

CARNIVAL

Journal of the International Students of History Association

Vol. X January 2003 ISHA News Issues 40-41



Human rights through History

Fascist Movements in the Baltic States I:

The Iron Wolf: Lithuanian Fascism (1927-1941)

The Romanian Countries during the Middle Ages, between Byzantium and West.

From adventures to tourism: Conquering Slovene mountains

The Uses of Microhistory

Rome in the imperial idea of the 14th century: The age of Lewis the Bavarian

- **Index**
- **Editorial**
- **News**
 - Officials
- **Activity**
 - Seminarbericht Dubrovnik
- **Articles**
 - The conquest of the Mountains. From Adventurism to Tourism in Slovenia
 - The Iron Wolf: Lithuanian Fascism (1927-1941)
 - The Uses of Microhistory
 - Rome in the Imperial Idea of the 14th Century
 - The Romanian Countries during the Middle Ages
- **Upcoming events**
 - AB-Meeting Berlin
 - Annual Conference in Helsinki
- **Recruitment information**
- **Guidelines for Carnival Contributors**

Carnival – Journal of the International Students of History Association (IISN 1582-3261) is an international publication of the International Students of History Association (ISHA). During the academic year 2002-2003 the editorial team is located at the university of Heidelberg, Germany.
Printed at the Ars Docendi Publishing House (University of Bucharest).

Edition: 300

Web edition:

http://www.geocities.com/carnival_isha

Editorial Team (Heidelberg)

Head:

Thomas Foerster

Language Consultants:

Alan Götz, Caroline Hesch

Cover, layout and page design:

Claudia Kölbl, Johan Grußendorf, Thomas Foerster

Web edition:

Claudia Kölbl

Contact:

carnival-hd@gmx.de

ISHA

Contact:

John Blake, President

dion_b@rocketmail.com

E-mail Forum:

isha-list@egroups.com

Join at <http://www.egroups.com/group/isha-list>

Web pages:

<http://www.isha-international.org>

Editorial

When I agreed - during the Legislative Assembly that took place at the Annual Conference in Nijmegen - to undertake the editing of *Carnival* for the academic year 2002/03, I was asked whether I actually knew what I was doing. But it was late already, the Assembly had lasted several hours, all of us were hungry and we just wanted to find somebody to do this job before we went to dinner. Afterwards I also asked myself whether I knew what I was doing. After all, the Nijmegen conference had been my first real experience with ISHA and besides, I have right up to now never had anything to do with the editing of a journal.

Therefore the faithful reader will notice several new ideas and changes in this issue. Most obviously we have once more changed the format, as well as other aspects of the layout. We hope that you will approve of the way we decided to design it. I would like to thank the Heidelberg editorial team for their tireless work, the authors for their support and the team of the Ars Docendi printing house, Bucharest for their patience.

But we were also interested in continuity. Therefore, the most important question was what the aims of *Carnival* are. First of all, it should be a journal for students and reflect their interests. Still, it also is a journal for ISHA, not only for our announcements, but also for our interests. This is why, once again, the breadth of topics in this issue shows the great variety in ISHA peoples' interests and work, both where subjects as well as temporal and regional focuses are concerned. In this issue you will find articles on the history of Slovenian Alpinism and on the Heidelberg University archive. There are articles dealing with the position of Rome in the imperial idea of the 14th century as well as with the Romanian countries in the Middle Ages, plus an article on fascism in Lithuania, part one of a series on fascist movements in the Baltic states. These mainly regional focuses are complemented by an article of rather general interest, which discusses the uses of microhistory. Both microhistory and local history are restricted in their view. It is therefore apparent that all these articles display an interest in bringing the knowledge of local history abroad and crossing the borders of regional or national historiography.

In the course of the unification of Europe historical research will become strongly focused on European and *inter*-national history. Most institutions and individual historians are increasingly working in this perspective — ISHA has been doing this for years.

Viva ISHA

Thomas Foerster

ISHA Officials 2002-2003

International Board:

President

John Blake (ISHA Nijmegen)

dion_b@rocketmail.com

Secretary

Outi Lyyli Nieminen (ISHA Turku)

ousini@utu.fi

Treasurer

Huub Bellemakers (ISHA Nijmegen)

h.bellemakers@student.kun.nl

Council:

János Betkó (ISHA Nijmegen)

janosbetko@hotmail.com

Corne Boomaars (ISHA Nijmegen)

cornossos@hotmail.com

Tanja Leikas (ISHA Helsinki)

tanja.leikas@helsinki.fi

Salla Sireeni (ISHA Helsinki)

salla.sireeni@helsinki.fi

Olli Sukeva (ISHA Turku)

oltasu@utu.fi

Treasury committee

Laura Ekholm (ISHA Helsinki)

laura.k.ekholm@helsinki.fi

Kristina Pavlek (ISHA Zagreb)

kpavlek@maie.inet.hr

Contact ISHA

Dubrovnik seminar

At the beginning of October we had another interesting ISHA experience, the seminar took place in Dubrovnik. There were 47 history students from Bucharest, Eindhoven, Groningen, Heidelberg, Helsinki, Maribor, Nijmegen, Pula, Turku and Zagreb as organizers. The Participants were accommodated in a youth hostel near the city centre. The seminar began in the afternoon of October 8th with a small opening ceremony on the terrace of the hostel. That was one of the few occasions that we could organize some event outside because it was raining almost during the whole seminar. Actually not the kind of weather one would expect in Dubrovnik. However we had a great time.

The topic of this seminar was „Human rights through History“. Although you may think that „Human rights“ are an idea of 20th century we had some papers from medieval times and even from ancient Rome. To make the discussion easier participants were divided in five workshops. The first one was dealing with the beginnings and birth of the idea, also with some aspects of historiography. In the second workshop you could hear everything about the rights of minorities. The third one was the most contradictory while it dealt with Human Rights in wartime. Are there any rights in that time and how are they realized. Another workshop topic was about rights of women and children, and the last workshop dealt with outstanding fighters who helped (or didn't help) to develop Human Rights. As always there was of course an AB-meeting where representatives of each section together with people of the Academic Board had the opportunity to deal with ISHA's problems and future. It was a „short“ meeting, only two hours. Each representative gave a brief description of the different section activities; there was a discussion about the association of history teachers, future events like the conference in Helsinki and the seminar in Heidelberg. After an interesting discussions in the morning, participants were offered to enjoy the lovely old town of Dubrovnik. The town is an interesting mixture of old buildings, churches, city walls and modern pubs, restaurants and boutiques. That becomes really obvious on the main street called Stradun. One rainy morning, not different to the other mornings we visited „Knezev dvor“, a sea museum and an aquarium. Climbing the city walls was also an interesting sport; well, there are stairs so it actually wasn't climbing.

Except all this there is, of course, an unofficial part as it always is when ISHA people meet. It began with the ice breaking party where we had a great opportunity to get to know each other better, and I can say that we didn't want to miss that opportunity. Now, after everything ended well I can say to everyone that both, ice – breaking party and national drinks party, were held in an old psychiatric institution. It's closed now, but maybe they will take in consider to re-open it after everything. On national drinks party, lots of interesting drinks from different parts of Europe were tasted. The most popular was, I guess, the Dutch golden drink; everybody thought that they would get rich if they drink enough of it. On the other evenings we stayed in the bar next to the hostel. If you will ever be in Dubrovnik, ask for ISHA in the Ferrari bar and you will hear all the details, but for now we are keeping them to ourselves.

A Few words from the organizers

Now you know how it ended, but you are going to hear the story behind. First of all it is not easy to organize a seminar for 50 – 60 persons in a town almost 600 km away. Here we have to thank a lot Renata Arar cause without her we would probably never have managed it. You may think that we have some experience in this things while ISHA – Zagreb organised the conference two years ago; but since than there was a big change in generations. More or less everybody who worked on the conference has finished their studies, and people who organised the seminar are almost all freshmen. But to all brave sections who will try to do it: „Don't worry, it's not that hard!“. The most important thing is to find a place for accommodation. In the past we had some interesting solutions but youth hostels are usually quite useful in this case. As soon as you have solved this problem, everything else is much easier. O, I forgot the financial part; unfortunately you need some money and nobody is willing to give it to you. But like an old proverb, stone by stone you can build a palace, or a youth hostel. The best way to begin is with the topic of the seminar. There were some reasons to choose „Human Rights“. It is always a big and important topic, and the majority of the organizations have been some discussions about it. Also Dubrovnik seemed to be a nice place for such a discussion. As a republic, Dubrovnik is famous for

it's freedom, it actually never was conquered until Napoleon. So, the topic was there, workshops were formed and a place where they will be held was found after a great search. In our plans you could find some really nice things that were rejected in the end; like the excursion. Next time you visit Dubrovnik, we will take you on a great excursion by boat to an island nearby. That island, called Lokrum, has got kind of mysterious history, lots of famous persons visited it. One of the first was king Richard Lionheart on his return from the crusades. This idea was ruined by the weather, you can imagine how impossible it is if it's raining with strong wind. Awful weather spoiled a great part of the seminar. You can only imagine how beautiful Dubrovnik is in the sun. As I heard some people used a free afternoon for swimming, but only a few „brave ones“. But I strongly believe that in the end everything ended well. People seemed satisfied, there were only a few complaints. As there were only 30 participants, plus the organisers there was enough time to get to know everyone personally. I attended some seminars and specially conferences, which were always bigger and in the end I didn't even know every face, much less the name.

In the end I would like to thank all organizers, participants, sponsors, the youth hostel, air band, exotic dancers, John (for Finnish sports) and ISHA for existing in general.

Kristina Pavlek

ISHA – Zagreb

Everything started with a crate. In the year 1388 all documents of the recently founded University Heidelberg were deposited in it and stored in a nearby church. This can be seen as the establishment of the University Archive which today is rapidly changing into a modern supplier for all sorts of information linked with the institution.

The first predecessor of this central collector of multiple kinds in the shape of a wooden box was stored away in the Church of the Holy Ghost for over 150 years. In the beginning the most important contents were the documents that secured the privileges and the very existence of the first university in the territory of the Republic of Germany. By 1557 the number of documents seemed to have increased to a level which made a more sophisticated way of storage necessary. The archive was moved to the Augustine Monastery where it was organised in new manner. But it did not in the least stay in its new home for the same time it had rested in the church, because the catastrophes of the 17th century resulted in many relocations of the biggest parts of the deeds. With the start of the 19th century the changes in the administrative structure lead to a temporary loss of importance by placing the university under the supervision of the state. Consequently the University Archive was no longer in use and in 1845 the entire quantity of files and documents was integrated in the Heidelberg University Library.

While the archive was under the supervision of the library the chaotic system of the archived goods was changed. The new method using the concern of the goods as main point of categorisation resolved in a great damage to the organic grown structures. At that time in the last decade of the 19th century the archive theory had already realised the problems of the organisation by concern but nevertheless the new pattern did not follow the idea of origin. An old concept was implemented that still creates problems today.

After enormous losses of files during the second world war the University Archive was slowly emerging as an independent institution again. Today the archive is situated in a former bank office which supplies it with a modern hall used by the regular clients of the archive but also for exercises for history students or for lectures. As the director of the University Archive, Dr. Werner Moritz points out, still more interest by members of the university could be handled: „The existence of the archive is partly unknown in some bodies of the many institutions of the University Heidelberg.“

The perspectives for this place of historical knowledge are for example the scientific background for not only the identity of the university but also insights in terms of the history of science, developments of university structures etc.

Today's projects are numerous and include a digitalisation of the photographic material of the University Archive sponsored by the Klaus Tschira foundation, the publication of the last volume of the Dictionary of Heidelberg Scholars and a project for the registration of slave labourers who had to work in Heidelberg during the Nazi years.

The staff is of course mostly engaged with more commonplace archive work. Large amounts of files and documents are to be registered and the most common inquiries asking for personal data. The high standard of the University Archive in both commonplace archive matters and implementation of modern digital and multimedia ways to learn more about historical aspects of the University Heidelberg at the same time leave no room for staff reductions in the future. Hopefully, no mistakes of the very own history of the institution will repeat itself.

Literature:

- H. Weisert, Das Universitätsarchiv Heidelberg und seine Bestände, in: Ruperto Carola, H. 52 (1973), P. 21-25;
H. Krabusch, Das Archiv der Universität Heidelberg. Geschichte und Bedeutung, in: Aus der Geschichte der Universität Heidelberg und ihrer Fakultäten. Sonderbd. der Ruperto Carola, edited by G. Hinz (1961), P. 82-111;
E. Wolgast, Die Universität Heidelberg 1386-1986 (1986).
W. Moritz, Das Archiv der Universität Heidelberg, in: Heidelberg. Jahrbuch zur Geschichte der Stadt, published by the History Club of Heidelberg, P. 243-246.

From adventuress into tourism

-

Conquering Slovene mountains

The subject matter of this research is to brighten the structural change in man's perception towards mountains. During the handle on my theme you will become aware of change, which led in conquering the highland which was before mysterious and pushed away.

I am analysing the mentioned mental change in relation towards mountains on the basis of historical movements in Slovene sphere. The new feeling towards mountains, which was mass manifested by the end of 19th century, was the product of the „complex feeling of the time“ distinctive in Slovene and also middle Europe sphere.

In all ancient history the mountains were understood as the region of holiness. They were place, where ancient populations saw their deity's. Many fairy tails and myths placed the imagination in this secret environment... Also the theology saw the mountains as an allegory of original sin or as ruins of cracked world, which disfigured the world of cultivated flat land.

Diderot found out, that during the growth of urbanized city centres man lost his connection towards nature. The nature as a place of many mysterious and unpredictable forces was seen as pretty and pleasant only there, where was domesticated and drawn with the compasses and the ruler (for example in baroque manor gardens). The mountains were far away from these ideals; they were seen as unshaped, uncultivated, and chaotic...

In such way comprehensive strange world finally began to trickle adventuress thoughts of individuals, who wanted to recognize and conquer wild and dangerous mountains. The Mountaineering namely origins in individuals and famous Slovene mountaineer Janko Mlakar once wrote, that the reason for such late conquer of the Alps has its origins in intellectuals and it did not spring from simple folk. Common inhabitants namely stood deep-rooted in famous sentence: „The mountain isn't mad, mad is the one, who climbs on it.“

While the first organized English mountaineers, joined in the first elite Alpine Club in London in the year 1857, had to listen during their pioneer's conquering of Swiss Alps the observations of natives. „Only a cow goes up to 1600 meter, only a goat up to 2000, only chamois up to 2500, higher goes only a fool!“

Well, If I try to analyse the term at the beginning formed as the „complex feeling of the time“, which led to men's completely closing up with mountains by the year 1900, I could say that this feeling began to load in 18th century and was brought for all „long 19th century“ by some various factors.

I am enumerating 5, which I distinguished as the major important factors:

1. Scientific discovering of mountains in the age of enlightenment

In the spirit of enlightening ideas of 18th century, which forced new scientific approaches towards explanation of men's surrounded world, the mountains began to interest some rationalistic inspired individuals. They wanted to observe, explore, measure and to realize the forces in this unconquered world of

mountains. The example of such natural scientist in Slovene mountain region was Breton doctor Balthazar Hacquet (round 1740-1815), which devoted a lot of his attention to stone and mineral researching, partly also in botanic collecting. He made his mountain journeys on duty of science and his capital guidance was that man could learn a lot from the nature.

Also the first rise on the highest Slovene summit Triglav (2864 m) in the year 1778 is taking roots in the time of enlightening, because the first four natives from Bohinj were inspired by the most important Maecenas of Slovene enlightening, Žiga Zois.

2. Romantic aesthetics discovery of mountains

As an example of Rousseau's call about return to nature in Slovene mountaineering could be Julius Kugy (1858-1944), who begins his most important autobiography with the sentence: „My mountaineering is rooted in the love towards nature“. He went to mountains, as many others, with the will of observing and consoling nature's beauties. As a great admirer of nature he responded poetically on nature's fairness, which has in mountains even greater effect. He was sick at heart, because many saw in mountain only climbing wall instead of looking its soul.

3. Desire on adventure and championship

This factor, which could be marked also as constancy in human nature, was at the beginnings often in connection with upper two factors. I can name here as an example Slovene mountaineer known often as the first alpinist in Eastern Alps, Valentin Stanič (1774-1847), named so because of his pioneer conquering of Grossglockner (3798m). Stanič was entering into mountains mainly because of the wish of scientific and aesthetic activities, however the experts of his life say that he was also filed by alpinist inspirations- to climb the more summits, to conquer unexplored mountains and being there first.

4. Technical necessities for conquering mountains.

All could end by money. The first mountaineers let their activity only sufficient financial basis. No only, that mountaineering because of the ignorance of high land and his danger demanded well paid Alpine guide, but also the absence from home, meant some waste of profit.

Middle class mentality with one of its attributes – rational and parsimonious dealing with money surely could not allow the blindly adventurous entering into mountains.

The second very important and very obvious factor was the closeness with the mountains. Although some pioneer mountaineers did not live in mountain surroundings, they had to have the least chance arriving till them rather very soon. In this case played the key role the final restoration of the railway network, which connected also some with mountain chain divided centres and consecutively notable brought nearer before remote and bad approachable high land.

5. Nationalism

The fifth important factor, which added by pouring oil to a glowed fire, (burned with 4 upper factors) was nationalism. Slovene nationalism which first in wider range began its spreading in Slovene spoken Lands by the year 1848, learned quite fast till the end of 19th century to use all means how the Slovenes could rise into a modern nation.

However, the important people who were leading Slovene national movement and consider themselves as a trippers already if they had went by carriage in tavern on city's surroundings, became aware of mountaineering quite late. They considered people who were evenings returning from railway stations in knickerbockers with alpenstock and flowers on hats despicably. Not earlier than German an Austrian Alpine society (Deutsch und

Oesterreichischer Alpenverein, its sections founded: 1874 Triest, 1875 Ljubljana, 1876 Maribor, 1884 Celje) began with systematic marking of alpine ways, setting up German signposts and building its mountain huts, the situation made sober Slovenes. They inflamed first time massively for the mountaineering. As in 1895 wrote Slovene Alpine Journal they had to show, that mountains in Slovene region are not in own of any German society. „It's our descent, our are mountains!“

Slovenes founded its Alpine Society in 1893 as the last in region, but they finally succeeded with ambitious efforts to mark as a Slovene all mountains in Slovene region. With endeavour in mountains (building mountain huts, paths and signposts) and in urban centres (by organizing dances, concerts, journal, slide shows, lectures...) they finally put nearer folks before distant mountains. Until the first world war Slovene Alpine Society build up 37 mountain huts and refuges and had in the year 1913 already 24 sections with 3385 members.

With all this factors were only build bases for later wider mountain activities. They enable also the cognition about health usefulness of mountaineering and founded the conditions for the growth of different types of alpine tourism. The first conquer of mountains, which was subject of this paper, namely brought the second conquer of mountains, which ploughed its way for developing the skiing and alpinism.

Sources and some Literature:

Planinski vestnik, vol.: 1895 - 1914

Gestrin Ferdo, **Melik** Vasilij, Slovenska zgodovina od konca osemnajstega stoletja do 1918, Ljubljana 1966.

Klinar Stanko (ed.), Valentin Stanič. Prvi alpinist v Vzhodnih Alpah, Ljubljana 2000.

Kocbek Fran (ed.), Savinjske Alpe, Celje 1926.

Kugy Julius, Iz življenja gornika, Maribor 1968.

Kunaver Pavel, Moje steze, Maribor 1979.

Lovšin Evgen (ur.), Valentin Stanič. Prvi alpinist v vzhodnih Alpah, Ljubljana 1956.

Mlakar Janko, 60 let slovenskega planinstva, in: Planinski vestnik, vol. 1953.

Razvoj turizma v Sloveniji, Zbornik referatov 28. zborovanje slovenskih zgodovinarjev, Ljubljana 1996.

Sport, Sinn & Wahn, Steirische Landesausstellung 1991 in Mürzzuschlag, Graz 1991.

Stoletje v gorah, Ljubljana 1992.

To in ono meščanstvo v provinci, Celje 1995.

Tuma Henrik, Pomen in razvoj alpinizma, Ljubljana.

Weltbühne und Naturkulisse. Zwei Jahrhunderte Salzburg – Tourismus, Salzburg 1994.

Wester Josip, Baltazar Hacquet. Prvi raziskovalec naših Alp, Ljubljana 1954.

The Iron Wolf: Lithuanian Fascism (1927-1941) - Fascist Movements in the Baltic States I -

Fascism was, in the words of Thomas Mann, „a disease of the times that is at home everywhere“;¹ and while everybody has heard of Hitler and Mussolini and probably of a fair number of other exponents of this historical and political phenomenon, the subject of fascism in the Baltic States is generally as obscure to a larger foreign audience as are most other aspects of their political history.

After the Baltic States gained their independence after World War I and the Russian Revolution, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania emerged from their wars of independence as liberal democracies in which the legislative held considerable power and minorities were granted rights to an extent which was viewed as exemplary by contemporaries. However, even before the Soviet occupation brought an end to Baltic independence for the next few decades, these liberal democracies had been replaced by authoritarian regimes.² This trend is also visible in the emergence of ‚fascist‘ movements in the Baltic States.

While, as we shall see in good time, it is fairly easy to name the most important fascist movements both in inter-war Latvia and Estonia, the subject of Lithuanian fascism must be approached with caution. Following an army coup against the newly-elected left-wing government in December 1926, Lithuania was ruled by an authoritarian, nationalist, anticommunist régime, headed by Antanas SMETONA (1874-1944) as president and as prime minister Augustinas VOLDEMARAS (1883-1942) of the Lithuanian Nationalist Union (*Lietuvių tautininkų sąjunga*, LTS). It may be of little surprise that the Comintern immediately labelled Lithuania a fascist state,³ although this could have been an exaggeration, missing the point of what genuinely constituted fascism as opposed to other forms of right-wing politics:

G.Dimitrov has pointed out that Fascism can differ from country to country, so that even if the Smetona régime was milder than those of Hitler, Mussolini, or Pilsudski, it was still fascist. (...) Indeed, any authoritarian, nationalist, anti-Communist régime would fall into this category of Fascism. If one considers Fascism more as a politico-ideological movement stressing the corporate organisation of the state, there is a question as to the degree, if any, that the Lithuanian government of the years 1926-1940 can be labelled as fascist.⁴

The Lithuanian-American historian V. Stanley Vardys agrees with this assertion and goes on to define Smetona's rule not as fascist but as marked by a „conservative, nationalistic character, [...] and restricted by his own philosophical theories on government and even more by the country's old pluralistic social structure, which he preserved rather than abolished“.⁵

Although Ernst Nolte - nowadays highly controversial in Germany, but in the 1960s still a generally respected expert on fascism - shares the view that it would not be correct to label the Lithuanian nationalist government as fascist, the section in his book on fascist movements that focuses on Lithuania only mentions the Smetona and Voldemaras administration,⁶ as if there had been no significant movement in this country which came closer to occupying the position **on/in** the political spectrum that the Nazis held in Germany. In fact, there had been one.

The IRON WOLF (*Geližinis vilkas*)⁷ was a paramilitary organisation, founded in 1927 under the cover of an athletic society but with plans to develop one day into a national militia of some sort. However, it soon became quite clear that this organisation's sole purpose was to function as Prof. Augustinas Voldemaras's personal tool in keeping down any opposition whatsoever.⁸

The Iron Wolf actually featured rather few formal criteria of fascist ideology to set it apart from the bourgeois-nationalist *Tautininkai* (LTS), except maybe for the fact that its nationalism and anti-Polonism exceeded even

the government's sentiments in that direction and that the glorification of Youth and Struggle featured strongly. However, being something of a clandestine organisation, there was no opportunity for the kind of paramilitary mass demonstrations that fascist movements are usually so fond of.⁹

On May 6, 1929 Voldemaras survived an attempt on his life (his adjutant did not, however) and as a consequence became increasingly dictatorial, alienating himself from a number of important supporters of the nationalist regime such as the Church and the military, not to mention his own colleagues in the cabinet, and spent more time on developing the Iron Wolf as his base of power than on matters of state. President Smetona, though a nationalist himself, a moderate compared to his colleague, began to see Voldemaras as more and more of a threat and finally relieved him of his offices on September 19, 1929, replacing him with his own brother-in-law, the rather more pragmatic Juozas TŪBELIS. But Voldemaras was not one to resign voluntarily and so he had to be forcibly removed from his luxurious quarters and banished from the interim capital, Kaunas.

Leadership of the Iron Wolf was now transferred to the deputy interior minister, B. ŠTENCELIS, who was ordered by Smetona to return the Iron Wolf to its original purpose as an athletic society. Not surprisingly, but slightly extreme nonetheless, Iron Wolf cadres loyal to Voldemaras tried to dispose of the new leadership by planting a bomb in their own headquarters. As a consequence, the government banned the Iron Wolf, forcing the group to go underground.

The organisation consisted mainly of young army and air force officers, with maybe 1,000 members in Kaunas and not many more outside.¹⁰ Some were rather active in Lithuanian politics though, such as Antanas MAČIŪKA, who had been the air force captain leading the unit which had dissolved parliament in the 1926 coup, and the businessman Algirdas SLIESORAITIS, the only civilian of any significance in the Iron Wolf and in 1938 also the chairman of a 'democratic', 'all-party' opposition coalition, the League of Lithuania's Activists (Lietuvos aktyvistų sąjunga, LAS).

The Iron Wolf was a source of political unrest in Lithuania for as long as it was active, but the first time it actually sought an all-out confrontation with Smetona was in Spring 1934 when the Army and the government were once again at odds over impending military budget cuts. Supporters of Voldemaras convinced General Petras KUBILIŪNAS that their leader's re-appointment to the post of prime minister would ensure sufficient funding for the military and, indeed, in the night of June 6 to June 7, 1934 there were clashes between army and police units in the streets of Kaunas. The coup failed though, presumably because the interior minister was prepared in advance and President Smetona strictly refused any compromise whatsoever, so that General Kubiliūnas gave up rather than risk a civil war. He and some of his officers were arrested, as was Voldemaras himself, who had flown into Kaunas a bit prematurely, no doubt expecting a certain victory. He was sentenced to a lengthy prison sentence by court martial, but was amnestied in 1938 on condition that he leave the country.

1934 was also the year in which the *Voldemarininkai* formed the Lithuanian Nationalist Party (*Lietuvių nacionalistų partija*, LNP) from the Iron Wolf. Like its predecessor, the LNP acted mainly in the underground and was responsible for most of Lithuania's political unrest throughout the '30s, with the exception of the very important 1935 farmers' revolt in the province of Suvalkija. The LNP was a part of the opposition coalition LAS (see above), that was formed in 1938 in the autonomous Klaipėda (Memel) territory, only to be dissolved when the Germans finally marched into the province in 1939 to bring it '*heim ins Reich*'. After that the *Voldemarininkai* seem to have engaged in several minor conspiracies and - under the influence and with the financial support of Nazi Germany - anti-Jewish activities that helped to destabilise the political situation in Lithuania.

The first occasion to present itself to the general public arose for the LNP in early 1940 when it buried its leader, Lieutenant-Colonel Mačiūka. But at this point its days were already numbered, because on May 26, 1940 the leaders of the LNP were charged with conspiracy and locked up (e.g. Sliesoraitis, who was sent to the Pabradė concentration camp). They were still incarcerated when the Soviet occupation commenced not much later. As part of their attempts to crush resistance to the occupation, the Soviets conducted arrests on a mass scale in the night of July 11 to July 12, 1940, arresting and deporting „among others well-known Lithuanian politicians such as [...] Prof. A. Voldemaras“.¹¹ As you may remember, Voldemaras had been exiled from Lithuania in 1938 but

had returned illegally in autumn 1939 only to be arrested and deported once more in 1940. In the same year „he returned unexpectedly from abroad soon after the Soviet invasion of Lithuania and was immediately arrested by the Reds and kept imprisoned until now,“ to quote a letter by a Lithuanian minister to the *Chicago Daily Tribune*, dated July 3, 1941.¹² Augustinas Voldemaras died in Soviet captivity in 1942.

Despite having lost its leaders, the LNP continued to exist illegally throughout the ‘Russian year,’ while certain exiled *Voldemarininkai* took part in forming the Front of Lithuanian Activists (Lietuvių aktyvistų frontas, LAF), an organisation led by one Colonel Kazys ŠKIRPA, who expected the liberation of Lithuania by Hitler’s troops. Inaugurated in Berlin on November 17, 1940, „the LAF was joined by people of diverse political views, from the social democrats to the voldemarininkai“,¹³ but in the end this organisation appears to have been fiercely pro-Nazi and anti-Semitic. For instance, an LAF flyer dated March 19, 1941 declares that:

All forces must concentrate on the moment when war breaks out. The local communists and other traitors must be apprehended immediately, lest they escape punishment for their crimes. (Traitors will only be pardoned if they can prove that they have killed at least one Jew.)¹⁴

When the Germans launched their attack on the Soviet Union in June 1941, a revolt erupted in Lithuania. On the Kaunas radio station, the LAF announced the anti-Soviet revolt, the resurrection of Lithuanian independence and a provisional government led by Kazys Škirpa. Indeed, by the time they reached them the Germans found a number of Lithuanian cities - including Kaunas - already ‘liberated’ from the Soviets. That, however, did not mean that they planned to accept Lithuania as a free country; in fact, they forced the provisional government to resign on August 5, 1941¹⁵ and dissolved the LAF on September 26, 1941. It must said, though, that the part of Lithuania’s population that suffered the most under the German occupation were the Lithuanian Jews, who before the war had been one of the most prosperous Jewish communities in eastern Europe - Vilnius was once called the ‘Jerusalem of the East’ -, with autonomy rights reaching back to the Middle Ages, but now had been all but annihilated in German death camps and Lithuanian pogroms.

Once the Germans had firmly proven that Lithuanian independence was out of the question there was only one political organisation left willing to collaborate with them — the LNP. Proving that old habits die hard, the members of the LNP had already tried on July 23/24, 1941 to topple the provisional government — presumably with German help, but definitely without success. But now that they were the only legal political party left they, too, did not face up to the expectations the Germans had as regards servility and so the LNP was banned by the end of 1941. This also marked the end of any legal Lithuanian political participation whatsoever, the little power the Nazis were willing to share being transferred to people like the already mentioned General Kubiliūnas.

But the LNP (or, for that matter, the Iron Wolf) had at this point outlived itself politically anyway. The political leaders were either deceased or deported, the much hated Anatanas Smetona had emigrated to the USA (and was soon to die in a fire in 1944) and Lithuania’s archrival Poland had been invaded by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union, resulting in the return by the latter of the Vilnius territory to Lithuania.

To conclude this article, one could cite Romuald Misiunas giving one of the possible answers to the question of whether or not one can speak of a ‘fascist’ movement in Lithuania:

Fascism in Lithuania consisted mainly of a reaction against what was, or was considered to be, a threat to Lithuanian nationality — Poland and the Polish cultural influence — as well as of a superficial imitation on the part of a nationalist authoritarian régime of some of the political and ideological styles then current in Italy. It developed virtually no ideology of its own. Some of the trappings of Fascism were superimposed on a much older movement which had existed independently of Fascism — Lithuanian nationalism.¹⁶

Bibliography:

Antano Smetonos Korrespondencija 1940-1944, Kaunas 1999.

ANUŠAUSKAS, Arvydas (ed.): *The Anti-Soviet Resistance in the Baltic States*, 2nd ed., Vilnius 2000.

MISIUNAS, Romuald: „Fascist Tendencies in Lithuania,” in: *The Slavonic and East European Review* 1970, 110, pp.88-109.

MYLLYNIEMI, Seppo: *Die baltische Krise 1938-1941*, Stuttgart 1979.

NOLTE, Ernst: *Die faschistischen Bewegungen*, Munich 1966.

VAIČIKONIS, Kristina: „Augustinas Voldemaras“, in: *Lituanus* 1984, 30 (3).

VARDYS, V. Stanley: „Die Entwicklung der Republik Litauen“, in: Boris Meissner (ed.): *Die baltischen Nationen. Estland, Lettland, Litauen*, Cologne 1990, pp.75-86.

(Footnotes)

¹ Cit. Widmann, Carlos: “Zirkus der Übermenschen,” in: *Der Spiegel* 1999, 34, p.147.

² Owing to several factors, of which some may be considered as normal for early-'30s Europe and some which were uniquely Baltic, such as the constant threat of a Soviet invasion and - in the specific case of Lithuania - the Polish occupation of Vilnius and the surrounding territory.

³ Cf. Nolte, Ernst: *Die faschistischen Bewegungen*, Munich 1966, p.233.

⁴ Misiunas, Romuald: “Fascist Tendencies in Lithuania,” in: *The Slavonic and East European Review* 1970, 110, p.97.

⁵ Vardys, V. Stanley: “Die Entwicklung der Republik Litauen,” in: Boris Meissner (ed.): *Die baltischen Nationen. Estland, Lettland, Litauen*, Cologne 1990, p.80.

⁶ Nolte, *Faschistische Bewegungen*, pp.233f.

⁷ The name is taken from the most important of Lithuania's pre-Christian myths, the story of how the legendary ruler Gediminas (1316-1341) was confronted in a dream by a snarling iron wolf. On asking the high-priest of Perkunas, the Lithuanian God of Thunder, about his dream Gediminas was advised to build a castle between the rivers Vilnia and Neris - which later became the Lithuanian capital Vilnius, occupied by Poland in 1920.

⁸ Hence the usual term for right-wing extremists in inter-war Lithuania: *Voldemarininkai*, ‘followers of Voldemaras’.

⁹ Misiunas, “Fascist Tendencies,” pp.100f.

¹⁰ For comparison: In 1935 the Lithuanian Communist Party had 1,500 members (the total population of Lithuania at that time was roughly 2,500,000), and in 1938 the LTS had 13,000 members.

¹¹ Myllyniemi, Seppo: *Die baltische Krise 1938-1941*, Stuttgart 1979, p.135.

¹² P.Žadeikis to the Editor of the *Chicago Daily Tribune*, in: *Antano Smetonos Korrespondencija 1940-1944*, Kaunas 1999, p.414.

¹³ Brandišauskas, Valentinas: “Anti-Soviet Resistance in 1940 and 1941 and the Revolt of June 1941,” in: Arvydas Anaušauskas (ed.): *The Anti-Soviet Resistance in the Baltic States*, 2nd ed., Vilnius 2000, p.11.

¹⁴ Cit. Myllyniemi, *Baltische Krise*, p.149.

¹⁵ Škirpa had not been part of the provisional government after all, having been placed under house arrest by the Germans earlier on.

¹⁶ Misiunas, “Fascist Tendencies,” p.109.

Victor Taki, ISHA CEU Budapest

Against the general background of crisis in various trends of history, microhistory ~~seems~~ appears to be surprisingly fresh and vigorous. To explain this one needs to consider the conditions, in which microhistory was born a quarter of a century ago and explore the opportunities for further elaboration of this successful approach. The 1960s, 1970s and 1980s were ~~the period of the growing~~ marked by dissatisfaction with major social theories, but this dissatisfaction, unlike in the previous instances, turned into „the revision of the existing tools of research,“ rather than construction of a grand new grand-system.¹ Microhistory was one of the responses to it, but not the only one. Along with it „the decline of systematic thought“² produced deconstructionism, postmodernism and other trends which denied the possibility of positive historical knowledge and reduced the scholars' activity to the literary analysis of historical writing, ignoring the problem of content of these texts. As part of ~~the so-called~~ what we call New History, microhistory was just as much an attempt to overcome the inadequacy of such systemic variants of positivism as Marxism and functionalism as it was a generally „positivistic“ response to the degradation of ~~the~~ historical cognition into literary exercises. Microhistory, which originated in the works of Carlo Ginzburg, Natalie Zemon Davis, and Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, is not only a response to this situation. It firmly introduced into the nomenclature of historical studies the concept of „popular culture,“ which came to be viewed as something ~~different~~ other than a mere variant of official culture imposed on the masses by the dominant classes. On the other hand, microhistory itself is not ~~secured safe against from~~ crisis tendencies, which will not be long in waiting if it fails to overcome the limits, ~~which were~~ set partly by the initial sphere of application of the new approach and partly by the insufficiency of the sources. To prevent this from happening, an enlargement of the sphere of studies ~~done by microhistorians is needed; and this is where the microhistorian comes in.~~ The application of the microhistoricaly approach to such traditional disciplines as social or intellectual history will help both to give a new impetus to the research in these spheres and prevent microhistory from „parochialisation.“

In order to trace the potential opportunities for the usage of microhistory in new domains it is necessary to give a brief definition ~~to~~ of this approach. Among the distinctive features of microhistory Giovanni Levi mentions the reduction of scale, the debate about rationality, the small clues as a scientific paradigm, the role of the particular, the attention to reception and narrative, a specific definition of context and rejection of relativism.³ Among them „the reduction of a scale of historical research in order to isolate and test the many abstractions of social thought,“ and the „evidential paradigm“ as „an alternative method for the evaluation of the historical evidence“ are sometimes referred to as the defining elements.⁴ In fact, these two elements are in ~~a~~-concealed opposition to ~~each one~~ another. While the former enables microhistorians to claim that microhistory is essentially nothing more than „historiographic practice,“⁵ the latter has epistemological implications, which amount to nothing less than a totally new „conjectural“ paradigm alternative to the one so far prevailing in social sciences.⁶ It is not the aim of this paper to discuss to what extent the radical reduction of scope of investigation leads to a complete reversal of epistemological principles. Rather, it is a discussion of the possibilities; which such a reduction may open before the researcher in the domains of social and intellectual history. To be sure, this idea is not new. Social microhistory already materialized in the works of Edoardo Grendi,⁷ whereas Giovanni Levi pointed out the possibility of application of the microhistoricaly approach to intellectual history.⁸ However, these spheres have not yet received due attention ~~of the from~~ scholars, and this has a number of reasons.

Microhistory was born in the specific conditions of Italy and France, where exceptionally rich archives of the inquisition trials against witchcraft in ~~the~~ rural areas allowed reconstruction; on the basis of the minute interrogations of the accused, of the thick layer of popular beliefs. Given the radical reduction of the scale of research, the availability of comprehensive sources would otherwise cause a problem; which limits the application of this approach to most periods of history. Through the official demonological concepts, which inquisitors were trying to impose on the accused, Carlo Ginzburg and Emmanuel La Roy Ladurie managed to perceive the original popular beliefs that were in opposition to the dominant culture. The subject matter and the procedure of their investigation accounted for the fact that the founders of microhistory find their work similar to that of anthropologists.⁹ This anthropological approach to the popular culture mainly of the Early Modern European period produced not only a „thick description,“ but also led to some important conclusions, which were beyond the purely anthropological model. It not only helped to ascertain the existence of a unique popular culture, which opposed the pressure of official dogmas, but also exposed the social conflict underlying this opposition, thus rendering to cultural studies the social plane that they ~~began~~ had begun to lose. However, the greatest achievement was the discovery of the exceptionally complex cultural and social reality based on the signs and clues that were neglected in the macro-scale studies.

One cannot help noticing, however, that all these achievements were made ~~on~~ with a relatively narrow category of sources and in the case studies, which were predominantly investigating popular witchcraft in the Early Modern period. This is a segment of historical social reality which, though very revealing, cannot be exploited endlessly. The advantages which the microhistoricaly approach has to offer, should be neither limited to nor dependant on a single category of sources (the records of inquisition and judicial trials) and single subject (popular beliefs and witchcraft). Meanwhile, the development of social microhistory can open up new possibilities on the plane of social history, especially when the method is applied directly ~~applied~~ to such traditional problems as social change. It ~~has~~ was already been mentioned that in its „anthropological variant“, microhistory addresses the problems of social conflict underlying the conflict of cultures. But so far the problem ~~has~~ was not been addressed in its dynamic aspect, i. e. by incorporation of the microhistoricaly

perspective in the context of traditional macro-scale study of social change. The combination of the two perspectives can provide a scholar with a kind of methodological binoculars, which would enable him or her to see not only the general premises, stages and outcomes of major social transformations, but also ~~let one to~~ perceive how these transformations occur ~~on the level of concrete~~ in relation to actual living individuals. This would, on the one hand, save traditional studies in social history from producing a recurrent „mechanical“ picture of social process, and on the other hand make use of the potential of social microhistory to reveal the *workings of social change*. The ~~m~~Microhistorically perspective can be particularly convincing of the fact that major social transformations occur in the consciousness of the living individuals, which would serve as a check for „mechanic“ theories of development, and can be a verifying device for many sociological generalizations. Naturally, there is a problem of the seeming incommensurability of the societal and individual scales. It usually took several generations ~~in order~~ for the major social transformations to become perceptible on the scale of the ~~society as a whole society~~, especially as far as the Early Modern Period is concerned. ~~G~~Thus, given an individual life-span ~~therefore~~, it is hardly possible to speak of the social change *diachronically*. But the workings of social change can still be perceived in a *simultaneous presence* in the mental and behavioural image of a historical individual of elements, which on a ~~macro-scale~~ macro-scale form a sequence in the course of many decades if not centuries. ~~It is o~~Only through the individual (which is often in fact collective) surpassing of the given social reality ~~do that~~ the outlines of the new social pattern take shape. The actual happening of this transformation process can be directly observed solely ~~through by exercising the exercise of the microhistory approach~~ microhistorical approach.

Despite its highly traditional character, intellectual history, too, can provide a good ground foundation for the application of the microhistorically method. This domain has been largely dominated by the deconstructionist and contextualist approaches. The main assumption of the deconstructionists is that there is nothing beyond the text and therefore all attempts to reconstruct the actual historical milieu are simply misleading. English contextualists, on the contrary, engage in intensive reconstruction of the original context, which is identified with the language of intellectual or political discourse that sets the substantive pattern of the development of thought of a certain period. The attempt to define the thinkable through the speakable ~~ignores assumes~~ the antecedent nature of ~~any~~ language in respect of ~~social reality reflected in thought (which is far from conclusive)~~ and posits the problem of ~~the~~ interpretation of ~~the~~ innovative thinking. This can clearly be seen in Quentin Skinner and John Pocock's interpretation of Machiavelli's political theory as basically a continuation of the humanist republican political discourse, ignoring its actual variance with the republicanism of Quattrocento humanists.¹⁰ In fact, such interpretations already fell subject to the criticism on the part of Carlo Ginzburg, whose interest can be explained by the fact that Machiavelli is the „exceptional normal“ of the intellectual discourse of the republican humanism. The advantage of the microhistory approach microhistorical approach consists in its potential to provide reference to the social plane of the living and struggling individuals, who are not only products, but also the producers of their social reality. Without such a reference, one cannot understand the „anomalous“ phenomena on the even surface of a given intellectual discourse. In other words, microhistory can supply the necessary social context, which is not prominent enough in the interpretations of the English contextualists.

These are only anticipations of what might be the case. Only practical studies can test the validity of these suggestions. This, however, does not detract anything at all from the argument of this paper. Microhistory proved to be a successful technique and a revealing approach. Due to the radical reduction of the scale of investigation, slow reading of the historical evidence, and thick description, a number of scholars managed to arrive at a description of a complex social and cultural reality, following the signs and clues and data, which were ignored by the scholars in traditional domains. They offered a convincing refutation of the extreme relativist tendencies, and at the same time provided a substantial correction of the current generalizing schemes and concepts. Moreover, some of them went as far as to offer a principally new epistemological paradigm. As far as the empirical aspect is concerned, the historians of this trend contributed to the concept of popular culture as a unique and deeply rooted phenomena, which, though long remaining in oblivion, resisted the imposition of the dominant percepts. Finally, the concrete case studies in this genre largely added up to the knowledge of popular witchcraft in Early Modern Europe. At the same time, the limits of set by the original sphere of application of microhistory, including the scarcity of sources, pose the question of the search for new uses of microhistory. As an example of such strategies, this paper suggested further development of social microhistory, particularly by means of combining the large scale and the microhistorically perspective on social change. Another way means of getting deriving the potential benefit from the application of this approach is the use of microhistory to solve the problems of intellectual history, particularly in the interpretation of the instances of innovative thought. These two, along with other possible uses of microhistory in the historical studies of the present, are the ways of universalizing the method, through which proving the discovery of the unprecedented complexity of the historical reality proved to be possible.

(Footnotes)

¹ Giovanni Levi, „On Microhistory,“ in *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, (Edited by Peter Burke,) (Polity Press), p.-94.

² Carlo Ginzburg, „Clues: Parts of the Evidential Paradigm,“ in his *Myths, Emblems, Clues*, (Translated by John and Anne Tedeschi), - (London: Hutchinson Radius, 1990,) p.-123.

³ Giovanni Levi, „On Microhistory,“ p.-110.

⁴ Edward Muir, Introduction to *Microhistory and the Lost Peoples of Europe*, E(edited by Edward Muir and Guido Ruggerio,) (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1991,) p.-9.

⁵ Giovanni Levi, „On Microhistory,“ p.-93.

⁶ Carlo Ginzburg, „Clues: Parts of the Evidential Paradigm,“ in his ~~*Myths, Emblems, Clues*~~, (Translated by John and Anne Tedeschi) (London: Hutchinson Radius, 1990)p.???

⁷ Edoardo Grendi, „The Political System of a Community in Liguria: Cerro in the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries,“ in *Microhistory and the Lost Ppeoples of Europe*, (Eedited by Edward Muir and Guido Ruggerio,) (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1991,) pp.-119-159.

⁸ Giovanni Levi, „On Microhistory,“ p.108.

⁹ Carlo Ginzburg, „The Inquisitor as Anthropologist,“ in: ~~*Myths, Emblems, Clues*~~, in his ~~*Myths, Emblems, Clues*~~ (Translated by John and Anne Tedeschi) (London: Hutchinson Radius, 1990) p.-165. This similarity is also mentioned by Giovanni Levi, „On Microhistory,“ p.98.

¹⁰ Quentin Skinner, *Foundations of the Modern Political Thought*, Vol. 1-2, (Cambridge University Press, 1978,); John Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment. Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Ttradition*, (Princeton, 1975.)

Rome in the imperial idea of the 14th century

The age of emperor Lewis the Bavarian

Thomas Foerster, ISHA Heidelberg

Rome's importance for the medieval order has always been looked at in the early and in the high Middle Ages. Especially the important role it played for the emperors throughout the centuries until the decline of the concept of an universal emperor after 1250 has always found big interest. In the time after that, there have also been attempts by the emperors to refer to this concepts. The reign of Lewis the Bavarian is a very good example for one of those attempts, but also with very individual concepts.

The town of Rome has had a huge importance within the medieval world. Besides Jerusalem it has always been seen as one centre place in medieval philosophy. This position comes from different origins. The medieval concept of the world order thinks of two heads: Empire and papacy which have both sacred and secular dimensions. Also do both have a connection with the town of Rome. For the popes, for example, being the bishops of the town, it is their seat, of course. For them, Rome is the place where St. Peter and St. Paul suffered their martyrdom, which also gives it a sacred position, and claiming their tradition back to St. Peter, the rock upon which Christ wanted to build his church, they fought for a supremacy of the *Roma aeterna* towards other Episcopal sees throughout the ages. So, it is important to distinguish ideal concepts of Rome and the real town. In imperial concepts it have always been rather ideas of Rome that determined with other factors the whole concept of the emperor, of his power and of his position. Not only because the imperial coronation always had to be in this town and was executed by the pope with his own relation to Rome, also the emperors claimed to continue the ancient Roman empire on a Christian basis, often referring to the first Christian emperor Constantine the great, but in the most cases the Roman empire and not one ruler in particular has been in the centre. A similar thought was maintained by the emperors of Byzantium, what caused different conflicts between the two empires, but the focus of this article shall be on the western emperors who called themselves *Imperator Romanorum* – emperor of the Romans. The title of the German ruler, who was the future emperor, has never been King of the Germans, but always *Rex Romanorum* – King of the Romans, too.

Since the year 800, when Charlemagne was coronated emperor, the mentioned claim as well as the entire imperial idea has been in a state of flux very often. Mostly an ideal picture of the town was drawn, apart or at least in a loose connection to the real Rome. Especially Otto III. (983-1002) stressed the importance of an ideal Rome for his own imperial dignity. After the big arguments between the two universal heads of the medieval order, empire and papacy, and especially after the fall of the Hohenstaufen dynasty with its eschatological-universal principles of the imperial idea, in a long vacancy of the empire (1250-1310), the German rulers for a long time did neither try to involve an ideal nor the real Rome into their position as ruler, as in the centuries before. But also the papacy saw its decline. After 1308, in the „Outrage of Anagni“, it came more and more under the control of the French king and finally left Rome and settled in Avignon.

Henry VII. was the first German ruler to be coronated emperor again and who tried to carry on the former universality of the imperial idea. But in this time the western European kingdoms had already began to grow to totally sovereign states upon the principle *rex imperator in regno suo*, and were far from acknowledging an imperial superiority. On the other side, early forms of national thoughts began to develop, in view of which both the empire and the papacy were mostly seen as obsolete. So, the attempts to continue the universal imperial power were either refused or given other theoretical basics.

Lewis the Bavarian, who has been elected German king in an ambiguous election against Frederick from the Habsburg family, and who was able to defeat Frederick in the battle of Mühldorf in 1322, interfered papal interests when he turned his focus on the Italian politics after that time, what caused great arguments between him and Popel John XXII. But the most important demand of the pope was the right to approve the election of the German king, being the future emperor. In the interest of the German prince electors this was denied by

Lewis, and soon he was excommunicated. In 1326, he moved to Italy in order to take direct influence on the conditions there, like many German kings did before him. In 1327/28 he approached to Rome, where he was coronated emperor with no participation of the pope, but by the roman people. This literal interpretation of the title *imperator romanorum* was totally new in this form and has never been repeated. To understand, where this idea came from, it is necessary to take a view on the position of the ideal and the real Rome within the imperial idea in the different fields where it always has been determined and defined: the position of the papacy, the ideas in the Italian part of the empire, the concepts in the contemporary philosophy and the position of the German princes.

The papacy had always stressed a superiority above the emperors. Another theory that the popes claimed very strictly was the *translatio imperii*, that said that the empire was transferred by the papal *plenitudo potestatis*, the entirety of power, and would not exist without it. Since the papal curia had left Rome, their own relation to the town was slowly confined to its own ideal aspect of the Rome concept (*ubi papa ibi Roma* – where the pope is, there is Rome). The Rome-related imperial dignity has never been questioned by the popes, as long as the empire had a subordinated role. The imperial dignity that Lewis was given by the people, has never been accepted, of course.

In the early 14th century, the nobles and especially the towns in northern Italy have been divided in the two major parties, the Guelf and the Ghibelline, that reflected the power of papacy (Guelf) or empire (Ghibelline). Most of the important towns were ruled by one of those parties, and very often there have been bloody riots in the towns between them. In this time very many different political thoughts emerged in Italy, that had great influence on the actual political situation. Caused by a very strict papal policy in these regions, a strong anti-papal attitude strengthened the imperial influence. These thoughts went along with early forms of democratic concepts. But also other main currents became obvious, for example the rise of Humanism, with its recourse to ancient concepts. In this current Rome became object of a new admiration, especially of its ancient ruins. But exactly this admiration showed the huge gap between the ideal and the real town, which lost huge parts of both its income and its glare by the absence of the papal court. The people of Rome had tried since the 12th century to re-establish their self-government, their senate and to take influence on papal and imperial politics. So, already in 1144, a Roman delegation offered an imperial crown to Konrad II., which he denied. In 1305 Pope Clemens V. received a roman request to return to the town, or they would raise an emperor themselves. These currents found their peak in the mentioned coronation of 1328, but were not its only origins. Some parts of it can, for example, also be derived from legal traditions of Ghibelline lawyers.

Another origin may be seen in the political theory of the early 14th century, with its most important exponents, Marsilius of Padua and William Occam. Marsilius had developed the most revolutionary concept with his book *Defensor pacis*. In 1326, Marsilius had fled from Paris, where he had taught theology, and sought asylum on the court of Lewis the Bavarian, where he soon reached important positions and became the most important adviser. In the reconciliation negotiations between Lewis and the pope, the abolition of this asylum had always been demanded, but never been executed. For Marsilius, the state is free from basics in natural rights, it is a rational building, for which the people is the *legislator humanus*. The church is subordinated to the state, and thus the pope also does not have the right to approve the German king. The tradition that the imperial coronation is led by the pope does not give him any superiority to other bishops. So, in his view, an ideal Rome's importance for both the imperial and papal dignity is not very big. Instead he stresses the acclamation by the people during the coronation ceremonies of Charlemagne and Otto I., the Great as a constituent part. So, his influence on the events in Rome in 1328 is quite obvious.

The English Franciscan William Occam was, because of the arguments between the Franciscans and the pope, also a refugee at the court of Lewis and began in the following time to underpin Lewis' politics with his philosophical works. He stresses the universal emperor as the head of the secular part of an order which clearly distinguishes the secular and the religious sphere. (*sicut secundum multos papa est praelatus omnium Christianorum in spiritualibus [...] ita imperator est Dominus in temporalibus omnium immediatus*)

Lupold of Bebenburg can rather be seen as an exponent of the German nobility. In Germany the tradition of the king being elected by seven German prince electors solidified. During the interdict that lasted since 1324 the German princes stayed on the side of Lewis and ensured their election right in 1338 an article, not mentioning

the pope and his right to approve the elected at all. In this article they stress own national traditions. The empire began to be seen as a German state. For them, Rome's position in the imperial concept is confined to the title *rex Romanorum*. That the imperial coronation by the pope in Rome was usual, has never been questioned, and yet the people's imperial dignity that Lewis brought across the alps has always been accepted in Germany. In this tradition, Lupold von Bebenburg, frees the imperial dignity de facto from its universality and sets it in a similar position to the king's. The dignity obtained by the coronation in Rome confers only very vague prerogatives to the emperor. He stresses German traditions, too: for him the centre of the empire is not Rome, it is Germany. By the *translatio imperii* theory he explains that the empire went from the Romans to the Franks and from those to the Germans. For him, as usual in Germany, the ideal Rome in the empire does just exist in the title and the honour given by it.

For Lewis the Bavarian himself it is not only his coronation in Rome that deserves interest. Especially during his stay in Italy 1327-1330 there are many sources that can give information about his concept of rule. He always stresses the universal character of the imperial rule, which already Dante greeted in his predecessor, Henry VII. Mostly those stresses are found in communication with the pope as a form of definition or with Ghibelline nobles. After his coronation, he issued a degree regarding the papal seat in Rome. Later, he removed pope John XXII. from office and installed another one (who was chased away from Rome soon after Lewis left the town), as many of his predecessors did. So, he combined imperial examples and traditions with modern political thoughts and specific Roman concepts. This can also be seen in other sources. In the mentioned imperial tradition, the seals of the emperor always showed a pictorial representation of the town of Rome. These always showed an ideal type of town, but under Lewis this was changed to a representation that showed the real Rome, with some of its most important real buildings in a topographical sense. So, the Lateran as well as St. Peter are moved far to the sides; in the centre there is the Coliseum, and in front of it the senator's palace, symbolic for the ancient ideal Rome and the actual government of the town.



So, there are three sectors of the concept of Rome in the later middle ages: The papal tradition and its connection to the town was in a crisis caused by the absence of the popes. The people of Rome often tried to reactivate ancient structures, what in the most cases was nothing more than a romantic anachronism. But also the imperial attempts to continue broken traditions of former grandeur, failed because they were quite obsolete. For Lewis the Bavarian Rome was mainly important during his time in Italy, in the world of Dante and the traditions in the town of Rome. In his actions in Germany, there are no reflections about the imperial traditions, but in Italy the traditional Hexameter around the representation of Rome on the seal may have had a more concrete meaning to him: *Roma caput mundi regit orbis frena rotundi*. (Rome, the head of the world holds the reins of the earth). The imperial dignity of Lewis has mostly been accepted, although it was a break of tradition. On the other side it stressed other traditions. This combination of traditions, that was shown, was only possible, because both

empire and papacy were having basically formative phases in the early 14th century. Papacy lost parts of its own connection to Rome by its stay in Avignon, whilst the empire, after its long vacancy, was rather seen as obsolete, facing the early forms of state authority. Yet this stayed an episode in the history of the concept of the emperor and has never been referred to again.

Bibliography:

Berg, M.: Der Italienzug Ludwigs des Bayern, in: QFIAB 67 (1987), p. 142-197.

Berges, W.: Die Fürstenspiegel des hohen und späten Mittelalters, Stuttgart 1938, (MGH Schriften 2).

Bielefeldt, H. Von der päpstlichen Universalherrschaft zur autonomen Bürgerrepublik, in: ZRG KA 73 (1987), p. 70-130.

Bornhak, O.: Staatskirchliche Anschauungen am Hofe Ludwigs des Bayern, Weimar 1933 (Quellen und Studien zur Verfassungsgeschichte des deutschen Reiches in Mittelalter und Neuzeit 7, Heft 1).

Erben, W.: Rombilder auf kaiserlichen und päpstlichen Siegeln des Mittelalters, Graz / Wien / Leipzig 1931 (Veröffentlichungen des Historischen Seminars der Universität Graz 7).

Föbel, A.: Die deutsche Tradition von Imperium im späteren Mittelalter, in: Imperium / Empire / Reich, ed. by F. Bosbach and H. Hiery, München 1999 (Prinz-Albert-Studien 16), p. 17-30.

Goez, W.: Translatio Imperii, Tübingen 1958.

Görich, K.: Otto III. Romanus Saxonicus et Italicus. Kaiserliche Rompolitik und sächsische Historiographie, Sigmaringen 1993.

Gregorovius, F.: Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter, Stuttgart 1859-1872.

Miethke, J.: Kaiser und Papst im Spätmittelalter, in: ZHF 10 (1983), p. 421-446.

Id.: Politisches Denken und monarchische Theorie, in: Ansätze und Diskontinuität deutscher Nationsbildung im Mittelalter, ed. by J. Ehlers, Sigmaringen 1989 (Nationes 8), p. 121-144.

Id.: Wirkungen politischer Theorie auf die Praxis der Politik im Römischen Reich des 14. Jahrhunderts, in: Political thought and the realities of power in the middle ages, ed. by J. Canning and O.G. Oexle, Göttingen 1988 (Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 147), p. 173-210.

Most, R.: Der Reichsgedanke des Lupold von Bebenburg, in: DA 4 (1941), p. 444-485.

Pauler, R.: Die deutschen Könige und Italien im 14. Jahrhundert, Darmstadt 1997.

Rehm, W.: Europäische Romdichtung, München ²1960.

Schneider, F.: Rom und Romgedanke im Mittelalter, München 1926.

Schramm, P.E.: Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio, Darmstadt ⁴1984.

Seidlmayer, M.: Rom und Romgedanke im Mittelalter, in: Id.: Wege und Wandlungen des Humanismus, Göttingen 1965, p. 11-32.

Suckale, R.: Die Hofkunst Ludwigs des Bayern, München 1993.

The Romanian Countries in the Middle Ages, between Byzantium and the West

A Unique and Fundamental Political Institution:

The *Domnia*

Dan-Alexandru POPESCU

ISHA Sibiu

There are two main aspects which characterise the Romanian Principalities (Walachia and Moldavia)[1] during the Middle Ages. First of all, we have to mention that the feudal epoch does not cover the same period in the western part of Europe as it does in the eastern part. Narrowing things down, one can describe the Romanian „Middle Ages“ as situated between the 7th and 17th-18th century.

One can distinguish three periods: „the time of confusion“ (the beginning of the Middle Ages to the foundation of the feudal Romanian Principalities[2]), „the heroic times“ (14th-16th centuries) and „the time of submission“ (16th century to the end of the medieval period[3]). Nevertheless, these are not scholarly guiding marks; the utility of this classification resides in the need to „settle“ the historical facts.

Another point concerns the concept of „medieval institution“, a central historical notion that must always be analysed in terms of two fundamental dimensions: the spatial and the temporal. From this perspective we will regard the monarch as a character who can be associated with a variety of representations and symbols.

For the territory situated between the Carpathians, the Danube and the Black Sea, the ruler was neither an emperor as in the Byzantine model nor a king as in the western model. The medieval Romanian monarchy is represented by the *domn* (the *domnitor* or the *voievod*), an institution whose particular characteristics we will try to emphasise.

The 14th century represents an exceptional period for the Romanian Principalities. This time witnessed the creation of the medieval Romanian state with its two representatives: Walachia (situated to the south of the Carpathians) and, to the east, Moldavia.

The foundation of the Romanian states is the historical process that led to the unification of all the ancient political formations[4] in the same territory under a single authority. This was followed by the establishment of the lay and ecclesiastic institutions and by the emancipation and affirmation of a political autonomy in the context of international relations.

The definitive portrait of the medieval Romanian Principalities results in the maturation of a political institution with a powerful character of its own: the *domnia*. The first independent Romanian princes (Basarab I[5] in Walachia and Bogdan I[6] in Moldavia) succeeded in not becoming the vassals of the Hungarians, in collaborating with the feudal lords and taking advantage of a social and economic situation favourable to independence. In the title, the notion of *domn* symbolises the autocratic monarch[7]. Without giving up their initial quality of „voievod“, they become *domni*, thus preserving the Roman tradition of the *dominus* (the Emperor Almighty).

Accepting the Byzantine influences, as well as those typically Roman, the *domnia* differs from the political conceptions of its neighbouring states[8] (particularly from the Balkan ones). The Romanian princes were not kings as in the western sense (Hungary and Poland); nor were they despots[9] (Serbia) or tsars (Bulgaria[10]) [11]. The *domn* was simply the great master of the country and protector of the Church; thus emphasising the divine character and the political and social superiority of the *domnia* institution.

The imperial idea of Byzantium was always considered a Roman imperial tradition. The Hellenistic heritage and the idea of a royalty coming from the Orient in its close relations with the Christian concept of the power have enlarged the Byzantine formula and given it its specific value[12].

The *basileus* represents the divine order on earth (*omnis auctoritas a deo*) and he has the right to reward and

castigate in the name of the infallible justice embodied by him[13]. Based on this theocratic conception, the imperial power had an ecumenical significance (universal, worldly) [14]. The emperor was master over a family of states[15] and peoples[16] whose sovereigns, united in the same religious beliefs (Orthodoxy), recognised his role as their political „father“[17].

But the *basileus* had to share his supreme authority with the patriarch of Constantinople, a spiritual „father“, and the two were condemned to govern hand in hand for the social and political order[18]. The neighbouring states, each one adapting it to its needs, took up this Byzantine model[19] each in their own way.

The medieval Romanian monarchy made a clear distinction between religious feeling and what is alien to religion. The prince had the duty to preserve the interests and privileges of the Church, without overstretching this position, although sometimes he had to take control of ecclesiastic business.

The tripartite western formula[20] was reduced here to two main social categories. On the one hand, there were the clerics, the *oratores*, who never interfered in the political business[21]. On the other hand, the *bellatores* (the blood aristocrats, army representatives, dignitaries) and the *laboratores* (the population of the towns, free peasants, serfs), who formed the lay society. The *domn* had in a sense a function of social regulator; owing to his dominant and legitimate position, he was the warrant for a good functioning of the society and of the fulfilment of the general interest.

Constantin C. Giurescu[22] identifies four main attributes of the *domni*, all of a lay nature: the prince was the supreme master of the army (owing to his quality of *voievod*[23]); he was the one with the initiative for the political acts, he supervised the administrative system and in judicial matters his word was law. To these must be added a religious responsibility to protect the rights and interests of the Church and a legislative power.

The Romanian prince was the chief of a feudal house. As far as the accession to power of the *domni* is concerned, the Romanian dynasty adapted the system of hereditary-elective succession. The principle of kinship and the election of the elder functioned at the same level (*partim haereditario iure, partim primatum electione*[24]).

Only men could accede to the throne (the principle of maleness); the women of the royal family had their own court, but their involvement in the State affairs was prohibited. Yet, the mother of the prince had access to political power during her son's minority (she constituted the regency, etc.).

The aspirant had also to be physically apt to meet the challenges of the royal function. Blind, deaf or lame candidates were usually refused or eliminated from the „competition“[25]. To belong to the Orthodox majority was another condition, and the age of the aspirant could be a very important advantage or a serious obstacle in the contest for the throne[26].

Since succession was not strictly regulated, candidates were in great abundance. The association with power had sometimes but a provisory feature, and after the death of the *domnitor* the principle of electivity brought about disputes among nobility and aspirants. Each aspirant to the throne sought the political and financial support of the neighbouring states: Hungary, Poland or the Ottoman Empire.

The *domn* was the representative of God and his power approached the divine[27]. As a consequence he had to embody the imperial virtues[28]: philanthropy, generosity, sobriety, justice, a sense of general good[29].

The prince's decisions were absolute in nature and therefore the royal power was very great[30]. No social or political mechanism controlled the actions of the *domn* (at least in theory) but common law[31] and moral Christian values[32] eliminated the risks of the abuse of power (the case of tyranny or despotism).

To study the *domn* as a model for a „chief“ would be a very difficult project. In his attempt to prove the power of this specific institution and at the same time to underline the political and judicial independence of the *domni*, Dimitrie Cantemir indicated[33] that they would have the same rights and status as the other Christian princes; their authority was therefore not limited other than by God.

These assertions are founded in a clearly subjective point of view[34]: Cantemir was an adherent of the authoritarian monarchy, an idea that he always held very dear[35]. One cannot deny that the political power of the Romanian princes was very important. A good case in point here would be the term *domn*, which originates from the Latin expression *dominus* (the formula *Dominus noster* symbolised the absolute power of the Roman emperor, who himself was deified by his subjects, like the Oriental despots).

As a fundamentally Romanian institution, the *domnia* distinguishes itself from other monarchic forms, even

from those of central and south-eastern Europe. Its name is reminiscent of the period of the „dominate“[36] of the Roman Empire and of the Byzantine emperor's autocracy[37]. Among the external models that were imposed in the Romanian Principalities up to the 15th century the Byzantine was the most influential[38]. Its presence and positive contributions are universally recognised[39]. Nevertheless, the *domnia* always had an intensely anti-imperial character. The medieval Romanian state pretended to be a specific local creation that had to put on the first level the national idea[40].

Roland Mousnier[41] underlines the divine origin of the monarchies and the sacred feature of the institution of royalty. But if in eastern Europe the traditions of the absolute imperial monarchy of divine right are very well preserved through the intermediary of the Byzantium, the medieval West brought certain changes to the concept of royalty. Those transformations were determined by the great migrations as well as by the specific evolution of Christianity; Jacques Le Goff refers to them as a synthesis between ancient pagan traditions and biblical symbols[42].

The ritual of the sacred shows very clearly the differences between East and West. This ceremonial invests the monarch with exceptional powers. We can even say that it forms a new character[43], the legitimate sovereign, omnipotent in his quality of being God's chosen.

The medieval West adopted this formula of sacred kings, in the ambience of sumptuous ceremonials, under the patronage of the clergy. What we are witnessing here is a paradox. If an individual got the royal attributions through this ritual that developed under the authority of the Church, wouldn't it be normal to depend on it for the power he was invested with? All of a sudden, the king becomes a sacred character towards whom obedience is a religious duty: as a reward he has to protect the Church.

By contrast, in the Byzantine society the image of the emperor is perfectly reflected in the formula of a deified chief who does not have to legitimate his right to govern, his portrait being a true object of cult for his subjects, an „icon“[44].

The Byzantine scheme is very well known: a God, a *basileus*, a Church, and also the imperial concept based on the formula of a supreme political structure, unified and hierarchised. Valentin Al. Georgescu, a historian who studied the problematics of the medieval Romanian institutions, claims that one must refer right from the very beginning to two formulae which are linked to this theme: one being the autocracy (*autokrateia*), the other the feudal independence[45]. *Autokrator* originally meant a sovereign and unique position of the Byzantine emperor.

The failure of the international policy of the *basileus* as well as the settlement of the new states in the region (the states organised by the Bulgarians, Serbs and the Romanians) brought about the detachment of autocracy from the imperial idea. It ended by issuing a new structure of sovereignty and independence, very different from Byzantine universality (ecumenism).

The institution of *domnia* transformed the imperial autocracy in keeping with political necessities, and this adaptation is defined as a national autocracy, in the service of the Romanian independence[46].

In keeping with the principle of *dominium eminens*, the *domnitor* was the legitimate ruler of the entire territory of the country, reigning over a vast area; he was „voievod“, the chief of the army; he represented the supreme siege of justice[47] and he controlled all political acts, both of internal and external importance[48].

And more than the kings, the *domnitori* were in a way, „small“ emperors, supreme chiefs of the Church and protectors of the State. The divine origin and the superiority of the institution they represented were underlined, too.

Trying to define the power of the Romanian princes, there are two major versions, attributed to the most reputable Romanian historians. A. D. Xenopol[49] draws a parallel to the Asian despotism, while N. Iorga[50] searches for the origins of the institution in the Roman and Byzantine area.

Taking into account the geographical setting of the Romanian Principalities - that refers to frontiers (territorial and imaginary) between the two Roman Empires, between East-West or Latins-Slavics - each of the two theories could give rise to scholarly debate. The Romanian historians end in accepting the thesis of an almost absolute political power[51] of the *domni*. But it is each prince's personality, his financial and political possibilities, as well as the internal and external political conditions that influenced the complete exercise of the central authority.

It is possible for the *domni* to be incapable of rejecting the domination of aristocracy, a very firmly manifested domination sometimes. At this very point, some conditions concerning the relations between the reigning prince and the nobles (the boyards, *boieri*) are imposed.

In Moldavia, where Western influences which arrived through the intermediary of Hungary or Poland had always been manifest, the political regime evolved deeply towards a formula of „principality“[52]. The boyards and the *voievod* shared the administrative functions[53] with the latter occupying a privileged position, the *primus inter pares*. Nevertheless, it lacked the strict hierarchy and that rigidity of society existing in Rome and Byzantium.

Many acts[54] suggest that the *domn* shared authority with the local landowners. Gheorghe Brătianu talks about a corporatist system „by that time a common phenomenon in most European countries“[55]. Roland Mousnier[56] himself upholds the idea of the division of power in the Romanian Principalities, in fact a political dyarchy. The *domnia* comes close in some points to similar European institutions (it is just this division of political power between the prince and nobility that indicates the Western influences in the Romanian Principalities, especially in Moldavia), but these external influences (from Byzantium and West) did not succeed in erasing its original character. The *domnia* adapted the external models very well to its own values and political needs.

Despite the fact that the Basarabi[57] (in Walachia) and the Mușatini[58] (in Moldavia) were animated by a centralising idea, the authority of the *domni* began to deteriorate towards the year 1500. The 16th century is mainly featured by the local aristocracy's forceful political actions. The nobility upheld its own aspirant to the throne (although this was not to be a legitimate candidate), an attitude mainly led by economic and financial interests.

The aristocracy voiced its claims as far as the election of a new *domn* was concerned, and the candidate needed a favourable response from the boyards and courtiers in order to succeed to the throne. The information reported by the chronicler Grigore Ureche[59] is eloquent in this respect.

The dying Stephen the Great[60] was taken to the *campum*[61], where the boyards were gathered to elect a *novus princeps*; thus Bogdan III[62] was crowned „with the permission of all his subjects“. Peter Rareș[63] was himself confirmed by the nobility before acceding to the throne: „the boyards were gathered [on an open field] to establish whom should they elect as *domn* [...] When they then learned of Peter's legitimacy, they all elected him...“[64].

Up to the second half of the 16th century, the Turks confirmed the boyards' choice of the new prince. The nobility gathered around an aspirant to the throne and the support given by the sultan to a certain candidate brought about confusion and dissatisfaction among his competitors and their supporters. Political rivalries and external involvement in internal matters profoundly affected the Romanian society. Towards the end of the medieval period, the sultan directly interfered in the nomination of the Romanian princes. This epoch is therefore characterised by the gradual installation of the Ottoman suzerainty.

Differences in the coronation ritual can be noticed: the Walach *voievod* were no longer anointed and consecrated by the metropolitan, an act that gave him national authority as well as international prestige. His position as independent sovereign was radically changed, since now he had to journey to Constantinople for his investiture with the power[65]. The Romanian Church gave him the consecration only after he had obtained the sultan's assent.

In the capital city of the Turks, the sultan confirmed the prince; this validation cost a veritable fortune. Thus the *domn* became a simple clerk of the Ottoman Empire[66]. The crown and sceptre - the Christian symbols of his royal function and prestige - were replaced[67] with Oriental ones.

The golden *cuca* was a cap woven of gold threads. It had a special significance, being the emblem of the chief of the janissaries, the most loyal of the Turkish soldiers. The *sangiac* (the famous green standard of the sultan with its half-moon in the middle) as well as the two *tuiuri* (horse tresses, a symbol of prestige in the Ottoman society) make the *domn* a high dignitary of the Empire. The idea of political and judicial independence of the Romanian princes collapsed as a result of the respect they owed to the sultan.

The policy of the Romanian Principalities had to represent the interests of the Turks. These realities will become more evident in the 18th century, during the great epoch of the Phanariotes[68].

This truly historical phenomenon was in fact a highly complex political, social, and cultural structure based on three principles: conservative Orthodoxy, anti-Western tradition, and strengthening of relations with the Ottoman Empire. The Phanariote *domnitori* were not all Greeks, but also Romanians, Albanians, Bulgarians and even Levantines. This impressive ethnic variety led implicitly to different attitudes towards the institution they represented.

The majority of the Phanariotes understood that their task was to add some more sacks of money to their fortune. Without ignoring their own political and economic interests, they were the loyal subjects of the sultan. There were a few who attempted in a visible way to reform 18th century Romanian society. A few innovations are to be found in several fields: administrative, legal, social, academic and financial.

In this study, we have attempted to trace the main phases of evolution of this typically Romanian political institution, namely the *domnia*. The concept of „Walach *voievod*“ has radically changed, acquiring a significance far from its initial values.

There is a true break between a *domnitor* at the beginning of the Middle Ages and his successors in the 17th and 18th century. The differences can be seen in the origin of his power, as well as his prerogatives, his relations with the aristocracy and his external prestige. This transformation is quite radical and tragic. The notion of *domn* at the end of the medieval period denotes a simple element of the political and military Ottoman hierarchy that maintains just a few from its old features of the *dominus*.

[1] When talking about the Romanian Principalities during the Middle Ages, we refer to Walachia and Moldavia. Transylvania, also a historic Romanian province, had a different status and political evolution, as it was occupied either by the Hungarians, the Turks or by the Austrians.

[2] The traditional data of the foundation of the Romanian Principalities are: between 1345 - 1359 for Moldavia and between 1247 - 1310 for Walachia.

[3] Some historians place the ending of the Romanian Middle Ages at the brief unification of the Romanian Principalities (Transylvania included here, too) by Mihai Viteazul (Michael the Brave, 1595-1601); others consider the modern epoch to start with the Phanariotes (1711, 1716) or with Tudor Vladimirescu's revolution (1821).

[4] The *cnezate*, the *voievodate* and the *țări* were the oldest political organisations (11th-13th centuries).

[5] Basarab I (c. 1310-1352), reigning prince of Walachia. He reunited under his authority the whole country.

[6] Bogdan I, reigning prince of Moldavia (1359-1365). He emancipated his territory from the Hungarian suzerainty.

[7] ***Instituții feudale din Țările Române. Dicționar, Ed. Academiei R. S. R., București 1988, p. 168.

[8] Andreescu, M. Mihai, Puterea domniei în Țara Românească și Moldova în secolele XIV-XVI, Ed. „Nicolae Bălcescu”, București 1999, p. 50.

[9] Sovereign who takes an absolute and arbitrary power, under the model of Byzantine autocracy.

[10] The tsars (*Caesares*) considered themselves successors of *basileus* ; they had imperial and universal political claims.

[11] Even if sometimes the *domni* wanted to claim the imperial Byzantine idea as an origin (by using in their titles such notions as *despot*, *tsar* or *autocrat*), they do that only to reinforce their legitimacy and prestige on an internal and international level. We cannot take it as a continuation of the ecumenical tradition of the *basileios*.

[12] Guillou, André, Antoniadis-Bibicou, Hélène, „Pour une grande histoire des Balkans“, comp. in the *Bulletin de l'Association Internationale d'Etudes du Sud-Est Européen*, 30/2000, Ed. Enciclopedică, București 2001, p. 82.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Georgescu, Al. Valentin, Instituțiile statelor românești de-sine-stătătoare, comp. in Constituirea statelor feudale românești, Ed. Academiei R.S.R., București 1980, p. 210.

[15] This refers to the Balkan states.

- [16] We have a similar case in western Europe, with the Pope and the *Respublica Christiana*.
- [17] Georgescu, Al. Valentin, *op. cit.*, p. 210.
- [18] Guillou, André, Antoniadis-Bibicou, Hélène, *op. cit.*, p. 82.
- [19] See Brezeanu, Stelian, „A Byzantine Model for Political and State Structure in Southeastern Europe between the Thirteenth and the Fifteenth Centuries“, comp. in *Politics and Culture in Southeastern Europe*, by Răzvan Theodorescu and Leland Conley Barrows, UNESCO- CEPES-Studies on Science and Culture, Bucharest 2001, pp. 65-95.
- [20] Duby, Georges, *Les trois ordres ou l'imaginaire du féodalisme*, Gallimard, Paris 1978.
- [21] As opposed to Byzantium and the West, where the clerics took an active part in the political life, see Andreescu, M. Mihai, *op. cit.*, p. 50.
- [22] Giurescu, C. Constantin, *Istoria românilor*, II, Ed. All Educational, București 2000, pp. 250-251.
- [23] The *voievod* (word of Slavic origin - *voj*, army, and *voda*, the one who leads). In the countries of the Balkans and in Poland, a great civil and military dignitary. The Romanians have adapted this notion to their own realities and political needs.
- [24] Cantemir, Dimitrie, *Descriptio Moldaviae antiqui et hodierni status*, bilingual edition Latin- Romanian, Ed. Academiei R.S.R., București 1973, p.122.
- [25] It was not the case with Bogdan cel Orb (Bogdan the Blind, 1504-1517), Petru Șchiopul (Peter the Crippled, 1574-1577; 1578-1579; 1582-1591) or Ștefan Surdul (Stephen the Deaf, 1591-1592), whose physical handicaps did not cause the annulment of their right to the throne.
- [26] Ifrim, Marcela, “Să fie neam de domn și tot neamul său domni!”, comp. in *Magazin Istoric*, XXXIII, new series, No. 10 (391), October 1999, p. 42.
- [27] See *Invățăturile lui Neagoe Basarab către fiul său Theodosie*, Ed. Roza Vânturilor, București 1996; Păun, Radu G., “La couronne est à Dieu. Neagoe Basarab 1512-1521 et l'image du pouvoir penitent“, comp. in *L'empereur hagiographe. Culte des saints et monarchie byzantine et post-byzantine*, Actes des colloques internationaux „L'empereur hagiographe“ (13-14 mars 2000) et „Reliques et miracles“ (1-2 nov. 2000) tenus au New Europe College, textes réunis et présentés par Petre Guran avec la collaboration de Bernard Flusin, Colegiul Noua Europă & Institut des Etudes Sud-Est Européennes de l'Académie Roumaine, Bucharest 2001, p. 194.
- [28] ***Instituții feudale din Țările Române. Dicționar, *op. cit.*, p. 168.
- [29] This is also the case with the Byzantine institution of *basileia*. Jean-Claude Cheynet states that the emperor must display certain capacities and certain cardinal virtues: philanthropy, clemency, justice, the sense of common good, see Cheynet, Jean-Claude, *Pouvoir et contestations à Byzance (963 - 1210)*, Publications de la Sorbonne, Centre de Recherche d'Histoire et de Civilisation Byzantines, 1990, p. 184.
- [30] Robert Bargrave's assertions are eloquent in this respect, in *Călători străini despre Țările Române*, V, București, Ed. Științifică, 1973, p. 493.
- [31] The reception of the Byzantine right in the Romanian Principalities was a long-lasting historical process. It is difficult to fix a departing point, since we are still barely informed where the judicial life of the Romanian pre-State formations is concerned. It took shape starting with the 14th century, after the creation of the medieval Romanian Principalities and their political and ecclesiastical institutions. Cf. Guillou, André, Antoniadis-Bibicou, Hélène, *op. cit.*, pp. 82-84.
- [32] Păun, Radu G., *op. cit.*, pp. 190, 194.
- [33] Cantemir, Dimitrie, *Descriptio Moldaviae*, *op. cit.*, p. 123.
- [34] Dimitrie Cantemir, *domnitor* in Moldavia (1710-1711), one of the greatest cultural personalities of the Romanian Middle Ages and wise humanist of European reputation. He left behind remarkable masterpieces on history, geography, literature, oriental studies and musicology; *Incrementa atque decrementa aulae othomanicae*, *Descriptio Moldaviae* (including the first map of Moldavia), *Hronicul vechimii a romano-moldo-vlahilor*, *Istoria ieroglifică*.
- [35] The idea of authoritarian monarchy appears in many of his books, ex. *Descriptio Moldaviae*, *op. cit.*, p.130, footnote 9; see Ioan Platon, “Unele idei înaintate din gândirea politico-juridică a lui Dimitrie Cantemir“, comp. in *Justiția Nouă*, 11/1966, pp. 69-80.
- [36] The *dominate* (in Latin *dominatio*) as a solution of government was introduced in the Roman Empire by

Aurelian (270- 275) and Diocletian (284- 305). This political regime had to strengthen the imperial authority and warrant the order and unity of the Empire. The Roman emperor, *dominus* and *deus*, was the only one to exert the political, military and administrative functions; the Senate and magistrates thus became figurative institutions. The *dominate* represents the Romanian formula of an absolute monarchy by divine right.

[37] Andreescu, M. Mihai, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

[38] See Pippidi, Andrei, *Tradiția politică bizantină în Țările Române în secolele XVI-XVIII*, București, Ed. Corint, 2001.

[39] Georgescu, Al. Valentin, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

[40] *Ibid.*, pp. 218-220.

[41] Mousnier, Roland, *Monachies et royautés. De la préhistoire à nos jours*, Perrin, Paris 1989, pp. 5-10.

[42] Le Goff, Jacques, *Pour un autre Moyen Age. Temps, travail et culture en Occident: 18 essais*, Gallimard, Paris 1979 (Romanian edition, *Pentru un alt ev mediu. Valori umaniste în cultura și civilizația Evului Mediu*, II, Ed. Meridiane, București 1986, pp. 73-74).

[43] In the Bible we find the formula: ...*mutaberis in virum alium*, I Sam. 10,6). This refers to the effect of unction upon the king.

[44] See Ducellier, Alain, *Les Byzantins. Histoire et culture*, Editions du Seuil, 1988 (*Bizantinii. Istorie și cultură*, Ed. Teora, București 1997, pp. 74-89).

[45] *Ibid.*, pp. 219-224.

[46] *Ibid.*

[47] See Georgescu, Al. Valentin, Strihan, Petre, *Judecata domnească în Țara Românească și Moldova 1611-1831*, first part: *Organizarea judecătorească*, vol. I: 1611-1740, Ed. Academiei R.S.R., București 1979; Giurescu, C. Constantin, *Istoria românilor*, II, *op. cit.*, pp. 342-343.

[48] Giurescu, C. Constantin, *op. cit.*, pp. 250-253.

[49] Xenopol, D. Alexandru, *Istoria românilor din Dacia Traiană*, II, Ed. Științifică și Enciclopedică, București 1986, pp. 171-172.

[50] Iorga, Nicolae, *Istoria românilor*, III, Editura Enciclopedică, București 1993, p. 292.

[51] Even though he himself accepted this fact, Constantin C. Giurescu estimates that this authority was limited by the norms of common law, Giurescu, C. Constantin, *op. cit.*, pp. 252-253, 343.

[52] Principate, *principatus*. Name given to the political regime of the Roman Empire from Augustus (27 BC-14 AD) to Diocletian (284-305). Power belonged to only one man, the emperor, invested with an exceptional mission. Apparently this regime constituted a compromise between monarchy and the traditional oligarchic Republic, represented by the Senate. Augustus was also entitled *princeps senatus*.

[53] Andreescu, M. Mihai, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

[54] *Ibid.*, pp. 40-41.

[55] Brătianu, I. Gheorghe, "Sfatul domnesc și Adunarea Stărilor în Țările Românești în cadrul istoriei generale", I, "Liniile generale ale problemei", in *Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice*, București, S. III, vol. XXVIII (1946), p. 17.

[56] Mousnier, Roland, *op. cit.*, p. 204.

[57] The Basarabi, Walachian dynasty (~1310-1512; 1522-1529), founded by Basarab I.

[58] The Mușatini, Moldavian dynasty (~1375-1595; 1666-1668), founded by Peter I Mușat.

[59] The Chronicles of Grigore Ureche (17th cent.), a document of great importance for the medieval history of Moldavia.

[60] Ștefan cel Mare (Stephen the Great), *domn* of Moldavia (1457-1504); during his long-lasting reign he succeeded in consolidating the central authority. He defeated the Turks on several occasions in memorable battles.

[61] There was a Romanian tradition of „investiture in an open field“; consisting of the *voievozi* sitting in a tent, listening to the complaints of the people. This image is reminiscent of Saint Louis of France dispensing justice under the oak.

[62] Bogdan III the Blind, *domn* of Moldavia (1504-1517).

[63] Peter Rareș, *domn* of Moldavia (1527-1538; 1541-1546), illegitimate son of Stephen the Great; he governed

in the same spirit of his father.

[64] Ureche, Grigore, "Letopisețul Țării Moldovei", in *Cronicari moldoveni*, Ed. Militară, București 1987, p. 53.

[65] This one supervised all the Christians in the Ottoman Empire and it represented the supreme forum of the Orthodox religion.

[66] Berindei, Dan, *Românii și Europa. Istorie, societate, cultură, I (18th-19th centuries)*, Ed. Museion, București 1991, pp. 4-11.

[67] It is also interesting to study the history of princely attire and its specific evolution during medieval and modern times, in Alexianu, Al., *Mode și veșminte din trecut. Cinci secole de istorie costumară românească, I-II*, Ed. Meridiane, București 1971.

[68] The name comes from a Greek district of Constantinople, where the Orthodox patriarchy was located.

Who Owns the Past?

What happens when the past becomes the present?

Who defines the truth?

Welcome to debate these issues in the International Students of History Association Annual Conference in Helsinki, 14th-19th of April 2003

The use of history should always be our concern. The conference covers a huge variety of topics which gives you the opportunity to study something you find interesting.

We have found it our responsibility to make this conference both informative and instructive. Our goal is simply to raise discussion about these subjects.

We Finns never miss an opportunity to party. Neither will you. Entertainment goes on every night including Finnish specialities -- Student Union parties, a cottage&sauna party next to a lake and a traditional singing celebration.

Helsinki, the mistress of the Baltic Sea, invites you to the ISHA conference 2003.

For more information please visit our web page: <http://valt.helsinki.fi/jarj/isha>

Helsinki, the capital of Finland, has been chosen to host the next annual conference of the International Students of History Association, ISHA-International. With its 550 00 inhabitants Helsinki is a relatively small urban capital. Situated between eastern and western Europe there are direct connections to the neighbouring cities of St. Petersburg (Russia), Stockholm (Sweden) and Tallinn (Estonia). Helsinki was founded in 1550 by the Swedish King Gustav Vasa but it really started to develop in 1748 when the Swedes decided to build the fortress of Suomenlinna (www.suomenlinna.fi) near the coast of Helsinki as a protection against the Russians.

In 1809 Finland became a part of the Russian empire. Helsinki became the capital of Finland in 1812. The university, founded in 1640, was transferred to Helsinki in 1827 after Turku, the former capital of Finland, had burned down. Its main building is situated in the heart of Helsinki by the Senate Square. It was designed by the German architect Carl Ludwig Engel along with several other buildings including the Lutheran cathedral and the university main library. The square is one of the most intact neoclassical squares in Europe.

With its various beautiful parks and its location close to the sea Helsinki is a very charming city. A number of trendy cafés and restaurants as well as a prospering business life ensure that Helsinki is a lively capital worth visiting.

Additional information on Helsinki:
www.hel.fi/tourism

Workshop themes

1) Why history?

New challengers for traditional historical writing. How are the „new“ genres, methods, research

materials changing the discipline? What do we need history for? Can for instance micro history, network analysis or gender history answer to the challenge of the 21st century?

2) „Counter history“ and popular memory

The popular memory preserving history and how it differs from the official historiography. How has history been interpreted among people. „The history of the common people“ in academic research projects.

3) Censorship, manipulation, propaganda

Distorting the facts, hiding the sources. Researchers face it everyday, but can it always be condemned? Usage of past events for propaganda purposes.

4) Can the past be a judge?

Who can write official history, the winners only? What happens to former rulers in history writing of today? Can and may history be used as a justification for actions.

5) „Hollywood history“

Movie history vs. „official“ history; How do the conceptions of history presented in films differ from the official interpretations? How do movies answer the public's questions of the past?

6) History, ideas and Europe

7) European integration: The making of a historical identity

European history vs. European histories. What makes the European integration project different from other great projects of history? Where does the European integration process get its legitimation? What role does historical argument play in this process/project?

8) Historical myths

How are myths created and by whom? How have they been used in pursuing self-interests? Some myths persist and some disappear: The might of Soviet Union in the 1980's, Germany's guilt in the First World War, the „Decline of Morals“ in the Roman Empire.

9) Instant history

The mass media is replacing researchers in the making of history interpretations. How does the mass media build and influence the public's ideas about the past? Is history for sale? Politicians sometimes refer to historical events to back up their own ideas. They choose facts that suite best their own interests. In this framework, what kind of role does the academic research play in the field?

10) Art mediating history

What kind of roles have art forms, books, architecture etc. had in the formation on the concepts of history throughout times? Do historical events create styles of art or does art shape history?

Guidelines for Carnival contributors

Read this before delivering your material

Length

Maximum length for a contribution intended as an historiographical article is approximately 21000 characters, or approximately 4100 words, or approximately six pages in 10pt font size, single line spacing. Maximum length for other kinds of contributions is approximately 13000 characters, or approximately 2500 words, or approximately four pages in 10pt font size , single line spacing.

Files and file format

Make as little definitions (e.g. do not center headings, justify the text to the left only, no hyphenation) as possible to the text file. Always deliver your texts as .RTF, that is, Rich Text Format files. This file format is available at a click from the save as - dialog box, under Save Files as or Save Files as Type, in Word and WordPerfect word processors respectively. This saves us enormous amounts of work when preparing the layout. Define the language of the file as English - U.K. (this does not pertain to contributors from the USA).

Pictures

If you have any suitable pictures to go with your contribution, please scan them and send them to us as attachment files in .TIFF, .JPG or other common format, or deliver them to us via snailmail!

Abstracts, captions, subheadings

If your contribution is intended as an historiographical article, start it with a short abstract of one paragraph. Start other kind of contributions with a caption. In both cases, please do use subheadings to structure your text at suitable intervals!

Endnotes

When notes are used, please define them as endnotes, not footnotes.

Delivery and queries

All contributions are to be delivered as attachment files to carnival-hd@gmx.de or via snailmail.

Recruitment information

An international journal of history students seeks writers and local editors

The recruitment of contributors as well as the distribution of the journal are international and expansive. So far, the main field of operation of the journal has been the network of universities with active ISHA sections located mainly in continental Europe. However, we aim at developing the profile of the journal from an internal publication of the organisation to a general international journal of history students. The journal is distributed to various university departments and libraries in Europe and overseas and published also as a web edition. In the future, the visibility and circulation of the journal will be systematically increased according to possibilities.

Contributing to *Carnival* provides you the possibilities of:

- having a publication in an international student journal with increasing visibility
- getting feedback for your work and idea from an international community of history students
- gaining practice and experience in working in English if that is not your native tongue
- getting into contact with history students of other countries regarding your particular projects
- becoming involved in the activities of a major international organisation of history students

We call for contributions related to any historiographical field, such as history of ideas, gender history, business history, medieval history, labour history, the history of consumption, rural history, the history of international relations, etc. Methodological and theoretical articles, discussion papers as well as cross-disciplinary approaches are encouraged. As a student journal, *Carnival* naturally also seeks contributions related to the practical interests of this particular group. Interested graduates are more than welcome to contribute as well.

Of the various types of articles that are welcomed, the following can be mentioned as examples: general articles relevant to history students (e.g. on recent discussions of wider interest within the discipline), articles on experiences of studying at various departments as an exchange student or on new international employment opportunities for young historians, historiographical articles based on studies and research at home universities or conference / seminar presentations, book reviews, such as reviews presenting domestic research on generally interesting themes not available in English or treating generally known international research from a fresh student angle.

We ask for the permission to reproduce a contact address (preferably e-mail) with every article to facilitate further exchange on the texts.

In addition to contributors, we are also looking for local editors: people who are willing to recruit writers from their home universities and take responsibility for the timely delivery of local material to the editorial team of *Carnival* on a regular basis. We ask anybody interested in such a task to contact us without hesitation. According to possibilities, an international editorial board of recognised status will be formed of such volunteers.