilds, and the Table Guilds; some of them were also city councillors. These groups offered memoria for their members and used it as a tool for representation and legitimation of their exclusive status.

The Great Guilds in Riga and Reval were the largest elite groups, uniting the long distance merchants, who controlled most of city’s economic resources and held political power. Established during the mid-fourteenth century, the Great Guilds in both cities established intensive memorial practices from their first statutes, performed during their drinking feasts at their altars in the main churches of these cities. Yet, most of the commemorative work for these groups was done by the Table Guilds, which were sub-organizations of the Great Guilds. The Table Guild combined charitable activities with memoria of its members. The tafelgilde commemorated dead members during the communal meals, and kept name lists of them. The poor were also involved in the commemorative activities of the wealthy benefactors through the distribution of food and clothing in the belfries of the churches. This charity and memoria strengthened both the identities of these elite groups and their awareness of their exclusivity.

The brotherhoods of the Black Heads in Riga and Reval, which developed during the early fifteenth century, were transitional groups in which members usually stayed only for a few years, leaving the brotherhoods when they married. Therefore for the Black Heads memoria was an essential tool in the maintaining and fostering of their identities. The Black Heads invested in their commemoration from the very early stages of their existence, creating centres of their spiritual life; one such centre in Reval was the Dominican church, while in Riga it was the Franciscan church and later also the parish church of St Peter. Despite these large investments in religious cults and remembrance, the Black Heads themselves dissolved their memoria during the early stages of the Reformation and in Riga, even destroyed their own altars.

The Ratsmemoria consisted of institutional remembrance carried out by city councils and also individual efforts by the city councillors’ families. The city councils in Reval and Riga never created memorial foundations, but they organized – and, when needed, financially supported – the memoria of its councillors. Church pews, altars, and chapels of the councils served as places where predecessors in office were commemorated. Yet,
for Ratsmemoria the individual efforts of councillors and their families were important. The councillors’ families, like Visch in Riga or Hunninghusen in Reval, strengthened their political positions by commemorating their predecessors. Although memoria greatly benefited the elites, many councillors in Riga and Reval sympathised with the reformers, even if that meant dismantling many memorial practices they and their families had maintained for decades.
CHAPTER 2: REMEMBRANCE OF NON-ELITE GROUPS IN LATE MEDIEVAL RIGA

Memoria has been described as a ‘total social phenomenon’ that influenced every sphere of life,¹ but it was also literally socially total. Memoria transcended all kinds of social differences and had no social boundaries. Memoria was practiced by everyone, and everyone longed to be commemorated after their death; only the forms of commemoration differed according to social status and material wellbeing. Rich and poor, powerful and powerless, privileged and marginalized ones, all memorialised their dead and cared also about their own commemoration.

Although scholars who deal with medieval remembrance have been fully aware of memoria’s social ‘totality’, there is little empirical research to confirm the existence of medieval remembrance as a practice across all social groups. Memoria scholarship deals mainly with the memoria of elites.² Research on commemoration within the urban non-elites has barely been conducted, and there are only a small number of studies on memoria performed by the poor and the socially marginalized, which I shall call the urban ‘non-elites’.³ The existing studies of remembrance among the poor have created a firm theoretical and methodological framework, but they offer only narrow perspectives in terms of period and location. They focus more on the involvement of the poor in remembrance of elites, rather than on their own commemorative practices.

This chapter is intended as a case study of the social role of memoria for ‘non-elite’ folk in late medieval Riga. The Livonian cities Riga, Reval, and Dorpat were ethnically diverse and socially differentiated between the immigrant Hanseatic (German) elites and indigenous non-German (Livonian, Estonian and Latvian) non-elites. This adds an additional angle to the study of memoria, a primarily ethnic one.

Research into the Livonian non-elites from an ethnic perspective enjoys a rich tradition, which shall be ignored when studying commemoration. From the late-nineteenth century, the Baltic historians – initially Baltic German ones – have dealt extensively with the question of the Undeutsche (non-Germans), the indigenous
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¹ See Oexle, ‘Memoria als Kultur,’ p. 39.
² In recent decades much research has considered the commemoration of the early and late medieval nobility, urban elites, and the clergy. See Babendererde, Sterben; MacLaughlin, Consorting with saints; Poeck, ‘Rat und Memoria,’ pp. 286-333; Scheller, Memoria an der Zeitwende; Plate, ‘Biddet vor dat geslecht,’ pp. 61-100; Rößner, Hansische Memoria in Flandern; Richard, Mémoires bourgeoises; Marie-Luise Laudage, Caritas und Memoria mittelalterlicher Bischof, Cologne, 1993.
population of Livonia. The term *Undeutsche* has been borrowed from the late medieval sources in which locals from the indigenous population – not withstanding ethnic differences – were called *undutsch* in Middle Low German; this term, however, was not used for Livonian Russians, Swedes, Finns, and Lithuanians. The historiography of *Undeutsche* began as research with ethnic focus, aimed at validating the importance of one or other ethnic group in Livonian society. It has now been transformed in the study of social history, regarding the medieval *undutsch* more as a social category, and less as an ethnic one. In order to emphasise *Undeutsch* as a social category, I shall most frequently use the term ‘non-elite’. The term non-elite is a broad one, but is here used primarily to describe individuals who were socially and economically marginalized for ethnic and/or economic reasons.

Non-German non-elite groups existed in all of the three largest Livonian cities, however, there is only surviving source material for the non-German guilds in Riga, since the archival sources of the non-German guilds in Reval and Dorpat have vanished. This chapter will discuss the importance of remembrance for the two transport workers’ guilds – the guilds of the Porters and of the Draymen – which included most of the non-German townspeople in medieval Riga.

The main questions which form this chapter are the following: how did non-elite guild members participate in the creation and performance of *memoria*? What role did the urban elites play in the remembrance of non-elite guilds in late medieval Riga and
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7 The two articles of Leonid Arbusow on non-German population and the Draymen and Porters guilds in the late medieval Riga contain also publication of fragments from the Porters’ guild’s account books.
how did it influence relations between elites and non-elites? How did the involvement of elites within the two guilds change the practices of commemoration? What effect did the abolition of memoria during the Reformation have on the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds? Since the memorial practices of these groups were grounded in their social position, I shall begin with the social context, then address their memoria.

2.1: Non-elites in late medieval Riga and their guilds. Undeutsche and the development of the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds

Riga, the biggest and most important city of Livonia, like its smaller counterparts Reval and Dorpat, was ethnically diverse. It was a ‘colonial town’ that emerged as a Hanseatic outpost in the Eastern Baltic from its foundation in 1201. Riga had two kinds of townspeople: the indigenous Livonians – later also Latvians (until the fifteenth century: Curonians, Latgaliens and Semigallians) – and Hanseatic Germans, Riga’s founders, the majority of whom were immigrants from the Hanseatic cities: Lübeck, Hamburg, Bremen and others.

From its beginnings until the mid-fourteenth century, a degree of equality existed between locals and immigrants in Riga. Non-German townspeople took part in trade, and at least three city councillors of probable indigenous origin can be traced. It cannot be stated with confidence that non-Germans in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Riga enjoyed all economic freedoms and were able to integrate themselves into the social elites, but nor was there legislation that prevented their integration. The status of non-Germans began to change gradually in the late fourteenth century and from then on Germans monopolized all lucrative business – both in trade and in crafts – thus marginalising the indigenous Livonians and Latvians. Presumably such marginalization was a result of demographic changes brought about by the plague in the late fourteenth century, and the urban mortality it caused. In general, medieval cities relied on immigration from the countryside or from other towns, because even in times...
when the plague was absent, urban mortality exceeded the birth-rate.\textsuperscript{12} As a colonial city Riga relied completely on immigration from northern German Hanseatic cities and a decrease in such migration endangered the position of the German population in every sphere of social life.\textsuperscript{13}

Exclusion of non-Germans from a number of social positions seems to have been an attempt to secure dominance for the ‘colonists’ who, although they constituted the majority of Riga’s townspeople, could be overrun by indigenous migrants from the Livonian countryside.\textsuperscript{14} The policy of the exclusion in Livonian cities was not legally compelled by the official city governments, but rather resulted from the initiatives of craft and merchant associations.\textsuperscript{15} By the mid-fifteenth century non-Germans could no longer participate in trade, were banned from the merchant Great Guild and the most prestigious artisan brotherhoods;\textsuperscript{16} they were also prohibited from owning real property.\textsuperscript{17} This exclusion meant that non-Germans were relegated to lower class jobs, though it cannot be claimed that individual social mobility was not possible.

Similar processes occurred around the same period in the towns of Prussia, Pomerania and Mark Brandenburg, where Germans – although a majority – were surrounded by non-German populations, Prussians and Slavs.\textsuperscript{18} However, in Livonia the non-Germans, despite their exclusion from number of urban social structures, were never prevented from claiming burgher rights, as, for example, Slavic Wends in Mark Brandenburg were.\textsuperscript{19} Non-Germans in Riga in the late Middle Ages and the sixteenth century could become burghers, who paid only half a Riga mark for the privilege.\textsuperscript{20} Yet burgher status did not mean that they enjoyed same rights that the German burghers did. They claimed burgher rights without acquiring membership in the artisan brotherhoods and merchant guilds, membership in which was essential for the acquisition of the legal

\textsuperscript{12} Brandt, ‘Die gesellschaftliche Struktur,’ p. 211.
\textsuperscript{13} Benninghoven, \textit{Rigas Entstehung}, p. 105.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p. 101.
\textsuperscript{15} Niitemaa, \textit{Undeutsche Frage}, p. 65.
\textsuperscript{16} Non-Germans were banned from the merchant Great Guild in 1354 and from the artisan guilds: coopers (1375), cloth cutters (1383), masons (1390), tailors (end of 14th century) and shoemakers (end of 14th century). Arbusow, ‘Studien,’ p. 80; Niitemaa, \textit{Undeutsche Frage}, p. 63.
\textsuperscript{19} Hopp, \textit{Zunft}, p. 64.
\textsuperscript{20} Arbusow, ‘Studien,’ p. 79.
status held by the German majority.\textsuperscript{21} Although non-Germans possessed burgher rights in the Livonian cities, they were not recognized as equals by the German majority, and, according to František Graus, should be considered as marginalized ones.\textsuperscript{22} Despite marginalization and exclusion from important urban social networks, non-Germans in Livonia never became Germanized as their counterparts in Pomerania, Mark Brandenburg and Prussia were. They retained their ethnic and linguistic identities.

Riga was a seaport and long-distance trade was at the core of the urban economy. Economic prospects and social structures were shaped by long-distance trade. Trade was dominated by the German merchants, but it involved the employment of large numbers of people for packing, transporting, guarding, and storing goods. Merchant activities would have been impossible without porters, who transported goods between the ships in the harbour and the warehouses. From the late fourteenth century there was no ethnic diversity within the groups involved in trade; the merchant business was German, and those who transported goods were overwhelmingly non-Germans i.e. Livonians and Latvians.\textsuperscript{23}

Because no trading activity could take place without it, the profession of transport worker was one of the oldest in medieval Riga.\textsuperscript{24} The porters, however, are mentioned relatively late in the sources, only in the mid-fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{25} Nor is there mention of transport workers’ brotherhoods until the late fourteenth century. These brotherhoods emerged when, between 1360 and 1450, new urban social structures – merchant and craft guilds – were created.\textsuperscript{26}

The first brotherhood for those employed in transport was formed in 1386, when the city council confirmed the statutes of the Draymen’s (Beer Porters’) guild (\textit{beerdreger gilde}).\textsuperscript{27} It is hard to say who the members were in 1386, all of Riga’s transport workers or only porters of beer, wine and other liquids, as is mentioned in the later edition of the statutes dating from the mid-fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{28} Constantin Mettig claims that guild of

\textsuperscript{21} Hopp, \textit{Zunft}, p. 67.
\textsuperscript{22} Graus suggests that marginalized ones (persons or groups) were those, who did not or could not live adhering to the norms of society and were not accepted by the majority. According to Graus marginality is a result of peculiarity and the reaction of majority. See his ‘Randgruppen der städtischen Gesellschaft im Spätmittelalter,’ in \textit{Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung} 8 (1981): pp. 385-437, at p. 296.
\textsuperscript{23} Arbusow, ‘Studien,’ pp. 82, 83.
\textsuperscript{26} Niitemaa, \textit{Undeutsche Frage}, p. 62.
\textsuperscript{27} Stieda and Mettig, \textit{Schragen}, no. 12, pp. 252-258.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid.
the Draymen was the founding organization, and that initially it united all the porters of Riga. Leonid Arbusow argues that there was a larger group of transport workers in late-fourteenth century Riga from which the guild of Draymen had split. It is more likely that in the mid-fifteenth century other groups of transport workers – the Porters’ guild (ghylde der losdregere) (first surviving statutes from 1450) and the Dockers’ guild (Ligger) (first statutes from 1463) – split off from the Draymen’s guild. The porters and dockers had similar professional obligations, thus after the Reformation the brotherhoods of the Porters and Dockers were united in a single guild.

The Draymen’s guild was the biggest non-German brotherhood in late medieval Riga. Between 1485 and 1519 it had on average 200 members (see Table 1), more than either the Porters’ or the Dockers’ guilds; before the Reformation all three guilds together numbered 500 to 600 members. The number of members in the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds fluctuated constantly by season, economic fortune, or political stability, war and disease. For example, in the 1480s, during the war between the Teutonic order and Riga, the Porters’ guild’s life was halted for a while: in 1482 the guild had only two new members, and in 1483, the guild did not hold its annual drunke and took on no new members. After this crisis came recovery. In 1485 and 1486 both guilds experienced rapid growth. Yet this recovery was short-lived, when in the 1490s Riga finally lost in its conflict with the Teutonic Order and had to pay restitution, the number of transport workers in Riga fell again. Just before the Reformation both transport workers’ guilds yet again experienced growth and the Draymen’s guild had around 300 members in 1517. These guilds brought together not only Riga’s non-German population, but also numerous German elite members (their membership will be discussed in detail below). The Reformation appears to have dealt a final blow to the strength of the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds. During the Reformation both guilds lost all elite members and considerable number of non-elite members too. Between 1524 and 1540 the Draymen’s guild accepted no new members.
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29 Mettig, ‘Gewerbe,’ p. 75.
30 Arbusow, ‘Studien,’ p. 83.
31 Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, no. 77, no. 74; Arbusow, ‘Studien,’ p. 83.
32 Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, no. 78, p. 418.
34 Arbusow, ‘Studien,’ p. 90; LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1087 l., fol. 32a.
35 Arbusow, ‘Studien,’ p. 90.
36 Ibid., p. 91.
37 Ibid., p. 92.
experienced grave crisis between 1523 and 1532 and when it resumed its activities, the guild had only 56 male members.\textsuperscript{38}

Table 1: Membership in the Draymen’s guild 1485-1512

Although both guilds were officially professional associations of draymen and porters, in reality, a considerable number of the guild members were individuals from other professional groups: Latvian and Livonian artisans, wage-workers, and their spouses.\textsuperscript{39} Arbusow suggests that the influx of artisans into transport workers’ guilds was influenced by the gradual exclusion of non-Germans from a number of craft guilds, so that both guilds hosted those Latvian and Livonian artisans who had no chance of being integrated in the craft guilds.\textsuperscript{40} The Porters’ and Draymen’s guilds were also suitable for those artisans whose crafts were not organized into guilds, and who were labelled as an unskilled labour force by the city government.\textsuperscript{41} In the members’ lists of both guilds one finds mention of non-German artisans: carpenters, masons, belt makers, coopers, bakers, sail and candle makers, and others.\textsuperscript{42} Although they were non-Germans their names and professions in the records were usually Germanized.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{38} LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1087 l., fols. 63b-64a.
\textsuperscript{39} Arbusow, ‘Studien,’ p. 84.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., p. 84.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., p. 85.
\textsuperscript{42} There were more craftmen listed in two members’ books of the guild. LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1159 l., fols. 20a, 37a, 29b, 19b; LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1087 l., fol. 36a, 48a; Arbusow, ‘Studien,’ p. 85.
\textsuperscript{43} Arbusow, ‘Studien,’ p. 81.
Members of the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds also came from outside the urban space. In both guilds there were people who either lived in or were descended from the villages in the Stadtmark, the territory located outside the town walls but still under the city’s government. Among the members of the two guilds were first generation immigrants from the countryside, places even 150 kilometres far from Riga. This meant that the guilds attracted individuals who had only recently entered the urban environment and who had yet to develop social networks.

Like most of their members, the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds were themselves socially marginal, even spatially within the city as their guildhalls were placed on the periphery. For a long time they had no guildhalls, and when these were created, they were located in Swinenstrasse (Swine street) where mostly warehouses were located.

As a result of the processes of social and ethnic urban segregation in late-fourteenth and early-fifteenth century Riga, non-German guilds acted as organizations in which members could easily enter and receive social recognition, and protection. The entrance fees were low: only 6 old ores for the Porters’ and 6 schillings for the Draymen’s guild. Yet the members were not allowed to hold concurrently membership of any other guild and they had to possess burgher rights before admission. In other medieval cities wage-workers, merchants’ helpers (also transport workers), servants, and self-employed women belonged to the group of nichtzünftige, who could not be part of artisan associations. In Riga the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds offered exclusive opportunities for these people.

In both brotherhoods a considerable number of members were male and female non-German artisans and servants. Not all members recorded in the lists have their occupations noted, but the largest named occupations in the guilds’ lists are female maidservants, weavers, and hemp spinners, leaving male artisans in a minority.
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44 LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1089 l. fol. 47a; Arbusow, Einführung, p. 727.
45 For example, porter (1453) Hynryck van der Barsonen was from Bersohn (Latv. Bērzaune), parish approximately 150 kilometres eastwards from Riga. Arbusow, ‘Studien,’ p. 89; LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1087 l. fol. 85a.
47 Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, no. 77, § 1, no. 12, § 3.
48 Ibid., no. 12, § 12, no. 77, § 27, 28.
50 Arbusow, ‘Studien,’ p. 85.
Altogether 116 maids entered both guilds between 1450 and 1520, followed by just ten weavers for the time period in the Draymen’s guild, and few hemp spinners.

Women played an important role in both brotherhoods. Between 1462 and 1479, 466 women were registered as members of the Draymen’s guild. A high proportion of women in the guild is evident in the records of all guild’s members for the early-sixteenth century. In 1507 more than a half of the altogether 222 individuals, who had paid their members’ fees, were female. The number of the Draymen’s guild’s female members was even higher than recorded in the members’ lists, because in 1495 the Cistercian nuns of the local nunnery joined the guild and their prioress paid annual membership fees on their behalf. It seems that in the Porters’ guild the tendency to have many female members was shared, though no full members lists have survived. The large number of female members definitely did not contribute to the guilds’ status and economic power; in fact, it even weakened it.

The majority of non-elite members in the guilds of Draymen and Porters as wage-workers were ‘working poor’. According to Bronislaw Geremek ‘material instability was a permanent and inevitable feature of the lives’ of medieval wage-workers. Seasonal change, weather conditions, economic and political factors in city and region directly affected the wellbeing of draymen, porters, servants, and maids in Riga; their numbers fluctuated depending on the navigation season, navigation conditions and with the number of merchant fleets arriving in the harbour. Medieval wage-earners spent most of their income on food, and were always at risk of falling into mendicancy to avoid starvation. In Riga, transport workers’ wages depended on services offered and were not high.

51 Between 1462 and 1523 77 maids can be identified in the Draymen’s guild and 39 in the Porters’ guild for the time period 1453-1519. LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1089 l., fols. 46a-48b; LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1159 l., fols. 5a-37a; LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1087 l., fols. 24b-87b.
52 LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1089 l., fols. 46a, 46b, 47b, 48a, 48b, 55b; LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1159 l., fols. 11b, 16a, 18a, 20b, 31b, 35b; LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1087 l., fol. 49b.
53 LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1089 l., fols. 46a-48a.
54 LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1089 l., fols. 46a-48a.
55 LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1159 l., fols. 9a-11b.
56 Constantin Mettig, ‘Bücher der Rigaschen Bierträgergilde,’ in Sitzungsberichte Gesellschaft für Geschichte und Alterthumskunde der Ostseeprovinzen Russlands aus dem Jahre 1890, Riga, 1891, pp. 120-125, at p. 123; LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1089 l., fols. 46a-48a; LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1087 l., fol. 35b; Arbusow, ‘Studien,’ p. 88.
57 On poor servants, maids and workers as ‘working poor’, see Groebner, ‘Mobile Werte,’ p. 171.
58 Geremek, Poverty, p. 67.
60 Schubert, ‘Hausarme Leute,’ p. 287; Geremek, Poverty, p. 60.
61 Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, No. 77, § 30; Kämmerei-Register 1405-1474, pp. 272, 316, 137.
Medieval poverty cannot be described solely as a material experience. In fact, ‘in medieval society, anyone – independent of gender, actual social status or original wealth – could, in specific situations, have been defined or have wanted to be characterised and recognised as being poor.’

Poverty has to be seen as a complex phenomenon, which depending on context involved lack of food, property, political power, social status, physical strength, and also lack of protective social networks, knowledge, and judicial rights.

This definition of poverty helps to distinguish between individuals who experienced temporary material need, but had social status and protection, and those who were exposed to the permanent threat of poverty. The non-Germans in both brotherhoods belonged to latter category.

Although most of the non-elitist guild members were ‘working poor’ not all members were such. Katharina Simon-Muscheid’s analysis of late medieval artisan guilds in Basel, shows that there were guilds which had higher numbers of ‘poor’, and that even the poorest guilds had a small minority of members who were better off. Also in Riga both brotherhoods had such a minority, who were better off than others and even owned houses and gardens in the city despite the restrictions on non-Germans owning real properties within the town walls.

Peter Lybete was an official of the Porters’ guild and owned a house in the city in 1473. Lybete’s colleague, Michael van der Nygemolen, owned a house in the city around 1464, when in 1458 the guild’s chantry was created, he donated a silver chalice and paten for its altar. He also supported the guild when it experienced a shortage in its funds by lending to it 10 marks. Claus Lachermunt, a non-German drayman, together with his German wife Ilsebe, owned a garden; however, they had to endow it, because non-Germans had no right to own real properties.

The brotherhoods of Draymen and Porters were not the most prestigious urban associations, but during the mid-fifteenth century their status evolved. According to their statutes, members the Draymen’s guild were exposed to stigmatising obligations,
but they freed themselves from these during the fifteenth century. The concluding paragraph of the guild’s statutes of 1466 stated that none of its present or future members would ever act as a city executioner.\textsuperscript{71} This can be interpreted as a rejection of duties the draymen fulfilled for some time before 1466 and forced on them by the city government. There is no doubt that acting as executioners stigmatized the group, lowering its status. In medieval society sanguinary professions, especially the ones of the butcher, executioner, and soldier, were considered in some places to be illicit.\textsuperscript{72} Riga’s draymen were aware of the ignobleness of the executioner’s office, describing it as a ‘shaming and dirtying job’, and wished to be freed of it.\textsuperscript{73}

The change in its status is also manifested in the brotherhood’s desire to prevent immoral individuals from joining the group. The statutes of 1466 stated that, ‘from this time on, no dishonest, infamous people or openly loose women (apenbare lose wyve) should be accepted as brothers and sisters of the guild.’\textsuperscript{74} Similarly, the Porters’ guild in the mid-fifteenth century, like brotherhoods in other German cities, distanced itself by forbidding members to invite weavers, blood-letters, and public bath custodians as guests of the guild.\textsuperscript{75} The simultaneous attempts made during the mid-fifteenth century to restrict people considered to be morally corrupt from entering the group, may show that both brotherhoods were dissatisfied with their status and wanted to improve it. This took place exactly at the time when both brotherhoods were intensifying their religious life and were investing in \textit{memoria}.

The ‘poor’ were important agents of \textit{memoria} since their prayers had remarkable value. Through distribution of alms they became involved in commemoration of institutions and individuals.\textsuperscript{76} The brotherhoods of the Draymen and Porters were associations in which most of the members can be considered to have been ‘poor’, both because of their economic vulnerability, and of their social marginalisation too. These groups were professional brotherhoods, but they were open to all townspeople, with the exception of few illicit occupations. This allowed them to become groups which united not only professional porters and draymen, but also most of Riga’s non-German artisans, maids, and servants. These were groups that enabled the city government to

\textsuperscript{71} Stieda and Mettig, \textit{Schragen}, no. 12, § 17.
\textsuperscript{73} Stieda and Mettig, \textit{Schragen}, no. 12, § 17.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., § 11.
control the non-elites by gathering them in these brotherhoods. These groups were used by the urban government for the fulfilment of shameful tasks before the mid-fifteenth century, but after 1450, when both groups intensified their religious activities, their status changed.

2.2: Commemoration within the non-elites in late medieval Riga

Memoria was equally important to the elite and non-elite guilds, because it formed and sustained their identities. Yet in the case of Riga’s non-elite guilds memoria was even more crucial for their existence, because it was one of the main ways of bringing together individuals of various backgrounds: transport workers, male and female artisans, servants, and even elite members. Memoria was both a reason for joining these guilds and also a guarantee for their existence and successful development. Memoria also helped to sustain groups’ identities in circumstances when the number of members constantly fluctuated.

The statutes of Riga’s non-elite guilds treats commemoration as an important activity. The Porters statutes (1450) emphasized the commemoration of all deceased guild members during the annual drinking feast at All Saints. The statutes of the Dockers guild (1463) declared that all deceased brothers and sisters of the guild should be commemorated annually with masses, vigils and almsgiving during the drinking feast on Pentecost, and that the priests of St Peter’s church should be paid 6 ores and sent one jug of beer on that occasion. The statutes of the Dockers’, Porters’, and Draymen’s guilds focused more on regulating the funerals of deceased members than on events that followed funerals, such as regular memorial masses and vigils.

The funeral, memorial mass, vigils and almsgiving marked the beginning of memoria and the guilds guaranteed that every member would be buried with respect. The alderman of the Porters’ guild was instructed to pay for the burial of those too poor to afford a proper funeral, and to provide it with bell ringing. This guild also assured all members that it would take care of a member’s body if he or she was murdered or
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drowned within a mile radius of Riga. Medieval guilds also guaranteed the large body of mourners at funerals that was considered to benefit souls of the dead. They aimed to have all members present at every commemorative event, although frequently guilds and confraternities failed to gather large crowds. Medieval guilds in general, and Riga’s transporters’ brotherhoods in particular, ensured attendance of the funerals by imposing fines for absence during any part of the funeral. As the Fine Book of the Porters’ guild shows, although guilds were committed to gathering large number of members at burials, in numerous cases they failed to do so.

The statutes of Riga’s non-elite guilds also described the funeral procession, as the body of the deceased was carried from church to grave. The Dockers’ guild specified elements of the funeral granted to every member: two priests, one schoolboy and a sacristan led the procession with funeral songs and bells ringing. The ringing of small bells during the funeral was part of the Porters’ guild’s funeral procession too. In addition to bell ringing, the Porters’ guild provided a pall and lights for the procession. In the case of the Porters, deceased members were probably buried in the cemetery of St Peter’s church, where the guild’s altar was located.

Funerals required the purchase of torches for the procession, the engagement of the services of priests, gravediggers and more. Non-elite guilds used donations and fines in wax to cover these expenses. Every member of the Dockers’ and Porters’ guilds, who failed to attend a funeral, memorial mass, or vigil, had to pay a fine ranging from one to five pounds of wax. Other wrongdoings, such as spilling a beer or sleeping during the drinking feast, were punished by a fine in wax and the Fine Book of the Porters’ guild
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90 Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, no. 77, § 18, no. 74, § 24.
for the years 1450-1459 shows that such infractions were common.\textsuperscript{91} The wax acquired in this way was most likely used to supply lights for the church altar and torches for the procession.

\textit{Memoria} began with the funeral, and was followed by other memorial rituals, both liturgical and also non-liturgical. Guilds were expected to deliver ‘eternal remembrance’ (\textit{ewige dechtnisse}) for all of their members.\textsuperscript{92} This was particularly important in the non-elite guilds, as the majority of their members could not afford large private investments in remembrance. To achieve long-term liturgical commemoration, guilds created their own altars: the Porters established their altar in 1458 in St Peter’s,\textsuperscript{93} and the Draymen had one altar in St Jacob’s and, from 1473, another in St Peter’s.\textsuperscript{94}

The altar of the chantry became the centre of commemorative activities. There is some information on the liturgical commemoration of the Porters’ guild in its altar account book.\textsuperscript{95} We know little about the commemoration performed after funerals for the time period before the foundation of chantry in 1458.\textsuperscript{96} It remains unknown whether the Porters’ guild between 1450 and 1459 had memorial practices other than the funerals of their members. In the Fine Book (1450-1459), only absences from funeral ceremonies are recorded, but other commemorational events are not mentioned.\textsuperscript{97} The guild had its own dead that would have needed long-term remembrance; between 1450 and 1459 the guild organized funerals for at least eleven guild members.\textsuperscript{98} During that time the Porters’ guild had neither the infrastructure – an altar – nor the resources – a chantry – for long-term \textit{memoria}. The Fine Book shows that, despite the lack of resources for institutionalized long-term commemorative practices, the guild still managed to organise remembrance of its members.

While the Porters’ chantry was founded around 1458, the first regular commemorative masses for the guild were celebrated in 1460, when a chaplain of the guild’s altar in St Peter’s received his annual wage, 12 Riga marks.\textsuperscript{99} Until the Reformation the guild continued to employ a single chantry priest charged with

\begin{footnotes}
\item \textsuperscript{91} LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1087 l. fols. 1a-23b.
\item \textsuperscript{92} In the late Middle Ages funeral of an individual usually was followed by anniversaries of death on the third, seventh and thirtieth day and also a one after a year. Babendererde, \textit{Sterben}, p. 148; Arbusow, ‘Kirchliches Leben,’ p. 207.
\item \textsuperscript{93} Arbusow, ‘Kirchliches Leben,’ p. 204.
\item \textsuperscript{94} Arbusow, ‘Studien,’ p. 83; LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1089 l., fol. 75a.
\item \textsuperscript{95} The text of this account book has been edited and published by Leonid Arbusow, see his ‘Kirchliches Leben,’ pp. 204-221.
\item \textsuperscript{96} Arbusow, ‘Kirchliches Leben,’ p. 204.
\item \textsuperscript{97} LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1087 l. fols. 1a-23b.
\item \textsuperscript{98} Ibid., fols. 1b-21b
\end{footnotes}
celebrating four memorial masses a week.\(^{100}\) This was not a busy schedule by the standards of the chantries of the more prestigious guilds in late medieval Riga. The brotherhood of the Black Heads, who also had a chantry in St Peter’s, employed five priests for the same duties during the 1480s.\(^{101}\) The Black Heads brotherhood paid every priest 20 marks a year, compared to the 12 marks received by Porters’ guild’s chaplain.

Even with its sole priest, the Porters’ chantry did not lack impressiveness. In 1460 the chantry paid 4 Riga marks to a schoolmaster (scholemester), to be present at the masses all year round together with singing schoolboys (scholeren).\(^{102}\) 10 ferdings were paid to an organist and one mark for the person who operated the bellows.\(^{103}\) In addition two sacristans were appointed for the altar.\(^{104}\) A continuous flow of donations, liturgical books, chalices and other objects, supported the services during the 1460s and 1470s.\(^{105}\)

Regular memorial masses celebrated at the guild’s altar and financed by the chantry were important because they constituted the guild as a community. Yet it was not the only the way to commemorate the deceased. The records of the Porters’ guild show payments for individual priests and Franciscan friars. In 1452, six years before the creation of the chantry, the porters donated to the Franciscan friars 8 shillings and one jug of beer for memoria of their deceased brothers and sisters; the Franciscan friars had to commemorate (bedenken) the guild’s deceased from the pulpit of St Catherine’s church.\(^{106}\) Even in 1460, when the chantry was up and running, similar records appear in the account book, requesting the Franciscan friars to commemorate the guild members.\(^{107}\) The naming of the dead during prayers did not have such a representative meaning as the memorial mass had, but it required fewer resources. Yet the Porters’ guild – for unknown reasons – decided to cease this memorial cooperation with the Franciscans; the record of 1460 was crossed out, and henceforward they were never mentioned again.\(^{108}\) Perhaps the disruption of this practice was influenced by the creation of the guild’s own chantry.

The Porters’ guild also involved individual priests in its memoria. The parish priest of St Peter’s received an annual salary during the annual drinking feast, as well as donations; before 1460 this amounted to 8 or 9 ferdings, and a jug of beer for

\(^{100}\) LUB 12, no. 288.
\(^{101}\) DSHI 120 no. 8, fol. 43.
\(^{103}\) Ibid., p. 202.
\(^{105}\) Ibid.
\(^{106}\) LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1087 l., fol. 0.
commemorating ‘the deceased brothers and sisters all year around’. The guild did not specify how the priest was to commemorate its members. Since his salary was nine times that of the Franciscans, his duties were probably more extensive than just individual prayers. The relationship could become quite close between parish priest and the guild; the St Peter’s parish priest and cathedral canon Hinrik Netelhorst (†1479) donated sometime between 1459 and 1475 a corporal to the guild’s chantry, and his mother Bele donated a white surplice.

A record in the Porters’ chantry account book reveals the rhythm of remembrance during the annual drinking feasts. The Porters’ guild stated in 1461 that every year during the main drinking feast of All Saints and the one of Corpus Christi (Thursday after Trinity Sunday), all guild members would gather to remember deceased guild members (beghan unse vorstorven brodere und sustere). On the Corpus Christi feast a vigil had to be celebrated on the Wednesday evening and the mass for ‘the eternal remembrance of our guild’ (tor ewiger dechnisse unser ghilde) on the Thursday morning. The Draymen’s guild also had two drunke, one at Pentecost and the other one during the feast of Our Lady – probably the Assumption of the Virgin – at which communal meals were celebrated.

In the case of Riga’s Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds it is easier to discover and analyse the donations made by members of the elite. The contribution of non-elite members to memoria is not so obvious. Individuals from the non-elites also wished to be commemorated individually and they managed to create individual remembrance despite their relative lack of resources and status. In Riga, despite the exclusion of non-Germans from lucrative crafts and possession of real property, we have seen that some members had substantial property. They were usually the leaders of their guilds, like Peter Lybete and Michael van der Nygemolen of the Porters’ guild. They made larger donations than other members. Although, in some cases these donations resemble endowments, it can be questioned whether these donations were such, like those made by the city councillors in both guilds.
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110 The Franciscans received 8 schillings, 9 times smaller sum than 8 ferdings or 72 schillings received by the parish priest.
113 Ibid.
114 LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1089 l., fol. 75b.
115 Erbebücher 1, no. 1040; LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 864 l. fol. 24 b.
In 1464, Michael van der Nygemolen, a deputy of the Porters’ guild’s alderman, and his wife Ilsebe bestowed income from a house upon St Peter’s church and the Porters Corpus Christi altar, the guild’s chantry.\(^{117}\) The rent from the house was to be divided after their death between the parish and the chantry. Since non-Germans were denied the right to own real property, some non-Germans turned properties into endowments to local churches in order to maintain control of them in their lifetime.\(^{118}\) By this arrangement van der Nygemolens may have been avoiding the prohibition, as other non-Germans did. However, this does not mean that there were no spiritual reasons behind such donations. By bestowing his house on the parish and the guild’s altar he became a benefactor of both institutions with the expectation of remembrance in masses at the guild’s altar and in St Peter’s church.\(^{119}\)

The van der Nygemolens made another large donation of a clear memorial character. They gave money for the production of a pall used to cover the body of the deceased during funeral processions.\(^{120}\) This was substantial donation, worth 22 marks in value and an important object; according to the statutes it was used at every burial.\(^{121}\) By commissioning a pall, both donors guaranteed their presence in all memorial activities of the guild.

Identifying the intentions behind such commemorative donations is always challenging.\(^{122}\) The account books of the Draymen and Porters have lists of donations made by members for the guilds, their chantries and altars, yet in most cases the intentions and requests of donors are not mentioned.\(^{123}\) This does not mean that these non-specific donations were not memorial ones. For example, in the Porters’ guild in the 1470s and 1480s, numerous members made donations for the Corpus Christi, yet this does not mean that memoria was completely ignored.\(^{124}\) Moreover, the memorial donations cannot simply be defined by the use of the donated object; the donations could have had a memorial purpose even if it was not explicitly manifested.

\(^{116}\) Arbusow, ‘Kirchliches Leben,’ p. 204.
\(^{117}\) Ibid., p. 209.
\(^{118}\) Claus Lachermunt, a non-German drayman, together with his German wife Ilsebe, donated a garden in 1470, bought years earlier, to the church of St Jacob with a condition that they use it during their lifetime. LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1159 l. fol. 56a; LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 864 l. fols. 24b 25a; LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1159 l. fol. 46a; Erbebücher I, § 998; Arbusow, ‘Studien,’ p. 81.
\(^{120}\) Ibid., p. 209.
\(^{121}\) Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, No. 77, § 17.
\(^{122}\) Truus van Bueren, ‘Care for the Here and the Hereafter. A Multitude of Possibilities,’ in Care for the Here and the Hereafter, pp. 13-34, at p. 16.
\(^{123}\) LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1089 l., fols. 55a-58b; Arbusow, ‘Kirchliches Leben,’ pp. 202-221.
The account book of the Draymen’s guild contains the names of brothers and sisters who donated objects ‘for the commemoration’ (to ener dechtnisse).\textsuperscript{125} Between 1460 and 1515 a total of 154 guild members donated tableware: tablecloths, towels, jugs, plates, tin glasses. Donations also included portions of wax for illumination as well as small sums of money for the guild’s chantry. Donations of money were rare and were mostly made by male members of the guild. Over fifty years only 13 of more than 150 donors donated a sum amounting to 39 Riga marks.\textsuperscript{126} Many gifts were produced by the donors themselves.\textsuperscript{127} For example, towels were frequent donations made by female weavers and hemp spinners. Other objects were made by the artisan guild members, e.g. the metal-caster Laurens donated a tin glass, and the glazier Claus, a jug.\textsuperscript{128}

The most active period of memorial donation in the Draymen’s guild was 1460-1465,\textsuperscript{129} with fewer donations between the 1470 and 1480, even fewer in the 1490s, and only five in the early-sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{130} Donations for the Porters’ chantry were collected by the guild’s officials, who went ‘from house to house’ (van husen to husen) to collect them.\textsuperscript{131} During such campaigns glasses, jugs, pots, tablecloths as well as wax, and rings were collected.\textsuperscript{132} Such gathering of donations had a sporadic character, and it took place when initiated by the guild officials.

Donations for the Porters’ chantry dropped considerably during the late fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{133} We may ask whether this decrease in donations to both guilds had something to do with the way they were collected. Indrikis Sterns suggests that the personality of an alderman affected the guild’s fortunes; more was collected under an energetic alderman.\textsuperscript{134} But with a decrease in donations in both guilds, we should seek a more general explanation. More donations were always offered straight after the foundation of the chantry, when the collective memoria was just established, because it needed to be fostered in order to secure it. Later, annual rent income sustained the chantries, so they no longer needed continuous donations. This development does not mean that memoria lost its role in the life of the guilds, simply that the sources for its sustaining changed.
Individual donations recorded in the Draymen account book show the involvement of guild members in commemoration. Even small donations were the result of individual choices. The Draymen’s list states that these donations were made ‘for remembrance’, but the individual records rarely admit the remembrance as intention. Merten Bodeker and his wife Margrete (1500) were the only donors who specified that their gift of a pot was towards their own commemoration (*to enyger dechnysse*).\(^{135}\) The modest formula, *to ener dechnisse*,\(^{136}\) used by the Draymen’s scribe at the beginning of the list, does not specify the form of commemoration.

The Porters also donated objects and small sums of money for individual commemoration or remembrance of others individuals; some even specified how such *memoria* was to be carried out. Only five donations between 1464 and 1523 explicitly recorded donors’ expectations. In 1499 Hans Bysschop donated a black cloak once owned by a certain Albrecht for the commemoration of the latter’s soul (*siner armen sele, Gade to love unde to eren*);\(^{137}\) Hans Tydevogel donated in 1461-1464 15 Riga marks for commemoration and an additional two for the memorial masses and vigils;\(^{138}\) Peter Ghowre and his wife donated 15 marks for the chantry;\(^{139}\) Hans Swen gave 5 marks for the remembrance of Hans Lybet and Jacob Maten’s wife donated 6 ½ pounds of wax for use in commemoration.\(^{140}\)

Although the majority of the objects donated were for habitual use, objects could be donated with a memorial intention even if they were later used for profane purposes.\(^{141}\) Precious objects donated to the guilds could, of course, be sold. The altar keeper of Reval’s Black Heads brotherhood in 1485 sold for four Riga marks a *paternoster* bead and invested the proceeds into the altar of the brotherhood.\(^{142}\) In the case of the two non-elite guilds in Riga, tablecloths, towels, glasses and other dishes of the guild given ‘for remembrance’ were in fact used at the communal meals. The Porters’ guild’s inventory shows that the guild owned tablecloths, towels, tin glasses, wooden and tin
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jugs, the candlesticks and other dishes. In 1465 the Porters had 27 pieces of the table cloths and towels, 53 glasses, 3 tin jugs, 4 brass pots, 2 candle sticks, 3 wooden jugs, one tub and numerous other dishes. Although the donations of dishes and tablecloth continued, such objects were often lost, broken and worn. Thus, in 1514 the guild owned as many objects as in 1465: 54 big and small glasses, 7 tablecloths, 14 towels, 7 pillows, a frying pan and several pots of different sizes. Inventories were kept by the Carter guild until the Reformation.

Objects donated by the guild members did not serve as a resource for the liturgical remembrance, but were used for the non-liturgical commemoration. Similarly as liturgical objects – chalices, altarpieces, and monstrances – represented donors, profane objects also commemorated benefactors by their existence and usage, manifesting the donors’ presence in the group after the death. As during a mass the dead were made present by the invocation of their names, during communal meals the dead members of the group were also present through the objects donated.

The non-elite guilds in Riga are unique in offering detailed information on the memoria of groups whose social lives are usually little known. The commemoration offered by the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds did not differ from that of other guilds, but they had less internal resources than other associations. The guilds of the Draymen and Porters provided burial and commemoration to their members; the Porters’ guild, even with its limited resources, had succeeded in establishing an association with the Franciscans and the parish priest of St Peter’s in its practices of the commemoration before they established their chantry in 1458.

Although in both guilds the majority of members lacked the resources for large commemorative donations, they still created remembrance. For the guild members of the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds, objects were the media through which they expressed their commemorative choices. Donated objects, primarily dishes or cloths, were not used for the liturgical remembrance, but for the non-liturgical commemoration during guilds’ communal meals. These donations show that even those who possessed little resources were ready to invest into their individual and collective commemoration.
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2.3: The practice of remembrance: the Porters’ guild’s fine book (1450-1459)

Such normative documents as guild statutes reflect expectations as to how the group’s piety or remembrance should be practiced, but fail to reflect the complex reality. The Fine and Members’ book of the Porters’ guild is a useful source when attempting to assess the relations between norm and practice in the life of such groups.\(^{147}\) It contains the names of newly accepted brothers and sisters, and lists transgressions against guild statutes for the period 1450-1459. Many offences took place during the annual drinking feasts: members were most commonly fined for spilling beer, failing to pay fees, sleeping in the guildhall, wife-beating, and urinating on the floor of the guildhall.\(^{148}\) Moreover, the Fine Book contains records of cases in which guild members failed to attend funerals, vigils and other memorial ceremonies and were subsequently fined.\(^{149}\)

From the late-fourteenth century, guilds in northern Europe usually codified three memorial rituals – funerals, memorial masses, and vigils – in their statutes as events all guild members were obliged to attend.\(^{150}\) In Riga the Porters’ statutes of 1450 ordained that guild members must attend funerals or pay five pounds of wax and pay one pound of wax for missing vigil and mass.\(^{151}\) The guild’s Fine Book shows how frequently such trespasses happened, but not the amount of wax paid.\(^{152}\)

The fine registers show that guild officials concentrated their attention on controlling the attendance at funerals. Between 1450-1459 guild members were absent, or misbehaved during memorial events, on 134 occasions.\(^{153}\) Absence from funerals was the main offence with 126 incidents, absence in funeral masses followed with 57 cases, and vigils with 12 cases. In 48 cases guild members were cited for absence from two of the rituals. They seem to have attended vigils and masses more frequently than they did funerals. This raises doubts about the importance of the funeral as a commemorational practice, if so many guild members refrained from attending it. For example, in 1450

\(^{147}\) LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1087 l.
\(^{149}\) Arbusow, ‘Kirchliches Leben,’ p. 221.
\(^{151}\) Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, no. 77, § 17, 18.
\(^{152}\) Arbusow, ‘Kirchliches Leben,’ p. 222.
\(^{153}\) LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1087 l. fols. 1a–21b.
sixteen guild members recorded as having failed to attend the funeral of Holken’s wife, but only three guild members were fined for missing her funeral mass.\(^{154}\)

Although the Fine Book cannot be used as a complete source, it shows different social patterns within the group. Between 1450 and 1459 there were 11 funerals in which some cases of misbehaviour were registered.\(^{155}\) Four of these funerals were for male guild members,\(^{156}\) and seven were for female ones.\(^{157}\) The funerals of male members appear to have been well-attended, and the number of absentees at them never exceeded seven. When a certain Stenbreker was buried, only five guild members stayed away.\(^{158}\) In the case of Versyskuls, six did not turn up to the vigil and funeral, while only one failed to attend the funeral, while seven missed the memorial mass.\(^{159}\) Two other burials mentioned in the Fine Book were apparently well attended; Peter Brucke’s funeral had no absentees\(^{160}\) and at Hans Balye’s funeral only two guild members were fined for absence.\(^{161}\)

The funerals of women, on the other hand, display a different pattern. In 1456, when a certain Glasewertsche was buried, 20 guild members were absent,\(^{162}\) and when Nycklawe’s mother had her funeral 24 guild members were not present.\(^{163}\) Even greater numbers of guild members were absent from the funeral of Lelkayschcen; 32 guild members stayed away from her funeral and the memorial mass.\(^{164}\) Overall, funerals of women had larger number of absentees than those of the men. As at Swekken’s wife’s funeral there were nine missing guild members and at Holken’s wife’s funeral 16.\(^{165}\) At only two funerals the list of absentees was short: that of a beguine, and that of the wife of a certain Hynryk Breden.\(^{166}\) Even with such limited data we note a difference between attendance at male and female funerals.

Missing funerals was against the guild’s rules for collective remembrance and it was costly too, with a fine at five pounds of wax.\(^{167}\) Nonetheless, some guild members were repeatedly absent: Jacop Mate was absent from memorial services five times during the
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1450s, Clawyn Stawedurs, Lawrens Samedurs, Peter Serbe, and Matyas Kursehawe three times, Peter Lybete, who would be a guild official in the 1460s, Clawyn Schapyn, and Andreas Kakkerok twice.\textsuperscript{168} Other individuals were fined only once. Those members who were regularly absent from memorial ceremonies, usually had an impressive record of other forms of misbehaviour too.\textsuperscript{169}

Funerals and other memorial ceremonies had to be well attended, and also properly organized and performed in a respectful manner. The Fine Book shows that proper celebration of memorial activities was guided and controlled. Almost all the wrongdoings during the commemoration were related to the funeral procession. The funeral procession was one of the most important parts of the Christian burial ritual, which retained its central role even after the Reformation. The Porters’ statutes instructed that the deceased be carried to the grave in a procession, with a pall over the dead body, and accompanied by lights.\textsuperscript{170} According to Eamon Duffy the carrying of lights in England was intended to ‘banish demons’.\textsuperscript{171} The number of torches mattered too – the higher the number of lights the higher the status – thus the poor and women were often paid to carry torches.\textsuperscript{172} Riga’s Draymen’s guild had also developed an elaborate funeral procession. They had lights and a pall during funeral processions by end of fifteenth century; by 1495 the guild officially offered the service of carrying lights and pall for every deceased Cistercian nun.\textsuperscript{173}

Some members of the Porters’ guild were negligent of their responsibilities during funeral processions. In 1450, a man named Myssener disobeyed the treasurer’s order to carry lights during the funeral procession for Peter Bruke, and did not follow the procession, but stayed in the marketplace through which the funeral procession proceeded.\textsuperscript{174} Hermen Speke similarly rejected the treasurer’s orders to carry lights during Hynrik Breden’s wife’s funeral, as did Hermen Kuylle at Stenbreker’s funeral.\textsuperscript{175}

Guild members showed their reluctance to take part in guild ceremonies not only in the case of light bearing, but also when they had to deal with corpses. In 1451, during the funeral of Swekken’s wife, when the guild’s treasurer instructed two guild members

\textsuperscript{168} LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1087 l., fol. 3a, 8b, 13a, 16a, 16b, 17b, 21b.
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\textsuperscript{170} Stieda and Mettig, Schragen, no. 77, § 17, p. 416.
\textsuperscript{173} LUB 2/1, no. 252.
\textsuperscript{174} LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1087 l. fol. 2a; Mettig, ‘Ältesten Bücher,’ p. 124.
— Stauwedur and Lapse — to place the corpse on a bier, they revoked treasurer’s orders and laughed.\textsuperscript{176} The bearing of a corpse during the funeral ceremony may have been perceived by guild members as an unattractive obligation, because of the direct proximity to the dead body in its early stages of putrefaction. In the Westphalian artisan brotherhoods members also avoided bearing a coffin or a corpse on a bier and, in order to combat such reluctance, guilds imposed fines of wax and beer.\textsuperscript{177}

An obligation to take part in the funeral ceremony as a light- or bier-bearer was not set out in the Porters’ guild’s statutes, but attempts to avoid fulfilling instructions by the treasurer counted as disobedience.\textsuperscript{178} A fine of 1454 issued to Clawyn Sennites reveals the opinion about him that he was unwilling to do anything during funerals, and that he is always the last to do ‘Lord’s works’ (\textit{heren arbeit}) and does not obey orders.\textsuperscript{179} Two years later, in 1456, Hans Broken, Hynryk Pyrssejalgh, Jacob Schuppel and Pupewal, were registered in the fine book for disobeying the treasurer during the burial of Glasewetersche.\textsuperscript{180} Hans Broken had been complaining about directions given by treasurer, and refused to obey him; Hynryk Pyrssejalgh and Jacop Schuppel had simply disobeyed, but Pupewal did not want to listen to treasurer since he himself was ‘a headman’.

It was the treasurer’s responsibility to deal with all these matters. The treasurer had to control all of the people taking part in memorial ceremonies, because, as seen in the case of Myssener, the person taking part in procession could simply change his or her mind, by just leaving it.\textsuperscript{181} In the Porters’ guild the treasurer was in charge of maintaining order not only during funerals, but also in the guildhall during the communal meals. The treasurer gave orders to the members during different guild activities and often received insulting responses in return.\textsuperscript{182} The treasurer in the brotherhood had a role similar to that of a testament warden, who supervised performance of testator’s \textit{memoria}. It is not known whether the treasurer organized the funeral, but he definitely had to act in order to prevent the failure of those ceremonies, which were so important for the individual and collective remembrance of guild members.
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It is hard to judge the significance of unruly individual behaviour in the context of the wider spirit of the guild. Members’ misdeeds do not prove that they did not favour commemoration and Christian religiosity, as the Latvian historian Indrikis Sterns has suggested.\textsuperscript{183} The Fine Book reflects the guild’s efforts to ensure discipline during all guild events, especially at funerals. The funeral processions of guild members were public events that represented the group and its memoria. It was, therefore, important to maintain discipline and involve all members in it. For a group that lacked social status, like the Porters’ guild, successful presentation of its commemoration was crucial. The Fine Book of the Porters’ guild demonstrates that organization of memoria did not solely depend on financial resources, but also on the guild’s ability to ensure discipline and order. These were the challenges the guild faced in the performance of its own memoria.

2.4: ‘entfengen in unse broderschop’:\textsuperscript{184} elite members in the brotherhoods of the Draymen and Porters

In the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, rich merchants, city councillors, clergymen and their families joined the two non-elite guilds of transport workers, the Porters and Draymen. An influx of high status individuals to these brotherhoods is a phenomenon found not only in medieval Riga, but also in other Hanseatic cities. Transport workers of all kinds were part of the Hanseatic mercantile economy, in charge of transporting goods to and from the harbour. In Stralsund and Stettin, city councillors, clergymen, noblemen and even local princes founded, joined, and supported transport workers’ brotherhoods.\textsuperscript{185} The brotherhood of Porters in Stettin was founded by duke Otto I in 1283; he also endowed the guild’s St Lawrence chantry in St Jacob’s church in Stettin.\textsuperscript{186} In Stralsund the brotherhood of Porters was founded by 1325 and Wizlaw III, prince of Rügen, was one of its founding members. In 1329 the brotherhood already had received a papal privilege, which was copied into the brotherhood’s account book,
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listing hundreds of names of living and dead members of the group. Among those included were numerous members of the princely family, four dukes of Pomerania, the bishop of Roeskilde, many members of local nobility, city councillors and burgomasters of Stralsund, clergymen and, finally, porters themselves.

So far scholars have rarely explored this form of cooperation between elite and non-elite townspeople in brotherhoods. Konrad Fritze, who has studied these brotherhoods in Stralsund, sees this cooperation of political, economic, and social elites and transport workers as ‘scarcely comprehensible’. Latvian historian Indrikis Sterns sees the reason for the ‘honorary membership’ of the elites in non-elite guilds in Riga as stemming from ‘a common interest’ of the merchants and the transport workers in the transporting business. Nor was the Baltic German historian Leonid Arbusow, who has extensively researched the non-elite guilds in Riga, able to explain this phenomenon; he vaguely suggested that the city’s elites joined the guilds of Draymen and Porters for ‘religious reasons’. Elites and non-elites represented two opposite social poles, but in these brotherhoods they existed side by side. Seeking the reasons and effects for this uncommon communion of ‘rich’ and ‘poor’ or patronage of ‘rich’ over ‘poor’ is the aim of my discussion.

The interaction of elite membership in non-elite guilds is a complicated phenomenon in which social, ethnic, and economic contexts intersect. As Antjekathrin Grassmann has pointed out, in the Hanseatic cities the merchants had a special relationship with the transport workers in a harbour and they took care of them. Yet I would suggest that, in addition to possible social and professional reasons, individuals from the elites in Riga joined the non-elite guilds for the sake of memoria and fulfilled the role of patrons in commemoration. Here I will examine the involvement of elites in these brotherhoods, their contribution to the memoria of non-elites, and the effect of the Reformation on the relationship of elites and non-elites.

Member-lists have survived in the account books of the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds from the mid-fifteenth century. Individuals belonging to the urban elite can be identified and it is also relatively easy to identify clergymen and city councillors as
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members of both guilds, referred to as her – lord,193 and in some cases prester was added to a priest’s name.194 Not all individuals designated as her can be fully identified because of gaps in urban documentation, and this is true for priests too.195

According the lists of members, the Porters’ guild had more clergymen and city councillors as members than the Draymen’s guild, with 44 individuals described as her between 1452 and 1520, 16 of whom were city councillors;196 and two other may have been too;197 four individuals in the members’ list of the Porters’ guild were priests.198 The names of 22 guild members recorded as her, cannot be found in the surviving sources.199

Although the Draymen’s guild was the larger of the two, there was considerably smaller representation of the city councillors in it. The Draymen members’ lists for the period between 1460 and 1520 have records of 19 city councillors or clergymen.200 Only for two individuals is there evidence that they were city councillors;201 the other eight who have been referred to as her are not identifiable in any other sources.202 At least two others, not named as her upon entering the guild, later became councillors.203

In the members’ lists of the Draymen’s guild it is easier to distinguish the clergymen from the city councillors than in the ones of Porters. All seven clergymen in the members’ lists were canons of Riga cathedral chapter, and were referred as domher.204
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Some of the city councillors who joined the Porters or Draymen’s guilds had remarkable careers. For example, Johan Schöning, who became a member of the Porters’ guild in 1486, had come to Livonia in 1456, became a city councillor of Riga in 1476, and a burgomaster in 1479.\textsuperscript{205} His son Thomas Schöning became archbishop of Riga in the 1520s.\textsuperscript{206} Other influential councillors also became members of the two brotherhoods. In 1459, city councillor Johan Geritsen joined the Porters’ guild, in the latter phase of 30 years long political career, during which he had been treasurer of the city for at least eleven years.\textsuperscript{207} A year after joining Geritsen endowed a chantry for the guild in order to foster his memoria.\textsuperscript{208} Other members of the Porters’ guild had long and successful careers in city government: Johan Meteler, who joined in 1503, became city councillor around 1503, was treasurer in 1511, and burgomaster in 1516.\textsuperscript{209} Ewert Steven, member in 1500, had a rapid career; he was first mentioned as councillor in 1481, and in the same year he was burgomaster too.\textsuperscript{210} Johan Treros (1453) was burgomaster in 1461, and in that year also represented Riga in the meeting of the Hansa in Lübeck.\textsuperscript{211} All these councillors played important roles in the urban politics of their day.

The Draymen’s guild attracted fewer city councillors than the Porters, and those who joined seem to have been somewhat less illustrious. There was only one burgomaster, Johann Moller, who joined in 1522, the year of his service as burgomaster, although his career began more than forty years earlier, in 1480, as an ambassador to Rome.\textsuperscript{212} The Draymen’s guild had as members such distinguished city councillors as Ewert Steven (1509), who a decade earlier had been a member of the Porters’ guild, and Peter Grawert (1516-1520), who had also been a member of the Porters’ guild in 1510.\textsuperscript{213}

The Draymen’s guild lacked an extensive representation of politically and economically influential urban politicians, but it attracted the Riga cathedral canons. Some canons were provosts and priests in the parishes of St Peter’s and St Jacob’s where the altars of the Draymen were also located, which may have been the link. Riga’s canons can be found in the Draymen’s guild for the first time in the 1460s, when the canons Johan Sleff and Gert van Borken, together with his father, became members
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of the guild. The canon Martin Epinckhusen was mentioned in 1473 as a member of the guild. In 1497 the guild was joined by three canons: provost Jasper Noteken, dean Jasper Linde and canon Jacob Huttini, priest of St Jacob’s. These were the highest-ranking officials of the diocese and their presence in such guild is striking. Indeed, Jasper Linde became the archbishop of Riga in 1509.

By joining the guilds of the Draymen and Porters, elite members fostered their family’s connections and other social networks. Elite women often joined with their councillor husbands, as with Hermen Lemsiike (1453), Johan Schöning (1486), Hinrick Molner (1488), Nicolaus Golste (1491), Ewert Steven (1500), Gosswyn Mennyngk (1503), Johan Meteler (1503), and Peter Grawert (1510). Some wives of city councillors joined on their own, like Lukke, wife of city councillor Johann van dem Orde, who joined the guild of Porters in 1453, though her husband apparently was not a member. Two other women from elite families, joined the Porters’ and Draymen’s guilds: in 1506 the wife of the city councillor Peter Grawert joined the Draymen; the mother of Blasius van Lessen, chantry priest and guild member, joined in 1509.

Where the description her is absent, locating and identifying individuals from elites in the members’ lists is more challenging. Some representatives of the Livonian nobility were present in both guilds. There are few members from noble families; only two noble women: Katerine Üxkull in 1464 and Katarina Patkull in 1497, joined the Draymen’s guild. In 1495, quite unusually, all 53 nuns of the Cistercian nunnery in
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Riga as a community joined the Draymen’s guild. Riga’s Cistercians recruited the daughters of the Livonian nobility and a few of urban elite families.

The Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds attracted rich and influential members, but these were always a minority. In the Draymen’s guild between 1485 and 1519 there were on average around 200 members per annum; the highest number, 300, was in 1517. Among the approximately two hundred members of the Draymen’s guild in years 1509-1514 there only three her can be identified paying fees: vicar Blasius van Lessen, priest Johan Wenkhusen, and priest Thomas Dethleui. Only 3 belonged to the urban elites, 1 to 2% in all. In the Porters’ guild the representation of elites may have been a bit higher. Altogether, individuals from social, economic and political elites were a numerical minority in the two guilds, but they were an influential and useful minority.

Even though the presence of elite members is evident, less is known about what status these prominent members enjoyed. Did they take full part in guilds’ activities as full-members? Johan Wenckhusen, a priest, in 1503 was accepted in the Draymen’s guild as ‘a full brother’ (eynen vullen broder), but others may not have been fully integrated? Konrad Fritze argues that in late medieval Stralsund, where elites also took part in the transport workers’ guilds, city councillors, priests, and noblemen were not full members. Also in the Porters and Draymen’s guilds some distinction between elite members and others existed. If both guilds demanded from their non-elite members that they belong only to one guild, the elite members combined their membership with the one of the Great Guild and some of them had joined both transport workers’ brotherhoods. As the events of the Reformation show, elite members were first to leave the guilds when the efficacy of their commemorative activities was called into question.

As Paul Trio has reminded us, many members in different brotherhoods and confraternities were members on paper alone, whose membership was restricted to participation in association’s charitable activities and other financial contributions. In

---

233 LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1089 l. fols. 52a-53a; LUB 2/1, no. 252.
234 Arbushow, ‘Studien,’ pp. 88; 90-91.
235 Arbushow, Livlands Geistlichkeit, p. 122; LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1159 l. fols. 16a, 18b, 24b, 25a, 28a, 32a.
236 LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1159 l. fols. 17b, 22a, 24b, 28a, 32a.
237 Arbushow, Livlands Geistlichkeit, p. 42; LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1159 l. fols. 16b, 19b, 21b, 25a, 28a, 32a.
238 Arbushow, ‘Studien,’ p. 88.
239 LVVA 4038 f., 2 apr., 1089 l. fol. 19a.
his view they did not participate in other activities and many of them enrolled in several confraternities concurrently. Trio claims that ‘one should be wary to imagine all kinds of networks between the members,’ because ‘they might have hardly ever met – at least, within the context of the corporation’s activities.’

Trio’s comments are a salutary reminder, but they do not necessarily apply to the relationships between guilds and their members when these were motivated by memoria. Firstly, even if it did not mean full integration in brotherhood, membership was a meaningful gesture towards the group. Secondly, the presence of all members at all guild or brotherhood events, at least in the case of Riga’s Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds, cannot be proven. As the Fine Book of the Porters’ guild (1450-1459) shows, the guild fined members who were absent from the guild’s drinking feasts, elite and non-elite alike. In 1452 the future city councillor and burgomaster Hans Gheismer, who in 1459 made a large endowment for the Porters’ guild, was fined together with other guild members for not attending the guild’s drinking feast. The drinking feasts were the events at which the membership fees were collected, and absence meant failure to pay them. Perhaps rich members paid their fees in other way, without being present during the communal meal.

Trio’s view that one should be ‘wary to imagine all kinds of networks,’ because the members may never have met, is well taken. Even if the membership of high status individuals in low status guilds was nominal, this does not preclude the existence of meaningful networks of remembrance. Joining such networks of remembrance was a process that did not require physical presence. There were long traditions of aristocratic benefactions to monastic communities that implied ‘distant’ brotherhood. Late medieval urban guilds may have emulated the links between such religious communities and their aristocratic patrons, and provided a similar relationship of memoria for benefactors and high status members. These elite members, although probably not full-members, were potential contributors to the social and memorial activities of the guilds.

Both transport workers’ guilds in Riga had numerous members drawn from the ranks of the elite: city councillors and their wives, rich merchants, high clergymen and ordinary priests. They formed a minority of the guild members, but their membership
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was a very important resource for these guilds, which promised additional resources for religious and memorial activities of the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds.

2.5: City councillors and clergymen as patrons of memoria in the non-elite guilds

Collective memoria, in the form of memorial liturgical services, soul masses and vigils, required investment in the form of an endowment. The foundation of liturgical memoria by the creation of a chantry established privileged memorial practices into the future. Foundations and their commemorative activities no doubt experienced change and transformations of meanings, but they were a safe form of remembrance. Larger financial investments provided constant incomes and were a preferred form of support over smaller donations of members. The endowment of a foundation supported a chaplain, choirboys and organist, the altar, and vessels necessary for liturgical remembrance; Riga’s Porters guild spent some 23 Riga marks a year on the early stages of their chantry during the 1460s. Smaller donations of money and objects fluctuated in numbers and were more influenced by external factors such as wars, disease, and economic crisis.

Neither the Draymen’s guild nor the Porters’ guild were able to organize long-term commemorative services without substantial support from rich donors. Guild officials were often well off, e.g. owners of properties in the city, but none had resources large enough for the endowment of a chantry. Yet the lack of such financial resources among non-elite guild members does not mean that they were unable to sustain or create memoria altogether. In 1458, without the presence of any elite guild members evident, the Porters created their chantry in St Peter’s church. Alderman Merten Ghargesul and his deputies Clawin Schapin, Hinrick Slachter, Mychel van der Nygenmolen and Peter Lybet acted as founders. All that the chantry acquired without an endowment was the donation of one Riga mark by each of the guild officials. After receiving the consent
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of the St Peter’s churchwarden for building an altar in the southern side of the church, the guild officials went from house to house of guild members, collecting donations for the chantry.\textsuperscript{251} During this fund raising campaign 33 members and other benefactors made donations, money and objects necessary for the construction and elaboration of the chantry’s altar, including chalice and paten, missal, liturgical towels, and tablecloths. A donation of 15 Riga marks was granted for the commemoration of St Peter’s former vicar Nicolaus Sasse.\textsuperscript{252} None of these contributions was large enough for perpetual endowment.

Although the chantry of the Porters’ guild was created without direct engagement of elite members, it was guaranteed by the efforts of two city councillors who joined the guild after the chantry’s creation. The first important endowment was recorded in the chantry book in 1459, when a city councillor, later burgomaster, Johan Gheismer granted 50 Riga marks, the equivalent of the chantry’s annuity rent of 3 marks.\textsuperscript{253} At the same time Gheismer became a member of the guild.\textsuperscript{254} The terms of this endowment are not known, because its charter has not survived, but it may have requested – as was the custom – to commemorate the benefactor, his family and also the deceased of the guild.

Gheismer’s example was followed a year later by city councillor Johan Geritsen, who in 1460 endowed the chantry of the Porters’ guild; he had joined the guild year earlier.\textsuperscript{255} A founding charter was issued by the guild, and recorded in the guild’s account book.\textsuperscript{256} Geritsen gave 100 old Riga marks in return for six marks annually, which was to support the chantry after his death, but was paid to the endower during lifetime. Two marks annually had to be paid for a memorial mass celebrated by all St Peter’s priests on the day of Geritsen’s obit and, on the same day, one mark had to spent on alms for the poor for the sake of all Christian souls.\textsuperscript{257} The endowment charter did set out that other services for Geritsen’s remembrance could have been added. From 6 marks of annual rent, three went for memorial services intended to commemorate Geritsen himself, but the other three, it seems, were at the free disposal of chantry to finance the altar and liturgical services.

The endowments made by Geritsen and Gheismer created the commemoration of the donors, but also benefited the collective \textit{memoria} of the guild. Incomes from
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endowments made to the Porters’ chantry by Geritsen and Gheismer, were used for the commemoration of all deceased guild members, not only the souls of the founders.\(^{258}\)

The main aim for benefactors was to be kept in the ‘memory’ of the guild by being named regularly in services and prayers. Geritsen’s and Gheismer’s endowments characterize the aim of the collective remembrance in the group—endowments were made for the sake of the endower’s commemoration, but at the same time they helped to perform *memoria* for the whole group. By making endowments that were so crucial for the remembrance of the group, city councillors became patrons, retaining their roles after death, when the resources endowed started to sustain guild’s collective remembrance. Moreover, this *memoria* of the two city councillors can be seen as part of the elite *Ratsmemoria* meant to represent and legitimize their power.\(^{259}\)

An example from the Draymen’s guild demonstrates the ways in which remembrance of an elite member was performed. Claus Glembeke created the chantry of the Draymen’s guild in 1473 in the parish church of St Peter’s. Glembeke was not a city councillor, but a rich merchant and the owner of many urban properties.\(^{260}\) Glembeke’s foundation reflects the founder’s prosperity and a wish for self-representation.

Claus Glembeke established a new chantry and altar in St Peter’s and handed it over to the Draymen’s guild’s alderman and the brethren.\(^{261}\) In the foundation document, Glembeke made at least 21 requests for endowments and donations to be made, mostly for the newly founded chantry and the guild of the Draymen.\(^{262}\) He requested the setting up an altar and the placement of his tombstone near it, with a statue and altarpiece; he provided a chalice, missal, lights and a number of other objects.\(^{263}\) Glembeke endowed an additional 200 marks for the chantry, based on the income from two houses.\(^{264}\) The resources allocated were worth approximately 768 Riga marks, and it is the largest endowment known in late medieval Riga. This foundation was later confirmed by archbishop Silvester Stodewescher, the city council, and later reconfirmed by archbishop Michael Hildebrant in 1506.\(^{265}\)

The foundation of the chantry which became the Draymen’s own, differed from the foundation for the Porters in the same church fifteen years earlier. The Porters created
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the chantry for themselves and later gifts by city councillors were made to it. There is another difference. As Leonid Arbusow has argued, the Draymen’s guild already had an existing altar and chantry in St Jacob’s church founded in 1386.266 Although there are no sources that would testify to the chantry’s existence in the 1470s, we may assume that the new chantry founded by Glembeke at the eastern side (ost siden) of St Peter’s, probably in the chancel of the church, was in addition to the Draymen.267 This foundation was a chance for the Draymen’s guild to establish their presence in a parish church more prestigious than St Jacob’s.

A year later, in 1474, Glembeke specified that a vigil and a memorial mass be celebrated once a year for his and his family’s remembrance, with two choirboys participating.268 The chantry’s priest was to celebrate a vigil and a mass on every Ember Day and a weekly mass in remembrance of all Christian souls and the souls of the chantry’s founders and supporters.269 Glembeke instructed the guild that if a member of his family were to become a priest, he should be employed by the chantry. This was memoria of Glembeke and his family within the guild of the ‘poor’ in which future family members could become involved. Although we do not know whether Glembeke had made any other large endowments, this one shows that he entrusted the memoria of his whole family not to a religious community or ecclesiastical institution, but to his city’s non-elite guild.

Glembeke’s endowment created liturgical memoria, but also supported a non-liturgical remembrance in the Draymen’s guild. Glembeke requested that his and ‘all Christian souls’ be commemorated twice a year at the guild’s drunke of Pentecost and Annunciation; one Riga mark was to be spent on beer and bread for each drunke.270 As shown in the chapter on elites, the communal meals were occasions not only of commensality, but also of commemoration.271 In Glembeke’s case, the wish to be commemorated during the communal meal shows that he sought to be effectively integrated into the memoria of the Draymen’s guild. Glembeke’s remembrance became an integral part of the guild’s memoria, although he did not belong to the group socially,
but rather spiritually. Glembeke’s relations with the Draymen brotherhood demonstrate a close, spiritual link between the group and the individual.

We may explore further the relation of elite members to the Draymen’s guild through the case of the priest, Johan Wenckhusen, who in 1503 became member of the Draymen’s guild, and donated a coffin cover (palle) and a corporal (corporall) to the guild’s chantry.272 Master (mester) Wenckhusen was first mentioned in Riga around 1492, and was a longstanding member of the Draymen’s guild, paying his member’s fees regularly between 1506 and 1514.273 Wenckhusen was not the Draymen’s guild’s chantry priest, but meanwhile he was employed by other memorial chantries.274 Although his name is absent from the guild’s records after 1514, Wenckhusen was still present in Riga in 1518.

Johan Wenckhusen was received into the Draymen’s guild together with his deceased parents, who also became members of the guild, so as to ‘take their part in the good deeds that happen in this guild’.275 The good deeds (guden werke) that would benefit the souls of Wenckhusen’s parents were the guild’s religious activities: masses, vigils, and prayers as part of memorial cycle. Memoria was the main reason for joining, his dead parents in tow.

The Draymen’s guild acted as a spiritual confraternity of remembrance for Wenckhusen and his parents.276 Spiritual confraternity integrated both living and dead.277 Ralf Lusiardi has showed that in the case of late medieval Stralsund’s Porters guild, the commemorative role of this group was on par with that of local religious communities. The porters, like local monasteries, incorporated noblemen, clergymen and city councillors, within their own remembrance.278 Riga’s Draymen’s guild was also a confraternity of remembrance that offered memoria within the group for individuals from other social groups and their families. In such a way the transport workers’ brotherhoods in Riga and Stralsund fulfilled memorial functions formerly and elsewhere reserved for the religious communities.279

---
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Wenckhusen’s case shows what cannot be seen in other examples where elite individuals joined both guilds: the entrance of elite members into the Draymen’s and Porters’ guild not only had a financial impact on the memoria or on the status of these organizations, but there were also spiritual ties between the guilds and their elite members. This was a long-term relationship, which involved not only the elite members themselves, but also their dead and future family members. There must have been some kind of distance between both transport workers guilds and elite members of those guilds which became evident during the Reformation.

As the members lists show, a significant group of city councillors, merchants, clergymen and their family members joined the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds, but only a few of them can be identified as donors. Not all elite members chose the two guilds as their commemorators or made donations for them. Among the elite members there were also individuals who belonged to the city elite – high clergymen or rich merchants – but who were not city councillors.

One such was Hans Grote, a burgher of Riga and most likely a merchant. In 1466 he endowed 200 marks for the chantry of the Porters’ guild. The annual rent of 12 marks had to be divided in two: 6 marks of rent to be invested in the chantry, and the other 6 to be spent on alms. Grote’s endowment was indeed significant and it can be compared to those made by the councillors Geritsen and Gheismer several years earlier.

Kersten van Dike (Dyke) similarly made a donation to the Draymen’s guild in 1487. A burgher and most likely a son of city councilor Johannes van Dyke, he donated 4 Riga marks for the making of pall, requesting remembrance for himself and all draymen (tho eyn dechnisse den berdregher). Like Grote, van Dike also cannot be found in the members’ list of the guild from which they requested a commemoration.

Other members of the upper classes of Riga made memorial donations for the two transport workers’ guilds. Hans Tydefogel, who owned a property in the city, donated in 1461/1464 15 marks for his memoria to the chantry of the Porters’ guild, requesting vigils and soul mass. The account book of the Draymen’s guild in 1491 also recorded that the deceased priest of St George’s chapel, Berent Vischer, had donated a number of liturgical objects for the Draymen’s guild.

---
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Those individuals from the social elite who created *memoria* for themselves and their families were probably attracted by the long-term prospect of commemoration offered by the guilds. In the two non-elite guilds, commemoration mixed that of their core members, transport workers and non-German townspeople of Riga, with that of the individuals from the social elite. The *memoria* of the city councillors and rich merchants, who made large endowments to the Porters’ guild, was integrated into the collective *memoria* of this non-German brotherhood. Without these large endowments and also the smaller donations of elite members long-term *memoria* of the non-elite guilds would not have been possible. Their resources sustained the *memoria* of non-German draymen and porters.

Both guilds allowed elite members to integrate personal *memoria* and that of their deceased family members, as we have seen it in the case of Johan Wenckhusen and his parents. Such a relationship could have become an intimate, long-term bond between the guilds and their benefactors, resembling the bonds created between benefactors and monastic communities. The Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds similarly as transport workers’ brotherhoods were groups which, like monastic communities, commemorated the rich and powerful.

### 2.6: Elites and the commemorative space of the non-elites

The charter that created the Porters’ guild’s altar in St Peter’s was issued by the city council two years after the creation of the chantry on 9 of October 1460. It secured for the guild the use of an altar at the south side (*zuderziide*) of the church, behind the pillar next to the *rathstole*, the pews of the council. In the charter the city council ordered the Porters’ guild to build a vault at its own expense that would stretch over the new altar and a window.

---
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The altar at the south aisle was a prominent location for the guild of poor porters and wage-workers.\textsuperscript{287} During the reconstruction of the church between 1456 and 1466 the old nave, dating back to the early thirteenth century, was considerably rebuilt and the adjacent aisles were attached to the nave.\textsuperscript{288} The vault built by Porters’ guild, was part of this major enlargement project, supervised by the churchwardens, who were city councillors. The vault was decorated with two stars and was the most luxurious vault in the church.\textsuperscript{289} An impressive 100 Riga marks was spent on the vault, the price of a small house. Officials of the guild paid 100 Riga marks to the churchwardens in 1468, ten years after creation of the chantry, but its sources remain unknown.\textsuperscript{290} In the chantry book there are no more details about the building process which was probably funded
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by members’ donations. Here again the elite members may have facilitated the building project. As to the labour, some scholars have suggested that the Porters’ guild may have used unpaid voluntary labour of the guild members.\textsuperscript{291} Indeed, the guild’s members supported the new chantry with their own labour; the city’s carpenter (\textit{stat tymmerman}), a certain Hinrik, member of the guild, erected voluntarily the Porters’ guild’s altar.\textsuperscript{292} Yet, even with unpaid labour, the costs of the vault were high.

![Image 5: The vault built by the Porters’ guild in St Peter’s church.](image)

The construction of the outstanding vault in St Peter’s church was part of a larger campaign to gain prestige for the guild and its chantry. In 1464 Silvester, archbishop of Riga, granted the Porters’ guild the right to a chantry, altar and perpetual mass in St Peter’s.\textsuperscript{293} His charter, in addition to the charter issued by the city council, ensured that the chantry was fully recognized by the council and by the archbishop. The
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archbishop’s charter was a privilege; it acknowledged the chantry, and the guild’s right to choose its chantry priest. This charter secured autonomy for the chantry and the guild spent a great deal in its efforts to secure it. The chantry’s account book shows that the alderman and his deputies used the city council’s letter to lobby for the charter from the archbishop, spending 22 Riga marks on gifts and other expenses, and 8 marks on the production of the document itself.

The support of elite members helped the Porters’ guild gain an excellent location in the church, at the very centre of St Peter’s, next to the council’s pews. Claus Glembeke also erected an altar for the Draymen’s guild in St Peter’s, establishing more prestigious commemorative space next to their altar in smaller parish church of St Jacob. These shifts would not have been possible without direct engagement of the elite and support by city councillors in charge of the parish churches.

2.7: The Reformation and memoria of non-elite guilds in Riga

The Reformation swept away memoria in its medieval forms. As Craig Koslofsky points out, denial of memoria – prayers for the suffering souls in Purgatory – was one of few issues on which all reformers agreed and memoria came under ‘a massive attack’ from them and their followers. The reformers in the northern Europe attacked memoria not only theologically, but also physically. Widespread iconoclasm and the halting of commemorative services changed both the urban landscapes and its social relations. The destruction of memoria in the guilds of the Draymen and Porters brought about a period of drastic change that impacted the relationships between elites and non-elites.

St Peter’s church was the centre of commemoration for the guilds of Draymen and Porters, but St Peter’s was also the centre of the Reformation in Riga during the early 1520s. Located in the centre of the city, St Peter’s was the largest parish church with the altars and chapels of rich elite families, and influential brotherhoods and guilds. Riga came under the influence of the Lutheran Reformation around 1522. Following a disputation in St Peter’s church between the priest Andreas Knopken, the first
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representative of the new faith in Riga, and the Dominican friars, some of the city councillors began to support the reformers and their ideas.298 Andreas Knopken and another reformer Silvester Tegetmeyer were appointed as preachers at St Peter’s and St Jacob’s in 1521, the Dominican and Franciscan friars were sent away in 1524 and violent crowds raided the city’s churches that year.299 The altars of the Draymen and Porters in St Peter’s were also destroyed. By the end of 1524 the Reformation had triumphed in Riga.

Andreas Knopken was a central figure in the Lutheran Reformation in Riga. Born and educated in Pomerania, Andreas arrived in Riga around 1517, and with the support of his older brother Jakob Knopken, a cathedral canon and parish priest of St Peter’s, he became a vicar in that church.300 Remarkably, the Knopken brothers were involved in the Porters’ guild, as members from 1517.301 Leonid Arbusow claims that Andreas was appointed as the priest of the Porters’ guild, and that he was hired to offer commemoration.302 However, in the members’ list Andreas Knopken’s status is not specified.303 Arbusow argues convincingly that Andreas Knopken was member of the Porters’ guild even after Knopken’s appointment as a Lutheran preacher 1521, but he acknowledges that nothing can be concluded about Knopken’s possible influence on the guild members, spreading Lutheranism among them.304

The involvement of the reformer Andreas Knopken in the Porters’ guild and his possible, but disputable appointment as a chantry priest of the guild, may well question, how both non-elite guilds and the non-German population in general reacted towards the Reformation. The records of the Draymen account book show that guild’s officials were not enthusiastic supporters of the reforming iconoclasm in Riga. The scribe of the Draymen’s guild described in the chantry’s account book the iconoclasm performed by the supporters of the new faith in St Peter’s and St Jacob’s in 1524. Referring to the violence, scribe wrote that on 16 March, the ‘Lutherans (luterianer) carried out
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something amazing (wunderlick) in Riga. The description of the Bildersturm appears to be opposed against the actions of the luterianer. In depicting the destruction by the iconoclasts, the scribe involves apocalyptic tunes, paraphrasing Isaiah: ‘Blind will see, mute will speak, the lame will walk and trees will become men.’ Next he discusses the violence in St Peter’s and St Jacob’s, and the destruction by the crowd of the altarpieces of the Virgin Mary and reliquaries. As they completed the day’s destruction the rioters sang Psalm 117 with the antiphon ‘Haec dies pascale’, and a Lutheran preacher preached in support of the violence, praising the iconoclasts for their righteous action against idolatry (afgaderye). The destruction was not total, and the remaining altars were removed during the second wave of destruction in August 1524.

The scribe of the Draymen’s guild, probably the chaplain of its chantry Johann Steffen, did not support the new faith and the actions of the iconoclasts. The apocalyptic tone of this story shows how distressed the author was by the events of the destruction of the Draymen’s altar in St Peter’s. Steffen was dismissed from the chantry and lost his incomes; in 1524 he was not paid his annual wage although in number of other chantries priests did receive their last wages.

Even within guilds attitudes to the challenges of the Reformation and to the violence related to it could differ. Steffen as a priest, who was paid for his services, did not represent the guild itself, so it could be questioned whether his attitudes towards the Reformation anything in common with those of the Draymen. An example that shows the discrepancy of attitudes between the officials and simple guild members is the reaction of Riga’s high status Black Heads brotherhood’s senior officials, who criticized younger members for destroying their chapel in St Peter’s church on 16 March 1524. Arbusow suggests that in Riga too the non-Germans, of whom many were members of
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the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds, took part in iconoclastic acts, as they did in Reval, Pernau and Dorpat, but I can find little evidence to support this.\textsuperscript{315} Some Draymen’s and Porters’ guild members took an active part in the Reformation, but these were elite members, city councillors and priests, like Knopken brothers who were active supporters of the Reformation.

It is hard to imagine that the disestablishment of \textit{memoria} could have been an easy process for the guilds, because it played important role in the maintenance of their identities.\textsuperscript{316} The deconstruction of \textit{memoria} posed a real challenge to the guilds even though many of their representatives took part in the Reformation theologically (clergymen), politically (city councillors), and also iconoclastically (townspeople). The deconstruction of \textit{memoria} evoked some reluctance when the guilds’ chantries were disbanded.

The guilds’ officials were ambivalent about the changes the Reformation brought. When in 1525 the Draymen’s guild had to pay its share to the \textit{gemeine Kasten}\textsuperscript{317} that consolidated the property of the chantries for charitable purposes, the guild’s officials entered in the account book ‘city councillors took from us’ (\textit{do nemet uns de radtlüde}) church wax.\textsuperscript{318} Here the words ‘took from us’ should be emphasized. Clearly, the Draymen’s guild’s officials did not show much of enthusiasm for voluntarily contribution of resources, which normally would be spent on sustaining \textit{memoria} and religious activities of the guild.

Unwillingness to pay the guild’s share to the \textit{gemeine Kasten} is a sign of reluctance to abandon \textit{memoria} after the triumph of the Reformation in Riga. The guild’s account book shows that between 1526 and 1530-1533 incomes from the chantry were spent on various secular purposes. The chantry’s rents, which before the Reformation had sustained the guild’s \textit{memoria} and liturgical services, were now spent on communal meals during the annual drinking feasts, for the funerals of poor guild members, distributed among the guild’s members, and invested in the fabric of the guildhall.\textsuperscript{319} Some of these acts still had commemorative meanings, particularly the communal meals, funerals, and almsgiving.\textsuperscript{320}
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When liturgical remembrance ceased to exist, remembrance of the dead within the Draymen’s guild still carried on; communal meals, burials and almsgiving continued non-liturgical memoria within the guild. For the reformers it was difficult, if not impossible, to eradicate that kind of activity. It is hard to assess how long the non-liturgical remembrance lasted in the Draymen’s guild, but it was continued at least until the mid-1530s, when Riga’s transport workers guilds were reformed.\(^{321}\)

The endowments made by elite guild members continued to serve for non-liturgical remembrance, even though they had left the brotherhoods when liturgical memoria ceased to exist. The members’ lists of both guilds show that the elite members had left the guilds even before the attacks of 1524. The last registered elite members of the Draymen’s guild were burgomaster Johann Moller and city councillor Tönnis Muther in 1522,\(^{322}\) in the Porters’ guild it was priest Hynricus Ludert in 1522.\(^{323}\) It is not a coincidence that the elite members cannot be found in the members’ lists of the brotherhoods after 1522, because the Reformation had won the support of the elites after the disputation between Andreas Knopken and the friars in the St Peter’s.\(^{324}\) Theirs was a political as well as a religious decision, promoted by burgomaster Conrad Durkop.\(^{325}\) The city councillors ceased their activities in the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds but the endowments made by them and other rich merchants, however, remained in the hands of both guild chantries.

The absence of elite members from the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds in 1523 was just the beginning of their decline. During the Reformation the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds lost all those members who were not involved in transporting work. The decline in numbers had already begun before 1523. In the Porters’ guild there were 42 new members in 1521, in 1522 there were 22 and in 1523 just 16.\(^{326}\) Then the members list stops for nine years. In 1532 records resume and 56 guild members were registered a year later, in 1533, after a longer interruption guild accepted eight new members.\(^{327}\) A similar pattern of decline appears in the list of the Draymen’s guild: in 1524 it admitted only two new members and similarly as in the Porters’ guild, there was then a 16 years
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long pause; only in 1540 did 12 new members join.\textsuperscript{328} When the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds resumed membership in the late 1530s and early 1540s, only draymen and porters and their spouses could join their respective guilds.\textsuperscript{329} After the Reformation the guilds never reached their previous strength.

During the decade after the Reformation the Draymen and Porters did not halt their activities, but they experienced crisis that resulted in transformation. In 1535 the city council imposed new statutes on both guilds.\textsuperscript{330} The Porters’ guild was transformed into the Servants’ and Porters’ guild, its membership now limited to seventy men, losing its previous traditions and statutes.\textsuperscript{331} Later in the sixteenth century this guild was united with the Dockers’ guild, while the Draymen’s guild continued to exist independently.\textsuperscript{332} Taking into account these dramatic changes, one could say that after the Reformation the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds ceased to exist in their previous form. By imposing the new statutes in 1535 the city council re-founded them as simple craft guilds.

The Reformation’s effect on the relations between elites on non-elites in these guilds can be described as a process of forgetting. The elites as patrons of the two guilds ‘forgot themselves’, forgot their commemorational and social obligations towards the non-elites and ‘forgot’ their patronage.\textsuperscript{333} They ‘forgot’ the dead, and also the social relations created for remembrance of the dead, and it was achieved through renouncing religious practices that had developed into social ones.\textsuperscript{334} Through the ‘forgetting of themselves’ the previous social bonds with groups and individuals were dismantled. If before the Reformation endowments and membership of the elites within the non-elite guilds guaranteed status and recognition for these groups, after it the privileges were equally ‘forgotten’.

Forgetting of these previous obligations developed over decades, resulted in deeper social and ethnic segregation in early modern Riga. \textit{Memoria} and other liturgical rituals did not obliterate the social differences between the non-Germans and Germans or non-elites and elites, but the tasks of remembrance brought these groups closer together. Even if elite individuals, who became members of the guild and requested commemoration were not present at all performances of that \textit{memoria}, they were
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spiritually part of the groups. The Reformation removed the possibility of such social rapprochement, by stripping the poor and lower classes of the rights of the counter-gift. Prayers for the benefactor’s soul were no longer needed, thus the charity itself did emphasise the role of the donor, not recipient, who before the Reformation had more important role.

The separation of the elites and non-elites brought about by the Reformation was concluded by the establishment of the non-German (Latvian) parish in St Jacob’s church, while St Peter’s church became a German parish. Under these circumstances the ethnicity, social status and language played an even greater role than before and the devotional spaces of the two groups were separated. After the Reformation the two groups had fewer opportunities for communication and social interaction.

The abolition of the liturgical memoria did not mean the end of the commemorative activities in the non-elite guilds. Although the elite members left both guilds as early as in 1522/23, their endowments remained and the Draymen’s guild continued to use those resources to distribute alms, organize funerals and communal meals. Yet, the Reformation was a blow to the guilds of the Draymen and Porters; their membership declined and for a decade new members were not admitted. The Reformation, the end of the liturgical memoria changed the relationship between the rich merchants and poor transport workers. The elite ‘forgot’ their bonds with the non-elites. Both rich and poor no longer had opportunities for symbolical exchange of donations and prayers that had bonded them for at least three generations. The Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds and their members lost their prestige accumulated during long period of time.

Conclusion

The guilds of Draymen and Porters were the largest non-elite guilds in Riga, with several hundred members throughout the late Middle Ages, a large section of Riga’s non-German population. The guilds were open to almost anyone who wished to join, but they maintained their profile as professional guilds of the porters and draymen. Both guilds experienced an upswing of activities from the mid-fifteenth century when their memorial practices were established and recognized also by other social groups in Riga.

Memoria in all its forms demanded resources, and these guilds of the working poor lacked resources for lavish remembrance. In their initial stages they maintained
remembrance by gathering small donations and using the funeral ceremonies as the main commemorative events. While long-term liturgical remembrance was ensured through endowments by richer members, non-elite guild members continued to donate objects such as vessels and cloths for use at the communal meals. In this way individual donations contributed to the collective memorial practices.

Commemorative events were important for these non-German guilds. Yet, as the Fine Book of the Porters’ guild shows, they also were confronted with problems. Guild members were obliged by the statutes to commemorate their deceased brothers and sisters, but many members of the Porters’ guild misbehaved during funerals and occasionally were absent. The guild had to control and punish its members in order to maintain collective memoria properly, because without control the commemoration could simply fail.

In my view elite guild members – city councillors, rich merchants, and their family members – perceived the majority of the members in the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds as ‘poor’, and that is why they joined them in memoria. This claim, however, cannot be directly confirmed by the sources, but it arises from the analysis here offered. Medieval elites strove to offer charity to the ‘poor’ and involve them in their commemoration. In Riga, the guilds of the Draymen and Porters, with their predominance of non-German members, were in fact, the poor.

Networks of remembrance involving elites and non-elites or transport workers may have also existed in other Hanseatic cities, as in Stralsund and Rostock. This case study of the memoria of the guilds of Draymen and Porters demonstrates that these groups were important centres of commemoration in late medieval Riga. Both guilds hosted memoria for elite families. Two city councillors – Gheismer and Geritsen – were the first endowers of the chantry of the Porters. A rich merchant, Claus Glembeke, created the chantry of the Draymen’s guild in the St Peter’s, and a number of elite individuals requested remembrance from both guilds. The Draymen accepted not only living individuals from elites, but also their dead kin as the members of the guild. In their commemoration of elite members and benefactors the guilds emulated commemorative practices of religious communities.

Cooperation with leading townspeople had advantages for the guilds of working poor. Although the draymen and porters were socially and politically marginal, their guilds received altars located at central spaces of the St Peter’s parish church. This
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would not have been possible without active support from the elites. Because of the elite endowments they could establish long-term memorial services which were resource consuming. Once elite members began to join the Draymen’s guild in mid-fifteenth century, the draymen were also relieved from the humiliating function of executioners. The social marginality or ‘poverty’ of most guild members served both guilds as the reason for elite interest. This was a kind of reciprocal exchange, the non-elites exchanged their poverty and prayers for the endowments of the city councillors and rich merchants.

The Reformation brought about dramatic changes to the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds. *Memoria* was degraded and then abolished, and so the urban elites no longer engaged with the guilds. *Memoria* had gained the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds status within the city and this was lost during the Reformation. By the time *memoria* was abolished in 1522-1524, the guilds lost the main attraction they held for the elites, their ability to commemorate the dead. After the Reformation draymen and porters returned to their initial social positions in Riga’s society and the social status of their guilds – now strictly professional organizations – declined. The Reformation limited contacts between the German elites and non-German working-poor. While the Reformation disrupted liturgical remembrance the sources of the Draymen’s guild show that the tradition of non-liturgical *memoria* continued into the mid-1530s. For the guilds of the Draymen and Porters *memoria* was even more important than for the elite guilds, therefore after the Reformation they still tried to maintain its non-liturgical forms.

The end of liturgical *memoria* marked the end of an age when the transport workers’ guilds in Riga brought together rich and poor for common aims: shared prayers and commemoration. The non-elites were those who had benefited most of these bonds, and so the end of this close relationship was bound to be felt most sorely by them.

---

CHAPTER 3: MEMORIA IN THE LIVONIAN BRANCH OF THE TEUTONIC ORDER

Memoria promoted the self-awareness of groups and served as a source for knowledge about its own history.\(^1\) Social groups created, recorded and sustained their own memories with the aid of memoria, while groups and their identities were also constructed by memories.\(^2\) Shared memories created the feeling of a common bond and thus constituted a group itself.\(^3\) In this context research into the Teutonic Order’s memoria is particularly important, and the influence of memoria on group construction and identity in the military orders has not yet been appreciated by historians.\(^4\) Studies of the Teutonic Order’s Livonian branch have concentrated on the political dimension of its activities and less on its social and religious practices.\(^5\) Whereas a study of the Order’s memoria can help us to understand how this corporation created and sustained its identities and which memories were important in a long-term, providing a new perspective on the Teutonic Order.

The Teutonic Order (Ordo fratrum domus Sanctae Mariae Teutonicorum Ierosolimitanorum) was established during the siege of Acre in the Holy Land in 1190 by merchants from Lübeck and Bremen as a hospital for the German crusaders.\(^6\) The Order’s main aim was to fight against the pagans and nonbelievers. However, the
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\(^1\) Oexle, ‘Gegenwart der Toten,’ p. 34.
\(^2\) Oexle, ‘Gegenwart der Lebenden,’ p. 75.
\(^3\) Althoff, ‘Geschichtsbewusstsein,’ p. 89.
Teutonic Order was not just an army with purely military objectives. Its network of houses and territories stretched from the Holy Land in the East (until 1291), to Sicily in the South, Spain in the West, and Livonia in the North. In all of these locations the Order was involved in social, political, religious, cultural, charitable, and economic activities.\(^7\)

The Order arrived in Livonia to subjugate the Livonian pagans by military force, four decades after the beginning of the crusading in the Eastern Baltic. In 1237 the Livonian Order of the Sword Brethren (*Fratres militiae Christi Livoniae*), founded in 1202, was incorporated into the Teutonic Order after defeat in the battle of Saule (1236).\(^8\) In its struggle with the Livonian pagans the Order suffered setbacks. It was heavily defeated by the Russians in 1242 at Lake Peipus, by the Lithuanians and Curonians at the battle of Durbe in 1260, and also experienced other major defeats in 1262, 1270, 1279 and 1287, but it managed to regain military and political strength. It concluded the crusade in Livonia in 1290 by conquering the last pagan stronghold: Semigallia.\(^9\)

The Teutonic Order sought to gain political hegemony in Livonia. It inherited the rights and territorial possessions of the Sword Brethren, thus taking charge of one third of the conquered territories.\(^10\) Soon after its arrival the Teutonic Order struggled to free itself from the bishop (later archbishop) of Riga, under whose lordship the Sword Brethren had been.\(^11\) The Order sought to obtain in Livonia the favourable position it had in Prussia, with large territorial possessions, and control of all bishoprics. However, the Order was not intending to unify Livonia under its sole authority, but it did attempt to gain unlimited control over different political subjects.\(^12\) Thus from the fourteenth
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\(^8\) Benninghoven, *Orden der Schwerbrüder*, pp. 321-353.


century on, the Order tried to establish control over the Livonian bishoprics and their cathedral chapters, particularly focusing on the cathedral chapter of Riga.\textsuperscript{13}

This aspiration for more power resulted in numerous political and military conflicts. After the conclusion of the struggle against the pagans in 1290, the Order confronted internal enemies, the archbishop and the city of Riga, for the next two hundred years.\textsuperscript{14} This rivalry continued until the late fifteenth century and resulted in numerous diplomatic standoffs and wars, for example, the civil war of 1297-1330 and military conflicts with Riga in the 1480s and 1490s.\textsuperscript{15} The dynamics of the relationship between the main actors in Livonia changed considerably in the late fifteenth century, when the Order’s influence was extended by Master Wolter von Plettenberg (1494-1535).\textsuperscript{16}

The Teutonic Order experienced far reaching changes during the Lutheran Reformation of the 1520s. Although the Grand Master, Albrecht von Hohenzollern (1490-1568), secularized the Prussian branch in 1525 and became a duke, the Livonian Master did not follow in his steps.\textsuperscript{17} The old and conservative Master von Plettenberg remained Catholic until his death in 1535, but the Livonian branch itself was affected by Protestantism even before that date and by the time the branch was dissolved in 1562, most of its members were Lutherans.\textsuperscript{18}

The Teutonic Order as a whole was in decline in the later Middle Ages, after its great defeat against the Lithuanians and Poles at Tannenberg in 1410.\textsuperscript{19} After 1410 the number of the brethren fell, the Order in Prussia lost territories, and its influence steadily lessened. Yet the Livonian branch was only indirectly influenced by this crisis.


\textsuperscript{14} Jähnig, Verfassung und Verwaltung, pp. 40-41.


\textsuperscript{17} Leonid Arbusow, Wolter von Plettenberg und der Untergang des Deutschen Ordens in Preußen, Leipzig, 1919; Militzer, Geschichte des Deutschen Ordens, p. 156.


Despite the fact that the hospital out of which the Order had developed was founded by the burghers of Lübeck and Bremen, the Teutonic Order remained the exclusive preserve of the nobility throughout the Middle Ages.\(^{20}\) The majority of the brethren in the Teutonic Order came from the lower nobility; it was frequently referred to by contemporaries as ‘a hospice of poor German noblemen’ (\textit{Spital des Armen Adels deutscher Nation}).\(^{21}\) Noble descent was one of the preconditions for admission to the Order and the majority of the brethren were German, although other ethnic groups were to be found among the brethren.\(^{22}\) The Order offered a refuge to members of the lower nobility of the Empire, and in this realm they could establish a considerable political influence, becoming high-ranking officials and even Masters.\(^{23}\) The higher nobility did not have special privileges and opportunities in this Order.\(^{24}\)

The Livonian branch recruited the majority of its brethren from the Order’s bailiwicks in the Empire. Noblemen from Westphalia and Rhineland dominated the Livonian branch for the whole period of its existence between 1237 and 1562.\(^{25}\) They were recruited and admitted into the Order already in the Empire and then left for Livonia, and as it was common in the later Middle Ages, never returned to their bailiwick of origin.\(^{26}\) In the Livonian branch only few brethren of local descent can be identified.\(^{27}\) Most of the brethren remained a ‘foreign’ element, whose social networks and customs reached back to their native regions. In addition, the Livonian branch was internally divided between the factions of the Westphalians and Rhinelanders; the Westphalians made up more than half and the Rhinelanders were around 40% of all the brethren.\(^{28}\) Due to the brethren’s origins, the Livonian branch was bound together with the institutions of the Order in the Empire.

\(^{22}\) Mol, ‘Hospice,’ p. 123.
\(^{24}\) Militzer, ‘Recruitment of Brethren,’ p. 276.
\(^{27}\) \textit{Ritterbrüder}, p. 24.
\(^{28}\) Militzer, ‘Recruitment of Brethren,’ p. 275.
The *memoria* of the Livonian branch reflected all the historical, social and political contexts presented above. Care for the burial and remembrance of its members was not only a religious practice for the Teutonic Order, but also an element that ensured the continued existence of the group itself. As a community of men bonded together and living in celibacy, the inheritance of rights, privileges, power and obligations did not derive from family, but from the traditions handed over by their predecessors in office. These were required through the remembrance of dead brethren and of the historical events they had experienced. The continuity of the group depended on *memoria*.

The Teutonic Order as ‘a community of men who live and fight together’ also commemorated their martyrs and heroes who had fallen in the struggle against the pagans and nonbelievers. The commemoration of the fallen brethren as role-models was essential for the Teutonic Order’s identity and was still practiced in the late Middle Ages even though the struggle against the pagans had ended. It maintained their identity as Christ’s warriors and even helped to legitimize the Order’s existence after the decline of crusading.

Taking these aspects of the Order’s *memoria* into account, this chapter will address the following questions. What role did Livonia and its fallen brethren play in the commemorative culture of the whole Teutonic Order? How were these memories transmitted from Livonia to the Order’s bailiwicks in the western Europe? How did the Livonian branch commemorate its dead brethren and Masters? How was *memoria* used for political purposes? What role did *memoria* play in the legitimation of the Order’s power in Livonia?

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first discusses the remembrance of the Masters and brethren of the Order who took part in the Livonian crusades during the thirteenth century. The second will deal with the fifteenth-century *memoria* of the Livonian branch, that of the Masters and the ordinary brethren. The study of the *memoria* of the Livonian branch is made more difficult by the lack of source material. The archives of the branch, which are held in the National Archives of Sweden, were severely damaged during the late sixteenth century. Some records have survived in other archival collections. However, most of the memorial sites of the Teutonic Order and memorial artefacts, e.g. tombstones, have also been destroyed. Due to the vast gaps
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in the source material, this discussion focuses on case studies. Likewise the Reformation and dissolution of memoria within the Order will not be discussed here due to the lack of sources.

3.1: Livonia in the memorial culture of the Teutonic Order. Remembrance of the Livonian brethren in the necrologies and chronicles of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries

3.1.1. Memoria of the brethren fallen in Livonia by the houses of the western European bailiwicks

Like all military orders, the Teutonic Order faced the challenges of long-distance communication. The Livonian branch of the Teutonic Order, far to the east, was geographically disadvantaged in communicating with the rest of the Order. Yet, a constant flow of recruits and information from the west to the east linked the branches in Livonia and Prussia with the Empire. Communication from east to west within the Teutonic Order is less well researched. Until the fifteenth century it involved not only the exchange of personnel, goods and information, but also of historical narratives and practices of remembrance. Despite its distant location on the periphery of Europe, Livonia played a unique role in the Order’s memoria, as the names of the dead were communicated to the western European bailiwicks. Moreover, Livonia was a lieu de mémoire of the Teutonic Order, embedded within the Order’s commemorational culture (Erinnerungskultur).

Livonia was a battleground for clashes between Christian and pagan forces from the early thirteenth century. After the arrival of the Teutonic Order in 1237, this struggle became part of the Order’s history that was remembered long after crusading had come to an end, and far beyond Livonia itself. The memory of a violent past, heroic deeds, and martyrdom of brethren was represented in different media which used various

32 Ibid., p. 181.
34 Bailiwicks were territorial structures of the Order in the western Europe, which united numerous commanderies and houses.
techniques to sustain memories of the Livonian crusades in the collective awareness of the Order. The remembrance of these events and of the fallen brethren shaped identity not only in the Livonian branch, but throughout the Order. Although the Order’s territorial units – branches and bailiwicks – spread all over Europe had distinct experiences and memorial cultures, they also shared memories, which constituted the Teutonic Order as the group. Thus the *memoria* of the Livonian branch became the experience of the whole Order.

The main sources with references to brethren fallen in Livonia are necrologies and chronicles of the Order used in the western European bailiwicks of the Teutonic Order. The *memoria* of the brethren of the Livonian branch appear in four of the dozen surviving necrologies of the Order: that of Alden Biesen (bailiwick Biesen) (c. 1350-17th century), of Mergentheim (bailiwick Franconia) (c. 1350-c. 1450), of Hitzkirch (bailiwick of Alsace-Burgundy) (1423), and of Bern (Alsace-Burgundy) (14th century). The *memoria* included in these necrologies was performed annually at liturgical services celebrated in the Order’s houses from the late fourteenth until the late fifteenth centuries, and in the case of the Alden Biesen even beyond. Historical texts, like the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, also constitute part of the memorial culture of the Teutonic Order and can be considered alongside the necrologies.
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35 On crusading in Livonia, see, Christiansen, *Northern Crusades*, pp. 89-100; on arrival of the Teutonic Order in Livonia, see Benninghoven, *Orden der Schwertbrüder*, pp. 354-369.


37 Oexle, ‘Gegenwart der Lebenden,’ p. 75.


41 Perlbach, ‘Deutsch-Ordens Necrologe,’ pp. 361-362

The brethren killed in Livonia were mentioned in many memorial narratives of the Teutonic Order, but not in every single necrology. For example, the necrologies of the bailiwick Hessen (Marburg) and the house of Ulm (bailiwick Franconia), which date from the fifteenth century, mainly commemorated local brethren, local benefactors, and Masters of the German branch.\(^{43}\) The focus on remembrance of local brethren and benefactors in the fifteenth century differs from the mid-fourteenth century necrologies, which had numerous references to brethren from other houses and branches. It seems that as time passed necrologies were less universal in reach.

The Order’s necrologies focused on the remembrance of officials, and particularly the Masters of the Livonian branch. The commemorative choices are very clear. The historical narratives and necrologies of the Teutonic Order commemorated only those thirteenth-century Livonian Masters who had died as martyrs. The Livonian Rhymed Chronicle, which describes the conquest of Livonia by the Order, omits the non-violent deaths of those Livonian Masters, who between 1237 and 1290 had left Livonia to assume the offices of the Grand Master or Prussian Master. The only exception was Hermann von Balk, first Master of the Livonian branch, who died a natural death in 1239 as the Livonian and Prussian Master; the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle praised his outstanding deeds and the peaceful death.\(^{44}\)

Although Livonia was a conflict zone, only 6 of the 20 Masters of the Livonian branch who held office between 1237 and 1290 were killed on the battlefield: Burkhard von Hornhausen (†1260),\(^{45}\) Otto von Lauterberg (†1270),\(^{46}\) Andreas Westfalen (†1270),\(^{47}\) Ernest von Ratzenburg (†1279),\(^{48}\) Gerhard von Katzenelnbogen (†1280),\(^{49}\) and Wilhelm (Willekin) von Nindorf (†1287).\(^{50}\) Three of them were commemorated not only regionally, but had their place in the memoria of the Order’s western European bailiwicks.

The necrology of Alden Biesen preserves the record of an anniversary (25 March) for ‘forty three brethren and many others’ killed in 1287 in a battle against the pagan


\(^{44}\) *Livländische Reimchronik*, vers. 2291-2298; *Ritterbrüder*, no. 46.

\(^{45}\) *Ritterbrüder*, no. 440.

\(^{46}\) Ibid., no. 537.

\(^{47}\) Andreas von Westfalen was a substitute of the Master. Ibid., no. 959.

\(^{48}\) Ibid., no. 695.

\(^{49}\) Gerhard von Katzenelnbogen was a substitute of the Master. Ibid., no. 483.

\(^{50}\) Ibid., no. 624.
Semigallians in Livonia, which took place just before the end of the crusading period. The necrology names Wilhelm von Staden alias Willekin von Nindorf (1282-1287) as the Master of the Livonian branch who had fallen in this battle. Willekin was also mentioned in the two chronicles of the Livonian branch. The Livonian Rhymed Chronicle even urged the brethren to pray for the souls of these fallen brothers by petitioning the Virgin Mary.

Master Ernst von Ratzeburg, killed in 1279, was commemorated in a similar manner. The necrology of Mergentheim contains his anniversary on 5 March, and with him 70 fallen brethren are also mentioned. The Livonian Rhymed Chronicle also reports Ernst’s death, its immediate communication to the Empire, and the impact on the whole Teutonic Order. According to the Chronicle the Grand Master and all the commanders were informed about von Ratzeburg’s death and summoned to Marburg for a meeting about the situation in Livonia. The fourteenth century Livonian chronicle of Hermann of Wartberge also mentioned Ernst’s death together with 71 other brethren near Ascheraden (Latv. Aizkraukle).

The brethren who died in Livonia after 1290 no longer appeared in these necrologies because of the loosening of ties between the Livonian branch and the Order’s western and southern imperial bailiwicks in the course of the fourteenth century. The bailiwicks of Alden Biesen, Franconia (Mergentheim) and Alsace-Burgundy (Bern and Hitzkirch) provided few brethren for the Livonian branch from the fourteenth century. Furthermore, in the thirteenth century brethren had habitually returned to the bailiwicks in the west, but from the fourteenth century on, brethren who entered Livonian and Prussian branches remained there. The gradual weakening of communication clearly diminished the exchange of memoria between Livonia and the Order in the Empire.

Memoria of the Teutonic Order focused on commemorating its high ranked officials.

52 Ritterbrüder, no. 624; Livländische Reimchronik, vers. 10675-10586; Hermanni de Wartherberge Chronicon Livoniae (2005), p. 60.
53 ‘Hic agitur anniversarium fratris Ernst magistri Livonie, qui occissus fuit cum LXX fratribus.’ StAL B 280 U 1, fol. 15; Ritterbrüder, no. 695.
54 Livländische Reimchronik, vers. 8511-8536.
In the case of the Livonian branch, only the names of the Masters killed during the thirteenth century crusades were transmitted to the Empire and recorded in the necrologies of the Order’s western European houses. Likewise they were mentioned in the Order’s Livonian chronicles. It is likely that those Masters who died non-violent death were commemorated regionally, but did not arouse the interest of the Order’s institutions outside Livonia. Memoria of the Masters who died as martyrs were recorded in the historical narratives of the Order and became part of the Order’s collective memory.

3.1.2: Memoria of the anonymous brethren

While the Livonian Masters and other officials were key figures in the necrologies and historical texts, most of the ordinary brethren killed while crusading in the Livonian forests and marshes remained anonymous. The necrology of Alden Biesen contains numerous records in which anonymous Livonian brethren are commemorated. It mentions 7 anonymous brethren killed on 25 July in the castle of Warthe (Latv. Vārtāja), Courland, in 1260. On 1 August, the same necrology commemorated 33 anonymous brethren killed in Livonia, without specifying the time and circumstances in which they fell. Similarly, the 7 unnamed brethren killed in Livonia (3 February) and the 17 unnamed brethren killed near Memel (Lith. Klaipeda) (7 January), were mentioned in the necrology of Alden Biesen. The absence of the names of the brethren killed, or even those of their fallen leaders, can be observed in other necrologies. The Mergentheim necrology mentions only the number of the brethren killed in the battle of Durbe in 1260, although other necrologies name their killed leaders: Master Burkhard and junkher Karl (Ulfsson). As the last example shows, the absence of names from a specific necrology does not mean that these names were not present in the memorial or historical traditions of the Order.

In medieval necrologies in general, and in those of the Teutonic Order in particular,

60 ‘3. Non. Febr. (3. Febr.) occisi sunt VIII fratres in Lyvonia.’ This battle is mentioned in the chronicle of Warberge and it had taken place at Lenewarden, where the Knight Brethren fought with the Lithuanians in 1261. Perlbach, ‘Deutsch-Ordens Necrologe.’, p. 363; Hermanni de Warberge Chronicon Livoniae (2005), p. 42; ‘7. Id. Jan. (7. Jan.) Occisi sunt in Memela XVII fratres.’ Perlbach, ‘Deutsch-Ordens Necrologe.’, p. 363; most probably this is reference to the battle near Memel that took place between the forces of Master Burkhard von Hornhausen (1257-1260) and the Samogitians. Livländische Reimchronik, vers. 4489-4515.
anonymity was the exception, because it contradicted the aim of memoria – to attain presence of the dead by evocation of their names. The name was the main medium of memoria and its inclusion in the necrology was itself of spiritual benefit. Thus, in the surviving necrologies of the Order, commemorated brethren were always named, with the exception of the previously mentioned Livonian records and the ones which memorialized the battle of Tannenberg (1410) and its hundreds of dead. Even in the case of Tannenberg, the names of the fallen leaders appeared in these commemorative records. The anonymous remembrance of the brethren fallen in Livonia and Prussia may be explained by the difficulties of communication of tens and hundreds of names.

The Order was aware that not all names of the brethren killed were recorded and remembered. The mid-fifteenth century Livonian prayer in the Order’s statutes instructed the brethren: ‘pray for all the brethren, who have been killed (geslagen) or died (vorstorven) in this Order since the time the Order has been founded; God knows all their names well’. This prayer indicates that the brethren should be commemorated despite the absence of a specific name. It implies that the memoria of long dead unnamed brethren was as important as the remembrance of those brethren whose names were known. With the help of such remembrance anonymous brethren were included in the community of the Order’s living and dead. Despite the oblivion of their names they were continuously commemorated.

Although the majority of simple brethren killed in Livonia remained unnamed, there were some who earned a place in the Order’s memoria. Ludwig von Dietenhofen, killed in Livonia in 1253, was commemorated on 25 July in the necrology of Alden Biesen, and the same necrology commemorated on 10 July two brethren, Wolfram and Friedrich, killed in Livonia some time during the thirteenth or fourteenth century. These three men cannot be traced in any other memorial or historiographical texts of the Teutonic Order, and the reason why their names were recorded remains unknown.

---

61 ‘Obierunt C et XXX fratres, qui in Livonia interfeci sunt.’ StAL B 280 U 1, fol. 48.
64 Perlbach, ‘Deutsch-Ordens Necrologe,’ p. 365, StAL B 280 U 1, fol. 48.
66 Statuten des Deutschen Ordens, no. 10, p. 132.
In other circumstances this anonymity would have meant oblivion, but in the case of the Teutonic Order the killed brethren were namelessly remembered. It appears that the Order was capable of remembering and recording only a limited number of names of their killed brethren and it most likely accepted anonymity as part of its collective *memoria*. Presumably the names of the brethren were forgotten in cases when a large number of them was killed on the battlefield, but if they died a solitary martyr death, it was more likely that they would be remembered by their names. Yet, as the case of the battle of Durbe shows, anonymity could create different versions of how many brethren were killed during a battle.

3.1.3: Durbe (1260) as a site of memory

In the necrologies analysed here, the naming of Livonia or one of its battlefields were the only keywords that gave some kind of context and acted as an agent of memory. Used in this way the name of Livonia was a ‘memory figure’ (*Erinnerungsfigur*) that symbolized the experiences of the Order in that region.69 Within the *memoria* of the Order Livonia was a land where tens and hundreds of the brethren had suffered martyrdom in the struggle against pagans. Together with the memorialisation of slain Masters and some of the individual fallen brethren, the intensive remembrance of Livonians within the necrology of Alden Biesen constructed Livonia as a site of memory (*lieu de mémoire*).70

One event is particularly prominent in the necrologies and it can be described as the Teutonic Order’s *lieu de mémoire*. The site of memory shared by numerous institutions of the Order is the battle of Durbe (Ger. Durben), in Courland, that took place on 13 July 1260. In this battle the Livonian branch, together with Swedish and Danish allied forces, took part in a raid, and suffered defeat against pagan Lithuanians, Samogitians, and Curonians.71 This defeat was one of the darkest chapters in the Teutonic Order’s history, comparable with the defeats at Lake Peipus in 1242 and at

70 Nora, ‘Between Memory and History,’ pp. 7-24; on the sites of memory see, Moeglin, ‘Hat das Mittelalter europäische lieux de mémoire erzeugt?’, pp. 17-38; Schneidmüller, ‘Europäische Erinnerungsorte,’ pp. 39-58.
Tannenberg/Grunwald in 1410. The Livonian branch lost between one hundred thirty and two hundred men at Durbe. For a group only some two hundred strong, this was a devastating result with political repercussions for the Order’s policies. This was the only event in the history of the Livonian branch that had so great an influence on the memorial culture of the Teutonic Order outside Livonia and, after the battle of Tannenberg, was the Order’s lieu de mémoire that served for the remembrance of its defeats.

The commemoration of defeats was no less attractive than that of victories. As Aleida Assmann has pointed out, in modern times memories of military defeats did not destroy group self-image (Selbstbild), but could even strengthen it. Reinhard Koselleck argues that in contrast to victors, those defeated can profit in the long-term from the reflection on their defeat, since the trauma of defeat stimulates fruitful self-examination. This is true not only for modern nations, but also for medieval societies and groups, which equally commemorated defeats in the long term. For the Teutonic Order, defeat on the battlefield was not only a historical event, but a religious experience to be remembered. Memories of the catastrophes experienced at Durbe and Tannenberg were thus part of the Teutonic Order’s cultural memory.

In contrast to commemoration of the late medieval battles, the remembrance of Durbe focused not on the event itself, but on the liturgical remembrance of the fallen brethren. Liturgical remembrance of the fallen was normally only one element of the
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73 Livländische Reimchronik, vers. 5657; Perlbach, ‘Deutsch-Ordens Necrologe,’ p. 365, StAL B 280 U 1, fol. 48; Hermanni de Wartherbe Chronicon Livoniae (2005), p. 33.
74 The political consequences of the battle were: the Lithuanian apostasy, and the Curonian, and the Prussian insurrections. Militzer, ‘Recruitment of Brethren,’ p. 272; Reinhard Wittram, Baltische Geschichte, Darmstadt, 1973, p. 24; Christiansen, Northern Crusades, p. 99.
76 Assmann, Lange Schatten der Vergangenheit, p. 65.
78 For example, in Silesia the defeat at the battle of Liegnitz 1241 was commemorated by the local monastic communities throughout the Middle Ages. Michał Kaczmarek, ‘Die schlesischen Klöster und ihr Beitrag zur Memorialkultur,’ in Schlesische Erinnerungsorte. Gedächtnis und Identität einer mitteleuropäischen Region, Görlitz, 2006, pp. 29-58, at pp. 55-56.
79 On the defeats and the commemorative practices of the Teutonic Order, see Kwiatkowski, ‘Verlorene Schlachten und Gefallene,’ p. 146.
communal programme of commemoration of the late medieval battles. After the battle of Tannenberg both sides founded commemorative chapels, churches or monasteries close to the battlefield.\textsuperscript{81} Durbe, however, remained a commemorative space rooted only in the memorial and historiographical tradition of the Teutonic Order.

The battle at Durbe qualifies as a \textit{lieu de mémoire} because of its wide representation in the Teutonic Order’s memorial texts and historiography. The battle and the brethren who fell during it are commemorated in the two oldest surviving necrologies of Alden Biesen\textsuperscript{82} and Mergentheim,\textsuperscript{83} as well as in the necrologies of Bern\textsuperscript{84} and Hitzkirch.\textsuperscript{85} It was also described in the Order’s chronicles, the Livonian Rhyed Chronicle and the chronicle of Wartberge,\textsuperscript{86} as well as in the Cistercian annals of Dünamünde (Latv. Daugavpils).\textsuperscript{87} The necrology of Alden Biesen names the fallen leaders of the crusading forces and explained the reasons why they had sacrificed their lives. It stated that on 13 July Master Burkhard von Hornhausen, with 136 brethren, and a Swedish Junker (\textit{junckher}) Karl (Ulfsson) with ‘his whole household’ had fallen during ‘a Christian conflict in the name of Jesus Christ’.\textsuperscript{88} Burkhard’s name is not represented in the other memorial records that commemorated the battle, such as the necrology of Mergentheim which commemorated 130 fallen brethren, but omitted the slaughtered leaders.\textsuperscript{89} Similarly the names of the Master and his companions were omitted from the two other necrologies of the Teutonic Order referring to the battle in Livonia and in the late fourteenth-century chronicle of Wartberge and Annals of Dünamünde as well.\textsuperscript{90}

Although omitted in numerous necrologies and historical narratives, Master
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Burkhard played an important role in this site of memory. Burkhard’s death and memoria are reflected in the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle.\textsuperscript{91} Master Burkhard and other brethren killed at Durbe were celebrated as heroes (helt) and their death was depicted as martyrdom (martir).\textsuperscript{92} Burkhard himself was described as an honourable (degen) and chaste (erkorn) man, who had been Master for three and half years.\textsuperscript{93} Although Burkhard’s participation in the battle was mentioned only in few lines, in Hartmut Kugler’s opinion, in describing the battle and its aftermath the chronicler was not so much interested in the political circumstances of the event as focused on the person of Master Burkhard himself.\textsuperscript{94} The mention of Master Burkhard in the battle concluded the long description of his good and courageous deeds: thus it was a part of a literary programme that created Burkhard’s fame (fama).\textsuperscript{95} Kugler suggests that the chronicle’s brief reference to Burkhard’s death at Durbe was one of the building stones for the Master’s memoria.\textsuperscript{96}

The Livonian Rhymed Chronicle not only created and sustained the memoria of this Master, but also referred to the battle itself. Kugler states that in the text Burkhard’s name was paired with the place of the battle, namely, Durbe. This pairing was used for mnemonic purposes as a combination of personal names and place names, similar to a pairing of loci and imagines in the classical art of memory (ars memorativa).\textsuperscript{97} The combination helped sustain the memories of the battle at Durbe and the deceased Master Burkhard. According to this argument, the chronicle constructed both the memoria of Master Burkhard and the defeat at Durbe as the memory of the Teutonic Order.

The commemoration of the battle at Durbe existed not only within the communicative memory of the Teutonic Order, but also as part of its cultural memory. The oldest memorial and historical texts commemorating the battle are from the mid-fourteenth or the fifteenth centuries, 40-90 years after the event.\textsuperscript{98} During that time the communicative memory, supported by oral history and eyewitness accounts, had to be
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\bibitem{93} Ibid., vers. 5680, 5685.
\bibitem{95} Livländische Reimchronik, vers. 4405-5595.
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transformed into the cultural memory, fixed and recorded.\textsuperscript{99} In the case of the battle at Durbe, it is evident that the surviving fourteenth century necrologies and chronicles mentioning the battle based their narratives on earlier written sources, noted down by contemporaries.\textsuperscript{100}

In this long chain of transmission through numerous media the 	extit{memoria} of the defeat in some cases apparently lost its context and was altered, but it did not completely lose its original meaning. Two necrologies from the bailiwick Alsace-Burgundy contain references to the battle of 1260. The fourteenth century necrology of Bern on 14 July commemorated 150 brethren killed in Prussia, incorrectly dating the battle of 13 July in Livonia.\textsuperscript{101} Similar inaccuracy can be found in the necrology of Hitzkirch in which the fifteenth century scribe, while copying the record, had apparently misspelt Livonia as 	extit{Linphonia}.\textsuperscript{102} These two mistaken records show that the 	extit{memoria} of the battle was spread through memorial texts in the Empire, though writers often lacked sufficient knowledge of it. To those using the necrologies of Bern and Hitzkirch for liturgical commemoration, it would have seemed that the martyrs were killed in a distant, even mythical, territory.

In summary, the numerous references in necrologies and historical narratives used outside Livonia show that the defeat of the Livonian branch at Durbe on 13 July 1260 became rooted in the memorial culture of the whole Order. This defeat was a site of memory that helped form the identity of the Teutonic Order, like the battle at Tannenberg. It was commemorated as the martyrdom of the Order’s brethren and helped maintain memories about both named and anonymous dead, thus forming the identity of the Order as a group that was fighting for the Christian faith. In the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries this event was still commemorated in the western European bailiwicks of the Order, although it had lost its spatial context. The battle at Durbe was deeply rooted in the cultural memory of the whole Teutonic Order.

\textsuperscript{99} Assmann, \textit{Das kulturelle Gedächtnis}, pp. 50-51.
\textsuperscript{100} On the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle and the usage of written sources and oral tradition, see, Angermann, ‘Mittelalterliche Chronistik,’ pp. 10-11; Kugler, ‘Livländische Reimchronik,’ p. 22.
\textsuperscript{101} ‘2. Id. Jul. (14 Juli) obierunt centum XL fratres, qui occisi sunt in Brussia.’ Perlbach, ‘Necrologe,’ 362.
3.1.4: Historical writing and memoria: the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle and the chronicle of Hermann von Wartberge

Commemoration of dead brethren involved communication between the Teutonic Order’s houses, bailiwicks and branches, and the recording of names in necrologies. As the Order’s necrologies show, memoria from Livonia was transferred to the Order’s institutions throughout the Empire. This took place not only through social contacts, but also by the exchange of written memorial materials. While we know very little about how this took place in the Order, we may compare it to the operations in early medieval monastic communities.

Since the early Middle Ages monastic houses exchanged the names of their dead with other monastic communities for reciprocal commemoration. Communication took place by exchanging letters, and though mutual recording of the names of the dead in the necrologies. The Teutonic Order likewise internally communicated names of the dead brethren and officials, which meant communication over vast distances and between the Order’s units. There is no general study to date of the Teutonic Order’s necrologies, so it is difficult to estimate the intensity of such interactions, yet they happened in the thirteenth century, and diminished in the fourteenth century, when all types of contacts gradually decreased in intensity.

Historical writing played an important part in the transmission of memorial information over large distances and its distribution among numerous communities. Histories and necrologies were genres in interaction. As Franz Neiske argues, historical and hagiographical writings served as sources for necrologies. Such exchange of names between the historiographical texts and the necrologies may have also taken place in the Teutonic Order. One source for the Order’s necrologies of non-Livonian houses was the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle, composed in Livonia by a member of the Teutonic Order soon after the end of crusading. Moreover, with the help of history and memoria, the chronicle transmitted to western Europe information about the Order’s past in the eastern Baltic which was so central to the Order’s identity.

The Livonian Rhymed Chronicle depicts events that took place in Livonia between 1180 and 1290, and was the Teutonic Order’s oldest chronicle, written in Middle High

\[\text{Ibid., pp. 97-98, 102.}\]
German (MHG) around 1300. Some scholars argue that since the chronicle was written in MHG, it was intended for use in the Order’s houses outside Livonia, because in the Livonian branch Middle Low German dominated. Hartmut Kugler suggests that the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle instructed seasonal guest crusaders (pilgerine) and brethren, who had come to Livonia from the regions in the Empire where MHG was spoken. Alan Murray adds that the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle ‘could have been used to mobilize support in Germany for the permanent crusade’. It must, however, be remembered that the Chronicle was used long after crusading had come to an end in Livonia, and was read not only within the western European bailiwicks, but in Prussia too.

The Livonian Rhymed Chronicle was thus intended for readers and listeners outside Livonia, that is for the brethren in regions where MHG was spoken. These are the very regions from which surviving necrologies commemorating Livonians originate. The Order’s communities in Alden Biesen, Mergentheim, Hitzkirch and Bern must have been exposed to its historical and memorial tradition. It propagated memoria of the same dead Masters remembered in the necrologies. Masters Burkhard von Hornhausen, Ernest von Ratzeburg and Wilhelm von Nindorf, whose names appeared in the necrologies of Mergentheim and Alden Biesen, were elaborately described and celebrated as fallen heroes in the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle.

The Livonian Rhymed Chronicle transmitted memoria across large distances, but it was also strongly influenced by memorial texts. In addition to charters, other historical narratives, as well as oral sources, the author used necrologies and other memorial
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manuscripts, a practice which was followed by other chroniclers of the Order. Furthermore, these chronicles were not only based on memorial sources, but became memorial narratives in themselves.

As a form of historical memory, historical writing was part of the collective or cultural memory that dealt not only with the historical facts, but was also intended to remember the past. Medieval historical writing had various forms and it was used for many purposes. According to Franz-Josef Schmale, all forms of history writing had one primary function: to sustain the relationship between living and future individuals with the dead through remembering of the past. Schmale’s definition does not imply that the whole of medieval historiography was effectively a memoria, but rather that close bonds between memoria and historical memory existed. Like memoria, medieval historical texts commemorated founders of monasteries and created dynastic lines of bishops and abbots, thus sustaining the identities of groups.

The Livonian Rhymed Chronicle delineated the succession of the Masters of the Livonian branch by describing the tenure of each Master and celebrating those brethren whose deeds and deaths were particularly important to the history of the branch. The Chronicle had also other mnemonic aims. It was a narrative without a clear literary aim: it monotonously described battle after battle, the construction of numerous fortifications, and also shaped the readers’ knowledge of the mental geography of Livonia. Hartmut Kugler states that the author used this mental mapping in an attempt to create Livonia, namely Nieflant, as a memorial landscape (Gedächtnislandschaft) in the historical self-consciousness of the Order’s brethren. The chronicle applied a variety of mnemonic techniques to create and sustain memory of the Order’s struggle against pagans. By reflecting the Order’s beginnings in Livonia the chronicle contributed to the group’s founding myth which was central to its identity.

Because the evocation of names is an essential element of medieval memoria the
Livonian Rhymed Chronicle would not have fulfilled any memorial functions if it was not performed. In fact, medieval chronicles were written to be performed, to be read and heard. It is not known exactly how and on which occasions the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle was used. Some scholars have suggested that the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle was read as a *Tischbuch* during meals in the Order’s houses. The Order’s statutes instructed reading of the word of God (*Godes worte*) during mealtimes, and usually adapted biblical texts and saints’ lives were read. It has been assumed that the Chronicle was in circulation for these purposes in the Livonian houses of the Teutonic Order. Hartmut Kugler has pointed out that, as a text read during the mealtimes, the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle had a function of ‘social memoria’. In his opinion such reading was not done for didactic purposes – to inform the brethren about the group’s history – but primarily ‘to attain presence among the living of those not present or dead’, namely the presence of the deceased brethren. Kugler’s suggestions allow us to understand this chronicle as a socially formative text that formed part of the Order’s life in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

The suggestion that the chronicle was used as a *Tischbuch*, has been contested recently, in a challenge to the idea that it would have qualified as a religious text. Yet evidence from late fourteenth-century Prussia shows that a close connection existed between the Order’s chronicles and liturgical and theological texts. Records of the *Marienburger Ämterbuch* show that a copy of the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle was kept in the sacristy of St Mary’s church in the Grand Master’s residence Marienburg alongside with approximately fifty other liturgical and theological texts: bibles, patristic works and liturgical manuscripts. In the records from 1394 and 1398 the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle, referred to as the *Cronike von Lyeflande*, was recorded as one of
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twelve German books.\textsuperscript{128} Besides the Livonian chronicle, the book collection kept in the sacristy of the Marienburg castle’s main church also contained a copy of the Prussian chronicle written by Nikolaus of Jeroschin.\textsuperscript{129} These two, along with the Legend of Barlaam and the Song of Roland, were the only books which had no obvious liturgical or theological character.\textsuperscript{130} Another Prussian copy of the \textit{Lieflandische cronica} can be found in the inventory of the castle church in Thorn in 1418 and 1446 where it was similarly part of a collection of liturgical and theological books.\textsuperscript{131}

Although the chronicles were not liturgical or religious texts in \textit{sensu stricto}, this does not mean that they had no influence on the Order’s liturgical practices and liturgical \textit{memoria}. The Livonian Rhymed Chronicle was as much an historical text as it was a memorial one; it provided the Order’s brethren with information about their predecessors who had died in the struggle against pagans in Livonia. The presence of two chronicles of the Order that described events linked to the Order’s early history on the eastern shore of the Baltic in the sacristy of the Grand Master’s residence, suggests they may have been used for liturgical purposes or as sources for sermons. As a residence of the Grand Master, Marienburg was the centre of the Teutonic Order and equally that of the Order’s \textit{memoria}, where its history was remembered. The crypt of St Mary’s church, the chapel of St Anne, was after all where the burial place of the Grand Masters.\textsuperscript{132}

The other historical narrative of the Teutonic Order originating from Livonia, the chronicle of Hermann von Wartberge, also reflects the close links between historical and memorial texts. This chronicle is of a later origin than the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle, yet it also strongly reflects memorial tradition of the Teutonic Order. The chaplain of the Livonian Master Hermann von Wartberge composed this chronicle in Latin during the late 1370s.\textsuperscript{133} Wartberge wrote his chronicle in order to defend the

\textsuperscript{128} Päslcr, \textit{Deutschsprachige Sachliteratur}, p. 353.
\textsuperscript{129} Mentzel–Reuters, \textit{Arma Spiritualia}, p. 249.
\textsuperscript{130} Marienburger Ämterbuch, pp. 124, 125.
\textsuperscript{131} \textit{Das grosse Ämterbuch des Deutschen Ordens}, ed. Walther Ziesemer, Danzig, 1921, pp. 436, 458; it has been noted that at least theoretically these entries of \textit{Lieflandische cronica} refer to \textit{Jüngere Livländische Reimchronik}, however, it seems unlikely, see Päslcr, \textit{Deutschsprachige Sachliteratur}, p. 272.
Order’s positions in Livonia in its struggle with the archbishop over the political supremacy.\textsuperscript{134}

Like the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle the chronicle of Wartberge also mentions all the major historical events experienced by the Livonian branch of the Order during the thirteenth century when it took part in the Christianization of Livonia. The Wartberge’s chronicle reports on the battle at Durbe in 1260 where 200 brethren were killed, as it does the death of brethren at Warthe (Latv. Vārtāja) castle in the same year.\textsuperscript{135} The chronicle informs its readers of the death of the Master Otto von Lauterberg and his fellow brethren in battle with Lithuanians in 1270.\textsuperscript{136} The death of Willekin von Nindorf and 34 other brothers in 1287 at Grose, which is described in detail in the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle, likewise appears in the Wartberge’s chronicle.\textsuperscript{137} Yet, because the Wartberge’s chronicle was written during the late-fourteenth century, it describes the martyr deaths of those brethren and Masters, who died after the crusading age, after 1290. The death of Master Bruno and other 60 brethren in the battle with the Lithuanians in 1298 is included in the Wartberge’s chronicle.\textsuperscript{138}

There is one major difference between the two Livonian chronicles of the Teutonic Order. In contrast to the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle the chronicle of Wartberge provides dates for death the brethren, thus enabling its users to commemorate appropriately the brethren who had fallen for the sake of the Teutonic Order and the Christian faith.\textsuperscript{139} The presence of dates in the text also explicitly shows that the chronicle’s author gathered information about the killed Masters and brethren directly from the Order’s necrologies. Yet, in the case of this chronicle it is not clear whether it was used mainly in Livonia, or outside Livonia too.\textsuperscript{140}

\textsuperscript{134} Selart ‘Livländische Chronik,’ p. 67.
\textsuperscript{135} ‘Ocissus autem fuit in Durben cum II C fratribus in die beate Margarete anno 1260 ab insequentibus Letwinis. […] Item marscalus ordinis cum multis peregrinis fuit in eodem conflict occissus, octo fratribus in castro Wartayen proditeri martirisatis.’ Hermanni de Wartberge Chronicon Livoniae (2005), p. 54.
\textsuperscript{136} ‘Fuit autem Otto magister occisus a Letwinis in Maritima circa Karuszen in glacie in die Juliane virginis cum LII fratribus ac Vlc fidelibus.’ Hermanni de Wartberge Chronicon Livoniae (2005), p. 58; Ritterbrüder, no. 537; the death of the Master Otto is not mentioned in the surviving necrologies of the Teutonic Order.
\textsuperscript{137} Ritterbrüder, no. 624; Livländische Reimechronik, vers. 10675-10586; ‘Idem facta expedition adversus Semigallos insecutus usque ad locum Grose cum XXXIIIII fratribus alisque anno 1287 in crusino announcementis virginis occubuit.’ Hermanni de Wartberge Chronicon Livoniae (2005), p. 60.
\textsuperscript{139} Hermanni de Wartberge Chronicon Livoniae (2005), p. 54, 58, 60, 62, 64.
\textsuperscript{140} The chronicle’s only surviving copy was found not in former Livonia, but in nineteenth-century Danzig. See Selart, ‘Livländische Chronik,’ pp. 62-63.
All this shows that in the Teutonic Order historical writing was closely aligned with *memoria* and it was used to support the remembrance. The Livonian Rhymed Chronicle served as a medium of *memoria* which not only transmitted information about the Order’s history, but also invoked the fallen through its performance. Both chronicles: the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle and the chronicle of Wartberge, follow the commemorative tradition of the Order’s Livonian branch, one which influenced the commemorative practices of the imperial bailiwicks. These chronicles were one of the key elements that sustained collective memory of the Teutonic Order and it was essential for the Order’s *memoria*. 
3.2: *Memoria* of individuals and *memoria* of the Order. Commemoration of the Master and individual brethren in the Livonian branch.

During the crusading years the members of the military orders were constantly exposed to the risks of violent death. As shown in the first part of this chapter, fallen brethren were commemorated as martyrs. In the late Middle Ages the military orders, and the Teutonic Order in particular, were less frequently involved in military confrontation. Most brethren died a natural death and were not venerated in necrologies of numerous Orders’ houses around Europe. Individual brethren were commemorated by the house to which they belonged, but the range and intensity of the remembrance depended on their status, i.e. the Order’s highest officials were granted more elaborate *memoria* than ordinary brethren.

Military orders provided not only proper Christian burial and remembrance of their brethren for the salvation of their souls, but *memoria* of individual members was essential to the group history. *Memoria* constituted each Order as a group and remembrance of individuals was an important part of this process. Medieval *memoria* was closely bound to an individual and *memoria* of a group constantly referred to an individual. As already pointed out, *memoria* of individuals contributed to the memory of a group, shaping its self-consciousness and identity.

Although *memoria* of individuals was important for collective memory in the Teutonic Order and its Livonian branch, little is known about such *memoria* of ordinary brethren. Within the Teutonic Order the death of a brother was first communicated to the branch’s or the bailiwick’s main house – the residence of the Master or commander – and then to other houses. In the Prussian branch the news of a brother’s death was circulated in a letter known as a *Todenbrief*. *Todenbrief* had to be sent to the Grand Master’s or Master’s residence similar to the manner in which the death of the Livonian lay confraternity members had to be announced by sending a letter to the Master’s

141 The Livonian branch after the end of crusading fought the pagan Lithuanians, then the Russian schismatics. See Norbert Angermann, ‘Livländisch-rußische Beziehungen im Mittelalter,’ in Wolter von Plettenberg und das mittelalterliche Livland, pp. 129-144.
142 Oexle, ‘Gegenwart der Toten,’ p. 34.
143 Oexle, ‘Memoria als Kultur,’ pp. 49-50.
144 Oexle, ‘Liturgische Memoria,’ p. 333.
‘main chapel’.\textsuperscript{146} The letter’s circulation marked the beginning of commemoration with a mass and prayers in other houses.\textsuperscript{147}

The Teutonic Order granted burial and remembrance to its members, but the statutes and their legislative supplements hardly regulated how individual \textit{memoria} of ordinary brethren was to be organized and performed.\textsuperscript{148} The statutes briefly described the Masters’ \textit{memoria}, but that of brethren is mentioned in the discussion of vigils.\textsuperscript{149} Vigils had to be celebrated for the remembrance of ‘the lay confraternity members and the benefactors of the house in an anniversary, and when a brother dies’.\textsuperscript{150}

Despite the absence of detailed regulation of brethren’s \textit{memoria}, it was performed in every Order’s house. The mid-fifteenth century prayer included in a copy of the statute manuscript from an unnamed house of the Livonian branch shows the community’s preoccupation with remembrance of its deceased members.\textsuperscript{151} The prayer instructed living brethren to pray for all the dead brethren of the Order, and mentions in particular ‘the brethren from this house who have died this year’.\textsuperscript{152} The prayer text left an empty space for the naming of the deceased brethren, marked by two capital letters ‘N.N.’.\textsuperscript{153} As the practice of the Order’s communities in the Empire and Prussia shows, every Order’s house recorded names of the deceased brethren and the necrologies served as sources of information for the commemorative prayers.\textsuperscript{154} We may assume that every house of the Livonian branch also had its own necrology in which names of deceased brethren were recorded.\textsuperscript{155}

If the Teutonic Order guaranteed only very basic commemoration – a funeral, one vigil and an evocation during liturgical services – other military orders provided more elaborate remembrance even for their ordinary brethren. The Hospitallers, for example, celebrated 30 masses after burial of a brother and an annual anniversary office, while
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also recording the name of each deceased brother in his house’s necrology. While the Teutonic Order did not provide much beyond basic commemorational services, ordinary brethren could have supported their memoria individually.

Most of the brethren could not invest large sums of money or real properties in their future remembrance since they were bound by vows of poverty. Yet during their lifetime they were allowed to keep some possessions. Some brethren belonging to old, rich, and influential noble families managed to retain considerable resources, and thus were able to make memorial endowments or donations during their lifetime. However, after death all these possessions became the Order’s property. Most of the brethren in the Teutonic Order died without making written testaments, and the making of memorial endowments depended on a permission of the Master; without it the Order could reclaim the resources invested and abolish the memoria they supported. In contrast to other military orders, almost no wills or foundational charters of individual brethren have survived from the brethren of the Teutonic Order.

The remembrance of the Teutonic Order’s deceased differed from memoria of the brethren in other military orders. Ordinary brethren of the Teutonic Order never had inscribed tombstones placed on their tombs. They were not buried within the Order’s burial chapels and churches, but in cemeteries. The precise motivation for this remains unknown, but presumably this was an aspect of their monastic poverty, that also included a very simple burial. Additionally, the erection of elaborate tombs would have been also financially unsustainable for the Order. Only one surviving tombstone for an ordinary brother in the Danzig (Prussia) castle cemetery is engraved with a large cross, but this sole survival does not allow us to conclude that such stones were placed on the graves of all the ordinary brethren. Remembrance without inscribed tombstones was difficult to sustain in the long-term, because memoria needed space where the main commemorative services could take place.
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brethren had the potential to remain present only in the liturgical texts of the house to which they belonged and their remembrance was not performed in the place where they were buried.

To sum up, ordinary brethren had few opportunities to create memorial foundations or otherwise to stipulate their individual memoria. Their memoria depended on the willingness of their fellow brethren and their successors to commemorate them. In such circumstances the memoria of the brethren could fade rapidly, unlike that of thirteenth-century brethren who fell during the struggle against pagans. The memoria of ordinary brethren in the later Middle Ages remained within the house to which they belonged during their lifetime and rarely travelled much beyond.

3.2.1: Memoria for a Master: A leader’s remembrance

The variety of memorial acts performed to commemorate medieval political leaders were not only a religious practice intended to obtain eternal life for their souls. Memoria was also an essential political tool. By remembering the dead, memoria legitimated rule in the present.166 The legitimising nature of memoria was particularly important at the point when leaders changed, when there was a transfer of power between generations, as power and authority were founded on the memory and remembrance of previous generations.167 Conversely, with its sense of continuity memoria also looked to the future, linking rulers not just with their predecessors but also with their successors.168

Although leadership in the military orders was not hereditary, memoria had the same legitimising power as it did within dynastic polities. Memoria of the deceased leaders was also used for these purposes of self-representation and self-legitimation of the groups. The memoria of the Masters as the political leaders of the orders played a central role within the memorial cultures of these groups and attracted the greatest pomp.169 Their remembrance was carefully nurtured and the deceased Masters were buried in solemn ceremonies, their names recorded in the necrologies of the orders’

houses, and tombstones erected.\textsuperscript{170} Within the Teutonic Order every branch focused on remembrance of its own Masters.

Here, however, a contradiction between a Master’s real political role and his central role in the Order’s \textit{memoria} arose. Although the Masters of the Teutonic Order in Prussia and Livonia were also secular lords, as the leaders of the Order they were not fully independent in their policies.\textsuperscript{171} Within the Order they were considered as \textit{primus inter pares} and not as princely lords.\textsuperscript{172} In the Livonian branch all the late medieval Masters originated from the lower nobility, with limited political authority of their own.\textsuperscript{173} They depended on high-standing officials, called \textit{Gebietiger}, who occasionally had greater influence than the Masters themselves, and the Masters had to consult a group of advisors in their decision-making.\textsuperscript{174} The Livonian Masters depended not only on inner factions of brethren originating from Westphalia and the Rhineland, but on its external commitments too. Until 1410 the Livonian Masters were elected in Marienburg; from the fifteenth century on they became more independent and the Grand Master now only confirmed a candidate elected within the Livonian branch.\textsuperscript{175}

The Masters were leaders of the branch and the scope of their leadership reached far beyond their lifetime, because the office of the Master ensured continuity within the Order.\textsuperscript{176} Individuals holding this position were transmitting the legitimacy of the office; therefore their remembrance was a practice that guaranteed political and institutional continuity. The Masters were the only brethren of the Teutonic Order to whom long-term \textit{memoria} was granted by the statutes.\textsuperscript{177} Their bodies were laid to rest in prestigious burial places, which became important for the Order’s self-representation. The remembrance of deceased Masters embodied \textit{memoria} of all the dead brethren of the Order and, when the Masters were commemorated, all other anonymous brethren were usually also included.
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The death of a Master was a moment of a potential political instability. Therefore, the Order’s statutes gave detailed instructions on the transmission of the power. Remembrance played an important role in this process. Before the election of a new Master, the deceased Master had to be buried and commemorated. Apparently it was the custom to hold elections only after forty days of mourning, as was the case in Livonia after the death of the Master Heidenreich Vincke von Overberg in 1450. After death, a Master’s name had to be recorded in the necrologies (des meisters iartith zal men schriven) ‘to commemorate him there’ where he was buried. The Livonian version of the statutes instructed that on their anniversaries, Masters were to be commemorated with a vigil in all of the Order’s (branch’s) houses with a sung mass celebrated where they were buried. Unfortunately, there are no documentary or liturgical sources describing the exact performance of the funerals and commemorations of the Livonian Masters.

Yet there are some descriptions of how Grand Masters were buried and commemorated. The funeral followed quickly after a Grand Master’s death. Konrad von Erlichshausen (1441-1449) died in his chamber in the Grand Master’s apartments in the castle of Marienburg on Friday, 7 November 1449, and was buried three days later on Monday, 10 November, after Mass in the chapel of St Anne. During a Grand Master’s funeral many candles were burnt; at the funeral of Grand Master Konrad von Jungingen in 1407 in Marienburg, the castle’s officials paid for two stones (twelve kilograms) of wax. The statutes stipulated that after the death of a Master all his clothing had to be distributed to the poor, and one needy man was to be fed for a year. In Prussia Grand Masters were commemorated with almsgiving to local and distant poor; in Marienburg after the death of the Grand Master Konrad von Jungingen in 1407 the castle’s officials distributed 2 marks to the poor for the Master’s remembrance. A donation of ten
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marks was given to the ‘poor house’ in Danzig in his memory.\textsuperscript{186} The Order distributed numerous donations to Prussian monasteries and nunneries in remembrance of Konrad von Jungingen, and paid six marks to a priest, for masses celebrated over a year for the Grand Master’s soul.\textsuperscript{187}

Although the medieval sources on the memoria of the Livonian Masters are scarce, numerous mid- and late-sixteenth century historical narratives mirror the rich memorial tradition of the Livonian branch. For example, \textit{Kleine Meisterchronik}, a narrative describing lives and deeds of all Livonian Masters produced after the Reformation (1535-1544), was apparently influenced not only by earlier historical texts, but also by memorial portraits of the Masters’ lives.\textsuperscript{188} These early modern historical narratives were based on medieval memorial texts aimed at creating perpetual fame and remembrance of the Masters.

Despite the fact that the executive power of the Masters was restricted, in remembrance they were celebrated as sole leaders of the Order and its branches. The funeral, mourning and remembrance of the Masters were important elements in the transmission and legitimation of power. The scant source material does not allow us to establish the pattern of the Masters’ memoria, but the statutes make it clear that memoria granted by the Order was focused around their burial place within the Master’s residence, where regular liturgical anniversaries were celebrated.

3.2.2: Individual remembrance of the Master: Heidenreich Vincke von Overberg

The individual memoria granted to the Masters by the statutes was very basic and it included only remembrance performed within the structures of the Teutonic Order.\textsuperscript{189} In order to foster their remembrance by involving other individuals and communities into it, the Masters had to possess their own resources and to lay out their memorial requests in a written form.

Medieval rulers used wills to define ‘two different futures: (..) their own future (..) of their body’s burial and their soul’s welfare, and secondly, (..) the future of their family

\begin{footnotes}
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\item[189] Statuten des Deutschen Ordens, p. 90.
\end{footnotes}
and the family estate (..)’. These two futures – private and political future – were interdependent and influenced each other. Within the last wills of rulers, the private future – *memoria* – was created by help of the donations and endowments for *ad pias causas*: almsgiving, chantry foundations, and other kind of donations. Such testaments named a burial place and expressed wishes for future commemoration.

In the case of the Teutonic Order it is evident that *memoria* of the group always referred to *memoria* of individuals, and that *memoria* of an individual referred to the remembrance of a group. In *memoria* a Master represented not only himself, but all the previous and future Masters and the whole branch and the Order: all the living and the dead brethren. As the foundation of the Livonian Master’s physician Johann Kerssenbrugge (1445) shows, the *memoria* of one Master almost automatically involved remembrance of all the Livonian Masters. Kerssenbrugge wanted the Cistercian nuns in Riga to commemorate the living Master Heidenreich Vincke von Overberg and his family, two early fifteenth-century Masters, Konrad von Vietinghof (1401-1413) and Siegfried Lander von Spanheim (1415-1424), and all the other Livonian Masters as well.

Only one charter of a memorial foundation created by a Livonian Master survives. In 1447, on 20 June, Heidenreich Vincke von Overberg leased a mill near Riga (*bruder Bartholdes mölen*) and the lands surrounding it, to the Cistercian nunnery of St Mary Magdalene in Riga, requesting a remembrance in return. Vincke’s foundation was not intended to be an independent memorial chantry and the *memoria* of the living Master was started soon after the lease of the mill.

In contrast to other memorial foundations, Heidenreich Vincke’s effort was rooted in the present and its aims were to be accomplished during the founder’s lifetime. Although the foundation aimed to commemorate ‘all living and deceased brethren’, the main focus of this *memoria* was the remembrance of Heidenreich Vincke himself and
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the future Livonian Masters. In addition to the convent’s prayers, one virtuous and educated nun had to be chosen in order to read ‘a psalter’ to commemorate the Masters’ souls.

In the charter ‘we and our successors’ – present and future Livonian Masters – were named twice as the main individuals to be commemorated. So the memoria founded by Heidenreich von Vincke was ‘prospective’ and not ‘retrospective’ memoria. It was directed towards remembrance of the future Masters, alongside the current one, but was not meant to commemorate the Masters before Vincke von Overberg. The memoria of the present and future living was based in the liturgical concept of the two memento performed during the Mass, which implied that there not only the dead (defuncti) were commemorated, but also the living (viventes) were liturgically remembered. Consequently, the separate remembrance of viventes was predestined to turn into memoria of defuncti.

The aims of ‘prospective’ memoria were far-reaching. It enabled founders to communicate with their successors and future living, sending them a message. This message strengthened the legitimacy and positions of their successors. A medium of the message was the secular posthumous fame (fama), which emerged as a result of memoria. The prospective memoria of Heidenreich Vincke equally aimed to create the Master’s fame even during his lifetime.

Although the memoria of the Masters created by this foundation was clearly ‘prospective’, the ‘prospective’ and the ‘retrospective’ memoria co-existed in the remembrance of all the brethren. The Master requested that ‘four times a year’ the Cistercian nuns had to pray for ‘all the living brethren of our order,’ and at they were

198 LUB 10, no. 351.
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also committed to commemorating ‘all the deceased Order’s brethren’ ‘with sung vigils and soul Masses’ for ‘the eternal times’.205

Among the other aims of this foundation was spiritual support for the Order’s military activities in the present. In the foundation charter Heidenreich Vincke requested that the nuns should pray for the Masters and the Order during the Order’s wars and military campaigns against ‘nonbelievers’ (ungelovigen) by singing masses, ‘attentive prayer’, and other ‘noble deeds’.206 During the military campaigns one nun was to read a psalter and to pray for the Masters, ‘us and our successors’, and the Order.207 The prayers said during the military campaigns were part of memoria delivered for the living brethren of the Order and could have been transformed into the remembrance of the dead if the brethren were killed during the struggle against the ungelovigen.

Collective aims combined with individual ones in Vincke’s foundation. The Master used collective resources to foster his own memoria, by leasing the Order’s mill to the Cistercian nuns.208 Yet the Cistercian nuns were entrusted with sustaining memoria of the individual Livonian Masters – present and future – and care for the collective remembrance of the whole Livonian branch. This investment into the memoria of the future Masters had a clear political dimension.

Heidenreich Vincke von Overberg died on 29 June 1450 and four weeks later the city council of Reval organized his commemoration.209 On 12 August the Livonian officers (Gebietiger) informed the Grand Master that the deceased Master was mourned with a great grief and that they had completed the mourning forty days after the Vincke von Overberg’s death.210 It remains unknown how the Cistercian nuns commemorated Master Vincke after his death and how long the memoria of the Livonian Masters was maintained by the nuns.

Although not much is known about the remembrance of the Livonian Masters, the foundation made by Master Vincke von Overberg reveals how the Masters created individual memoria during their lifetime. Where Vincke’s physician Kerssenbrugge fostered memoria of the living Master and his dead predecessors, the foundational
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charter issued by Vincke shows him to be exceptionally preoccupied with his own remembrance and with that of the future Masters. Vincke’s foundation did not reflect on the group’s past, but focused on the prayers delivered in the future. Strict boundaries between the private and political or individual and collective memoria cannot be drawn, for the remembrance of a prominent individual meant the commemoration of the whole group and of the office of the Master itself.

3.2.3: Remembrance of the Livonian Masters. An urban perspective

The death of a medieval ruler influenced not only the ruling family or group, but also the ruler’s subjects. In the period between the death of a ruler and the investiture or election of a new one, the subjects mourned and commemorated the deceased ruler. Such commemoration occurred not only where the burial took place, but also in more distant regions; it made a ruler present in those places where remembrance was performed. Commemoration of a deceased ruler was important for the transfer of the power and also to reinforce ties of allegiance between lord and subjects.

Livonia was not a secular domain, but a collection of ecclesiastical estates and the territories of the Teutonic Order. The bishops and the Masters of the Livonian branch functioned as feudal lords as well as religious leaders. In total eleven Livonian cities were the subjects of the Order and the Masters. As lord, each Master developed relationships with these cities, issuing privileges and legal acts. This relationship was also confirmed by his personal presence. The Livonian material provides rich evidence of the Master’s visits to the cities subject to him, of his lordly entry (adventus), ceremony of homage, swearing of oaths, exchange of gifts, and communal meals.

This relationship governed by symbolic and material exchange between the lords and their subjects was not limited to the lifetimes of the Livonian Masters, but was


continued also after their death. The extent of remembrance of the Masters depended on
the specific political and historical circumstances in each city.

Relations between the two largest Livonian cities, Riga and Reval, and the Livonian
Masters were somewhat complicated. The relationship between Riga and the Order was
one of constant tension which from the early fourteenth century regularly erupted into
diplomatic or military conflicts. Reval’s relationship with the Teutonic Order
developed differently. The Order established its power over Reval only in 1346 and co-
operation rather than dissent characterised the relationship between the city and its
lord. These different historical and political contexts affected the role of the Livonian
Master as lords of the cities. Relations between the Masters and the two largest cities
were to a certain extent formed by the oath of fealty. The relationship created by the
oath of allegiance also influenced the memoria of the lord. In Riga, this oath was given
to the Livonian Master and the Teutonic Order after 1452. In Reval, however, the
question of an oath of allegiance generated much uncertainty.

Although Reval was part of the Order’s possessions in Livonia, when the Order
purchased northern Estonia from the Danish king in 1346 it became a dominion of the
Grand Master not of the Livonian Master; a relationship of dependency between the
Grand Master and Reval persisted until the Reformation. Even though Grand Master
Ludwig von Erlichshausen surrendered northern Estonia to the Livonian Master in
1452, this surrender was not final. It is still unclear whether during the late fifteenth
and early sixteenth century the Livonian Master received the oath as the Grand Master’s
representative or as the Livonian Master in his own right. The city paid homage to
both Masters and reconfirmed it every time the Grand or Livonian Master changed.
Until 1525, however, the Grand Master remained the city’s overlord.
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Reval was directly involved in a relationship with individual Masters.\textsuperscript{223} In Reval the oath was sworn not to the Order, but explicitly to the (Grand) Master (\textit{mineme heren deme meistere}).\textsuperscript{224} This personal bond between the Grand/Livonian Masters and the city (Reval), resembles the relationship between king and subjects, and also influenced communal \textit{memoria}.

Both the Grand Masters and the Livonian Masters were commemorated in fifteenth-century Reval with liturgical services after the burial. The remembrance of the Grand Masters is less frequently recorded in the rich Revalian medieval source material than that of the Livonian Masters. The town books record only one case of the commemoration of a Grand Master. On 11 January 1450 the city council of Reval paid 5 marks and 3 schillings for the funeral service of a \textit{homester}, the deceased Konrad von Erlichshausen (1441-1449), who had died on 7 November 1449.\textsuperscript{225}

In contrast to the \textit{memoria} of the Grand Masters, numerous Livonian Masters were remembered in Reval during the fifteenth century. As the council’s ledger shows, all of the Livonian Masters who died in office in the period between 1432 and the Reformation, received such \textit{memoria}. The first Livonian Master whose remembrance was recorded in the \textit{Kämmereibuch} is Heinrich von Böckenförde, known as Schüngel (1435-1437).\textsuperscript{226} The Master died at the end of 1437, between Karkus and Riga, and on 7 January 1438 the city council paid 18 Riga marks for his commemoration.\textsuperscript{227} The Revalians also commemorated Schüngel’s successor Heidenreich Vincke von Overberg (†1450); on 8 August 1450, the city council of Reval paid 17 marks for the Master’s commemoration.\textsuperscript{228} Although the exact programme of these funeral services is not known, it seems that the city council, by spending almost the same sum for remembrance, followed a certain routine in commemoration.

A few weeks after the death of Master Johann von Mengede Osthof on 15 August 1469, the city council of Reval celebrated a commemorative service with less expenditure than for Heidenreich Vincke and Schüngel, just 4 ½ Riga marks.\textsuperscript{229} The Master’s \textit{memoria} took numerous forms. The commemoration took place at three altars,
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in the Dominican church of St Catherine, in the church of Holy Spirit, and elsewhere.\(^{230}\) The wife of a burgomaster donated candles for these altars to support remembrance. In addition, the Master was commemorated liturgically with a vigil and a soul mass in the Holy Spirit church, where the council’s altar was situated.\(^{231}\) The city council also invited some ‘women to pray’ for the soul of the Master.\(^{232}\) Bells were rung ‘in all churches’ in his remembrance, a common feature provided for the remembrance of Masters in Reval.\(^{233}\) When the Livonian Master Johann Freitag von Loringhoven died in 1494, the churchwardens of St Nicholas received 5 marks as *ludegelt*, that is ringing money.\(^{234}\) Bell-ringing organized by city councils was also an important part of the commemoration of the deceased rulers in the Imperial cities of Germany.\(^{235}\)

The remembrance of Masters manifested the allegiance and loyalty of the cities towards their deceased lord. In this way, Reval appears to have developed a special relationship with the Masters and Grand Masters of the Teutonic Order, commemorating them soon after their deaths. The *memoria* of both the Grand and Livonian Masters in Reval were organized and expenses were covered by the city council, just as it organized the *adventus* of lord into the city. The commemoration of the Master symbolically concluded the relationship with the deceased Master and thus the city was ready to await entrance of a new Master and pay homage to him. From the surviving sources it seems that Reval commemorated the Grand Masters, who were officially its overlords, less frequently than the Livonian Masters and it shows that the city had a closer relationship with the latter.

### 3.2.4: The residence as a commemorative space

Although the residence of a medieval ruler was not a capital in the modern sense, it was a centre of power and as such was also a memorial centre of a ruler’s realm. The burial place of rulers or a ruling family was one of the essential elements of a city or a castle

\(^{230}\) Ibid.
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which served as the residence of a late medieval ruler. The presence of burial grounds in proximity to a residence provided an opportunity for living rulers to use the tombs of their predecessors for self-legitimation and self-representation. The tombs created a memorial space within which the deceased, present and also future rulers were continuously commemorated by regular liturgical services. In this way the dead rulers were part of the political legitimation of their successors.

Medieval rulers were not always present at their residences. As their itineraries show, the Grand Masters and the Livonian Masters of the Teutonic Order also travelled extensively throughout the Order’s dominions to execute their duties; they spent only short periods of time in their residences. The highest officials of the Teutonic Order, the Masters of the branches and the Grand Master himself, were still buried at their residences. They were granted a burial within the main church or chapel of the Order’s branch, part of the Master’s residence. There, according to the statutes, they were commemorated annually, on the anniversaries of their deaths.

As the residences of the Masters were occasionally relocated due to political or military reasons, their burial grounds also changed location. For example, in Prussia from 1341 most of the deceased Grand Masters were buried in the burial chapel of St Anne in the Marienburg castle, but when the Order lost its headquarters in 1457, the burial grounds of the Grand Masters were moved to the cathedral of Königsberg. The burial grounds of the Livonian Masters also changed several times. However, the actual location of the burial grounds of the Livonian Masters before the mid-fifteenth century remains unknown. From the time of the Order’s arrival in Livonia in 1237, the Master’s main residence was the castle of Riga. After the destruction of the castle in 1484 the Master’s residence was relocated to Wenden (Latv. Cēsis), a small town 70
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kilometres north of Riga.\textsuperscript{241} Before 1484 the residence had also temporarily moved from Riga, for example, in the 1470s when the Order’s castle in Fellin was briefly used as the Master’s residence.\textsuperscript{242}

The residence in Riga was under constant threat from the city of Riga and its political ambitions. These constant political tensions frequently developed into warfare. In 1297 the townspeople of Riga destroyed the Order’s castle, located within the town walls, and killed all the brethren who had defended it.\textsuperscript{243} The castle was rebuilt after victory over the city in 1330, this time outside the town walls, on the bank of Düna.\textsuperscript{244} The relocation of the castle meant that the Order had to also relocate its burial grounds as well.

The brethren were usually buried in cemeteries outside the Order’s castles, attached to nearby churches, because the chapels within castles were located on the first floor, and could not be used for burials.\textsuperscript{245} These chapels and cemeteries outside the castles were, however, vulnerable during military action.

The burial grounds of the Order’s highest officials were usually located within the castle compounds or near the castles, as in Marienburg the chapel of St Anne and the cathedral of Königsberg hosted tombs of the Grand Masters residing in Prussia.\textsuperscript{246} In Livonia before the late fifteenth century the Order evidently lacked an influential burial ground for the Masters comparable in status to the Prussian burial grounds, and the exact burial place of the Masters before 1469 is difficult to identify.\textsuperscript{247}

The chapel of St Andrew, located in the immediate vicinity of the Order’s castle in Riga, is the most likely burial place of the Livonian Masters before 1469.\textsuperscript{248} There is however, no clear evidence to confirm this. The chapel, which was surrounded by a cemetery and was already described as an old building in 1450, was definitely used for the burials of the brethren.\textsuperscript{249} In 1452 Master Johann von Mengede received a papal bull issued by Nicholas V (1397-1455) that allowed the demolition of the building and the
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transfer of ‘the earth and the remains of the dead’ to another chapel nearby.\textsuperscript{250} It has been suggested that the Order spared the chapel of St Andrew in 1452, and that it was destroyed or damaged by the Rigans in the 1480s when the castle itself was ruined.\textsuperscript{251} Despite this destruction, St Andrew’s chapel was still referred to as a burial place near the castle in the mid-sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{252} The destruction brought by the military conflicts in the late fifteenth century also destroyed the probable resting place of the Livonian Masters.

In this way the Order lost the memorial space where its Masters were buried and commemorated. As a result of this destruction no tombstones of the Masters have survived for the period prior to 1494. Another possible burial location of the Livonian Masters before 1469 was suggested by Leonid Arbusow senior, who argued that all the Livonian Masters were buried in Riga cathedral.\textsuperscript{253} Yet, because of the complicated relationships between the Order and the archbishops and the Riga cathedral chapter, this seems improbable. The only known attempt to bury and commemorate a Master there turned into conflict.\textsuperscript{254}

\subsection*{3.2.5: New friends and old enemies: the conquest of memorial space by the Teutonic Order}

Several developments in the mid-fifteenth century show that the Livonian branch wished to gain a more appropriate memorial space for its Masters. The transfer of the memorial space from the chapel of St Andrew to a new location in the 1450s is a good example. The decision to change the location of the burial ground of the Livonian Masters must have taken place around 1450, when the leadership of both the Livonian branch and the archbishopric of Riga had changed. On 11 August 1450, forty days after Heidenreich von Vincke’s death, Johann von Mengede called Ostho, a Westphalian, called Ostho, was appointed as the new Master of the Livonian branch.

\textsuperscript{254} Neitmann, ‘Riga und Wenden,’’ p. 79; Gert Kroeger, \textit{Erzbischof Silvester Stodewescher und sein Kampf mit dem Orden um die Herrschaft über Riga}, Riga, 1930, p. 168,
was elected as the Livonian Master. Two years earlier, Pope Nicholas V (1447-1455) had nominated Silvester Stodewescher, the Grand Master’s chaplain and chancellor, as the new archbishop of Riga (1448-1479), after receiving 4000 Rhenish guldens from the Grand Master. The ascent of these two men to power marked a new phase in the relationship between the Livonian branch and the church of Riga. This also led to new developments in the Order’s memorial policies.

The rise of Silvester Stodewescher, a priest brother of the Teutonic Order, and Johann von Mengede, the Livonian Master, reinitiated the relationship between the church of Riga and the Order. Since the fourteenth century, the Livonian branch had aspired to establish control over the archbishopric of Riga by incorporating the cathedral chapter into the Teutonic Order. Despite the Order’s protracted efforts, the cathedral chapter had successfully defended its independence. The chapter was incorporated into the Order in 1394 with the assistance of archbishop Johann von Wallenrode, but in 1426/28 archbishop Henning Scharpenberg helped to restore the Augustinian habit and the statutes. However, the arrival of two new leaders, the archbishop, who in the first years of his reign faithfully followed the Order’s policies, and an energetic and ambitious Livonian Master, made possible the cathedral chapter’s integration into the Teutonic Order.

The first agreement between the Teutonic Order, the archbishop of Riga and the cathedral chapter was made soon after the two leaders had taken office, in Wolmar on 6 July 1451. According to the terms of this agreement, in future all cathedral canons would wear the habit of the Teutonic Order, and would be presented to the Livonian Master before election and the Order also gained the right to make visitations of the cathedral chapter. This agreement thus incorporated the Riga cathedral chapter into
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the Teutonic Order once again.\textsuperscript{263} The Order not only took over the church as an institution, but also aimed to establish control over the physical and memorial space of the cathedral.

The final article of the agreement announced that from then on all Livonian Masters would be buried in the cathedral of Riga.\textsuperscript{264} As the agreement termed it, the burial of the Masters in the cathedral was intended as a ‘sign’ (\textit{czeichen}) of ‘friendship and love’ (\textit{frandschaft und liebe}) between the Order and the archbishop, as well as the cathedral chapter.\textsuperscript{265} The Master declared that he had decided with the consent of his officers that ‘we and our successors, the Livonian Masters will be buried in the cathedral of Riga in the chancel.’\textsuperscript{266} For their part, the archbishop, provost, dean and chapter agreed to ‘gratefully host’ the Master’s tomb in the cathedral and promised commemoration of the Master; the archbishop and the chapter had to commemorate the current Master with one annual anniversary. In addition to the posthumous remembrance of von Mengede, the archbishop and the chapter promised to perpetually commemorate his predecessors and successors with annual anniversaries, using the Order’s endowment of 2000 marks and the village of Bowsel for the purpose.\textsuperscript{267} This request to hold anniversaries of the former and future Livonian Masters symbolically transformed the cathedral of Riga into memorial space of the Livonian branch even though no Masters were as yet buried there. This remembrance was added to the already existing annual memorial services in the cathedral commemorating the Masters and the deceased brethren of the Order, which had begun in 1428 when the chapter regained its independence.\textsuperscript{268} In short, the plan of von Mengede was to confirm the cathedral as a memorial space for the Order, using his own physical remains for this purpose. The tomb of the Master was to serve as the political legitimation of the Order’s presence in the cathedral and its control over the archbishopric.\textsuperscript{269}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{263} Murawski, \textit{Zwischen Tannenberg und Thorn}, pp. 171-172; Jähnig, ‘Kampf des Deutschen Ordens,’ p. 104.
\item\textsuperscript{264} \textit{Akten und Rezesse}, no. 537, § 14; Neitmann, ‘Riga und Wenden,’ p. 78; Jähnig, \textit{Verfassung und Verwaltung}, p. 168.
\item\textsuperscript{265} \textit{Akten und Rezesse}, no. 537, § 14.
\item\textsuperscript{266} \textit{Akten und Rezesse}, no. 537, § 14.
\item\textsuperscript{267} Later, in the report of the Order’s officials in 1470, it was claimed that the Masters not only had to be buried in the cathedral, but that they also were granted a participation in the good deeds (liturgical services) which would take place in the cathedral. \textit{Akten und Rezesse}, no. 537, § 14; LUB 12, no. 768, pp. 440-441.
\item\textsuperscript{268} These memorial services were instigated in 1428 as a compensation for the Order’s concession of its patronage over the chapter. LUB 7, no 733, p. 524; Glauert, ‘Bindung,’ p. 300.
\item\textsuperscript{269} On a grave as a political tool see Olaf B. Rader, ‘Legitimationsgenerator Grab. Zur politischen Instrumentalisierung von Begräbnislagen,’ in \textit{Grab, Kult, Memoria. Studien zur gesellschaftlichen}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
The agreement was a triumph for the Order, yet the gains were fragile. In cooperation with the new archbishop, the Livonian branch established control over the cathedral chapter and gained new, prestigious and politically significant memorial space, by taking over the cathedral chapter and thus the archbishopric itself. Eighteen years later, in 1469 when the Order’s Master Johann von Mengede died, this initial triumph was reversed into a political defeat.

Archbishop Silvester went from being the Order’s friend in 1451 to its opponent almost two decades later; the tradition of his office transformed him into the Order’s enemy. Although tensions had arisen in the 1460s between the archbishop, who was becoming more independent in his policies, and the Order, Silvester had not engaged in an open conflict with the Livonian branch before 1469. The death of Johann von Mengede made the latent conflict visible.

In 1469, after the burial of Johann von Mengede in the chancel of the cathedral, the archbishop refused to give consent for the placing of a tombstone over the Master’s grave. This may have been due to the fact that in the text of the agreement of 1451, the Masters were promised burial in the cathedral, but the tombstone was not even mentioned. Silvester may have used this imprecise formulation as a pretext not to place the tombstone on the Master’s grave, but Johann von Mengede and his advisors in 1451, in orchestrating the conquest of the memorial space, undoubtedly perceived the tombstone as an integral part of the burial. Likewise, the archbishop himself must have been aware that the absence of a tombstone on the grave would hinder the Master’s commemoration.

The absence of the tombstone meant that the Master was effectively ‘defaced’ and his memoria could not be performed. Moreover, the archbishop’s action constituted the destruction of the Master’s memorial image (Memorialbild), which was constituted by numerous elements, among them a pictorial representation of the dead individual – a tombstone – as well as liturgical memoria. The two elements – pictorial
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Glaupert, ‘Bindung,’ p. 316.
The development of the conflict between the archbishop and the Order, see Kroeger, Erzbischof Silvester, pp. 211-220.
Hellmann, ‘Deutsche Orden und die Stadt Riga,’ p. 28.
LUB 12, no. 768, p. 439.
Neitmann, ‘Riga und Wenden,’ p. 79; Akten und Rezesse, no. 537, § 14.
representation and evocation of a dead man’s name in the liturgy – were interdependent. As the Order’s representatives later wrote, the tombstone had to be placed for ‘eternal memory’. Its absence therefore endangered the memory of the Master. Silvester had effectively attacked the Order where it was vulnerable.

This conflict over the Master’s tombstone had many implications. First, it was a struggle over the memorial space and against political dependency. By denying the Master a tombstone, archbishop Stodewescher presumably attempted to nullify the agreement of 1451, which determined not only the Masters’ burials in the cathedral, but also incorporated the cathedral chapter within the Teutonic Order. Secondly, the death of Johann von Mengede was an opportunity for the archbishop to oppose the Order’s aspirations to submit the archbishop and his chapter to its control. The struggle over the burial and memoria of the Master was a symptom of the deeper antagonism between the Order and the archbishop. Mengede wanted to use his own body in order to complete the conquest of the cathedral as a memorial space for the Teutonic Order, but it turned out to be a misfortune for him and the Livonian branch. The Order’s wish to increase its influence and gain new memorial space was doomed to failure, because of the archbishop’s symbolic action, the denial of the tombstone. It was an act of aggression which disrupted the Order and its memorial practices.

The archbishop’s passive aggressive blocking of Mengede’s memoria had to be countered. To solve the problem of the faceless grave, the Order had to take on the struggle against the archbishop, tackling the case with political and legal arguments. In 1470 the Order’s representatives composed a long text which accused the archbishop and defended the deceased Master Johann von Mengede, his deeds, and his rights to have a tombstone on his grave. Mengede was portrayed as a victim of the archbishop’s duplicity, who in the presence of the Master always spoke ‘beautiful, sparkling, shiny and friendly words’, but changed his attitude in the Master’s absence. It was claimed that Mengede could have chosen the burial grounds of his predecessors. The Master had, however, listened instead to the archbishop’s advice that he should choose the cathedral’s chancel as the burial place of himself and all the future
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278 LUB 12, no. 768, p. 440.
279 Akten und Rezesse, no. 537.
280 In the Order’s document of 1470 it was argued that struggle to attain the placing of the tombstone on the Master’s grave should be continued by propagating information about this injustice in the documents and other written texts. LUB 12, no. 768, p. 440.
281 Ibid.
282 ‘wort (.) de weren altiet schone, sote, blenckede unde frundlick (.)’ Ibid., p. 439.
Livonian Masters.\textsuperscript{283} The archbishop had promised that by this choice the Master would become the archbishopric’s protector. The authors of the text implied that if the Master had chosen the burial grounds of his predecessors, after death he would have received his tombstone and remembrance without any hindrance, apparently to emphasise the archbishop’s dishonest and illegitimate actions.\textsuperscript{284} Similarly, they argued that if the archbishop had granted the greatest honour – the Master’s burial in the cathedral – why did he refuse to offer such a small one, the placement of a tombstone on the grave?\textsuperscript{285} The Order partly reused this accusatory text eight years later in the legislative record of Weissenstein (Est. Paide) to show Silvester’s evil deeds.\textsuperscript{286}

Despite the energetic efforts of the Order’s representatives, this eloquent depiction of Master Johann von Mengede as a victim had no immediate impact on his memoria in the cathedral. In 1474 liturgical memoria was still not being performed. Then the Order complained that, although Johann von Mengede had richly disposed of villages and plots of land to the cathedral chapter of Riga for his remembrance, the annual anniversaries promised in the agreement of 1451 were not being properly celebrated by the cathedral chapter.\textsuperscript{287} The Order’s representatives implied that the archbishop and the cathedral chapter should be reminded that they had to celebrate the liturgical services diligently and respectfully.

Finally, five years after the Master’s burial in the cathedral, the Order achieved its aims by forcing the cathedral chapter to issue on 27 September 1474 a charter confirming the Master’s memoria and rights to place a tombstone.\textsuperscript{288} The provost, Gregorius Hollant, and the dean, Detmar Roper, of the cathedral chapter stated that it would commemorate Johann von Mengede, his predecessors and successors with annual anniversaries in the cathedral for eternity. In order to avoid further misunderstandings, the cathedral chapter also promised not to create any future obstacles to the Masters’ burials in the church chancel and promised to place tombstones on the Masters’ graves.

Despite this the final attempt to transform the cathedral of Riga into the memorial space of the Teutonic Order failed. It is not known whether a tombstone was placed on the tomb of Johann von Mengede, but he remained the only Master to be buried in the

\textsuperscript{283} LUB 12, no. 768, p. 439.
\textsuperscript{284} Ibid., p. 440.
\textsuperscript{285} Neitmann, ‘Riga und Wenden,’ p. 79; LUB 12, no. 768, p. 440.
\textsuperscript{287} Geheimen Staatssarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz (GStA PK), XX. HA, OBA no. 16502; Neitmann, ‘Riga und Wenden,’ p. 79.
The transfer of the Order’s memorial space, which was initially intended as the ‘sign of friendship and love’, resulted in a conflict that endangered not only the memoria of Johann von Mengede, but the remembrance of all his predecessors. The memoria of von Mengede, his predecessors and successors had to be performed, yet they were not commemorated for five years after his death. As a result of this conflict the cathedral of Riga never became a memorial space of the Livonian branch. The next Master, who died in office, Johann Freitag von Loringhoven (†1494), was buried in the new residence, in Wenden.

Although the struggle for memorial space and political influence began with success for the Teutonic Order, it developed into a humbling experience for the Order. The Order and its deceased Master became hostages of the archbishop Silvester Stodewescher, who by denying the tombstone for Johann Mengede and thus memoria, symbolically attacked the Order. Johann Mengede and his advisors had apparently decided to gain new memorial space for the Livonian Masters and the whole branch in the early 1450s. This plan had entirely the opposite effect. As a result of this failed conquest, the Order left the cathedral of Riga forever and in the 1480s moved the residence as well as the burial grounds from Riga to Wenden. The Livonian Masters were buried there, in St Johannes parish church, until the dissolution of the Livonian branch in 1561.

**Conclusion**

The collective memory of the Teutonic Order shaped the reality in which the knight brethren lived. This memory of the Order’s experiences in Livonia, which was manifested through chronicles, necrologies, tombstones, and other memorial media, told
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288 GStA PK, XX. HA, OBA no. 16510; Neitmann, ‘Riga und Wenden,’ p. 79.
290 Akten und Rezesse, no. 537, § 14.
291 GStA PK, XX. HA, OBA no. 16502; Neitmann, ‘Riga und Wenden,’ p. 79.
292 Johann von Mengede was followed by the two Masters who were ousted – Johann Waldhaus von Heerse and Bernd von Borch – but Freitag von Loringhoven was already buried in Wenden, see Jähnig, *Verfassung und Verwaltung*, p. 168; Neitmann, ‘Riga und Wenden,’ pp. 79-80.
293 Since 1494 when Johann Freitag von Loringhoven found his resting place in the St Johannes church of Wenden, two Livonian Masters after the Reformation were buried there: the illustrious Wolter von Plettenberg (†1535) and also Hermann von Brüggenei, named Hasenkamp (†1549) had their graves and tombstones in the St Johannes church. See Māra Siliņa, ‘Ikonographie und Typologie der gotischen Memorialplastik in Lettland,’ in *Gotik im Baltikum*, ed. Uwe Albrecht, Lüneburg, 2004, pp. 143-166, at p.
the story and provided justification for the Order’s presence in the Eastern Baltic. These memories, through their transmission to other regional bodies, were used to shape the identity of the whole Order, emphasizing the group’s crusading past. The commemoration of the fallen brethren in Livonia created a framework within which the identities of the Order could have been formed.

Despite the lack of serial sources for the memoria of the Teutonic Order in Livonia, it is possible to reconstruct numerous structures of memory, which existed in the Livonian branch and the whole Order. The events of the crusading period dominated the collective memory of the Teutonic Order also in the later centuries. The battle of Durbe (1260) was a site of memory and the fallen brethren were commemorated far beyond Livonia. The battle and killed brethren were commemorated in the Order’s necrologies in the western European houses. It was also described in the Order’s chronicles. The commemoration of this defeat strengthened the identity not only of the Livonian branch, but of the whole Order. Moreover, the brethren killed in other Livonian battles during the thirteenth century were also commemorated in the houses of the Teutonic Order outside Livonia. When the name of Livonia appeared in the necrologies and historical narratives of the Teutonic Order, Livonia was operating as a memorial device symbolising the Order’s experiences in that region. This exchange of memories between the Order’s branch in Livonia and its western European bailiwicks stopped soon after the end of the crusading in the Eastern Baltic.

The historiography of the Teutonic Order was part of its memorial culture. The Livonian Rhymed Chronicle, written in MHG around 1300, was not only a historical text, but reflected the memorial practices of the Order and also served to create memoria of individuals mentioned in it. The chronicle itself was a medium of memoria. As the evidence from late fourteenth century Prussia shows, the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle was kept together with liturgical and theological texts in the sacristies of at least two Prussian castles. Thus it may have been used as source of information for commemoration of the Order’s past during liturgical services.

Little is known about the individual memoria of the Order’s brethren and the statutes only vaguely regulated it. The brethren were limited in their resources, because they were not allowed to have properties, and tombstones were not placed on their graves. They fully relied on memoria granted by the Order – prayers of a house they had belonged to.

The Teutonic Order in Livonia focused its collective *memoria* on the remembrance of the branch’s leader, the Livonian Master. In the *memoria* of the Master the resources of the Order as well as the resources of individuals affiliated to it were invested. The memorial foundation of Master Heidenreich Vincke von Overberg, made in 1447, shows his wish to create prospective *memoria* of his successors, and thus to strengthen their positions in the future.

The Livonian Master was the only official of the Order to be commemorated also outside the Order, by the cities of which he was lord. The records of Reval show that during the fifteenth century the city council organized *memoria* of the deceased Livonian Masters and some Grand Masters of the Order. These communal commemorations concluded the relationships between the deceased Masters and the city which were created when the latter swore oath of fealty.

The Masters’ remembrance was centred around their residences, where they were usually buried and where memorial services for them were celebrated. Until the mid-fifteenth century the Livonian Masters were buried in the chapel next to the Riga castle. The Order needed a more prestigious burial place for its Masters. In the 1450s the Order as a part of its plan to incorporate the cathedral chapter, wanted to convert the cathedral of Riga into the burial site of the Livonian Masters. The Order used the favourable situation after the appointment of its member, Silvester Stodewescher, as the archbishop of Riga to gain political benefits, including a burial site that had both prestige and symbolic meaning. When the Livonian Master Johann von Mengede was buried in the cathedral in 1469, and the archbishop denied him *memoria*, a long and fierce conflict broke out. Although the Order tried, it did not succeed in the struggle for proper *memoria* of its Master and in a result all the successive Livonian Masters were buried in Wenden.

The Livonian branch of the Teutonic Order had a rich collective memory and memorial culture which referred both to the experiences of the branch and its deceased brethren. This memory was used both to sustain corporate identity and to legitimize the Order’s political aims. The Order focused on the remembrance of its leaders, but by commemorating them and nurturing their individual *memoria*, the Order was sustaining its identity and its own mission.

*Jahrhundert, Riga, 1929, pp. 25-26, 31-32.*
CHAPTER 4: CLERGY AND MEMORIA. LIVONIAN RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES AS COMMEMORATORS OF THE DEAD

In the course of an inquiry into a territorial dispute between the chapter of Riga cathedral and Johann Tiergart, the bishop of Courland (e. 1425-1456), 1 Arnold Dattelen, dean of Ermland (Prussia), was sent in 1431 to Riga to question potential witnesses. 2 The investigation focused on the bishopric’s past. The investigators questioned numerous witnesses – the bishop’s vassals, priests, and diocesan officials, aged between twenty-eight and seventy – on the history of the diocese and their memories of Courland’s bishops. 3

Although the questions have not survived, the answers to them have been recorded. They show that the witnesses were asked about those bishops who had preceded Johann Tiergart. Their knowledge about the past of the bishopric was scarce; the witnesses had difficulty in naming more than a few bishops. Yet they did remember the first bishops, who had died some two hundred years earlier. A forty-year-old vassal, Arnold Sacken, said that according to what he had heard from ‘old people’, a certain Danish king, Abel, came with his army to Courland and appointed his chaplain, Ernomodus (Ernomordus), as bishop, who was then confirmed by the pope. 4 This narrative, which is present in a sixteenth-century list of the Curonian bishops, claimed that Abel came to Courland in 1161 and appointed Ernomodus in 1169. 5 Yet, despite the detail, this narrative is a fiction: there was no Danish twelfth-century king called Abel, nor a bishop named Ernomodus, and the Danes did not found the bishopric; this was done by German missionaries in the 1230s. 6

The witnesses also remembered some real bishops. When asked about the first Curonian bishops, witnesses described murals in the great hall (aula majori) of the bishop’s residence castle in Pilten (Latv. Piltene), in which all of the bishops are
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2 These protocols have survived only in a form of sixteenth century copies, in the introduction of which a list of Curonian bishops (Series episcoporum Curoniae) is given. LUB 8, no. 440; Thumser, ‘Livländische Amtsträgerreihen,’ pp. 238-250.
3 In the protocols only testimonies of six witnesses have survived, but there were more of them. LUB 8, no. 440, p. 260.
4 Ibid., p. 258.
5 LUB 8, no. 440, p. 255.
6 Thumser, ‘Livländische Amtsträgerreihen,’ pp. 238; Edgar Anderson has suggested that the first two Danish bishops Enemordus and Hermannus were added to the list of the Curonian bishops by the Pilten’s castle custodian Johann Behr. Šterns, Latvijas Vēsture. 1290-1500, p. 448; Edgar Anderson, ‘Early Danish Missionaries in the Baltic Countries,’ in Gli inizi del cristianesimo in Livonia-Lettonia, ed. Michele Maccarrone, Vaticano, 1989, pp. 245-275, at pp. 260-262.
depicted (*de primo ad ultimum*), with their names and dates. A knight Lubertus Kule named the first six Curonian bishops, starting with the non-historical Ernomodus and Herman, and continuing with the historical bishops Engelbert (1234-1236/37), and Heinrich von Lützelburg (e. 1251-1263), but he also named the fictional bishop Johann, and finally Edmund von Werth (1263-1292). When asked how he remembered them, Lubertus Kule referred to the murals in the great hall. A vassal Otto Sacken also referred to the bishop’s gallery, and also knew that Engelbert and his canons were killed by the pagans at Degerhovede (Latv. Valguns) in 1234, and that subsequently the bishopric remained vacant for many years.

Other witnesses also referred to the murals in the great hall at Pilten. The custodian of the castle, the seventy year old Jacob Sandow, remembered all the Curonian bishops from Jacob (1360-1371) onwards, and counted fifteen bishops, just as in the murals. Jacob Sandow remembered the bishops of his life-time (he was born around 1360), but he knew the predecessors of bishop Jacob only from the murals.

The protocols of this investigation were copied during the late sixteenth century in order to prove the close relationship between Courland and the Danish crown, and thus must be treated with caution. But, if the protocols are copies, and not sixteenth century forgeries, they demonstrate how the past was remembered in two distinct ways: cultural memory in the form of painted portraits of the Curonian bishops, and communicative memory in the form of stories about the past told by people of Courland. It is not known when the murals were painted, but by commissioning them an early fifteenth-century bishop converted the communicative memory of his predecessors into a shared cultural one. Murals of bishops in late medieval episcopal residences created and maintained the history of bishoprics and bishops, and helped to legitimate the episcopal
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7 Pilten’s castle has not survived into the modern age, therefore we fully rely on the protocols. LUB 8, no. 440, p. 258, 259.
9 As it appears from the answer of Arnold Sacken, the fictional Ernomodus was absent from the bishops’ gallery. LUB 8, no. 440, p. 258, 259.
10 Ibid., p. 258.
11 Ibid., pp. 257-260.
13 The surviving copies of these investigation protocols were produced by the Courland’s nobility in order to present them to the king of Denmark Friedrich II (1559-1588) and it is possible that these protocols were chosen for this purpose because of their references to the Danish kings. Thumser, ‘Livländische Amtsträgerreihen,’ p. 238; Anderson, ‘Early Danish Missionaries,’ pp. 262-263.
power.\textsuperscript{15} The witnesses in Courland would not have remembered the first bishops without the assistance of these murals. The murals in turn influenced communicative memory, which was supported by stories about the bishops told by each generation to the next, even if they were not true, as in the case of the fictional Ernmodus.

This exceptional case vividly illustrates the mechanisms by which the memory of late-medieval Livonian bishops was created and sustained. The bishops of Courland and their community – cathedral canons, officials, priests and vassals – sustained the memory of the dead bishops as part of their collective identity.\textsuperscript{16} This chapter will consider how Livonian religious communities created their identities by remembering the dead. The following questions will guide the discussion: how did the archbishops of Riga and their cathedral chapter use space in \textit{memoria}; what role did the \textit{memoria} of the archbishops and their chapters play in their conflict with the Teutonic Order; how did the cathedral canons create their \textit{memoria}; how did the communities of Cistercian monks and nuns, as well as the Dominicans, act as commemorators of other groups?

In Livonia, as in other European regions, religious communities of different types lived side by side. Livonia had five bishops with cathedral chapters: the archbishopric of Riga and the bishoprics of Courland, Dorpat, Ösel-Wiek, and Reval.\textsuperscript{17} There were also communities of religious orders in Livonia. Reval, Riga, and Dorpat had Dominican friaries and Cistercian nunneries since the first half of the thirteenth century, while the Franciscans had a friary in Riga and houses in smaller Livonian towns.\textsuperscript{18} The Cistercians were also present in Livonia since the early thirteenth century, with monasteries in Dünamünde (Latv. Daugavgrīva) (1205-1305), in Padis (Est. Padise) (1317-1559), and Falkenau/Valkena (Est. Kärkna) (1234-1558).\textsuperscript{19} Later, during the early fifteenth century, the Bridgettines arrived and founded their convent in Mariendal (Est. Pīrīta) (1407-1575/77), near Reval.\textsuperscript{20} Despite the great number of religious communities in Livonia, sources for their commemorational practices are scarce.

\textsuperscript{15} Marc Jarzebowski, \textit{Die Residenzen der preussischen Bischöfe bis 1525}, Torun, 2007, p. 296.
\textsuperscript{16} Assmann, \textit{Das kulturelle Gedächtnis}, p. 132.
\textsuperscript{17} Jähnig, ‘Verfassung der Domkapitel,’ pp. 53-72.
Therefore, this chapter will focus on the memoria of the bishops (after 1253 archbishops) and cathedral chapter of Riga\textsuperscript{21}, and the Cistercians and Dominicans will be considered as commemorators of other groups, because no sources concerning their own communal practices have survived.

4.1: Riga Cathedral as a site of memory: the memoria of the archbishops of Riga

As with the collective memory of the Teutonic Order’s Livonian branch, the late medieval memoria of the Rigan church also went back to its roots in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, and remembered its founders. Legal documents drafted by archbishop Silvester Stodewescher and his associates between 1450 and 1452 show that memories about the founding bishops were essential for sustaining the archbishop’s and cathedral chapter’s identities during periods of crisis and conflict.\textsuperscript{22} For generations the archbishops and cathedral canons had shaped not only the liturgical and historiographical memory of their church, but the cathedral itself as a space of memory.\textsuperscript{23} Riga cathedral was home to the tombs of many bishops, archbishops, and lesser clergymen, though only some of their tombstones have survived.\textsuperscript{24} Thus, the physical space of the cathedral itself helped the Riga clergy to commemorate its bishops, supplementing the remembrance which was imprinted in the liturgy as well as in historical texts. Here ‘the architecture as a medium of memory was itself a memorial message’,\textsuperscript{25} constantly reminding the viewers about the past and their predecessors.

The construction of the cathedral in Riga began in 1211.\textsuperscript{26} The third Livonian bishop, Albert Buxthoeven (e. 1199-1229), had moved the bishop’s seat from the first Livonian cathedral in Üxküll to the newly founded city of Riga in 1201 together with the

\textsuperscript{21} Only very few wills and foundation charters of the canons have survived. See, the testament of Reval’s canon Dietrich Tolk (1443), LUB 9, no. 1025; the will of the Reval cathedral canon Carstianus Czernekow (1499) LUB 2/1, no. 845; the foundation charter of the memorial chantry drafted by Dietrich Nagel (1447) LUB 12, no. 297.

\textsuperscript{22} Levāns, ‘Lebendigen Toten,’ pp. 3-35.


\textsuperscript{24} Loeffler, Grabsteine, p. 18, 22, 23.


\textsuperscript{26} Andris Caune and Ieva Ose, Latvijas viduslaiku mūra baznīcas, [The Medieval Churches of Latvia] Riga, 2010, p. 252.
cathedral chapter of twelve canons led by a provost.27 The cathedral’s buildings belonging to the chapter’s jurisdiction were separated from the rest of the city within the cathedral close.28

Riga cathedral as a commemorational site was shaped by the resting places of the founding bishops of the diocese of Üxküll/Riga: Meinhard (e. 1186-96), Berthold Schulte (e. 1196-1198), and Albert, who had led the Christian mission.29 Their tombs reflected the narrative of beginnings the Chronicle of Henry of Livonia also told, as the story of three Livonian bishops.30 The tombs combined with historiography to create the central narrative for the collective memory of the Rigan church.

The first bishops of Üxküll, Meinhard and Berthold, were the key figures to whom the Livonian church referred even centuries after their deaths. Meinhard, a priest from the community of Augustinian canons-regular at Segeberg (Holstein), arrived in Livonia as the first Christian missionary in 1184, became bishop of Üxküll in 1186, died peacefully in 1196, and was buried in the church of Üxküll.31 Two years later, on 24 July 1198, his successor Berthold, a former abbot of the Cistercian abbey in Loccum, was killed in battle with the pagan Livs in ‘the place of Riga’ (ad locum Rige), and was also buried in Üxküll.32 When bishop Albert moved the centre of the Livonian church to Riga in 1201, the graves of the two bishops remained in Üxküll. According to Henry of Livonia, the papal legate William of Modena (also known as William of Sabina) (c. 1180-1251) visited Meinhard’s and Bertold’s tombs (tumbe episcoporum) in 1225, and celebrated the memory of ‘the first holy bishops’ (primorum sanctorum episcoporum memoriam commemorans).33

27 The cathedral chapter was led by provost (prepositus, provest), his deputy was a dean (decanus, dekenn), each canon had his own office, for example, of cantor, scholastic, treasurer, and others, see Šterns, Latvijas Vēsture. 1290-1500, p. 31; Glauert, ‘Bindung,’ pp. 272-273; Benninghoven, Rigas Entstehung, pp. 72-73.
30 Heinrici Chronicon, p. 121; Hermann Brüningk, ‘Die Frage der Verehrung der ersten livländischen Bischöfe als Heilige,’ in Sitzungsberichten der Gesellschaft für Geschichte und Alterthumskunde der
Henry’s account shows that at the time of writing (1225-1227) the Livonian church perceived Meinhard and Berthold as holy men.\textsuperscript{34} He emphasized their sanctity elsewhere in the chronicle too, by naming Meinhard as confessor (\textit{confessor}) and Berthold as martyr (\textit{martyr}).\textsuperscript{35} The fame of Berthold’s martyrdom reached further west. In his \textit{Chronica Slavorum} (c. 1210) Arnold of Lübeck presented a miracle: Berthold’s body was found on the day after the battle and, despite the heat, it had not decayed like the other corpses.\textsuperscript{36} However, the bishops’ veneration was local, as they were never canonized.\textsuperscript{37}

The bodies of the two holy bishops were precious to Riga cathedral and its community as relics that attracted devotion and shaped a sacred space.\textsuperscript{38} They were also an essential part of local collective memory.\textsuperscript{39} The remains of Meinhard and Berthold were translated from Üxküll – which lost its status after 1201 – to Riga, the centre of the Livonian church and later the seat of the archbishop. The translation of saints, even if it was the case that they were not yet canonized by the papal curia, was a festive event that emphasized their saintly status and equivalent in importance to canonization.\textsuperscript{40}

If, as Bernd Ulrich Hucker claims, the translation took place in 1229 or 1230,\textsuperscript{41} then it was precipitated by the death and burial of the third Livonian bishop, Albert, who died on 17 January 1229. According to a sixteenth-century chronicle, he was buried in the cathedral chancel ‘under the third tombstone, under the Paschal candlestick’.\textsuperscript{42} The cathedral was incomplete as a memorial site with Albert’s sole tomb; the translation created a clear line of succession and a continuous history.

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[34]{Angermann, ‘Mittelalterliche Chronistik,’ p. 7.}
\footnotetext[35]{\textit{Heinrici Chronicon}, p. 36.}
\footnotetext[36]{Bruiningk, ‘Frage der Verehrung,’ pp. 15-16; Mänd, ‘Saints’ Cults,’ p. 220.}
\footnotetext[37]{Bruiningk, ‘Frage der Verehrung,’ pp. 3-4; as the Cistercian, Berthold was remembered not only in Riga, but also in his former abbey – Loccum – in whose necrology his name was recorded on 25 July, see Hucker, ‘Bertold,’ p. 51.}
\footnotetext[39]{Rader, ‘Legitimationsgenerator Grab,’ p. 9.}
\footnotetext[40]{This was the case with St Wenceslas, see František Graus, \textit{Lebendige Vergangenheit. Überlieferung im Mittelalter und in den Vorstellungen vom Mittelalter}, Cologne, 1975, pp. 161-162.}
\footnotetext[41]{Mänd, ‘Saints’ Cults,’ pp. 220-221; Levāns, ‘Lebendigen Toten,’ p. 19; Jähnig, ‘Bertholt Schulte,’ p. 644; according to Hucker the processional transfer took place on 11 October, when Meinhard’s bones were taken to Riga and ten days later, on 20 or 21 October Berthold’s remains arrived there see Hucker, ‘Bertold,’ p. 52.}
\end{footnotes}
The importance of the two bishops was reflected in the locations of their tombs within the cathedral. Meinhard was reburied in a central location, in the chancel, near the high altar, in front of the Holy Blood altar.\textsuperscript{43} During the late fourteenth century a richly decorated niche tomb was built into the north wall of the chancel, where Meinhard’s bones – in an oak casket – were placed, and on which a small tombstone with an image of a bishop was erected.\textsuperscript{44} The contemporary inscription states: ‘In this grave lie the bones of the bishop Meinhard’ (\textit{Hac sunt in fossa Meijnhardi presulis ossa}).\textsuperscript{45} Although according to tradition Meinhard died on 14 August, the date 11 (12) October (\textit{IV (V) idus mensis octobris}) was inscribed on the tombstone, probably the date of his reburial and liturgical commemoration.\textsuperscript{46} On this non-effigial tombstone a bishop was depicted with ‘hands crossed downward, very plain vestments, and crosier placed
erect at a right side. The Gothic decoration of the tomb was destroyed during the late eighteenth century, yet reconstructions show that it was influenced by the tomb of the saintly Pope Urban V (1310–1370) in the abbey of St Victor in Marseilles. This elaboration of Meinhard’s tomb was undertaken with the aim of emphasizing his holiness visually. The construction of the tomb revived Meinhard’s memoria two centuries after his death. Such erection of tombs centuries after the death of their occupants was practiced in cases when a group needed to refer to its founders in order to reconfirm its present identity. As with the tombs of holy bishops in other cathedrals, Meinhard’s tomb became the heart of the cathedral’s life, where pilgrims and believers came to pray.

Image 6: St Meinhard’s tomb. Drawing of J. Ch. Brotze (1742-1823)
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49 Rader, ‘Legitimationsgenerator Grab,’ p. 11.
50 For example, in Meissen the centre of the cathedral was tomb of the holy bishop Benno, see Matthias Donath, ‘Der Meißen Dom als Grablege,’ in *Die Grabmonumente im Dom zu Meißen*, ed. Idem., Leipzig, 2004, pp. 11-24, at p. 15.
Berthold’s tombstone has not survived. According to a sixteenth-century chronicle, his tomb was also placed in a prestigious location, in front of the Holy Cross altar, next to the chancel.\(^{51}\) As will be discussed later, the altar of the Holy Cross became central to remembrance in the Riga cathedral. Like Meinhard, Berthold – at least in the post-medieval Cistercian tradition – was commemorated on 20/21 October, the day of his translation to Riga.\(^{52}\)

Meinhard and Berthold maintained their role in the memory of the Rigan church for two centuries after their reburial in the cathedral. In archbishop Silvester Stodewescher’s complaint against the city of Riga in 1452, the founding bishops *(unser ersten vorfärn)* were portrayed as martyrs, who had ‘bought’ with their own blood the whole of Livonia, even the land on which the city of Riga was later built.\(^{53}\) In their arguments for their right to lordship over Riga, archbishop and chapter both referred to the three bishops: Meinhard, Berthold, and Albert.\(^{54}\)

These early bishops were not only remembered, but also venerated as saints in the later Middle Ages. If Meinhard and Berthold were perceived in Livonia as holy bishops until the Reformation and even beyond,\(^{55}\) Albert – also buried in the chancel – played a less important role in the *memoria* of the Livonian church despite his thirty-year-long episcopate and his role in the Christianization of Livonia. Hermann Bruiningk concludes that Albert was not venerated as a saint since his name is absent from the surviving liturgical manuscripts, and no altar was erected next to his tomb.\(^{56}\)

The tombs of the first Livonian bishops shaped the cathedral as an environment of memory (*milieu de mémoire*) where the whole history of the Rigan church was remembered.\(^{57}\) Thus the cathedral building was itself a memory. Most episcopal tombs were located in the chancel, next to the high altar. Since only St Meinhard’s tombstone has survived, we rely completely on the narrative of the sixteenth-century *Cronica episcoporum Rigensium* for information about other bishops’ burials. According to the chronicle, the following bishops were buried in the chancel alongside Meinhard and Albert: bishop Nicholas (e.1229-1253) *(unnter dem grossen pulte)*, archbishops Albert

---


\(^{53}\) Levāns, ‘Lebendigen Toten,’ p. 29; *Akten und Resesse*, no. 549, p. 533.


\(^{56}\) Albert appears as a saint in the post-medieval tradition and was commemorated on 1 June. Bruiningk, *Messe*, pp. 353-354; Idem., ‘Frage der Verehrung,’ p. 20.
Suerbeer (e.1253-1272/73) (*under dem anderenn Steine vor dem hoen Altare*), Johannes von Vechta (e.1286-1294) (*vor dem hohen Altar*), Johannes Ambundi (e.1418-1424) (*vor dem hohenn altare*, als man zu opper gehet), Stefan Grube (e. 1479-1483) (*leit begrabenn beniedden Siluester*), and Jasper Linde (e.1509-1524) under a brass tombstone (*im kor unnder das Messingsteine*). The tombs of archbishops Johannes von Lune (e.1273-1284) (*vor Sannt Katharinenn Altar*), and Henning Scharpenberg (e.1424-1448) were also located in the cathedral, but not in the chancel. Michael Hildebrand’s (e.1484-1509) tomb was exceptional among the archbishops’ tombs: it was a brick-laid tomb, placed not in chancel, but outside the cathedral in the cloister garden (*in Kreutzhoue bey dem Umgange nach der Schule in ein gemeurten grabe*). It remains unknown why Hildebrand’s was buried outside the cathedral.

Only bishops and archbishops of Riga were buried in the chancel, thus it was place where the history of Christianity in Livonia and the diocese of Riga was constantly present in the form of the bishops’ tombstones. The comparison can be made with the way in which the chapel of St Wenceslas (c. 907-935) in St Vitus cathedral in Prague – the burial place of the royal saint himself – functioned as the centre of medieval Bohemian monarchy. In a similar fashion the cathedral chancel of Riga cathedral, with tombs of its founder bishops, was the centre of the whole Livonian church. The sepulchres of Meinhard, Berthold and Albert provided a link to the group’s origins, but the tombstones of their successors were a reminder of the more recent past. The episcopal burials demonstrated the power of the episcopal institution over the territory of the archbishopric and its control over the cathedral, as well as the archbishop’s sovereignty. This was why the Teutonic Order, which from the late thirteenth century attempted to gain control over the bishopric, tried to enter the memorial site of the archbishops by burying their own leaders there. As we have discussed above, in 1451 the Livonian Master of the Teutonic Order, Johann von Mengede (†1469), was
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57 Nora, ‘Between Memory and History,’ pp. 7-24.
promised burial in Riga cathedral’s chancel, in an attempt to convert the chancel into the Order’s memorial site and establish control of the Order over the archbishop and the cathedral chapter.\textsuperscript{62} Although von Mengede was buried in the chancel, the Order’s plan to take over the cathedral as a memorial site failed.\textsuperscript{63}

4.2: Conflict and \textit{memoria}: the struggle between the Teutonic Order and the church of Riga

\textit{Memoria} was affected by periods of conflict. In an institutional context, \textit{memoria} usually granted a sense of continuity, but during crises and conflicts \textit{memoria} was used as a defensive mechanism.\textsuperscript{64} The \textit{memoria} of the Rigan church was directly influenced by the conflict between the archbishops, the cathedral chapter and the Teutonic Order. Memory often becomes crucial when identity is weak or threatened.\textsuperscript{65} In hands of the archbishops and the cathedral canons \textit{memoria} was as powerful tool as arms; it enabled them to defend something more valuable than a single life, the identity of their community.

Riga cathedral as a memorial site was framed by internal Livonian politics. After the burial of Johannes von Vechta (†1294) in the cathedral, no other archbishop was buried there for a hundred and forty years. This was a result of the Teutonic Order’s constant pressure on the archbishops, who were forced to seek refuge in the papal curia; some, between 1294 and 1424, even died there.\textsuperscript{66} Johnnes von Vechta’s successor, Johannes II (r.1294/95-1300), was incarcerated by the Order in the castle of Fellin (Est. Viljandi) after the beginning of the civil war between the archbishop, the city of Riga and the Teutonic Order (1297-1330). Once freed, he left for the papal curia and died in Anagni on 19 December 1300.\textsuperscript{67} Because of the distance between southern Europe and Livonia, no attempt was made to transfer the archbishops’ remains to Livonia.

The absence of archiepiscopal burials over such a long time affected the memorial culture of the community. The reconstruction and elaboration of Meinhard’s tomb

\textsuperscript{62} See below the subchapter 3.2.5.
\textsuperscript{63} \textit{Akten und Rezesse}, no. 537, § 14; Neitmann, ‘Riga und Wenden,’ p. 78.
\textsuperscript{64} On \textit{memoria} and crises, see Gerd Althoff, ‘Zur Verschriftlichung von Memoria in Krisenzeiten,’ in \textit{Memoria in der Gesellschaft des Mittelalters}, pp. 56-73.
\textsuperscript{66} In Avignon: Friedrich von Pernstein (r.1304-1341), Engelbert (r.1341-1347), Siegfried Blomberg (r.1370-1374). Fromhold von Vifhusen (r.1348-1369) died in Rome. ‘Cronica episcoporum,’ pp. 175-177.
during the late fourteenth century was possibly intended to compensate for the memorial absence of contemporary archbishops and to reinforce the identity of the cathedral chapter in the face of mounting pressure from the Order.\textsuperscript{68} The new tomb was a copy of that of Pope Urban V (†1370), an influence on the archbishop’s entourage from its stay at the papal curia.

As already shown in the chapter on the memory of the Teutonic Order in Livonia, Riga cathedral was a contested memorial space for the Order, the archbishops and the cathedral chapter.\textsuperscript{69} This struggle over the memorial significance of the cathedral was a facet of the Order’s aspirations to control elections to the see. The Livonian branch of the Order, with the assistance of well-disposed archbishops, attempted to incorporate Riga’s cathedral chapter into the Order on two occasions, in 1394 and 1451, by changing the chapter’s statutes and imposing its white habit on the canons.\textsuperscript{70} By doing so the Order followed the approach used in Prussia and Livonia, where the cathedral chapters of Kulm, Samland, Pomesania and Courland had already been incorporated into the Order by the late thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{71} Yet the Order was not fully successful in its attempts; the first incorporation was cancelled by a papal bull in 1423 and, although the chapter formally followed the Order’s statutes after 1451, it never came under its full control.\textsuperscript{72} The Order experienced continuous opposition from the cathedral canons, who struggled for their institutional independence. This was a dangerous game, which sometimes ended in bloodshed: in 1428 the Order in Prussia killed a number of canons from Riga who were on their way to Rome.\textsuperscript{73}

The struggle between the Order, the archbishop, and the cathedral chapter affected the memory of the Rigan church. The death of archbishop Silvester Stodewescher and its aftermath demonstrates this impact in detail. Silvester turned from the Order’s close ally into an enemy.\textsuperscript{74} Following a decade-long feud between him and the Order,

\textsuperscript{69} Neitmann, ‘Riga und Wenden,’ pp. 78-79.
\textsuperscript{72} Glaubert, ‘Bindung des Domkapitels,’ pp. 296, 310-313.
\textsuperscript{74} For Stodewescher’s relationship with the Teutonic Order, see the subchapter 3.2.5 and Boockmann, ‘Einzug,’ p. 3.
Silvester was arrested in 1479 and held in the castle of Kokenhusen (Latv. Koknese); although he was later released from arrest he died there on 12 July. Silvester’s death was initially kept a secret because Master Bernd von der Borch (1472-1483) wished to secure the appointment of his cousin, Simon von der Borch (e. 1475-1492), bishop of Reval, as archbishop, thus establishing the Order’s control over the archbishopric. According to the Master’s own letter to the Grand Master in the autumn of 1479, following tradition (gewonheit) Silvester’s body was brought by ‘us’ (habe wier) to Riga and buried beside his predecessors in the cathedral. Borch omits, however, to mention the fact that Silvester, despite the summer heat in which a body would decay rapidly, was brought to Riga and buried nearly a month after his death, on 7 August.

The delay of Silvester’s funeral was part of a political game which aimed to destroy the independence of the Rigan church. The death offered an opportunity for Bernhard von der Borch to finally reduce the archbishop from a territorial lordship to a mere ecclesiastical office devoid of political power or lands. In 1481 Grand Master Martin Truchsess (1477-1489) acknowledged that the Order had not forgotten that the two last archbishops – Henning Scharpenberg (†1448) and Silvester Stodewescher – had caused political trouble for the Teutonic Order, even though they were its members. Both Masters claimed that this had happened because the archbishop exercised secular power. In order to make the intended structural changes, the Livonian Master appealed to the Imperial court, hoping that emperor Friedrich III (r. 1452–1493) would assist with the transfer of the archbishop’s territories to the Order’s fief. Like his predecessor Johann von Mengede, von der Borch sought control over the cathedral chapter to ensure that it would elect the Order’s candidates as archbishops.

The Livonian master and the Grand Master were planning to take over the Rigan church, and reduce the archbishop and the cathedral chapter to the Order’s dependants. The pope, however, did not support the Master’s strategy and ignored Bernhard’s

75 ‘Cronica episcoporum,’ p. 177; Kroeger, Erzbischof Silvester, pp. 276-277; Bruiningk, Messe, p. 208; Levāns, ‘Lebendigen Toten,’ p. 32.
76 Kroeger, Erzbischof Silvester, p. 277; Arbusow, Livlands Geistlichkeit, p. 29; Neitmann, ‘Einheit Livlands,’ p. 112; GSTA PK, XX. HA, OBA 16835.
77 Kroeger, Erzbischof Silvester, p. 277; GSTA PK, XX. HA, OBA 16835.
78 Kroeger, Erzbischof Silvester, p. 277.
83 Neitmann, ‘Einheit Livlands,’ p. 112.
episcopal candidate, Simon von der Borch. On 22 March 1480 Sixtus IV (p. 1471-1484) appointed Stefan Grube (e. 1480-1483) a priest of the Order in the Italian bailiwick of Apulia, as the archbishop of Riga. Although a member of the Order, Grube became an enemy of the Livonian branch as his two predecessors have been. Master von der Borch remained loyal to his own candidate and the battle over the office escalated into military conflict in 1481 when the city of Riga clashed with the Order’s forces.

This political struggle was reflected in the memoria performed in the cathedral. The only surviving liturgical manuscript from the cathedral, the Riga Missal (Missale Rigense), belonged to the altar of the Holy Cross, next to the cathedral’s chancel. This missal, probably produced in the late fifteenth century, includes a calendar into which names and dates of death of five archbishops and cathedral canons were inserted: Johannes Ambundi (†1424), Henning Scharpenberg (†1448), and Silvester Stodewescher (†1479), provost Georg Holland (†1481/84), and canon Hinric Netelhorst (†1477). These interlinear interpolations were made on separate occasions (in different inks) by a single hand, in bastarda cursive, presumably during the 1480s. These records were most likely made to provide information for the celebration of memorial masses at the Holy Cross altar on the anniversaries of their deaths.

It is notable that the calendar has only five memorial records, all of individuals who had actively fought for the autonomy of the Rigan church and suffered from the hand of the Order. Johannes Ambundi defended the cause of the Rigan church at the papal curia and was successful in 1422/1423, when the chapter’s first incorporation in the

85 Caune, ‘Rīgas pēdējais bruņotais konfliktis,’ pp. 36-45.
86 ‘Istud missale pertinet ad/ altare sancte crucis in maiorie ecclesia ante pedem chori subter/ ambonem ubi ewangelium/ cum epistola leguntur.’ LUAB R, Ms. 1, Missale Rigense; Bruiningk, Messe, p. 25.
87 Hermann Bruiningk claimed that the missal is of late fourteenth, early fifteenth century origin, but Nicolaus Busch dates it to the late fifteenth century. Bruiningk, Messe, p. 25; Nicolaus Busch, Die Geschichte der Rigaer Stadtbibliothek und deren Bücher, ed. Leonid Arbusow, Riga, 1937, p. 91.
88 16 June ‘obiit Johannes Ambundy Anno etc xxiiij [1424] archiepiscopus Rigensis.’ Bruiningk, Messe, p. 207.
90 12 October ‘Anno domini m cccc lxxxiiij [1484] obiit Georgius Hollant prepositus Rigenis in castro Kokenhusen.’ Ibid., p. 211.
92 This contradicts Bruiningk’s claim that Ambundi’s name was inserted after his death. Bruiningk, Messe, p. 26.
93 The surviving sources do not enable to evaluate role of Hinric Netelhorst in the chapter’s struggle against the Order, but he died in 1477, when the Silvester’s conflict with Bernhard Borch was evolving.
Order was abandoned. Henning Scharpenberg and Silvester Stodewescher were celebrated enemies of the Order, who shifted from alliance with the Order to defending the Rigan church. In the case of Silvester’s memorial record, it emphasized the fact that the archbishop died in Kokenhusen (in castro Kokenhusen), as a prisoner of the Order. The description of the circumstances of his death had mnemonic significance; remembering where Silvester had died also helped to recollect the unjustness of the Order’s behaviour towards him and the cathedral chapter.

Some of these memorial records reflect the emotional reaction to the dramatic events experienced by the chapter during the late 1470s and 1480s. The provost of the cathedral chapter, Georg Holland (1469-1481/84), was captured by the Order in Dünamünde, probably in 1481, when he attempted to board a ship heading to Danzig, with ‘some important documents’ (etlike merklike boke) of the Rigan church in his baggage. Holland had been involved in opposing Bernhard Borch’s actions against the archbishop and the cathedral chapter after Silvester’s death, but failed. A letter from two cathedral canons to Stefan Grube on 18 December 1481 reported that Holland died while in the Order’s captivity. The calendar records that he died on 12 October 1484 in the castle of Karkhus (Est. Karksi) where he was held by the Order for defending the freedom of the Rigan church (libertatis ecclesie defensionem). Although the memorial record contradicts the canons’ letter, both sources show that the chapter was aware of the Order’s wrongdoings against their provost and remembered them. 12 October 1484 may have been the date on which Holland’s remains were brought to Riga from Karkhus, once relations between the Order and church of Riga were normalized after the resignation of Bernhard von der Borch in 1483.

The statement that Holland defended the independence of the Rigan church is meaningful, and his death was like that of a martyr for a cause. This suggestion is reinforced by the fact that the martyr bishop Berthold was buried near the altar of the Holy Cross. The altar was just next to the chancel where all three bishops commemorated in the calendar were buried; Netelhorst and presumably also Holland

---

97 Bruiningk, Messe, p. 208.
98 Arbusow, Livlands Geistlichkeit, p. 87; Archiwum Państwowe w Gdańsku (State Archive in Gdańsk) [hereafter APG], 300 D 9, 102.
99 Holland’s death in 1481 cannot be confirmed, but after 1482 his name no longer appears in the sources. APG, 300 D 9, 102, 104.
100 Bruiningk, Messe, p. 211.
were also buried in the cathedral, not far from the altar. Thus, when Ambundi, Scharpenberg, Stodewescher, Netelhorst and Holland were commemorated on the anniversaries of their deaths, their *memoria* at the Holy Cross altar was just by their tombs.

These memorial records in the calendar of the *Missale Rigense* represent a late-fifteenth century memorial tradition aimed at strengthening the identity of a group in peril. The Livonian Master Borch hindered the *memoria* of archbishop Stodewescher and aimed to destroy the archbishop’s office and the chapter’s autonomy; this struggle took place at the time when it is presumed that the memorial records in the missal were made. This *memoria* helped the cathedral chapter to remember all the Order’s offences against the canons and archbishops during the fifteenth century. The five liturgical memorial records were a counter-statement against the Order’s attempts to destroy the traditions and identity of institutions some two centuries old. Although the missal remained in use in the sixteenth century when the daily morning mass was celebrated at the Holy Cross altar, no other names were recorded after that of Gregor Holland had been entered.

4.3: Heaven, purgatory, and hell according to Dietrich Nagel. *Memoria* of the cathedral canons in the late fifteenth century

On Candlemas (2 February) 1447 five individuals – cathedral provost Dietrich Nagel, laymen Andreas Seppelbeke and Hinrik Harnisch, a priest Georg Dazeberg, and a noblewoman Anna van Aalen – founded a memorial chantry in Riga cathedral. The foundation charter is remarkable in that it not only explains the founders’ memorial preferences, but proclaims their views on death, the afterlife, and *memoria*. In the introduction the author describes what happens to all people after death and how they should be remembered. He begins by stating that ‘all humans are mortal and blessed are those who have died well in the Lord Christ, but the death of a sinner is terrible,
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103 The tombstones of numerous cathedral canons have survived in the cathedral of Riga, thus Netelhorst and Holland also must have been buried there. ‘Cronica episcoporum,’ p. 117; Jähnig, ‘Henning Scharpenberg,’ in *Bischöfe des Reiches*, p. 657; Loeffler, *Grabsteine*, pp. 22-23.
dreadful, and very bad, because they stay perpetually separated from God with the prince of darkness damned in hell, in perpetual death, and no memory stays with those dead.\textsuperscript{107} The author goes on to make a strong statement: those in hell ‘are erased from the book of the living’ and ‘we also forget them and do not commemorate them.’\textsuperscript{108} Hell was a place of eternal damnation where the dead were obliterated from the memory of the living. After this description of sinners in hell, the author described those lucky folk who had died in the grace of the Lord, saints whose righteousness ‘will never be forgotten’ (\textit{nummer wert vorgheten}) by God and men. Saints do not need the prayers of the living, but the living praised and venerated them, and prayed to them for intercession.\textsuperscript{109}

According to the text remembering and praying were closely bound. There was a third group of individuals, to which the founders themselves belonged, who were to be intensively remembered with prayers for their souls. These people, although they had died in grace (\textit{yn gnaden}), were exposed to ‘great suffering’ (\textit{swaren pynen entholden syn}) for a period of time (\textit{tor tyd}).\textsuperscript{110} The place of this suffering – purgatory – is not specifically named in the text, but the instruments of their salvation are clearly indicated. The living could help these souls by praying, giving alms, and celebrating the Eucharist at the altar.\textsuperscript{111} This meant that these dead should be remembered and their names had to be evoked.\textsuperscript{112}

With an emotive description the author explained why the living should remember those suffering souls, for they ‘are calling the living unceasingly by begging: have mercy on us, have mercy on us, our dear friends’.\textsuperscript{113} He also encouraged those praying for the dead, with the words of Jesus: ‘whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers and sisters of mine, you did for me.’\textsuperscript{114} Prayers for the dead are acts of mercy and good deeds that would also benefitted the living after their own deaths. After explaining and justifying prayers for the dead, the charter laid out in detail how the \textit{memoria} of the five founders should be established and maintained.\textsuperscript{115}

With its vivid descriptions of hell, heaven, and purgatory the charter was most likely written by Dietrich Nagel, provost of the cathedral chapter, whose name appears first

\textsuperscript{107} LUB 10, no. 297, p. 201.
\textsuperscript{108} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{109} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{110} LUB 10, no. 297, p. 201; on the purgatory, see Le Goff, \textit{La Naissance du Purgatoire}.
\textsuperscript{111} LUB 10, no. 297, p. 201.
\textsuperscript{112} Oexle, ‘Gegenwart der Toten,’ p. 31.
\textsuperscript{113} LUB 10, no. 297, p. 201.
\textsuperscript{114} LUB 10, no. 297, p. 201; Matthew 25:40.
among the founders. Nagel had been a key figure in the Livonian church for forty years. Born around 1400, in Münster, near Hanover, he studied in Leipzig and Rostock and was a notary as well as a priest. Nagel was first mentioned in Riga in 1425, at which time he was a schoolmaster of St Peter’s. In 1429 he was appointed a canon of the cathedral and he subsequently represented the archbishop in Rome (1429-1432); he later became the provost of the cathedral chapter in 1439/42, an office which he held until his death in 1469. Nagel was a highly respected clergyman not only in Livonia, but also in the highest circles of the Church. He represented the Rigan church at the Council of Basel (in attendance 1437-40), where Enea Silvio Piccolomini, the future Pope Pius II (p. 1458-1464), described him as a man known for his righteousness (*probitate cognitus*); the representatives of the Teutonic Order at the council saw Nagel as a great threat to their interest.

Back in Riga Nagel was an intellectual and political leader of the local ecclesiastical community. He was an energetic individual, who possessed great historical knowledge about the Rigan church, so essential for defending the interests of the chapter and the archbishop. He wrote a chronicle in Latin on the history of the Riga bishops and archbishops, and during the 1450s, drafted Silvester Stodewescher’s legal documents on the past of the Livonian church as evidence. Nagel was highly conscious of the significance of the cathedral of Riga as a memorial site. Both as a notary and as canon he had worked with the thirteenth century chronicles and charters, which referred to the origins of the church in Livonia and the bishops, Meinhard, Berthold and Albert, all of whom were buried in the cathedral.

By the time the foundation charter was issued in 1447, Dietrich Nagel had already proven himself as a leader. When archbishop Henning Scharpenberg was still alive, Nagel was sent to Rome in 1447 on a mission to defend the archbishop’s rights over the city of Riga and to promote the Teutonic Order’s opponent, Ludolf Grove, as bishop of Ösel (Est. Saaremaa). However, a year after the foundation of the chantry archbishop
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121 Levāns, ‘Lebendigen Toten,’ p. 11.
Henning Scharpenberg died and the Grand Master’s favourite Silvester Stodewescher was appointed in his place.\textsuperscript{123} The foundation charter was issued when Nagel was at the peak of his power; archbishop Scharpenberg was already old and his closest collaborators must have assumed that his death was imminent. Furthermore, this expectation may have motivated Nagel to invest in his own self-image, because the current archbishop Henning Scharpenberg had also been the chapter’s provost before his election.\textsuperscript{124} By 1448 Nagel was also the administrator of the diocese. However, despite all his efforts, the Order succeeded in appointing its own man as archbishop, and not the eminently suitable Nagel.\textsuperscript{125}

So the aim of this collective foundation was to create a perpetual memorial mass (\textit{eyne ewighe selemissen}) for the founders in Riga cathedral, and to erect an altar dedicated to St Joseph at which it was to be celebrated.\textsuperscript{126} The memorial mass was scheduled to follow the morning Mary mass in the chapel (\textit{na unser leven vrowen missen}).\textsuperscript{127} During these services a pall had to be laid over a bier, and two lights were to be placed besides it, imitating a funeral and attaining real presence of those commemorated.\textsuperscript{128} The chantry employed four or as many priests as it could afford with its annual income of ten new Riga marks, an income granted by the \textit{rentbreve} of the city council.\textsuperscript{129} In addition to the memorial masses, these priests for memorial purposes had to sing the canonical hours (\textit{officium}) seven times annually.\textsuperscript{130} They were additionally expected to recite the office (\textit{Requiem eternam}) for all Christian souls on other appropriate occasions.\textsuperscript{131} The services planned were a busy schedule of commemoration in perpetuity, supported by a sizeable endowment.

Nagel paid careful attention to funding the \textit{memoria} and perhaps joined with others for that very reason. Some of Nagel’s predecessors had died in debt, endangering their long-term \textit{memoria}, thus it was more secure to create it together with other individuals and to attract resources from different sources.\textsuperscript{132}
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As provost Dietrich Nagel inhabited a privileged position. Like leaders of cathedral chapters elsewhere in the medieval Europe, he controlled the creation of memorial foundations within the cathedral by the chapter’s canons.\textsuperscript{133} Nagel was privileged founder of an impressive memorial chantry; he funded creation of individual \textit{memoria} by the resources of the cathedral chapter. With the consent of the chapter, he endowed the chantry with 50 Riga marks from the chapter income and with 30 marks from the inheritance of the intestate priest Nikolaus Falkenberg.\textsuperscript{134} Other founders invested lesser amounts; Andreas Sepelbeke endowed 75 marks, Hinrik Harnsch and Georg Dazeberg 36 ½ marks each, and Anna van Aalen only 25 new Riga marks.\textsuperscript{135} Altogether 250 Riga marks provided an annual income of 10 Riga marks, which were paid to the chantry priests.\textsuperscript{136} Nagel was both founder and patron of this foundation, able to grant resources and space by virtue of his office, and to attract powerful chantry wardens.

Although the founders of chantries always aimed for perpetual provision, even minor crises could halt the flow of prayer. In order to ensure continuity, the five founders involved both ecclesiastical and urban authorities as chantry wardens.\textsuperscript{137} They required the provost of the cathedral chapter to act as the chantry’s patron.\textsuperscript{138} In this way Nagel obliged his successors to take care of these services and with the chantry wardens to oversee the performance of masses and prayers.\textsuperscript{139} Johan Meyer, a cathedral vicar, was also chosen to be a chantry warden alongside the provost.\textsuperscript{140} Alongside those two clergymen, two powerful laymen were chosen as wardens: the Riga burgomasters Hinrik Eppinghusen and Gerwen Gendena.\textsuperscript{141} In the event of a warden’s death, the surviving three chose a successor.\textsuperscript{142} The wardens were also entitled to transfer these memorial services to another church if they could not be continued in the cathedral of Riga.\textsuperscript{143}

This foundation charter is particularly interesting since it regulates strictly not only the commemoration, but also the long-term existence of the foundation. Two copies
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were made; one to be kept by the city council, the other, together with the account book, money and precious liturgical objects, in the hands of the wardens.144 By appointing influential wardens and entrusting them with numerous functions, the founders formed the memorial chantry as a robust institution.

Nagel and his co-founders had clearly given much thought to the issue of remembering. They instructed that those who made donations and endowments be recorded in the inventory (inventarium), their names alongside their gifts (se alle by namen mit erer gifte), so that they would not be forgotten (nicht vorgheten werden).145 Once a year, when the priests were paid their salaries, these names had to be read out so the priests would know ‘from whom they receive their alms and for whom they are obliged to pray for’.146 After receiving the annual stipend, each one of them had to celebrate a vigil and a memorial mass.147 The founders perceived the commemoration as a counter-gift and wished that they and their gifts were made known to the recipients-commemorators.148 This was a ritual by which the benefactors were introduced to their commemorators; it created a bond between the dead and the living.

Nagel was acting in a tradition laid down by provosts before him. In 1463 Dietrich Nagel issued a charter regarding his predecessor Arnold von Brinke, who had endowed 1000 Riga marks for the chantry of the Three Kings in the cathedral.149 Nagel and his successors were responsible for the maintenance of the chantry, and thus for von Brinke’s memoria.

The foundation charter of 1447 reveals a clear sense of the purpose and structure of the proposed memoria, which were manifested once again in the confirmation charter issued by archbishop Silvester in 1464.150 The archbishop praises his cathedral provost and restates the beneficiaries of the chantry: the soul of Dietrich himself, the souls of his predecessors and successors, the souls of Nagel’s parents, and souls of the living and dead peasants of the cathedral chapter (pro agricolis et rusticis prepositure Rigensi).151 Silvester fostered Nagel’s chantry by ensuring episcopal protection, and financially, by endowing it with 500 old Riga marks.152 The endowment had to deliver an annual payment for the chantry even during Nagel’s lifetime. After Nagel’s death the provost
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and his predecessors were to be commemorated on his obit by the cathedral’s canons and the chantry priests. Money was also distributed to the priests on this anniversary, following the practice laid down in the foundation charter of 1447.

Silvester Stodewescher’s endowment seems to be a sign of his allegiance to the cathedral chapter and to Nagel personally, following their close relationship during the preparation of the treaty of Kircholm (1452). In addition to supporting the individual remembrance of Nagel, Silvester also invested 500 marks in the institutional memoria of the cathedral chapter, particularly that of its provosts. The charter claims that many of Nagel’s predecessors had died and were buried outside Livonia (extra patriam) and that the endowment therefore secured their memoria in Riga. The fact that the cathedral chapter’s living and deceased peasants were also mentioned for commemoration, further reinforces the institutional character of the chantry that was already integral to the foundation charter in 1447. Stodewescher’s charter and endowment shaped this chantry to commemorate all members of the cathedral chapter of Riga, thus creating a community of clerics and laymen, living and dead. Here, as in other case studies discussed in this dissertation, individual remembrance was intertwined with memoria of an institution, past and future; the memoria of Nagel and his family became part of the institutional remembrance of the cathedral chapter.

Nagel’s foundation shows how remembrance of the cathedral canons was created and promoted in late medieval Livonia. This is particularly important since few testaments or foundation charters of the Livonian canons have survived. The foundation charter of 1447 drafted by Nagel shows both the intellectual and financial resources that the provosts possessed and were able to invest in memoria. Nagel institutionalized his own memoria, binding it to the provost’s office; he also used the chapter’s resources for it and seventeen years later was able to attract an additional endowment from the archbishop. Nagel, like any other ecclesiastical office holder, sought to imprint his name on the collective memory of the group alongside his predecessors and successors; his memorial foundation was one of the instruments for fulfilling this desire.
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4.4: Cistercian nuns and Dominican friars as commemorators

The dead of urban communities were commemorated not only in parish churches but also in urban religious communities: nunneries, friaries, and monasteries located within the town walls or in close proximity. Religious communities, unlike parishes or chapels, offered prayers by their members – nuns, monks, and friars – professional religious. This professionalism attracted townspeople, who made large endowments for the houses and smaller donations to individual nuns and friars, expecting commemoration in return.

In Riga and Reval the Dominican friars and Cistercian nuns dominated the offering of *memoria*. *Memoria* served for the creation of relationships between religious communities and laymen. Most of the surviving sources pertain to the commemoration of laypeople, while little is known about commemoration of fellow brothers and sisters. This section will offer the analysis of a unique case, of the Cistercian nuns of Riga who cooperated with a secular brotherhood in remembrance of their sisters.

The Cistercian nunneries in Reval and Riga were established during the mid-thirteenth century: St Michaelis in Reval in 1249 and St Mary Magdalene in Riga in 1257. The foundation of the nunnery of St Catherine in Dorpat occurred later, in the early fourteenth century. These Livonian nunneries were not bound together by institutional ties, as each was founded by local noble families and were home to the daughters of such families. Nuns of noble descent dominated the membership of Livonian nunneries. In Riga during the late fifteenth century, only two of the fifty-two nuns of St Mary Magdalene were not of noble descent. Noble families sustained strong ties with their kinswomen in the nunneries and supported them with individual donations and annuity rents. Although the nunneries were situated within the town walls, and because of these strong ties with the nobility the townspeople perceived them as somewhat ‘foreign’. As Kadri-Rutt Hahn’s analysis of wills in Reval has shown, St Michaelis enjoyed less support and trust from urban testators than other religious institutions in Reval.

---
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Despite the gaps in the source material, it is evident that the nunneries were strong and reliable partners for rich and influential Livonians who wished to secure lasting and solemn commemoration. The Cistercian nunnery in Riga was a place of remembrance not only for noble families, but also for rich townspeople and individuals affiliated to the Teutonic Order. The city councillor Hartwich Segefridt created his memorial chantry at the nunnery in 1434, where two priests were appointed in 1442 after the death of his son. Before 1495, the burgomaster Peter Hinrickes endowed 1000 marks for the nunnery to commemorate his soul (alle tiid begaen szyn) and the souls of all other Christians. In 1445 Johan Kerssenbrugge, physician to the Master of the Order, founded a memorial chantry in the nunnery, which was to be served by two priests.

Many townspeople requested memoria from the Cistercian nunneries, but most big donors were noblemen who were kin to the nuns. The archbishop’s vassal Christopher von Ungern, whose three kinswomen Otilia, Margreta and Anna von Ungern were nuns in Riga in 1495, endowed St Mary Magdalene with 100 Riga marks in 1517 for a weekly sung mass on Thursdays. This endowment was made in support of the cult of Corpus Christi and for the soul of his brother Hinrich von Ungern.

The nunneries in Reval and Dorpat also commemorated local noblemen. In 1460 Hermann Soye (Zöge), a nobleman from Harria-Vironia, founded a memorial chantry in the St Michaelis nunnery in Reval with the consent of his brothers. The initial endowment was 300 Riga marks and a further 100 marks were added ten years later. In his will of 1470 Hermann Soye requested that the nuns sang the office Deus eterne every morning in remembrance of him and his kin (vrunden) in the chancel of their church. Soye’s permanent commemorative presence in the Cistercian church was reinforced by services at the Corpus Christi altar. In addition, Soye made a smaller endowment of 100 marks for his own remembrance in the Bridgettine convent of Mariendal. He requested that the sisters and brothers celebrate two memorial masses.

---

164 LUB 8, no. 782, 790, 792; LUB 9, no. 844; LUAB Ms. 61, fols. 44a-45b, 66a; Bothführ, Rathslinie, no. 355.
165 LUB 2/1, no. 253; Bothführ, Rathslinie, no. 388.
166 LUB 10, no. 150, 151, 179.
167 LUB 2/1, no. 252; LGU 2, no. 238.
168 On commemorative practices of the late medieval European nobility, see Saul, Death, Art and Memory in Medieval England; Adelige und bürgerliche Erinnerungskulturen.
169 LUB 12, no. 36; Schmidt, ‘Zisterzienser,’ p. 222.
170 Eesti Ajalooarhiiv (Estonian Historical Archives) [hereafter EAA], f. 2069, n. 2, s. 128.
171 Ibid.
and vigils annually. During the 1450s, he had made two agreements with the Bridgettines in Mariendal about landed properties.\textsuperscript{172}

During the fifteenth century several noblemen from the bishopric of Dorpat and Harria-Vironia included the Cistercian nunnery of Dorpat in their memorial strategies. Otto von Üxküll, vassal of the bishop of Dorpat, who also founded a memorial mass in the Cistercian monastery of Falkenau, made an endowment of 150 marks in 1417 to the nunnery of St Catherine in Dorpat, in return for commemoration in nuns’ prayers and the celebration of a vigil on the anniversary of his death in the chancel of their church.\textsuperscript{173} In 1412 Johann von Lechtes from Harria-Vironia chose three Livonian religious communities in which he wanted to be commemorated – the Cistercian nuns in Dorpat, the Franciscans in Riga, and the Cistercians in Padis – endowing each of them with a hundred marks.\textsuperscript{174} All three communities were obliged to commemorate Johann, his parents, his wife Margarethe, and souls of all his relatives. The services were to be celebrated each quarter, a vigil on Friday and a mass on Saturday; during both of these services a bier had to be placed in front of an altar, as if a body lay on it.\textsuperscript{175} These noblemen also founded their remembrance in other locations, but the Cistercian nuns were among the main commemorators.

With their involvement in the memoria of the nobility, the Cistercian nuns were closely bound with the elites. Yet in late-fifteenth century Riga the nuns entered into an unusual partnership in which memoria played an essential role. On 20 August 1495 an agreement to create a confraternity between the Cistercian nuns of St Mary Magdalene and the non-German Draymen’s guild was established.\textsuperscript{176} According to the agreement abbess Gerdrut Vitingess, together with all ‘honourable and virtuous virgins (nuns)’,\textsuperscript{177} was accepted into ‘the guild and brotherhood’ of the Draymen.\textsuperscript{178} In the event of the death of a nun the draymen had to be ‘perpetually ready’ to attend the funeral with lights and a pall, and to offer prayers at the vigils and soul masses.\textsuperscript{179} In return for the guild members’ presence at the funerals and commemorations, the nuns promised to commemorate the deceased brothers and sisters of the Draymen’s guild with vigils and
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masses.\textsuperscript{180} This charter lists the names of fifty-two nuns; the names of the draymen are not included.\textsuperscript{181}

This agreement created a spiritual confraternity (\textit{Gebetsverbrüderung}) between the nuns and the draymen.\textsuperscript{182} The creation of spiritual confraternities between communities had a long tradition going back to the early Middle Ages, when monasteries exchanged the names of their living and dead between each other and mutually prayed for them.\textsuperscript{183} These prayers made the absent present, creating a community of the living and dead, separated in time and space.\textsuperscript{184} Spiritual confraternities between institutions were created by legal acts, which enshrined spiritual and material benefits for both sides in perpetuity.\textsuperscript{185} The institutional character of this kind of \textit{memoria} made it more secure in the long term.

This type of spiritual confraternity between a religious community and a guild was, however, unique. The cooperation benefited both parties and it was clearly motivated by \textit{memoria}. The confraternity enabled the nuns to have large funeral processions including lights and a pall; in turn the draymen were promised regular liturgical remembrance of their dead in the Cistercian church.\textsuperscript{186} By joining the Draymen’s guild, the nuns attained something they could not have achieved without the help of a large group in which had many male members. During a funeral procession draymen were able to carry the corpse to the grave, covered by a pall, and other members provided a large crowd of mourners. This confraternity between the nuns and the draymen was created just as the city council of Riga was pressing the nunnery towards reform, a pressure the nuns resisted; they also involved the Livonian Master, Walter von Plettenberg, in their defence.\textsuperscript{187}

With around two hundred members, the Draymen’s guild was one of the largest brotherhoods in late-fifteenth century Riga.\textsuperscript{188} The guild of the Draymen must have had a reputation for its commemorative rites and because of that the nunnery decided to cooperate with it.\textsuperscript{189} The commemorative obligations the guild accepted were not easy to fulfil, but the guild’s \textit{memoria} also benefited greatly by the addition of fifty nuns,
'professional commemorators’ and providers of prayer. Moreover, the draymen achieved this without having to invest significant financial resources.  

The agreement bound the two groups financially as well. The Draymen’s guild had to pay the abbess two marks a year. According to the account book of the Draymen’s guild, the nuns were considered as part of the guild. Between 1495 and 1511 the abbess paid an annual membership fee of 3 marks for all the nuns during every drinking feast and, in 1504, the nuns were described as full members of the guild. The nuns’ membership in the guild did not demand their presence in all secular activities of the brotherhood. The membership of the nuns in the Draymen brotherhood was meant to provide memorial benefits, not social participation.

Their memorial cooperation with the draymen was not the only example of the Cistercian nuns’ entry into spiritual confraternity. In the mid-fifteenth century they entered into spiritual confraternity with a religious community at the other end of Livonia. On 4 September 1428, Gerlach, the superior (pater) of the Bridgettine convent in Mariendal, near Reval, issued a charter including the Cistercian nuns from the St Mary Magdalene in the good deeds and prayers of this Bridgettine convent. In addition, the Bridgettine community of nuns and brothers promised individual memoria of the deceased Cistercian nuns from Riga.

The Bridgettine community in Mariendal was founded in 1407 as a filia of the first Bridgettine foundation in Vadstena, Sweden. Initially the city of Reval opposed its foundation, because of its strategic locationdangerously close to the city. But the Bridgettines had numerous supporters. The founders of Mariendal were three Reval merchants, but local nobility and the Teutonic Order were also patrons of the community in its initial stages. Cooperation with other religious communities in
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Livonia was necessary for them to strengthen the positions of the Bridgettines on the Eastern shore of the Baltic Sea.

Map 6: The Cistercian nunneries and the Bridgettine convent in Mariendal

Although most of the liturgical manuscripts of the Mariendal monastery have been lost, two leaves have survived of a calendar once used by it. The names and dates of death of five nuns and clergymen have been recorded in these four pages. Alongside the names of the late-fifteenth century sisters, is Dorothea van Aalen (Soror Dorothea van Aalen obijt anno mo vco xliiiij. Schwester) (†1544). A noblewoman with the same name was a nun of the Cistercian nunnery in Riga in 1495. Paul Johansen argues that the Dorothea van Aalen mentioned in the calendar of the Bridgettines of Mariendal was Bridgettines. LGU 1, no. 293; on the relationship between the Bridgettines and the Reval’s merchants and testators, see Neumann and Nottbeck, Geschichte und Kunstdenkmäler, p. 130; Hahn, Revaler Testamente, pp. 93-94; Kreem, Markus, ‘Kes asutas Pirita kloostri?’ pp. 60-74. Paul Johansen, Ein Kalenderfragment aus dem Sankt Brigittenkloster zu Tallinn für den Mai und den Juni 1474-1544, Pirita, 1939. May 2, 1474 Brigitte Eppenscheiden; May 6, 1477 Elisabeth Stoltevoet; May 15, 1486 her Hermen Schulte, diaconus, May 1, 1492 Gerdrut Lode; June 1, 1544 Soror Dorothea van Aalen obijt anno mo vco xliiiij. Schwester. Ibid., p. 16. Ibid., p. 16, 22. LUB 2/1, no. 252.
unlikely to be the nun from Riga.201 Yet, it is possible that she was the nun mentioned in 1495, who died in Riga as a Cistercian and was commemorated in Mariendal because of the confraternity agreement. Even after the Reformation the two female communities – the Cistercians in Riga and the Bridgettines in Mariendal – survived because of their bonds with the local nobilities. The convent of Mariendal was only destroyed in 1575/77 during a siege of Muscovite troops, and the last nuns of the Cistercian nunnery in Riga died in the 1580s.202 Thus it is possible that the institutions continued to commemorate their dead mutually throughout the period of unrest and disruption that began in 1524.

The Cistercian nuns in Reval were involved in a similar confraternity with other religious communities. On 22 March 1431 abbot Alexander of the Cistercian abbey of Roma in Gotland issued a confraternity charter which shared prayer and good works with the nuns of St Michaelis.203 The Cistercians of Roma owned an estate called Kolk in Harria, northern Estonia, and a house in Reval; thus the two communities already had a degree of geographical proximity; they exchanged the names of the nuns and monks for whom they mutually bound to pray.204

Although they possessed similar commemorative capabilities to any other religious community, the Cistercian nuns in Livonia seem not to have been trusted by the urban testators and donors. Their main supporters were noble families, who also made commemorative foundations in the nunneries. Apart from caring for remembrance of laypeople, the nunneries involved other religious communities and even secular groups in their commemoration. These were attempts to secure the long-term commemoration of the nuns and to ensure that they would be offered appropriate burial and memoria after death.

The Dominicans played a different role as commemorators in Livonian cities and towns. They were closer to the urban population to whom they preached and from whom they were recruited. There is no evidence on how the Dominicans in Livonia commemorated their own dead, but Dominicans in Riga and Reval were active commemorators of townspeople and local nobility.

The Dominicans arrived in Livonian cities in the 1220s, introduced by the papal legate William of Modena. The friary of St John the Baptist in Riga was founded in
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1234, when bishop Nicholas donated his old castle to the friars.\textsuperscript{205} In Reval the Dominicans first settled on the cathedral hill in 1229, but left four years later only to return in 1246.\textsuperscript{206} In 1262 they received a large plot next to the town wall, where they had a friary built, dedicated to St Catherine of Alexandria.\textsuperscript{207} In Dorpat the friary was founded during the late thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{208} In contrast to Riga and Dorpat, where almost no sources on the commemorative activities of the Dominicans has survived, Reval’s source material offers unique insight into these arrangements.\textsuperscript{209}

According to Kadri-Rutt Hahn the Dominican friary of Reval, together with the parish churches of St Nicholas and St Olav, received most testamentary donations. They were clearly closer to the townspeople’s hearts than the cathedral or the Cistercian nunnery.\textsuperscript{210} From the late fourteenth century until the Reformation, 70\% of Reval’s testators made donations to the Dominican friary.\textsuperscript{211} In comparison with other German medieval cities, this is a high number indeed. In Cologne in the fifteenth century, around 85\% of lay testators donated something to the all mendicant orders;\textsuperscript{212} in Lübeck in the second half of the fourteenth century, 26\% of testators were donors to the Dominicans and around the same percentage of testators made gifts to the Franciscans.\textsuperscript{213} The Dominican friary in Reval may have received donations from testators more frequently than in other cities because it was the only mendicant community there.\textsuperscript{214} Most of these donations (70\%) were smaller than ten Riga marks, and only 3\% of them exceeded 100 Riga marks.\textsuperscript{215} The majority of the donations were small because the donors were men and women of all social classes.\textsuperscript{216}

Dominicans and other mendicants were popular with the laity because of the high reputation of the liturgical services they provided.\textsuperscript{217} Townspeople in Reval often chose
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the Dominican church as their burial place over their parish churches.\textsuperscript{218} Yet the parish – the centre of social life – was also a centre for \textit{memoria}; most of the testators wanted to be primarily commemorated in the parish churches, but the friars were additional commemorators.

Testators sought not only commemoration at masses, but also the friars’ individual involvement.\textsuperscript{219} Between 1378 and the 1470s, more than half of those testators who donated to the Dominicans also provided money gifts to individual friars (\textit{in de hande to delende}).\textsuperscript{220} Such donations were made alongside the endowments towards church fabric or liturgical services; for example, Martin Busch in 1449 donated to the construction of St Catherine’s church and also gave three marks to be distributed between ‘young and old friars.’\textsuperscript{221}

Testators valued the Dominicans as a group, but they wanted to oblige each friar to commemorate them privately. Regular payments of money reminded the beneficiary of prayer and created a personal bond between commemorator and beneficiary. In 1510, Reynold Korner, Reval’s city clerk, donated to each friar four schillings to pray for him on the anniversaries of his death, paying two schillings for masses and two for vigils.\textsuperscript{222} Testators in Reval and in other medieval cities engaged friars, priests,\textsuperscript{223} nuns,\textsuperscript{224} and poor people\textsuperscript{225} in individual commemorative praying for their souls. In Reval, as in Lübeck, testators valued friars who were ordained priests more, and their liturgical services had more value than the prayers of simple brethren.\textsuperscript{226} Wilm vame Schede in his will of 1447 donated one Riga mark for the prior, lector, and old friar called Johann, and one \textit{ferding} for each ordained friar, but others received only five schillings each.\textsuperscript{227}

\textsuperscript{218} Twelve tombstones of the townspeople have survived in the former Dominican church of St Catherine and seven requests of burials there were made in the last wills. See Neumann and Nottbeck, \textit{Geschichte und Kunsidenkmäler}, pp. 174-180; Mari Loit, ‘Keskaegsest surmakultuurist ja hauatähistest reformatsoonielsel Tallinna kirkustes ja kloostrites,’ [On the Medieval “Culture of Death” and the Tombstones in the Churches and Monasteries of Tallinn from 1309 to 1524] in \textit{Vana Tallinn 17} (21) (2006): pp. 15-190; Strenga, \textit{Devotion}, p. 66.

\textsuperscript{219} Hahn, \textit{Revaler Testamente}, p. 184.

\textsuperscript{220} Eight of fifteen donors requested to be commemorated by individual friars. \textit{Revaler Urkunden}, no. 20; \textit{Revaler Regesten}, no. 4, 6; LUB 3 no. 1263; LUB 8, no. 1965, 896; LUB 9, no. 911; LUB 10, no. 334, 582; LUB 11, no. 442, 385, 397; LUB 12, no. 297, 303; \textit{Revaler Regesten}, no. 24.

\textsuperscript{221} LUB 10, no. 582.

\textsuperscript{222} LUB 2/3, no. 849.

\textsuperscript{223} \textit{Revaler Urkunden}, no. 20; \textit{Revaler Regesten}, no. 3, . . 42, 48, 50, 52, 53, 57, 93, 105, 106, 110, 118; LUB 11, no. 397.

\textsuperscript{224} LUB 3, no. 1263; \textit{Revaler Regesten}, no. 4, 6, 36, 50; LUB 9, no. 911; LUB 10, no. 334, 582; LUB 12, no. 303; LUB 2/3, no. 849.

\textsuperscript{225} LUB 8, no. 1965; LUB 9, no. 911; LUB 10, no. 582; LUB 11, no. 442, 385; LUB 12, no. 303; \textit{Revaler Regesten}, no. 24, 35, 36, 44, 50; LUB 2/2, no. 264.


\textsuperscript{227} LUB 10, no. 334.
Other testators also donated larger sums to the priests, lectors, and preachers than to others, showing that for them the status of friars mattered.\textsuperscript{228}

The frequency of personal donations decreased in the late fifteenth century. After the 1470s only three testators donated money to individual friars.\textsuperscript{229} This may have been caused by the Dominican reform in Reval in 1474/1475, when the friary became part of the reformed Congregatio Hollandiae.\textsuperscript{230} This reform aimed to restore an ideal of poverty promoted in the first constitutions and to prohibit the use of private property by the brethren.\textsuperscript{231} Individual donations were to be received by the community as whole.

The decrease of individual donations for friars may have also followed a general trend. Donations to individual religious decreased in the case of the Cistercian nuns, and even to the poor in hospitals.\textsuperscript{232} Thus, modification of general donation habits for individuals in religious communities may have been influenced by the Dominican reform. The bond between testators and individual friars was important for memoria, it created a certain intimacy, and the abolition of individual donations affected this bond.

Testamentary donations did not assure long-term commemoration, which needed large endowments that only few could make. Gherwen Bornemann (1480) was the only known testator who made a large endowment; he requested a memorial mass read every week on the broderschopp altar, endowing 100 marks for the purpose.\textsuperscript{233} Yet the city council’s ledgers record large endowments made to the Dominicans for the memorial chantries by the city councillors Herman van der Hove (1415-1426),\textsuperscript{234} Bertold Hunninghusen (1434-1524),\textsuperscript{235} and burgher Woldemar Reval (1434-1463).\textsuperscript{236} These chantries strengthened the bonds between the elite families and the friars.\textsuperscript{237}

\textsuperscript{228} LUB 3, no. 1263; LUB 9, no. 911.
\textsuperscript{229} Revaler Regesten, no. 36, 50; LUB 2 / 3, no. 849.
\textsuperscript{231} Kaspar Elm, ‘Reform- und Observanzbestrebungen im spätmittelalterlichen Ordenswesen. Ein Überblick,’ in Reformbemühungen, pp. 3-19, at p. 16; Bernhard Neidiger, ‘Die Reformbewegungen der Bettelorden im 15. Jahrhundert,’ in Württembergisches Klosterbuch. Klöster, Stifte und Ordensgemeinschaften von den Anfängen bis in die Gegenwart, ed. Wolfgang Zimmermann, Ostfildern, 2003, pp. 77-90, at p. 80; in Reval also reformers demanded to abandon private property. TLA f. 230, n 1, s Bk 3, fol. 11r.
\textsuperscript{232} Strenga, Devotion, pp. 59-60.
\textsuperscript{233} TLA f. 230, n 1, BN 1/1, Gherwen Borneman, fol. 1.
\textsuperscript{234} TLA f. 230, n 1, 107 Aa 7, fol. 10, 23; LUB 7, no. 451.
\textsuperscript{235} Kämmereibuch der Stadt Reval 1432-1463, p. 701; Kämmereibuch der Stadt Reval 1463-1507, p. 896; TLA f. 230, n 1, A.d. 32. fols. 16, 27, 33, 39, 46, 58, 158.
\textsuperscript{236} Kämmereibuch der Stadt Reval 1432-1463, p. 722; Kämmereibuch der Stadt Reval 1463-1507, no. 1206.
\textsuperscript{237} See the subchapters 1.3 and 1.4.
Like the Cistercian nunneries, the Dominican friaries were the chosen spaces for commemoration of the Livonian noble families. The friars in Livonia were deeply rooted in the urban environments, but they also managed to create close relationships with local nobilities. Until the Reformation the nobility of Harria-Vironia held their regular assemblies (manntags) in the Dominican church of St Catherine in Reval.\(^{238}\)

Few foundation charters survive to demonstrate the long-term obligations undertaken by the Dominicans, but two examples explicitly show the place of the friars in the memorial strategies of the Livonian noblemen.\(^{239}\) On the vigil of Epiphany (5 January) 1436, in the Dominican friary in Riga nobleman Detlef von der Pahlen, the archbishop’s vassal, endowed 100 Riga marks for the liturgical services.\(^{240}\) Prior Johan Schaffer and his brethren promised to celebrate during Detlef’s lifetime a daily mass on one altar in the church.\(^{241}\) At each mass the living and dead members of the von der Pahlen family had to be commemorated (dencken derghenen, beide levendigen und doden). It specified the living – Detlef himself, his wife Margrete, his son Detlef – and the dead: his parents, Ludeke and Ylsebe, brothers Johannes and Gotschalk and 3 more relatives.\(^{242}\) Remarkably, after Detlef von der Pahlen’s death the number of services was to be reduced to two weekly memorial masses for all individuals mentioned.\(^{243}\)

By requesting intensive services during his lifetime, and less intensive commemoration after his death Detlef von der Pahlen sought to benefit from memoria of his kin while alive. The benefits were spiritual as well as social and political, strengthening the position of himself and his family, which had been in Livonia since the late thirteenth century.\(^{244}\) Detlef von der Pahlen was also involved with other institutions which commemorated him and his family. In 1438, Detlef von der Pahlen and his kin, both living and dead, were received into the confraternity of the Bridgettine convent of Mariendal, where commemoration and prayers were offered in return already during Detlef’s lifetime.\(^{245}\) In the summer of 1436 archbishop Henning confirmed Detlef von der Pahlen’s earlier endowment of 100 marks for the memorial chantry in

\(^{238}\) Ritscher, *Reval an der Schwelle*, p. 117.
\(^{239}\) On the Livonian noblemen as the benefactors of the Dominicans, see Walther-Wittenheim, *Dominikaner in Livland*, pp. 98-100.
\(^{240}\) LUB 9, no. 4; on family von der Pahlen, see Astaf von Transehe-Roseneck, *Genealogisches Handbuch der livländischen Ritterschaft*, vol. 1, Görlitz, 1929, pp. 532-551, 542.
\(^{241}\) Ibid.
\(^{242}\) LUB 9, no. 4; LUB 7, no. 106; Detlef’s father Ludeke or Ludecinus de Pale has been mentioned in the sources between 1385-1397, see Transehe-Roseneck, *Genealogisches Handbuch*, p. 542.
\(^{243}\) LUB 9, no. 4.
\(^{244}\) Transehe-Roseneck, *Genealogisches Handbuch*, p. 532, 542.
\(^{245}\) LGU 1, no. 293.
the cathedral of Riga.\textsuperscript{246} All these memorial efforts were made at a time when the influence of Detlef and his family was on the rise; in 1444 Detlef van der Pahlen received new fiefs in bishoprics of Dorpat and Ösel once held by his uncle Hans van der Rope.\textsuperscript{247}

The friars of Reval also became commemorators to noble families. On 1 February 1411 Johan van dem Rode, the prior of the Reval Dominicans, and eight brethren promised to commemorate in their masses all living and dead members of the von Vietinghoff family, particularly Dietrich von Vietinghoff, his living wife Anne, and his sons Heinrich and Arnd, as well as Dietrich’s deceased wife Adelheid.\textsuperscript{248} Dietrich von Vietinghoff, like Detlef von der Pahlen, was an influential nobleman, a leader of the local nobility in Harria-Vironia, and this request of remembrance can be likewise interpreted as an attempt to gain spiritual benefit as well as social prestige even during his lifetime.\textsuperscript{249} The Dominicans were first to commemorate the founders of this endowment and then all deceased belonging to this kin.\textsuperscript{250} The Dominicans for five marks had to commemorate the Vietinghoffs each week with a mass celebrated on Sunday, at the altar of St Anthony in the Dominican church of St Catherine, and also to evoke their names from the ambo (\textit{der selen to denkende van deme predyckstole}).\textsuperscript{251}

In contrast to the majority of townspeople, Livonian noblemen requested commemorative roles already during their lifetimes. The Livonian Dominicans fulfilled commemorative roles traditionally undertaken by the monastic communities which commemorated their benefactors.\textsuperscript{252} In 1495 the prior of the Riga friary, Jacob von Brugen, accepted Hermann Keyserlingk and his wife Anna and their children into the benefits of the friary’s good works, granting them continuous prayers.\textsuperscript{253} The Keyserlingks were also promised that after their deaths the friars would commemorate them during daily prayers.\textsuperscript{254} This involvement of the Keyserlingks with the Dominicans was important for this family, recently arrived in Livonia from Westphalia,
following receipt of a fief in Courland in 1493. The Keyserlingks gained a bond with the Dominicans in their new country of residence.

The Reformation ended the relationships between the Dominicans and those groups for whom they once prayed. In Reval, already at the beginning of 1524, members of the city council arrived in the friary and demanded an audit of the friary’s property and prohibited friars from delivering sermons. The council also declared that the friars should accept for burial in the Dominican church and cemetery only those laypeople who had requested it in their wills. This meant that the performance of memoria in the friary was halted, because the friars could not freely use resources needed for memorial services. In Riga the Dominicans were expelled from the city in early 1524; in Reval the city council officially closed the Dominican friary on 12 January 1525, and confiscated its property.

In contrast to the Cistercian nuns, the Dominicans were commemorators who were popular not only among one social group, but attracted individuals from all classes of the townspeople and also the local noblemen. The testators created closer bonds with the friars, by making individual donations in order to receive personalized commemoration. Yet, in Reval the practice decreased after the Dominican reform.

As we have seen, the Cistercian nuns could not compete with the friars in this market of memoria, possibly because they were outsiders in the urban spaces as members of noble families. Yet, the Cistercian nuns found partners, other monastic communities or even secular brotherhoods, with whom they made confraternity agreements. These spiritual confraternities strengthened the memorial traditions of the Cistercians and their partners.
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256 Kala, ‘Dominikanerkloster,’ p. 86.
4.5: *Annales Dunamundenses*: the historical tradition of the Livonian Cistercians and the Teutonic Order

Monastic communities in late medieval Europe had strong memorial traditions and hosted *memoria* of individuals not belonging to them. This practice reveals not only commemoration itself, but also relationships between groups involved in the exchange of prayers and memory. There were only three men’s monasteries outside cities in medieval Livonia, all Cistercian: Dünamünde (Latv. Daugavgrīva) (1205-1305), Padis (Est. Padise) (1317-1559), and Falkenau/Valkena (Est. Kärkna) (1234-1558).259 Although no necrologies from these Cistercian communities have survived, there is one source of evidence on their memorial traditions concerning the Teutonic Order. The so-called Annals of Dünamünde of the Livonian Cistercians, present a mid-fourteenth century narrative of crusading and Christianization of Livonia which refers to those who lost their lives during these crusades. This section will deal with the *memoria* in the Dünamünde annals in the context of the relationship between the Livonian Cistercians and the Teutonic Order.

The Cistercians were actively involved in the Christianization of Livonia and in promoting crusades.260 The Cistercians ‘held a crucial position in integrating Livonia with the Christian world’ until the 1230s.261 They played an important role in the communication of the Baltic crusades through their network of abbeys in Europe, thus fostering both the Christianization and implantation of European institutions in Livonia. Within Livonia itself, the Cistercians were also deeply involved in missionary work and military activities, playing key roles in the newly established Christian church even before the foundation of a Cistercian abbey.262 Three Cistercian missionaries and bishops Berthold Schulte (†1198), Theoderic of Treiden (†1219), and Bernhard of Lippe (c. 1140-1224), contributed greatly to the Livonian mission in which they combined the roles of military and religious leaders; Theoderic and Bernhard were the

---

first two abbots of Dünamünde abbey and later became bishops of Estonia and Semigallia correspondingly.263

Once the Teutonic Order arrived in Livonia (1237), the role of the Cistercians within the Livonian church gradually began to diminish. The Cistercians still played a part in the mission, as in the religious and economic life of Livonia through the work of their abbeys. The first Cistercian foundation in Livonia was the abbey of Dünamünde, founded in 1205 as a daughter of Marienfeld abbey in Westphalia; it belonged to the German houses of Morimond filiation.264 Dünamünde was located 10 kilometres north of Riga, on the right bank of the Düna, on a high sand dune, near the river mouth.265 This was a strategically important location from which all activities in the river mouth could be controlled. Exactly a hundred years later the strategic location influenced the relationship between the Teutonic Order and the Cistercians. The Order convinced the Cistercians to sell the abbey in 1305, during the war which broke out between the city of Riga and the Teutonic Order (1297-1330).266 Thus, the Cistercians withdrew from the agreement with Riga (1263) not to sell their abbey without the consent of the city. This transaction was contested by Riga and confirmed only in 1318 by Pope John XXII (1316-1334).267 Despite these objections the Teutonic Order immediately began to rebuild the abbey into a castle. Meanwhile, the Cistercians moved to Padis, where they founded a new abbey in 1317.268


266 LUB 2, no. 614; Poelchau, ‘Geschichte Dünamünde,’ pp. 185-191.

267 LUB 1, no. 374; LUB 2, no. 670; Caune, ‘Rīgas pilsētas,’ pp. 63-74; Schmidt, ‘Zisterzienser,’ p. 63.

Cistercian abbeys and their churches were not only centres of political, economic, and religious life, they were also important burial grounds and places of commemoration. They commemorated their founders, benefactors and supporters. Despite the prohibition of lay burials in Cistercian churches which existed until the thirteenth century,269 Cistercians in neighbouring Scandinavia hosted the tombs of kings and princes, commemorating them as founders and supporters of their abbeys.270 Similarly, in Silesia Cistercian monasteries and nunneries were burial sites of the ruling families.271 Such commemoration of rulers as benefactors was an essential part of the memoria offered by monastic houses and it created strong relationships between monasteries and regional political elites.

Upon arrival in Livonia the Cistercians found no kings or nobles to commemorate. Since the mid-thirteenth century the Teutonic Order had tried to gain the upper hand first over the archbishop of Riga, and later over the city of Riga in a struggle for

---

269 Sauer, Fundatio und Memoria, p. 156.
leadership in Livonia. The Cistercians were obliged to choose between the two. The war between Riga and the Teutonic Order (1297-1330) and the sale of Dünamünde abbey (1305) show that the Livonian Cistercians maintained a close relationship with the Livonian branch of the Order. Remembering their common past and the deceased was important for this relationship.

The Dünamünde annals record the influence of the Teutonic Order on both Cistercian historical writing and on the memorial culture in Livonia. Although described as a historical text, the annals contain numerous commemorative references, which reflect the memorial practices of the community in which they were composed.\(^\text{272}\)

The presence of memorial references does not contradict the historiographical character of annals; monastic annals in the Middle Ages were often used to commemorate benefactors, donations and prominent members of communities.\(^\text{273}\) In this respect the Annals of Dünamünde differ from other fourteenth century Cistercian set of annals produced in the Baltic region, for example, the annals of the Cistercian abbey of Pelplin (Prussia), which refer exclusively to historical events and make no mention of the dead.\(^\text{274}\)

\(^{271}\) Kaczmarek, ‘Schlesischen Klöster,’ pp. 29-58.
\(^{272}\) Angermann, ‘Mittelalterliche Chronistik,’ p. 12.
\(^{273}\) Goetz, Geschichtsschreibung, p. 299; Eckhard Freise, ‘Kalenderische und annalistische Grundformen der Memoria,’ in Memoria. Der geschichtliche Zeugniswert, pp. 441-577.
To understand better the memoria embedded in the annals, the manuscript itself has to be examined closely. The annals are written on a single folio and bound within a larger codex (Codex 8), now held in the Tallinn City Archives. The whole text or sections of the Tallinn manuscript have been named as the Kleine Dünamünder Chronik, Die Chronik von Dünamünde, or the Annales Rigenses, but it is most frequently referred to as the Annales Dunamundenses or the Annals of Dünamünde. The


There are two later manuscripts that are described as later versions of the Dünamünde annals: Lemberg (Lviv) manuscript and so-called Annales Ronneburgenses, see Konstantin Höhlbaum, ‘Beiträge zur Quellenkunde Alt-Livlands,’ in Verhandlungen der Gelehrten Estnischen Gesellschaft zu Dorpat 7 (1873): pp. 21-77.

examination of the annals by nineteenth-century Baltic German scholars suggests that they were initially compiled in the Cistercian abbey of Dünamünde. After the sale of the abbey in 1305, the annals were continued in Riga and at the archbishop’s residence of Ronneburg (Latv. Rauna) until 1348, or later in the Cistercian abbey of Padis to which the Dünamünde Cistercians moved. The history of the codex is equally unclear and it can only be assumed that Tallinn City Archives acquired it after the dissolution of the abbey of Padis in 1559.

Although most scholars have linked the annals to the abbey of Dünamünde, the text was compiled long after 1305, using sources which cannot be securely linked to Dünamünde. An analysis of the manuscript shows that the text, with the exception of only one insertion, was written by a single hand at some point after 1348. It may, therefore, represent a historical tradition of the Dünamünde abbey, but the text shows influences of other historical and memorial traditions, namely those of the Teutonic Order.

The influence of the Teutonic Order’s Livonian branch on the narrative of the Dünamünde annals is evident in its depiction of historical events that took place in Livonia between 1211 and 1348. The earliest recorded event is the foundation of Dünamünde abbey itself, and the last is the construction of the Teutonic Order’s castle in Marienburg (Latv. Alūksne). Although these were Cistercian annals, the events and actions of the Teutonic Order’s Livonian branch are given a dominant position in the text. Thus, the annals mention the acquisition of the abbey of Dünamünde by the Teutonic Order in 1305, the papal privilege issued by Pope John XXII (p. 1316-1334) confirming this transaction in 1319, and the construction of the Teutonic Order’s castles. Furthermore, the annals offer detailed descriptions of the Teutonic Order’s military campaigns, in which context the deaths of numerous brethren are noted.
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277 ‘Die Chronik von Dünamünde,’ pp. 131-134.
280 Ibid., p. 613.
282 TLA, f. 230, n. 1, Cm 8, fol. 29v.
283 Angermann argues that the annals represent the monastic history writing, see his ‘Mittelalterliche Chronistik,’ p. 12.
285 The annals date the foundation of the abbey with year 1211. Poelchau, ‘Geschichte Dünamünde,’ p. 73, 192.
287 Ibid.
Although the annals contain the names of several dead men, no Cistercian monks – with the exception of St Bernard – appear in it. Remarkably, the annals omit the illustrious thirteenth-century Livonian Cistercian, the second abbot of Dünamünde, bishop Bernhard of Lippe, believed to be buried in the abbey, and who was honoured as a saint with the hagiographical work of master Justinus, the *Lippiflorium*.289

All aspects of the text demonstrate the author’s – or authors’ – interest in the liturgical and historical texts of the Teutonic Order. Just as in the Order’s chronicles and necrologies, five prominent dead brethren from the Livonian branch were recorded in the annals: Master Ernest von Ratzeburg (†1279), Master Wilhelm von Nindorf (†1287), Master Bruno (†1298), and brother Heinrich von Plotzke (*Henricus de Plozch*) (†1320).290 The defeat of the Order at Durbe (1260) was also recorded in the annals.291 These names have been selected according to the same principle used in the necrologies and chronicles of the Order; all were brethren who died during battles with the pagans. The records of their deaths in the annals are brief, and thus resemble the commemorative inscriptions of the necrologies. For example, according to the annals, Master Ernest von Ratzeburg and *dominus* Eilard, Danish captain of Reval, were killed in Lithuania on 5 March 1279 along with ‘numerous Christians’.292 As mentioned earlier, Ernest is also commemorated together with 70 brethren in the necrology of the Teutonic Order’s commandry in Mergentheim (bailiwick Franconia), and there the circumstances of his death are likewise omitted.293 Ernest’s death is described in detail in the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle and the chronicle of Wartberge.294 Equally, *dominus* Eilard commemorated in the annals also appeared in the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle, where he merited a long description of his struggle with Lithuanians and his tragic death on the battlefield.295

The other Master mentioned in the Dünamünde annals was Wilhelm von Nindorf, (alias Willekin or Wilhelm von Staden), who was killed ‘together with many brethren
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288 ‘Anno domini m c liii obiit beatus Bernardus primus abbas Clarevallis.’ Ibid., p. 286.
290 *Ritterbrüder*, no. 695, 624, 126, 27, p. 805.
291 On the commemoration of the battle at Durbe, see the subchapter 3.1.3.
293 See the subchapter 3.1.1. StA Ludwigshburg B 280 U 1, fol. 15.
295 *Livländische Reimchronik*, vers. 8322-8489.
and Christians’ in the battle with the Semigallians in 1287. Wilhelm’s *memoria*, like Ernest’s, was noted in the two Livonian chronicles of the Teutonic Order, and also in the necrology of Alden Biesen.

The Dünamünde annals, in contrast to the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle and the Teutonic Order’s necrologies in western Europe, holds records of the brethren killed in Livonia after the end of the crusading era. The annals reported the death of Master Bruno during the Order’s war against Riga and its Lithuanian allies (1297-1330). Master Bruno was killed in a battle with the Lithuanians near Wenden, by the river Aa (Latv. Gauja) in 1298. The contemporary chronicler, Albrecht von Bardewik gave a gruesome description of the battle’s aftermath, when the pagan Lithuanians nailed Bruno’s dead body on a cross. The death of Bruno in battle is not included in the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle, because the chronicle only referred to events before 1290, but Bruno’s death is mentioned in the chronicle of Hermann von Wartberge. The death of Bruno was part of a broader narrative describing the Teutonic Order’s struggle against the enemies of the Christian faith.

The Dünamünde annals also include the names of brethren which were missing from the Order’s historical texts. They mention the death of Heinrich von Plotzke, who was killed near Memel in 1320, together with 22 brethren. Heinrich was probably a commander of the Commandery at Årsta in Sweden, yet his name does not appear in other contemporary charters or historiographical texts of the Livonian branch. The exception is the so-called Necrology of Ronneburg, the late sixteenth century Polish copy of the necrology, in which Henrik z Pleczka and another 29 brethren fallen at Memel are mentioned. Heinrich’s death is commemorated in the necrology of Alden Biesen in an indirect way; on 3 February the necrology memorialized 17 anonymous brethren killed near Memel.
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302 *Ritterbrüder*, no. 27, p. 805.
304 Perlbach, ‘Deutsch-Ordens Necrologe,’ no. 9.
Although events in the Dünamünde annals are not arranged in a chronological order, the text contains the dates of death for the brethren that a liturgical commemoration would require.\textsuperscript{305} In most cases there was a direct correlation between the dates of death in the necrologies and in the Cistercian annals. Ernest von Ratzeburg’s anniversary was celebrated on 5 March both in the annals and in the Mergentheim necrology.\textsuperscript{306} In the case of Master Wilhelm von Nindorf there was a slight discrepancy between the anniversary in the necrologies and that in the annals; the annals reported his death on 26 March, while the necrology of Alden Biesen gave it as 25 March.\textsuperscript{307}

These examples show that the Livonian Cistercians knew well the memorial tradition of the Teutonic Order and its Livonian branch. The source of the information may have been the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle, the chronicle of Wartberge or necrologies of the Livonian branch. Yet it is possible that the Livonian Cistercians were commemorators of the Knight Brethren and this information about their deaths was taken from the Cistercian liturgical manuscripts.

The memorial character of these annals is also visible when they are analysed in the context of the codex within which the annals are bound. ‘Codex 8’ 47 leaves contain numerous theological and liturgical texts. They include a treatise on the art of preaching by a Cistercian theologian Alain de Lille (c. 1120-1202) \textit{Summa de arte predicatrixa} and several contemplative texts, such as, \textit{De contemptu mundi}, \textit{De corpore Christi}, \textit{De nativitate beate virginis} etc.\textsuperscript{308} All the texts of the codex were written in the fourteenth century, although the treatise of Alain de Lille may have been copied earlier. The annals were entered on the last page of the quire which contains de Lille’s work, thus it is possible that the scribe filled in an empty folio (29v).\textsuperscript{309} The hand of the annals can also be found on the last folio of the codex (47r-v); it was bound during the Middle Ages, shortly after 1348 (the last record in the annals), and the scribe of the annals was involved in it too.\textsuperscript{310}

Because there was a close relationship between annalistic and liturgical texts, this codex may have supported liturgical activities at which important events or the deceased were commemorated.\textsuperscript{311} In this way the annals formed part of the ‘liturgical

\textsuperscript{305} With an exception of Heinrich von Plotzke all the other brethren had dates of their death. Schmidt, ‘Zisterzienser,’ pp. 284-286.
\textsuperscript{306} Schmidt, ‘Zisterzienser,’ p. 285; STA Ludwigsburg B 280 U 1, fol. 15.
\textsuperscript{307} Schmidt, ‘Zisterzienser,’ p. 127; Perlbach, ‘Necrologe,’ No. 9, p. 363.
\textsuperscript{308} TLA, f. 230, n. 1, Cm 8; Schmidt, ‘Zisterzienser,’ p. 127; Höhlbaum, ‘Annalen,’ p. 612.
\textsuperscript{309} TLA, f. 230, n. 1, Cm 8, fol. 29v.
\textsuperscript{310} TLA, f. 230, n. 1, Cm 8, fol. 47r-47v; Kala, \textit{Mittelalterliche Handschriften}, pp. 85-86.
\textsuperscript{311} Goetz, \textit{Geschichtsschreibung}, p. 299.
past’ and a history of salvation into which the life of the Virgin, the lives of Saint Paul and Saint Peter, and the foundation of the Cistercian (1098) and Teutonic Orders (1190), all of which were mentioned in the annals, also fitted. \(^{312}\)

The presence of the dead Teutonic Knights in the Cistercian annals was not coincidental, but formed part of an exchange of *memoria* between the Cistercians and the Order’s Livonian branch that had begun at least half a century before the production of the annals. The two groups were bound by promises of mutual *memoria*, a historic bond was created or reinforced by the sale of Dünamünde abbey in 1305.

The sale of the Dünamünde abbey to the Teutonic Order in 1305 was not solely a financial transaction, but the beginning of a long-term relationship with obligations for both sides. The charter of sale and its surviving draft recorded in detail the obligations of both parties. \(^{313}\) The Cistercians agreed to hand the abbey over intact and in return the Teutonic Order paid 4000 silver marks. In addition, the Master, his successors and the whole Teutonic Order were compelled to continue the *memoria* of those Cistercian monks buried in the abbey’s cemetery next to the chapel of St Catherine. \(^{314}\) In the charter of 1305 the Cistercian abbots of Dünamünde and Falkenau, Libert and Dithmar, stipulated a weekly memorial mass for the deceased Cistercians, continuing the *memoria* in perpetuity. \(^{315}\) Moreover, the two abbots expressed their confidence in the *memoria*’s continuity once the Teutonic Order was in charge. \(^{316}\) The presence of the dead Teutonic Knights in the Cistercian annals is part of the long-term relationship created by the sale of the abbey in 1305.

The charter of sale described the process as a *translatio* of the community. \(^{317}\) The community was moved from Dünamünde to Padis, where the Cistercians already had a church, and this *translatio* also included the transfer of the historical tradition. \(^{318}\) The annals served as one of the channels of this transfer, as the community entered into its new environment. The history and *memoria* of the Teutonic Order were added to the historical narrative of the annals. These merged into a future mutual tradition and the dead were part of the common history shared by the two groups.

\(^{313}\) LUB 2, no. 614; LUB 3, no. 614a; Schmidt, ‘Zisterzienser,’ p. 55.
\(^{314}\) LUB 2, no. 614; Poelchau, ‘Geschichte Dünamünde,’ pp. 187, 188.
\(^{315}\) LUB 2, no. 614; this document was a draft of the contract. LUB 3, no. 614a; Schmidt, ‘Zisterzienser,’ p. 55.
\(^{316}\) LUB 2, no. 614.
\(^{317}\) LUB 2, no. 614; LUB 3, no. 614a.
\(^{318}\) Schmidt, ‘Zisterzienser,’ pp. 68-76.
As historical writing, the annals were part of historical and memorial traditions. Even if the annals were not used as a source of information for the performance of memorial services, they certainly reflected the memorial tradition of the environment in which they were written. It is not clear where the annals were compiled, but the strong influences of the historical and memorial traditions of the Cistercian and Teutonic Orders are visible in the text. In that sense the text belonged to both groups, although Cistercian origins for its creation are more plausible. The text offers insight into the memorial culture of the Livonian Cistercians, because it shows the transfer of their historical tradition from Dünamünde to Padis.

**Conclusion**

As Jan Assmann and Gerhard Otto Oexle have shown, the collective memory of a community creates its identity. The religious communities in Livonia also created and strengthened their identities by remembering their dead, and by caring for remembrance of others. The first three Livonian bishops, Meinhard, Berthold and Albert, were present in the collective memory of the Rigan church from the thirteenth century and up to its dissolution in the mid-sixteenth century. Their tombs played essential role in shaping of Riga cathedral as a memorial site, especially the tomb of Meinhard, which was reconstructed during the late fourteenth century. The tombs of the bishops and archbishops, located in the cathedral chancel, represented and celebrated episcopal power. It is no wonder that in the fifteenth century the Teutonic Order wished to convert the chancel into the burial site of the Livonian Masters and thus to reflect the Order’s hegemony.

*Memoria* helped the archbishops of Riga and the cathedral chapter to defend their identities and independence during the two centuries long conflict with the Teutonic Order, which saw attempts to incorporate the chapter into the Order. The death of archbishop Silvester Stodewescher in 1479 offered another chance for the Order to achieve its aim, and this prompted an anonymous scribe to record the names of the Order’s opponents – the dead archbishops and the cathedral canons – in the so-called Riga Missal, in support of their *memoria*. The memorial records in this missal were part of the memorial counter-narrative against the Order’s ambitions.

The example of Dietrich Nagel, Riga cathedral’s provost, shows how important *memoria* was for the continuity of an office, and how the resources of a community
were used for the remembrance of an individual. The foundation charter of 1447, presumably drafted by Nagel himself, uniquely demonstrates the perception of afterlife and role of memory. Nagel in 1464 succeeded in attracting additional resources from the archbishop for his own memoria, and that of his parents and all chapter provosts. In Nagel’s memoria individual remembrance was intertwined with the commemoration of the office and institution.

In the case of the Livonian Cistercian nuns and Dominican friars we know very little about how they commemorated their own dead. But in 1495 the Cistercian nunnery of St Mary Magdalene in Riga created a unique spiritual confraternity with the local Draymen’s guild in order to join efforts for common memoria. This alliance promised great spiritual benefits for both groups, offering the nuns male participants during funeral ceremonies, and the draymen regular prayers in the Cistercian church.

Both the Cistercian nuns and the Dominican friars were active commemorators in Livonian cities. The nuns of Reval were less attractive commemorative partners to the townspeople than the friars were, but the local noble families were eager to use their commemorational services, as the nuns belonged to those families. The Dominicans in Reval were popular amongst testators, many of whom wanted to be commemorated by the friars. The Livonian nobility also used their services by founding chantries in the Dominican churches, and holding their political meetings there, as it was a custom in Reval.

Finally, the few sources that bear witness to commemorative activities in the Livonian Cistercian monasteries reflect a historical tradition in commemoration. The so-called Dünamünde annals, a historical text compiled by the Cistercians, contains numerous names of the Livonian Masters who were killed during the struggle against pagans, but no Cistercian names. Although the annals are a historical text, their compilation was influenced by necrologies and it may have served as a source for liturgical commemoration. The presence of the names of the Teutonic Knights reflects a close bond between the Order and the Cistercians, which was reaffirmed in 1305 when the Cistercian Dünamünde abbey was sold to the Order. Both parties exchanged their memorial traditions, and the Cistercians, who moved to Padis, continued the annals in their new home.

The memorial traditions of the local clergy and religious groups were influenced by Livonian politics. The memoria of the archbishops and the chapter was shaped by the conflict with the Teutonic Order, but the Livonian Cistercians as the allies of the Order were closely bound with the memorial tradition of the Knight Brethren. Although the
surviving evidence is scarce, it shows that the Rigan church and the Cistercians in the late Middle Ages were preoccupied with remembering the dead from the period when the Christianity took root in Livonia.
CONCLUSION

This thesis has aimed to demonstrate that memoria was a form of collective memory and a social practice. Although the two were not exclusive phenomena, as a collective memory memoria was orientated more towards the past, while as a social practice it focused more on the present and future. Collective memory means a shared remembering of the past: it is fostered and it is not necessarily the truth about the past. Collective memory also shapes identity, which is where it overlaps with social practice. As a social practice memoria shaped reality in the present, it made commitments into the future, created bonds, and constituted groups. Memoria created reciprocity between the commemorated and the commemorators; it was a form of memorial gift-giving in which material donations were exchanged for prayers and rituals.

Within this broad framework of memoria as collective memory and social practice, this conclusion further explores several sub-themes: memoria as a constitutive phenomenon, the role of memoria in creating and maintaining social bonds, memoria and the legitimation of power, the political purposes of memoria, memoria of individuals and groups, the impact of the Reformation on memoria, memoria and charity, and memoria as the evocation of real presence.

Collective memory is here the most relevant place to begin. When this research project began, the intention was to map out the collective memory of medieval Livonia. However, it quickly became clear that there was no single tradition of collective memory in medieval Livonian society and, moreover, that in any medieval society there were always multiple collective memories at play. Each social group in Livonia – the urban elite guilds, non-elite brotherhoods, cathedral chapters, monastic communities, and the Teutonic Order – had its own collective memories. These were group based narratives, which differed both in form and content. Memoria had the same purpose in all groups – remembering the dead helped to remember the common past and to attain salvation of souls – but memoria operates differently in different contexts; it has one purpose, but different forms. Groups used different tools for the maintenance of memoria. Moreover, even where the narratives of different groups referred to the same historical events or epochs, these frequently contradicted one other. There are at least two distinct forms of remembering that occur in this thesis – the urban memoria, and the memoria of the Teutonic Order and the ecclesiastical institutions, such as the Rigan church.
Although urban commemoration has the broadest range of surviving sources, it reflects only two types of memorial activities: liturgical *memoria* and non-liturgical *memoria* by associations, mainly during communal meals. According to Jan Assmann, all these practices can be described as a communicative memory that almost never reaches more than 80 to 100 years into the past.\(^1\) According to their fifteenth-century ordinance, during the communal meals the Reval Table Guild commemorated its foundation in 1363. Such references to the distant past and beginnings of the urban associations are, however, extremely rare: this is the only surviving example from late medieval Livonia of collective memory which predates communicative memory in the urban environment.

The material from Riga and Reval shows that the memory of urban associations was focused on the recently dead and the recent past. This can perhaps be explained by the fact that all late medieval guilds and brotherhoods in Riga and Reval were of mid-fourteenth or early-fifteenth century foundation. Of the late medieval institutions of the Livonian cities, only the city councils were founded in the thirteenth century. It would further seem that the guilds and brotherhoods were only interested in the commemoration of the dead and events that were associated with their groups. When compared with the other groups analysed in this thesis, such as the Teutonic Order or the Rigan church, the urban associations had a larger number of members to commemorate and their numbers fluctuated more dynamically than in non-urban groups.

There was greater diversity in the urban *memoria* than in other environments. Not only did multiple institutions create remembrance, but individuals who possessed resources were active in the creation of their own *memoria*, which in turn interacted with the group *memoria*. Numerous ecclesiastical institutions were also involved as commemorators. For example, a fifteenth-century merchant from Riga could have been commemorated by his family, by a foundation in a parish church, by the Great Guild, the Table Guild, the Black Heads brotherhood, the town council (if he had been a councillor), perhaps by the non-elite transport workers’ guilds too, and also the parish churches, nunneries, friaries, and hospitals to which he had made donations. In a way it was a communal *memoria*, because almost the whole community was involved in a commemoration of a one person.

---

\(^1\) Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis*, pp. 50-51, 56.
Urban memorial culture was rich and enacted in the hands of many urban associations and commemorators. Every association possessed its own altar and had its own commemorative practices, but these commemorative traditions only met when they were coupled, as in the example to the Great Guilds and the Table Guilds. Communal memory of the dead, shared by the most members of the community, was memory of elites, because only they could afford to sustain broad commemoration involving large number of individuals – such as the poor – and institutions, such as churches and monasteries, in their remembrance. This ability to command the field of memory was also a political tool that helped to legitimate their power and exclusivity.

The longevity of memory depended on the resources groups had at their disposal. Elite groups like the Black Heads could invest more in liturgical remembrance at brotherhood altars than the guilds of the transport workers. The merchant guilds and the town councils had more opportunities to sustain their *memoria* and collective memory in the long-term than did the non-elite brotherhoods. In Riga, *memoria* of the non-German groups depended on the political support and resources of the elite; for example, the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds were only able to maintain their own altars and memorial chantries in the long-term because of their elite members.

In contrast to urban *memoria*, the *memoria* and collective memory of the Teutonic Order’s Livonian branch and the Rigan church reached far into the past. It seems safe to say that in late medieval Livonia only the Teutonic Order’s Livonian branch and the Rigan church possessed the cultural memory that related back to their beginnings in the thirteenth century. *Memoria* of those who had died during this time period played a crucial role in the formation of cultural memory. Within the Rigan church and the Teutonic Order, communicative memory was successfully translated into cultural memory during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries through various media, including historical writing, necrologies, liturgical manuscripts, and tombstones. The memorial traditions of both groups were similar to the memorial cultures of monastic communities, which were institutionalised and lasted for centuries. This continuity was possible because of the fixed and stable institutional structures they depended on, and which altered comparatively little between the early thirteenth century and the Reformation. This cultural memory helped these groups to sustain identities until the Reformation.

Tombs of founders and leaders were crucial to the maintenance of identity and cultural memory. The Rigan church – bishops and cathedral chapter – possessed valuable assets, namely the tombs of the first three Livonian bishops, who brought
Christianity to Livonia and shaped it as an ecclesiastical realm. The tombs of these bishops – Meinhard, Berthold, and Albert – in Riga cathedral’s chancel were constant reminders of the Rigan church’s beginnings and helped to legitimise episcopal power. Meinhard and Berthold were revered as saint bishops in the local tradition, and their remains added further sanctity to the cathedral. All three bishops were part of the collective memory of the Rigan church during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

This cultural memory developed in the thirteenth century with the translation of Meinhard and Berthold from Üxküll to Riga and the composition of the Chronicle of Henry of Livonia, which later served as a source for the early history of the church in Livonia. The memory of the first bishops was supplemented by the remembrance of the fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century bishops, who were likewise buried in the cathedral chancel. The cathedral, and the chancel in particular, were places where the history of the Rigan church was constantly remembered. This memoria was spatially bound to Riga cathedral was performed by a small community: the archbishops and the cathedral canons.

The Teutonic Order in Livonia lacked the tombs of their thirteenth-century Masters and its memorial tradition was not as closely bound to the remains of its leaders as was the case in the Rigan church. Yet the Teutonic Order in Livonia had a memorial tradition that existed not only within the Livonian branch, but which was also shared with the Order as a whole. After their arrival in Livonia in the late 1230s, the Teutonic Order engaged in the military struggle against Livonian and Lithuanian pagans during which their brethren were killed. They were not forgotten; their memory was transformed to the cultural memory of the Teutonic Order.

This cultural memory was shaped by historical writings and also the Order’s necrologies. The early fourteenth-century Livonian Rhymed Chronicle was not only a historical account of the Teutonic Order’s participation in the Baltic crusades, but also a text that created the memoria of the Livonian Masters and the brethren who were killed during the crusading period. The chronicle was one of the media that transmitted the information about those who had died in battle to the Order’s bailiwicks further west where the memory of these events was maintained. The Livonian Rhymed Chronicle was also used in the fifteenth century, and was kept in the sacristies of the Order’s Prussian castles.

The necrologies of the Order’s bailiwicks in western Europe demonstrated the fact that the brethren killed in Livonia during the crusades were part of the Teutonic Order’s collective memory. Numerous records in these necrologies commemorated the brethren
and Masters killed in Livonia. In consequence, we know more how the brethren killed in Livonia were commemorated outside Livonia than we do about their commemoration within the Livonian branch. The battles in Livonia became realms of memory for the Teutonic Order. The battle at Durbe (1260) in which the Order suffered defeat, similarly to the later Tannenberg/Grunwald (1410), was the Teutonic Order’s lieu de mémoire. The brethren killed at Durbe were commemorated by the Order in the Empire even two centuries after the battle. Livonia itself was also constructed as a realm of memory within the whole Order. With the help of chronicles and necrologies the collective experiences of struggle against the Baltic pagans were communicated to those brethren of the Order who had never taken part in the crusade against non-believers and who lived centuries after that epochal age. These memories were used to sustain the identity of the Teutonic Order and they were particularly important during the fifteenth century when the Order no longer primarily countered pagans.

Memoria not only created and sustained collective memories, but constituted groups, their identities, and created relationships between groups and individuals.\(^2\) The cases studied in this thesis demonstrate how a variety of groups used memoria for the sustaining of their identities and maintaining social bonds.

The brotherhoods of the Black Heads, groups of young unmarried or foreign merchants in Riga and Reval, were established in the early fifteenth century. From the earliest stages of their existence, even before they had their ‘own’ dead, they already performed memoria. These brotherhoods were transitional groups in which membership did not last a lifetime and but more likely for only a few years. For the Black Heads memoria was crucial to maintain the group’s long-term identity in the circumstances when members constantly changed. Without commemoration of the dead and the past maintenance of an identity would not have been possible.

In order to achieve these aims, the memorial activities of the Black Heads in Riga and Reval were intensive, especially during the brotherhood’s drinking feasts. Because the Black Heads were not burghers and did not take part in urban politics, memoria served for their self-representation and helped to maintain social status. The Black Heads possessed extensive resources for their commemorative and religious activities; they sustained several altars, employed numerous priests for the celebration of regular commemorative services, and commissioned valuable altarpieces.

If *memoria* helped to ensure continuity and identity within the brotherhoods of the Black Heads, within the non-elite Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds in Riga *memoria* and religious activities served to constitute these groups in the urban environment. Most members of these guilds were not professional transport workers, but non-German artisans and servants; thus they had little in common with one another, and collective memorial activities played an important role in formation of these guilds as communities. The events of the Reformation, when these guilds lost most of their members, support the hypothesis that religious activities and *memoria* were the main factors that attracted individuals to the Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds. Soon after the abandonment of liturgical *memoria*, the city council reorganised both brotherhoods and they lost their previous status and recognition.

*Memoria* also played an important role in constituting and shaping the identities of the Riga and Reval Table Guilds. Alongside charity *memoria* was the primary *raison d’être* of these charitable sub-groups within the Great Guilds. Although associated with the Great Guilds, the Table Guilds were independent in their social and commemorative activities; they kept name-lists of their own deceased members and commemorated them. The Table Guilds especially fostered the remembrance of those members who contributed to their charitable activities, and involved the urban poor in their *memoria*. It appears that these guilds fulfilled commemorative functions of the Great Guilds, and in case of the Table Guild it becomes evident how closely *memoria* and charity were intertwined.

Several of the case studies in this thesis illustrate how *memoria* created and reflected relationships between groups and individuals. *Memoria* was involved in the relationship between elites and non-elites in late medieval Riga, as for example in the case of Draymen’s and Porters’ guilds. The town councillors, rich merchants, high status clergymen, and their family members joined the non-elite guilds for the sake of *memoria*. These guilds of socially marginalised non-Germans welcomed members from other social classes, many from the economic and political elites, in order to attract additional prestige and resources. Some elite members – rich merchants and city councillors – made memorial foundations for these guilds and requested *memoria* from the Latvian and Livonian porters, draymen and artisans. Although elite members did not engage in all of the social activities organised by these guilds, a memorial exchange of resources and services did take place, similar to that between the early medieval monastic communities and their secular patrons. This kind of relationship between the transport workers guilds and the elite can be found also in other Hanseatic ports.
Memoria played a central role in the unusual relationship between the Cistercian nuns of St. Mary Magdalene and the guild of the Draymen in Riga. This relationship began in 1495, when more than fifty nuns became members of the Draymen’s guild, and continued during the early sixteenth century. The groups exchanged commemorational services based on this membership; the nuns had to pray for the deceased draymen and the draymen had to take part into the funerals of the nuns. They also exchanged payments in form of membership fees and gifts for commemoration. This has to be considered to be a unique relationship between a religious community and a secular brotherhood not only in Livonian, but also within the broader northern European context.

The Cistercian nuns in Riga maintained other relationships too based on mutual commemoration. In the mid-fifteenth century they established a spiritual confraternity with the Bridgettines in Mariendal, near Reval, with the mutual promise of prayers for the dead of both communities. This bond between the two religious communities survived the Reformation, when the Bridgettines in the mid-sixteenth century recorded the name of a deceased Rigan Cistercian nun in their calendar. These communities supported each other by exchanging prayers for the dead; for example, the Bridgettines needed to strengthen their position in the eastern Baltic region in the mid-fifteenth century.

The Cistercian nuns in Riga, Dorpat, and Reval, as well as the Dominican friars in Reval, sustained close bonds with the Livonian nobility. Because in Livonia few monasteries existed outside urban centres, noblemen requested commemoration from the nunneries and friaries in the towns and cities. Many noblemen chose the Cistercian nuns as their commemorators because the majority of the nuns came from the nobility. The Dominican friaries similarly hosted memoria of the Livonian noble families. Yet, the Dominicans, as the Reval testaments show, were more closely bound to the townspeople. The friars in Reval were one of the main commemorators in the urban space.

The significance of memoria can be further seen in the relationship between the Teutonic Order and the Livonian Cistercians. The mid-fourteenth-century historical text – the Annals of Dünamünde – compiled by the Cistercians in Dünamünde and later in Padis, demonstrates the influence of the memorial tradition of the Teutonic Order on the collective memory of the monks. The history and the dead of the Teutonic Order dominate these Cistercian annals which reflect the close relationship of the two groups that had developed during the thirteenth century. As the charter of the sale of
Dünamünde abbey shows (1305), the relationship of the monks and knights was partially constituted by mutual remembrance. Although a historical text, the annals mirror the tradition of liturgical *memoria* practiced in the Livonian Cistercian abbeys, in which the commemoration of the Teutonic knights played an important role. The annals testify that the historical and memorial traditions of two groups were so closely intertwined in some aspects that they are difficult to separate.

*Memoria* was essential for the legitimation of power and continuity of institutions; as Assmann famously phrased, ‘power needs origin’.\(^3\) This kind of legitimising remembrance can be found in all institutions which exercised power. In the urban context, *memoria* helped the city councils to maintain their power, yet it was performed not only by the institution itself. *Ratsmemoria* combined institutional commemoration and family remembrance. It was organised by the councils, but the memorial efforts of the individual councillors and their families were integral to *Ratsmemoria*. In Riga and Reval the city councils were small exclusive groups, which were selected from the members of the merchant Great Guilds. *Ratsmemoria* helped to maintain this exclusivity. Likewise, the institutional commemoration of their deceased predecessors legitimated power of living city councillors. The councils in the Livonian cities took care of *memoria* of individual councillors, controlled their memorial chantries and, when necessary, transformed them to maintain the memory. As the examples of the commemorative efforts of the Visch and Hunninghusen families in Riga and Reval demonstrate, *memoria* formed a bond between generations of city councillors. Investment into the memorial programmes increased the possibility that future generations of the councillors’ families would be able to maintain a position in the city government. These families supported foundations made by their predecessors, and in doing so all displayed dynastic continuity. Political *memoria* was not only directed towards council itself, but towards the wider urban population, while regular memorial services in the city’s churches fulfilled function of self-representation.

The political *memoria* of the Teutonic Order’s Livonian branch likewise sought to ensure institutional continuity and to present it to its subjects. The Teutonic Order’s political *memoria* focused on the person of the Master. The Masters’ *memoria* created a line of succession and provided legitimacy for the office. He was the only official to whom a burial place was granted in the branch’s main chapel or church, and for whom elaborate memorial services were enshrined in the Order’s statutes; in the Masters’

\(^3\) Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis*, p. 71.
commemoration that of all brethren was enfolded. The *memoria* of those Livonian Masters killed in battle dominated the historical and memorial texts which referred to the Order’s experiences during the Baltic crusades. Also in the late Middle Ages *memoria* of the Masters played an important role within the Order’s memorial culture. As the foundation of Master Heidenreich Vincke von Overberg (1447) demonstrates, *memoria* of the Masters was not only retrospective, but also prospective; Masters attempted to strengthen the legitimacy and positions of their successors.

The *memoria* of the Order’s Masters was also projected outwards. In Livonia, as in Prussia, they were secular rulers on behalf of the Order, with Riga and Reval as its subjects. Reval’s city council organised memorial services for deceased Livonian Masters in the city’s churches and paid for their commemoration. Like the rituals which accompanied the Livonian Masters in life – such as entries into the city and oath-giving – in death, his *memoria* marked the end of his role in what was essentially a political relationship.

So *memoria* not only legitimised power, but it also served as a political tool. Livonia was exposed to the political and military struggles between the Teutonic Order, the archbishops of Riga, and the city of Riga. The Order aimed to establish control over the archbishopric, and *memoria* played important role in this struggle. When the Order took over the cathedral chapter in 1451, it converted the cathedral chancel – where the archbishops were habitually buried – into the burial ground of its Masters. It was a political and a memorial conquest of a space where previously only the archbishops were buried. The planned burial and *memoria* of the Masters in the cathedral was to mark the intended incorporation of the Rigan church into the Order. Yet, although Master Johann von Mengede Osthof was buried in the cathedral in 1469, this precipitated a new conflict between archbishop Silvester Stodewescher and the Order. The dead Master was denied a tombstone and liturgical *memoria*. The denial of *memoria* exposed deep divisions between the Order and the archbishop. The Order fought for the Master’s *memoria*, but failed. As a result, Stodewescher’s actions against the Master’s *memoria* prevented the chapter’s incorporation in the Order and also forced the Order to choose another location for the burial of its Masters.

Livonian politics were reflected in the *memoria* of the archbishops and the Riga cathedral chapter too. With its aspirations to increase the Order’s power, the Livonian branch had pursued and persecuted those archbishops and canons that opposed them. The cathedral chapter and community of the Rigan church in the late fifteenth century developed a memorial counter-narrative to that of the Teutonic Order. As the calendar
of the Riga Missal demonstrates, the members of the cathedral community at the Holy 
Cross altar commemorated five fifteenth-century archbishops and canons who had 
suffered at the Order’s hands. This memoria was politically motivated and it expressed 
the chapter’s aspirations for autonomy.

The question of an individual’s role within group memoria has been raised on several 
occasions in this thesis. Memoria was a group phenomenon and all memorial efforts, 
including those fostering the commemoration of an individual, contributed to the 
collective memoria. According to Oexle, group memoria always referred to individuals, 
and in fact groups remembered their past by remembering individuals.\(^4\) Individuals 
strengthened a group by founding their individual memoria, especially in cases where 
founders were office holders. Dietrich Nagel, a mid-fifteenth-century provost of the 
Riga cathedral chapter, created his individual memoria by using resources of the 
chapter. Nagel obliged his successors in office to foster his remembrance, but at the 
same time also strengthened his predecessors’ memoria, many of whom had died 
abroad. His individual commemorative efforts contributed to that of all provosts, past 
and future. Similar aims can be seen in memoria founded by the late medieval Livonian 
Masters. Heidenreich Vincke von Overberg created a memorial foundation for himself 
and for future Livonian Masters, but he also sought to commemorate all living and dead 
brothers. Vincke’s individual memoria was sustained by the Order’s resources and 
benefited the whole community. Similarly, city councillors in Riga and Reval fostered 
memoria of themselves and their families, in the wish both to gain individual benefits 
and to strengthen these institutions. Memoria revealed individual aspirations, yet this 
was only possible within the collective commitment of a group; individual memoria was 
integrated in the remembrance of a group.

Medieval memoria and charity were intertwined. Memoria enabled the elite to 
egrate in gift-exchange with the urban poor, though the making of material donations 
in return for prayers. The charity of elite groups, like the charitable Table Guilds in Riga 
and Reval, was aimed at self-legitimation and fostering of their own commemoration. 
The Table Guilds distributed food and clothing in church bell-towers, the logical 
environment in which prayers would be turned for the gifts received. In Riga elite 
members requested memoria from the Draymen’s and Carter’s guilds, because they 
within this exchange were perceived as the ‘poor’. The exchange of gifts and

commemorative prayers was crucial for memoria; urban people and their institutions used it for the promotion of social and political aspirations.

Medieval memoria made the dead and absent present. By help of memoria the dead became part of the community of the living. The dead and the absent became present when their names were evoked during liturgical commemoration as well as in non-liturgical practices, like communal meals. Alongside the performance of memoria, visual objects such as tombstones and altarpieces made the dead depicted on them constantly present amongst the living. As the example of the Black Heads in Reval demonstrates, there was a meaningful interplay between the images of brotherhood members on the altarpiece of the Virgin Mary altar, and the liturgical commemorations performed at the brotherhood’s altar in the Dominican church. Such interplay of memorial media can rarely be studied closely since little has survived the iconoclasm of the Reformation. Yet that was the nature of memoria, to combine liturgical remembrance with different media of commemoration. In so many ways memoria can be described as an unending, a permanent process in which the new names of the dead were constantly added for commemoration and old ones were being constantly replaced and forgotten.

The developments over the period of the Reformation further highlight the relationship of urban groups to their own memoria. The urban elites of Riga and Reval eagerly supported the Reformation and were first to abandon memoria, even though remembrance had been an instrument which helped them to maintain the power and exclusivity. Members of some elite groups, like the Black Heads in Riga, took part in the destruction of the associations’ altars where commemorations had taken place for decades. The Reformation and the dissolution of the liturgical memoria in the Livonian cities was radical and violent.

Despite the end of liturgical memoria, urban associations continued to commemorate their dead. Such continuity of memorial practices can be found in both elite and non-elite brotherhoods. The Black Heads in Reval in the 1560s commissioned an image commemorating the brethren who had died during the Livonian war; during the 1530s the Draymen’s brotherhood in Riga continued to spend its resources on activities – such as the almsgiving and communal meals – which before the Reformation, had possessed a memorial character. After the Reformation memoria continued to exist, but was transformed.

***
Memoria played a particular role in Livonia partly due to the unique characteristics of the region. Livonia was integrated into European Christendom relatively late, in a process which began in the late twelfth century and continued during the thirteenth century. Memoria was brought to Livonia from western Europe alongside other ideas and practices, and it fulfilled the important social and political roles within Livonian society as in any other medieval society.

Memoria enabled Livonian groups to remember their past and to reach back to their origins. It helped them remember the past by commemorating individuals and their deeds, but in the process constituted groups and shaped identities. Memoria played an integral role in creating the social fabric of Livonian society and it was essential for maintaining continuity of its institutions: the guilds and brotherhoods, the Teutonic Order, the episcopal sees, and the cathedral chapters. There was also an important political dimension to memoria, which reflected, formed and legitimated political relationships.

This dissertation has argued that memoria was overwhelmingly a ‘total social phenomenon’ within late medieval Livonian society. Liturgical memoria was the most obvious form of memoria, but memoria was more than liturgy alone. Liturgical memoria interacted – and was intertwined – with a diversity of social practices, and the memorial image of the dead was carried by a wide range of media. Remembering the dead rendered them present. Finally, memoria was not only a process of recollecting and reaching back to the past, but also one of validating the present and forging connections into the future. Memoria was at one and the same time retrospective, present, and prospective.
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## Appendix

### Appendix 1: Livonian place names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German/English</th>
<th>Latvian/Estonian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascheraden</td>
<td>Aizkraukle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courland</td>
<td>Kurzeme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorpat</td>
<td>Tartu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Düna</td>
<td>Daugava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dünamünde</td>
<td>Daugavgrīva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durben</td>
<td>Durbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkenau/Valkena</td>
<td>Kārkna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellin</td>
<td>Viljandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harria-Vironia/Harrien-Wierland</td>
<td>Harju-Viru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karkhus</td>
<td>Karksi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokenhusen</td>
<td>Knēse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemsal</td>
<td>Limbaži</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livland/Livonia</td>
<td>Livonija/Liivima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariendal</td>
<td>Pirita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ösel-Wiek</td>
<td>Saare- Lääne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padis</td>
<td>Padise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilten</td>
<td>Piltene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reval</td>
<td>Tallinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronneburg</td>
<td>Rauna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Üxküll</td>
<td>Ikšķile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warthe</td>
<td>Värtāja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenden</td>
<td>Cēsis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>