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Chapter Seven

History Made Sacred: Martyrdom and the Making of a Sanctified Beginning in Early Thirteenth-Century Livonia

Carsten Selch Jensen

FROM THE TENTH TO the thirteenth century, the countries around the Baltic Sea were subjected to a process of Christianization that did its best to supersede the old pagan beliefs and worldviews, replacing them with a new Christian way of thinking. At the same time, some of these countries also became subjected to an equally zealous process of colonization that often set aside the old rulers and installed new ones together with new political structures. These processes taken together changed the identities of the local people dramatically, as paganism gradually was replaced by a Christian way of thinking and new political structures came into being. As a consequence (or perhaps rather as a part of the process) the people living in these regions felt an urgent need to reinterpret both their present and their past so as to make them fit into these new religious and political structures and emerging identities. Thus, histories had to be written (or rewritten) in order to reconstruct local history in line with the changes that had taken place (and were taking place) in the various regions. This important process of rewriting history happened whenever a new territory became absorbed into Western Christendom—and it was not just history writing for history’s own sake (to recount what had happened). Rather, it arose out of a need to articulate their new identities and thus to proclaim that the inhabitants of the territory belonged within Christendom, not by their own merits, but because it was in accordance with the will of God and part of his plan for all mankind.

This rewriting of history among newly Christianized peoples was in a sense regarded as a continuation of the biblical narratives because it demonstrated that God was still governing and directing history. In this
way it has been argued, that “all history was regarded as the history of the salvation of mankind,” rendering a distinct theological perspective to an important part of medieval historiography. These medieval chronicles offer not only a unique insight into some very important periods of transformation in the history of Europe, they also offer a first-hand account of how different local “foundational stories” were constructed by the various authors within a Christian worldview.

One of the key elements in the construction of these Christian foundational stories was the need to promote local holy men, or “champion[s] of the sacred,” who played a key role in the transition from paganism to Christianity. They were, so to speak, living proof that the history of a particular region was in fact unfolding in accordance with God’s will, and they were therefore portrayed by the historiographers and chroniclers as truly holy men responding to a divine calling and thus on an equal footing with the holy men of the biblical narratives.

In the minds of these chroniclers, this way of thinking implied that newly Christianized peoples in the regions around the Baltic Sea had experienced some recent events that were in reality an echo or a reiteration of the biblical narratives, demonstrating that the history of the newcomers was also a part of God’s plan and the overall holy history that would eventually serve the salvation of all mankind. It has been argued that saints played a particularly important role in the creation of these local Christian myths or foundational stories by establishing, through their saintly lives, a connection between the local and the universal within the greater Christian world. In some cases, important and universally recognized saints’ cults would be drawn into the new regions to play their part in the process of Christianization at a regional or very local level and thus lay the foundations for the new religious identities of the local people. In other cases, new and local saints would emerge from within the local societies themselves through the rewriting of local history, thereby acting as connecting figures between the newly converted people and the established Christian world.

A third type of chronicles, however, seldom refers to any saints at all in the construction of a local “foundational story.” Instead, they used other literary strategies in their texts.

One such example is found in the chronicle of Henry of Livonia. In this particular text, the cults of saints only play a minor role, inasmuch as the chronicler only makes a very few direct references to any established saints or saints’ cults playing a part in the process of Christianization in
these regions. This chronicle was written not long after the events it describes—actually, the later part of the chronicle seems to have been composed almost immediately after the events portrayed. As such, Henry himself was more or less a part of the events and thus became a player in his own narrative. This proximity in time obliged Henry to look for his “champion[s] of the sacred” outside of the well-established group of universal or local saints already acknowledged by the Roman Church. In line with the third type of chronicles, he rather picked his champions of the sacred from among the more recent figures who were playing their part in the contemporary process of Christianizing the pagan peoples in Livonia and Estonia, as witnessed by Henry himself. These were the characters Henry believed to be the key players in a process that was drawing these lands and their history into the overall history of Christendom.

Henry makes almost no reference to foreign saints playing a part in the process of Christianization in this particular region. One notable exception is, however, the Virgin Mary, who is portrayed in the chronicle as the supreme guardian of Livonia, intervening on behalf of the truly Christian people living among pagans and schismatic Russians. Henry has a very powerful description of how Bishop Albert, during the meetings of the Fourth Lateran Council in Rome in 1215, pleaded for the Pope and the assembled prelates to acknowledge Livonia as the land of the Virgin Mary and to throw their support behind the crusaders and missionaries who were risking their lives in Livonia as much as those who traveled to the Holy Land, the country of the Son. In the words of the bishop, “the Son loves his Mother and, as he would not care to lose his own land (terram filii), so, too, he would not care to endanger his Mother’s Land (terram matris).” Thus Livonia was not just a country among other countries—it was the country of Virgin Mary, the mother of Christ and thus was placed on an equal (or nearly equal) footing with Jerusalem and the Holy Land. In Henry’s mind, that obviously placed Livonia (and Estonia) on the highest level of holy places within Christendom. In his attempt to create for his own region the ultimate local foundation story and sanctified beginning, Henry ignores similar claims from other European frontier regions that they, too, should be regarded as the land of the Virgin Mary.

Alongside his references to the Virgin Mary, there are some hints in the chronicle that might indicate that Henry actually intended to promote some upcoming saints (or protosaints) from within the ranks of missionaries and the newly converted locals in Livonia and Estonia. One example is the story of a monk named Siegfried, who lived among the Livs
in the parish of Holme, serving them as their priest. According to Henry, “Siegfried was most devotedly carrying on the cure of souls committed to him ... and, persisting in the service of God day and night, he imbued the Livonians with the example of his good manner of life.” In this, Siegfried might not have been very different from other priests working piously among the newly baptized in Livonia. What made Siegfried different is the miracle that allegedly happened when the monk died in 1203, after having for years carried on God’s work among his parishioners. Henry explains in his chronicle how the converts took the dead body of Siegfried to the church in Holme, as was the custom when one of the Christians had died. They also made him a coffin “out of good timber,” as the chronicler says, but immediately discovered “that one plank cut for the cover was a full foot too short.” The parishioners then tried to add another piece of wood to the board, only to discover “that the first plank, lengthened not by human but by divine skills had, according to their desires, been made to fit the coffin perfectly.” Siegfried was then buried and the jubilant people of the parish praised God “who worked such miracles for his saints” (qui in sanctis suis talia facit miracula). As can be seen from the chronicle, Henry carefully underlined Siegfried’s presumed sanctity and his acclamation as such by the parishioners (and also by the chronicler himself). Nothing, however, is known from other sources about Siegfried’s possible saintly status and most likely no saint’s cult ever emerged around this apparently holy man.

At a later stage in the chronicle, Henry makes another reference to a possible emerging local cult of saints that seemingly leads to some sort of formal acknowledgment within the Church of Riga—at least for a brief period of time in the early thirteenth century. At the end of his chronicle Henry explains that a papal legate, William of Modena, in 1225 visited the church of Üxküll with the purpose of venerating the two first bishops of Livonia, Meinhard and Bertold. Earlier in the chronicle Henry had described “the bishops Meinhard and Berthold, of whom the first was a confessor and the second a martyr who ... was killed by the same Livonians” (episcoporum Meynardi et Bertholdi, quorum primus confessor, secundus martyr,..., ad eisdem Lyvonibus occisus occubuit). That Henry actually considered the two bishops worthy of a liturgical celebration and veneration that normally only befell acknowledged saints becomes apparent when he describes how William recalled “the memory of the first holy bishops” (ubi primorum sanctorum episcoporum memoriam commemorans). The use of the expression “memoriam commemorans” seems to me
to indicate that Henry is in fact referring to a liturgical celebration of the deceased bishops, thereby acknowledging them as saints. The narrative of the chronicle might thus be viewed as an attempt from Henry’s side and (perhaps also from the Rigan Church) to promote the two bishops as official saints within the Roman Church, in the hope that the visit of the papal legate might promote their case and thus secure for the Livonian Church a properly sanctified beginning through the promotion to saintly status of Meinhard and Bertold. A peculiar element in this, however, is the absence of any miraculous deeds by the two bishops in the chronicle of Henry of Livonia. Henry does not refer to any miracles that might be associated with Meinhard and Bertold, though such accounts would certainly strengthen their saintly candidacy. Scholars have pointed out that there were in fact some known miracle stories associated with both bishops. These are found in works contemporary with Henry’s chronicle, for example the work of Arnold of Lübeck, who wrote around 1210, and the later Livonian Rhymed Chronicle from approximately 1290. These texts may represent contemporary and well-known miracle narratives associated with these two bishops that were circulating at the time of Henry’s writing.

The Livonian Rhymed Chronicle claims that the piety of Meinhard, who “gave all his food to the poor,” led to the miraculous restoration of dwindling food supplies in a time of famine, thus attributing miracles to the saint during his lifetime. The chronicle of Arnold of Lübeck, on the other hand, describes Bertold as a martyr and explains that the dead bishop, who had been killed in a hard-fought battle between crusaders and the Livs in the summer of 1198, was found the next day lying on the battlefield with his body well preserved and completely unaffected by the weather and by roaming animals. According to Arnold, all the other corpses on the battlefield were already decaying, infested as they were with flies and maggots because of the very warm weather.

Albert also claims that Bertold was buried in the Cathedral of St. Mary in Riga, but that was obviously an error inasmuch as we know from other sources that he was not moved from his initial resting place in the church of Üxküll to the Cathedral of Riga until much later, in the fourteenth century. Only at this time do we know for certain that Bertold had been laid to rest in the most important church in Livonia together with Bishop Meinhard. This “translation” of both of the dead bishops also seems to indicate that they were in fact venerated as saints among the local congregations.

These narratives from the various sources lend some support to the idea that the first two bishops of the Livonian Church may in fact
have been venerated as saints during the early years of the Rigan Church. Apparently, however, they were soon superseded by other official saints in the liturgy and calendars of the churches in the provinces of Livonia and Estonia, and thus they left no lasting imprint on the foundational story. 29

In the Livonian chronicle, however, there are other champions of the faith who appear to be essential to Henry in his attempts to construct a sanctified beginning in Livonia and Estonia in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, and these are the martyrs. Throughout the chronicle, martyrdom plays an important part in the construction of a proper foundational story that would prove to everyone that the Christianization of the people of Livonia and Estonia did in fact happen in accordance with God’s holy plans. In Henry’s mind, these martyrs from among the ranks of the new converts, the crusaders, and especially from among the ranks of the priests and monks, are the true workers in the Lord’s vineyard. Important in this context is the fact that these martyrs not only functioned as a sort of protosaints, thus paralleling the saints’ cults of other foundational stories, but through their deaths they also sanctified the very ground on which they had died, thus creating a Christian place (or several Christian places) out of a pagan space, literally claiming more and more land for the Roman Church. 30 In recent research it has been much debated whether or not these claims of martyrdom by the chronicler of the crusaders are to be read as if people actually believed the deceased to be proper martyrs, or at least hoped for the official recognition by the church of the holiness of the deceased. Professor Housley has convincingly argued that the various claims of martyrdom probably have to be understood, as he says “in a celebratory rather than technical sense.” 31 This definitely seems to be the case in Henry’s chronicle. Therefore, the rest of this chapter will examine the martyr narratives in the chronicle of Henry of Livonia, analyzing the ways in which the chronicler uses these accounts of martyrdom as components in the construction of a sacred history for Livonia and Estonia.

Martyrs from among the Local People

In connection with mentioning that Bishop Bertold was a martyr buried in the church of Üxüll, Henry states that this particular church also became the burial place of two local Livs named Kyrian and Layan. 32 These two men were new converts and had tried to persuade their kinsmen not to fight the Christians and instead to accept Christianity themselves. As a
consequence, both were killed by their former companions after having been tortured because they refused to denounce their newly acquired Christian faith. Henry explains: “there is no doubt that they received eternal life with the holy martyrs for such martyrdom” (De quibus non est dubium quin cum sanctis martiribus pro tanto martyrio vitam receperint eternam). The martyrdom of these two men is also mentioned by Arnold of Lübeck, and probably also confirmed by the Danish Archbishop Anders Sunesen in a report addressed to Pope Innocent III. 34

In a similar way, Henry also refers to another of the local converts, who was killed by the marauding Estonians in 1215, portraying him as a martyr. This time it was a Christian from among the Letts, by the name of Thalibald. He was one of their elders, and is mentioned several times in the chronicle. Henry states that Thalibald and his family had hidden themselves in a nearby forest because of the plundering Estonians when he decided to come back to their village for a bath. 35 That was not a wise decision with the Estonians roaming the countryside, and when Thalibald showed up in his village the Estonians immediately seized him and tortured him, demanding that he should give them all his money. Eventually he was burned to death—according to Henry they were “roasting him like a fish” (tamquam piscem assaverunt), and the chronicler goes on to state that “[s]ince he was a Christian and one of the number of faithful Letts, we hope that his soul is gladly rejoicing for such a martyrdom in eternal happiness in the company of the holy martyrs” (Et quia Christianus fuit et de fidelium Lettorum numero, speramus animam ipsius lete pro tanto martyrio in eterna leticia in sanctorum martyrum societate gaudere). According to Albert Bauer, the editor of the scholarly edition of the chronicle, the text has some obvious references to liturgical texts in this part of the narrative, seemingly stressing Henry’s urgency to make a literary connection between the sanctified past of the Universal Church and those events that have taken place in Livonia and Estonia during his own lifetime, thus rendering this an equally holy history. 36

Apart from these examples of local converts who ended up as martyrs, Henry seems to show a preference for those fellow clerics who were martyred as a consequence of their devotion to missionary work among the pagans and the newly converted people of Livonia and Estonia. As mentioned above, some of these martyred clerics are likened to the ideal workers in the Lord’s vineyard, thereby appearing as the foremost representatives of a sanctified beginning in Livonia and Estonia. Obviously this powerful biblical image is clearly central to Henry’s attempt to argue that
the events in Livonia and Estonia were part of the divine plan, and thus an echo of biblical narratives. 37 In Livonia and Estonia, the clerics eventually managed to transform the once pagan space into Christian places by baptizing the people, erecting churches, and dividing the countryside into parishes, thereby superseding the old pagan beliefs and eradicating their old places of worship. 38 Thus Livonia and Estonia gradually but inevitably became a part of Christendom according to the narrative of Henry of Livonia, and the whole process of conquest and Christianization was perceived by the chronicler as a continuation of that holy history that had begun in biblical times and had continued down through the history of the Church, reaching into Henry’s own time.

The human participants in this holy history were thus first and foremost the priests and the missionaries. According to Henry, they had obeyed God’s command to take upon themselves the task of converting the pagan people living along the fringes of Christendom. Thus, they also generated the highest number of martyrs: they were in reality the true champions of the faith and therefore also the main characters in this constructed Christian myth of a sanctified beginning. In one of the last chapters of the chronicle, Henry describes how the papal legate William of Modena proclaimed that this God’s vineyard (vineam Dei) had been gloriously planted by the Rigan Church and watered with the blood of the faithful of the Church (gloriose plantatam et ecclesiam fidelium sanguine multorum irrigatam). 39 The most prominent among these martyrs were those whom Henry considered loyal to the Church of Riga.

The Ideal Worker in the Lord’s Vineyard

The first cleric to be martyred according to the chronicle was a priest named John, portrayed by Henry as the ideal priest and shepherd to his flock. According to Henry, John worked among the Livs in Holme until 1206, when he was killed by the very same people whom he had served as a priest. The people of Holme and nearby Üxküll had been among the first in Livonia to accept missionaries in their midst. In the early 1180s, Bishop Meinhard and his followers had settled in these two villages and built the first known churches in the country. Still, many people in the area continued to harbor deep resentment toward Christianity at the time John was living among them. The simmering unrest eventually turned into open rage, culminating in an attack by some of the locals on John and his followers. As Henry says, the people of Holme “are quick to shed blood.” 40
In addition to condemning the people of Holme for their ungodly ways, Henry is also making an obvious reference to St. Paul’s letter to the Romans, chapter 3, verse 15, in which the apostle scorns the bellicosity and the thirst for blood of all the ungodly people who are incapable of doing good.41 The attack on John is thus interpreted within the grand biblical narrative, equating the events in Livonia with the events of the New Testament and making them a pair in the ongoing holy history that Henry believes is unfolding before his very eyes. Not only did the people of Holme kill their own priest, they “took their Priest John, cut off his head, and cut the rest of his body into pieces” (caput eius abscidunt, corpus reliquium membratim dividunt).42 During the same incident the Livs also killed two other clerics named Gerhard and Herman. Henry does not, however, go into any specific details with regard to the deaths (or for that matter, the lives) of these two clerics. Instead, he is rather detailed about John as the ideal priest. According to Henry, John was an Estonian by birth, from the province of Vironia. As a boy, he had been carried off and enslaved by the Livs from whom he was later ransomed by Bishop Meinhard. The bishop then sent him to his own home monastery in Segeberg, Saxony, because he wanted to “imbue him with sacred letters” (sacris litteris).43 It was a very common practice among missionaries throughout the Middle Ages to educate young boys from the pagan lands in the hope that they might eventually return to their native lands as priests and missionaries to preach in their native language.44 Some of these boys might have been kept as hostages by the newly arrived Christians before they were sent to some monastery or cathedral school abroad. Others, like John, were ransomed by the missionaries from enslavement by one of the local pagan tribes. In that respect, John seems to have been treated like most of these boys, and eventually he returned to Livonia (not to Estonia) in the company of Bishop Albert. There he was ordained as a priest and sent to Holme, where he converted many of the local people before he was eventually killed in 1206.45 It is therefore hardly surprising that Henry seems to consider his death an ideal end to a godly and devout life. John and his fellow clerics are depicted as true “confessors of the faith” (pro fidei confessione) who, through their cruel death, “attained eternal life through the martyr’s palm” (per martyrrii palmam ad vitam pervenit eternam).46 Compared to some of the other martyrs’ deaths mentioned in the chronicle, Henry is not very detailed about John’s actual killing. The priest is decapitated and his body mutilated, but no other torments are mentioned. Instead Henry is clearly more fascinated by John’s birth, his upbringing, and his life until
he is eventually killed by the people of Holme. In this life, Henry sees the ideal life of a servant in the Lord’s vineyard, from his birth and early life among pagans, his rescue through the intervention of Meinhard, and his upbringing in a monastery, which prepared him for his service as a priest among those who were once his captors. To Henry, this seems to be John’s greatest virtue: that he seemingly personifies an ideal progress from paganus to Christianus. In this way, John has gone through a double deliverance: first he was liberated from the captivity among the pagans, then he was liberated from paganism through his baptism and his acceptance of the Christian faith, followed by his education in sacris litteris. John (this was clearly his baptismal name) could then return to Livonia as a priest and a missionary to continue the work Meinhard had begun. Therefore, Henry can proudly proclaim that John “converted many in the parish of Holme from the cult of idols” (multos convertit ab ydolorum cultura) before he was eventually killed and earned his martyr’s palms.

However, it was not only Henry who appreciated John as a true worker in the Lord’s vineyard. In the chronicle, we are told that other priests came to Holme some time after John and his followers had been killed, to retrieve the body of their deceased fellow priest. The bones were then taken to Riga and “[t]he lord bishop with his chapter devotedly buried his body and bones … in the church of Blessed Mary of Riga” (Cuius corpus et ossa … in Riga in ecclesia beate Marie domnus episcopus cum suo capitulo devote sepelivit). It is not explicitly said in the chronicle that John was venerated as a martyr or as a saint. The entire construction of the narrative, however, seems to indicate that is was actually Henry’s intention to propagate the idea that John was a true martyr and a genuine saint “in the making,” revealed through his life and death. The narrative bears a great resemblance to other genuine saints’ vitas in which the body and bones of a known martyr and saint are buried in a nearby local church, thereby creating an important and powerful religious center that acquires a certain holiness through the presence of that particular saint. In the chronicle, Henry seems to suggest that the Cathedral of Riga first became the grave of a local martyr when John was buried there. At the same time, it should not be forgotten that Bishop Bertold, who had been killed some years prior to this incident, was definitely venerated as a martyr according to Henry, and was probably also reburied in the Cathedral of Riga together with Bishop Meinhard. Other sources tell us that these two bishops were first buried in the church of Üxküll and only later transferred to Riga. Therefore, the burial of a presumed martyr was a very important
step forward in Henry’s effort to construct a narrative that would present the Church of Riga as truly in accordance with the grand narrative of the Bible and the traditions of the church fathers. At the same time, Henry seems to be using the term “martyr” in the celebratory sense that Housely suggests was common among crusader chroniclers. These chroniclers did not make formal claims with regards to these alleged martyrs; instead they used these implied martyrs as an essential part of their own narratives to accentuate the real holiness of their local history.

The next secular priest martyred by the locals according to the chronicle was named Salomon. According to Henry, Salomon had, in 1212, been sent to the Estonians in the southern province of Saccala. In the previous year, the bishop had sent an army of crusaders, together with their Livonian and Latvian allies, to attack and conquer the main stronghold in Fellin. In the chronicle, there is a very lengthy and detailed description of the battle of Fellin. In the end, the Estonians were forced to surrender to the crusaders and, according to Henry, they interpreted their defeat as a sign of the superiority of the Christian God over their own pagan ones, and thus submitted themselves to the stronger deity. In the chronicle, Henry makes the Estonians come forward with this proclamation: “we acknowledge your God to be greater than our gods. By overcoming us, He has inclined our hearts to worship him. We beg, therefore, that you spare us and mercifully impose the yoke of Christianity [iugum Christianitatis] upon us as you have upon the Livonians and the Letts.”

To Henry, this is the perfect scene: the pagans had been defeated by the crusaders and their allies, and as a consequence the pagans (more or less voluntarily) accepted Christianity. Following the peace negotiations, the Estonians agreed to accept priests into the fort, and “[t]he priests sprinkled all the houses, the fort, the men and women, and all the people with holy water [aspergentes aqua benedicta]. They performed a sort of initiation and catechized [cathezizantur] them before baptism because of the great shedding of blood which had taken place.” Apparently too much blood had been spilled during the fighting and therefore only an initial catechization and sprinkling with holy water was carried out. The actual baptism had to wait almost a year, until Salomon and his companions arrived in Fellin in 1212: “[h]e was to minister to them by preaching the Word and by celebrating the sacrament of baptism [ut eis predicationis verbum ministraret et baptismi sacramentum], which they had long since sworn they would receive.” Henry thinks it important to stress once again that the Estonians themselves had agreed to be baptized. When the
priests arrived in Fellin, they were greeted by the Estonians but Henry sarcastically notes that it was greetings merely from “the mouth and not from the heart, as Judas hailed the Lord” (salutatusque est salutatione oris et non cordis, qualiter Iudas Dominum salutavit). Once again, Henry equates the events in Livonia and Estonia with those of the Bible, comparing Salomon and his companions with certain elements in the Passion of Christ. The Estonian people, on the other hand, were collectively allotted the role of the treacherous Judas in Henry’s version of this narrative.

Some of the Estonians actually underwent baptism as they had promised, but according to Henry, a rebellion was being fomented among the rest. Salomon and his companions therefore decided to return to Riga. One of the Estonian chiefs, by the name of Lembit, followed the fleeing priests, and during the night he and his band attacked the group and immediately killed both Salomon and his two interpreters, Theoderich and Philip, together with the rest of the group. There is no doubt in Henry’s mind that these men were killed because of their Christian beliefs (pro fide Christi occubuerunt) and should therefore be received into the company of martyrs (in martyrum ... consorcium transmigraverunt). Thus Henry can present yet another group of potential saints, who like true workers in the Lord’s vineyard had shed their blood to fertilize the ground, thereby inserting the events in Livonia and Estonia into God’s holy history.

It is interesting to notice, however, that Henry seems to change his focus slightly at the end of this particular narrative. Until the point when the priests are murdered, he has referred to Salomon almost exclusively as the head of the group. No doubt he was the most senior person among the clerics, but Henry then goes on to explain a bit more about one of Salomon’s companions, the one who was named Philip and presented as one of the two interpreters. Phillip’s background seems similar to that of John, about whom we learned in the preceding paragraph. He was a Lithuanian by birth (de gente lettonum) and therefore he knew the local languages very well. This was essential to the process of Christianization. According to Henry, Philip had been raised by Bishop Albert as a member of his household (curia) in Riga. During his upbringing, he had proved himself to be a devout Christian and therefore he had been sent “as an interpreter to teach the other people” (ut interpres ad ceteras gentes docendas mitteretur), thereby earning his martyrdom. Now he, like John, had completed his life and his transformation from pagan boy to devout Christian adult by becoming a martyr (et sicut martyrii particeps factus est), by which he of course “merited the blessedness of eternal rest” (sic et
It is evident that Henry has a special veneration for Philip, presenting him (like John) as the ideal priest and co-worker in the Lord’s vineyard, watering the soil with his blood. Both of them had transformed themselves from pagans to devout Christians, priests and even martyrs, thus earning the Church of Riga a place in the holy history according to Henry.

Henry is not entirely clear about whether he firmly believes that these clerics have been received into the company of martyrs, or whether he only hopes so. At first he states that he hopes (speramus) that they all “passed over in the company of martyrs,” then later in the paragraph he seems more certain of their status, especially with regards to Philip, who “was made a partaker of martyrdom” (et sicut martyrii particeps factus est). This ambiguity in the chronicle makes it very difficult to draw firm conclusions about how Henry views the ultimate sanctity of the men whose martyrdoms he describes. Both groups are seemingly considered essential in the literary construction of a sanctified beginning or Livonia and Estonia.

**Martyrs from among the Monks and Knightly Brethren**

In the chronicle, Henry makes no other detailed reference to the martyrdom of secular priests. Other accounts of martyrs are nonetheless found in the chronicle. Henry refers to an incident involving one of the Sword Brethren, and several cases involving some of the Cistercian monks who were very active as missionaries. On several occasions in the chronicle their violent deaths are portrayed as martyrdom in accordance with the old traditions of the Church.

Arnold, the only knightly martyr mentioned in the chronicle, a member of the Sword Brethren, was actually killed during the siege of Fellin in 1211—the very same siege that became the preamble to the martyrdom of Salomon and his followers one year later. According to Henry, Arnold was killed when he was hit by a stone from one of the catapults used during the battle. During the earlier stages of the campaign, Arnold had spared no pains to be in the forefront of the attack day and night (ibidem nocte et die laborans), striving only to defeat the enemy in the Estonian stronghold. This eagerness in battle seems to be one of the main reasons for portraying Arnold’s death as something more than one of the usual casualties that would occur during any military campaign. Henry is very specific in stating that Arnold, through his death, entered into the company of martyrs (in martyrum consorcium transmigravit).
The siege of Fellin in 1211 is not the first occasion on which Henry mentions Arnold’s merits. As early as 1206, Henry records that this particular Sword Brother had proved himself to be a remarkably brave man during a battle between the Christian forces from Riga and their enemies around the castle of Holme. During this particular battle, Arnold was the first among the knights to throw himself into the midst of battle, despite the numerical superiority of the enemies. A few years later, in 1210, Henry again describes Arnold’s exceptionally courageous behavior when he, during a battle against the Estonians, grabbed a battle standard that presumably displayed the image of the Virgin Mary. Such standards are mentioned several times in the chronicle. Arnold then summoned his fellow knights to fight bravely against their pagan foes. In this particular case, Henry makes Arnold paraphrase a sequence from the Book of Maccabees, proclaiming “[l]et us come together, brother Germans, and see if we know how to fight; let us not flee from them and thus bring shame upon our people” (Tunc Arnoldus frater milicie sumpto vexillo: “Conveniamus,” inquit, “fratres Theuthonicci, et videamus, si pugnare queamus, et nonfugiamus ab eis et non inferamus crimem genti nostre”). Henry most certainly chooses this adjusted quotation from the Book of Maccabees very carefully; this particular biblical text describes how God’s people are fighting a holy and just war against the enemies of God. That was exactly the case in Livonia in the early thirteenth century, with the new chosen people being the Church of Riga and the Christian army fighting on its behalf against the enemies of God. Moreover, the biblical text describes how Judas, who was the leader of the Maccabees, was killed in a battle that he had begun in spite of the numerical superiority of his enemies. Through this careful choosing of his textual references, Henry seems to predict the death of Arnold the following year. In this way, this particular Sword Brother is also inscribed into the holy history that continues to be played out in Livonia. Arnold is thus portrayed as a proper godly warrior and hero who undauntedly fights God’s war in spite of the numerical superiority of the enemies (in this case the pagans). Therefore, when Arnold dies in a battle fought against the enemies of the Rigan Church, Henry is obviously convinced that he had become a martyr inasmuch as he has committed himself entirely to God’s war and the propagation of the Christian faith. In that way, in Henry’s view, he also joins the ranks of the biblical role models.

The next examples of martyrs mentioned by Henry are all Cistercian monks engaged in missionary work among the various peoples in and around Livonia and Estonia. One of these monks was Friederich of Selle,
who was sent to the castle of Fredeland by Bishop Albert to provide for the newly converted Livs living around that castle—among them were also the kinsmen of the aforementioned Thalibald. 68 Fredeland had been built in the province of Treiden by Bishop Philip of Ratzeburg in the hope that “the district would be made peaceful by this fort and that it would be a refuge for the priests and all his men” (per idem castrum terram pacificare et sacerdotum et omnium virorum suorum ibi esse refugium). 69 According to Henry, Friederich had been granted the right by the pope to leave his monastery and dedicate himself entirely to the work of the gospel (ad opus ... evangelii). 70 To Henry, it is important to point out that Friederich’s work among the converts (and also that of the Rigan Church) was completely in harmony with papal plans and thus also supported by Rome. The narrative of the chronicle takes place in the year 1215, during Easter week, and we are told that Friederich “celebrated the mystery of the Lord’s passion” on Palm Sunday. 71 Friedrich was a very pious man who celebrated the Lord’s Passion with tears running from his eyes (Dominice passionis mysteria multis lacrimis celebrans). 72 After having celebrated mass also on Easter Sunday, Friedrich decided to leave for Riga. Traveling with him was a scholar of his (scolare suo) and some servants from among the Livs. They had decided to travel by boat and thus sailed down the Livonian Aa toward the sea when they were suddenly attacked by Estonians from the island of Oesel (mod. Saaremaa). Friederich and his companions were overpowered by these Oselians, who placed them in their own pirate ships (Henry refers to the Oselian ships as pyraticis). The people from Oesel then took their prisoners to the nearby estuary of the river Adje (Adia River), probably because they felt safer there, and there Friedrich’s ordeal began.

Henry is very detailed in his description of what happened then. At first the Oselians began to mock and sneer at Friederich, “sing, sing priest” (Laula, laula, pappi) they shouted, all the while beating him with their clubs. 73 Then the real torture of the prisoners began: “the Oselians sharpening hard, dry wood, inserted it between the nails and the flesh and tormented every member with the points. They set the wood afire and tortured them cruelly. At last they killed them by hacking with their axes between their shoulders.” 74 Following this gruesome description of the torture inflicted on Friederich and his followers, Henry cites Psalm 128, verses 3–4, on the sufferings that God’s servants have to endure before God himself will avenge them. Read in context, however, it seems more plausible that Henry is in fact making a reference also to the Passion of Christ that Friederich had commemorated just a few days prior to this incident,
During his celebration of Easter. Now it is Friederich who has to follow in the footsteps of the Lord and endure the mockery, sneers, and beatings, not of the Jews, but of the pagans. Eventually, Friederich and his followers are all tortured and killed, just like Christ. In Henry’s eyes, there could hardly have been a more worthy and ideal way for a missionary priest to complete the celebration of the Easter (and end his life) than through this downright *imitatio Christi*. It comes as no surprise that Henry states that the souls of Friederich and his companions “beyond any doubt” have been sent “to heaven to the company of the martyrs” (et in martyrum consor-cium animas absque omni dubio in celum transmiserunt).\(^75\)

So Henry was certain that the souls of the slain Christians were now among the martyrs in heaven. Their bodies, however, were left unburied by the Oselians, a point that stresses the barbarous behavior of the latter. This provides Henry the opportunity to cite another Psalm, namely Psalm 78, verses 2–3: “the flesh of thy saints for the beasts of the earth. They have poured out their blood as water, roundabout Jerusalem, and there was none to bury the dead” (carnes sanctorum tuorum bestiis terre, effuderunt sanguinem eorum tamquam aquam in circuitu Ierusalem, et non errant, qui sepeliret).\(^76\) Through this comparison between the Bible and the events in Livonia, Henry puts Friederich and his companions on an equal footing with biblical figures and biblical events: it is still God’s work that is carried out, even if it is now taking place in the lands of Livonia and Estonia and not in the Holy Land proper.

Although the mockery and beatings endured by Friederich and his companions may be seen as a parallel to the sufferings of Christ leading up to his crucifixion, their mode of death does not as easily follow the biblical model. The chronicle’s very detailed description of the torture that the Oselians inflicted on the Christians seems to be more an eyewitness account than literary construction. That assumption seems to fit Henry’s own description, inasmuch as he states that he has spoken to some of the Livs who had accompanied Friederich during his last journey. The Oselians spared these men from torture and instead took them to Oesel as captives. On their return (perhaps they were ransomed or freed during a raid), the men were able to provide an eyewitness account what had befallen Friederich and his companions.\(^77\)

Not all the martyr narratives in the chronicle are as lengthy as the one presented above. A shorter example is that of a hermit (*heremite*) who originally came from the monastery of Dünamunde, but in 1218 was living by himself on a small island in the River Dvina not far from the
monastery. It appears that he was anticipating his own martyrdom (*ibidem martyrii sui agonem expectabat*). Like Friederich, the hermit was killed by marauding Oselians and happily entered the company of martyrs (*feliciter ... in sanctorum communionem transmigravit*), according to Henry.78

More in line with the lengthy descriptions mentioned above are Henry’s accounts of the martyrdom of the two Cistercians, Theoderich and Segehard. Theoderich eventually became a bishop in Estonia and was one of the central figures of the Rigan Church until he sided with the Danes in the northern provinces of Estonia and became more or less a rival to Bishop Albert in Riga. Segehard was a monk who became involved in the missionary work among the still pagan Semgalls living south of Riga.79 Both were killed by pagans in 1219 and are described as martyrs by Henry. However, while Theoderich is portrayed in a rather ambiguous way because of his alliance with the Danes, Henry presents Segehard as an obvious contrast both with regard to his martyrdom and his loyalty toward Riga. The two episodes therefore lend themselves to a closer examination of how Henry constructs his narrative.

The martyrdom of Segehard took place among the Semgalls living south of the River Dvina, in an area where the Rigan Church had not yet been challenged by any foreign power. Presumably, the renewed Danish efforts to subdue the northern Estonian provinces in the summer of 1219 had urged the Germans to try to extend their power into these southerly regions. The center of the renewed mission was the area around the castle Mesothen (Mezotne), on the banks of the River Aa (Lielupe).80 Henry very carefully explains that the initiative for the renewed missionary work in fact came from the Semgalls, and not from the bishop. The Semgalls asked Bishop Bertold for military assistance against marauding Lithuanians and hostile kinsmen. In return, the bishop demanded that the Semgalls accept Christianity. The emissaries of the Semgalls agreed, and Henry goes on to explain how the bishop and his men went to Mesothen together with a sizable force of knights, crusaders and priests to commence the Christianization of the Semgalls by baptizing and instructing them in the teachings of the gospel (*recipientes doctrinam evangelicam*). He notes that some three hundred men, in addition to women and children, were baptized during the initial process of Christianization among the Semgalls.81 As such, the narrative in the chronicle seems trustworthy in its description of how the missionary work evolved, not always as a consequence of war and conquest, but often also following meticulous negotiations and the forming of alliances against mutual enemies.
During the German mission, a small army that was on its way by boat, with additional men and supplies from Riga, was ambushed by hostile Semgalls. Together with the army was also the aforementioned Cistercian monk, Segehard, from the monastery of Dünamunde. He had been sent from the monastery to the castle in Mesothen to serve as a priest under the auspices of Bishop Bernhard of Lippe, who was to incorporate the new land into his bishopric as soon as the Semgalls had accepted Christianity. Segehard never reached the castle; he was among those killed during the surprise attack on the army. When the Semgalls attacked, the men from Riga were resting on the riverbank and had no way to flee. When Segehard realized that the attacking Semgalls would definitely kill him, he sat down and shrouded himself in his cloak, awaiting the stroke of the pagans’ swords. Henry tells his audience that Segehard, in the instant of his death, commended his spirit to the Lord (et in manus Domini spiritum commendans). According to the editors of the 1955 German edition of the chronicle, this was a reference to yet another Old Testament Psalm—Psalm 30, verse 6. Another, more obvious reference seems, however, to be the Gospel of St. Luke, in which the last words of Christ are precisely the words of Segehard. Thus Segehard (or rather Henry) makes the words of Christ his own, thereby drawing another parallel between the Passion of Christ and the sufferings of the missionaries in Livonia. What happened in Livonia is somehow equal to the biblical narratives inasmuch as those events seemingly took place within a similarly sanctified time. It is therefore hardly surprising that Henry points out that the spirits of Segehard and the other Christians killed alongside him now rest firmly with Christ, rejoicing in the company of all the other martyrs (quorum anime in martyrum societas sine dubio cum Christo gaudebunt). Henry even goes one step further, exclaiming that Segehard’s and the other missionaries’ “business was holy, for they, when called, came to baptize the pagans and to plant the Lord’s vineyard—and planted it with their blood. Their souls, therefore, are coequal with the saints in heaven” (eo quod vocati venerunt ad baptizandum paganos vineamque Domini plantandas, quam sanquine suo plantaverunt; ideoque sunt eorum anime sanctorum in celis coequales). Once more, Henry underlines that a certain element of sanctity rests on the Rigan Church and its servants among the clerics and monks, that equates them with the figures of the Bible. One could argue that, in the grander picture, the venture into the land of the Semgalls was no success, inasmuch as the attack on the castle in Mesothen and the ambush on the small army from Riga forced the
remaining crusaders and missionaries to abandon the enterprise altogether and return to Riga without fulfilling the Christianization of the Semgalls. Moreover, those among the Semgalls who had accepted baptism soon lapsed back into paganism when the Christians from Riga fled the land. If we study the text a little more closely, however, we will see that in this narrative Henry has in fact legitimized any future military campaigns and crusades launched from Riga into the lands of the Semgalls, because they were now to be considered apostates who could (and should) rightfully be forced to accept Christianity again, according to the laws of the Church. Furthermore, Henry now has portrayed the lands of the Semgalls as a part of the Lord’s vineyard that can only be cultivated rightfully by the Church of Riga and not by any other secular or ecclesiastical power in the region—and that would be the case even if the Church of Riga for the moment was prevented from exercising its pastoral care among the rebellious Semgalls.

Thus in the wider perspective, this story about the failed attempt to convert the Semgalls and the martyrdom of Segehard is also important because it in a way counters the Danish campaign against the Estonians the very same year of 1219. An army of crusaders commanded by the Danish King Valdemar II had landed in the northern province of Estonia at the place were Tallinn is now located, to enforce his claims on these lands and also to Christianize the local population.

Henry writes in relative detail about this campaign by the Danish king. In particular, he describes how King Valdemar rather foolishly allowed himself to be tricked by the local Estonians into believing that the Danes would be received peacefully, whereas the Estonians secretly prepared to attack the crusaders and nearly succeeded in defeating them during a surprise attack on the crusaders’ camp. In later Danish historiography, it was God who saved the Danish crusaders from the attacking Estonians, when he made the Danish national flag, Dannebrog, appear in the sky and slowly descend on the fighting crusaders, thereby granting them the victory. Henry has no reference to such a miraculous intervention on behalf of the Danish (and in his mind, intruding) crusaders. According to Henry, the Danes were saved only by the timely intervention of their Wendish allies, who had been hiding from the attacking Estonians until they themselves carried out a counterattack that drove the Estonians from the camp. Henry also explains that the Estonians, during their surprise attack, came upon Bishop Theoderich in one of the army’s tents. Believing that he was the Danish king, the Estonians imme-
diately killed the bishop. From early on in the chronicle, Theoderich is portrayed as one of the key characters in the process of Christianization in Livonia during the last years of the twelfth century and the early decades of the thirteenth, and also a person who was loyal to the Rigan Church. According to Henry, it was Theoderich who founded the Order of the Sword Brethren (even if this is questioned by modern scholars), and he was also closely associated with the Cistercian monastery of Dünamunde, where he was made abbot. Theoderich is also portrayed in the chronicle as a devout missionary, who worked tirelessly to convert the local pagans to Christianity. Henry even associates certain miracles with Theodorich’s work during his early years in Livonia. In 1219, however, Theoderich had switched his allegiance from the Rigan Church to the Danes, becoming bishop of Estonia. That made him a dubious person in Henry’s eyes, and when the bishop was killed by the Estonians, the chronicler is slow to recognize his death as a martyrdom, in contrast to his interpretation of some of the other deaths of clerics and monks in Livonia and Estonia. It is only later in the chronicle that Henry, rather as a passing remark, notes that he hopes that Bishop Theoderich through his death has “passed into the company of the martyrs” (in martyrum ... consorcium transivit). Obviously, Henry is not eager to portray Theoderich as the ideal worker in the Lord’s vineyard because of his alliances with the Danes—which is contrary to the description of Theoderich in the earlier chapters in the chronicle. Therefore, Henry seems to downplay Theoderich’s martyrdom in a way that parallels his later description of the killing of some Swedish crusaders and clerics by the Oselians in the province of Rotalia. The Swedish King John Sverkersson had led an army into this part of Estonia in 1220, settling in Leal. In Henry’s mind, that was nothing but an infringement on the rights of the Rigan Church, which had long been cultivating this part of the Lord’s vineyard. Like the Danes in the northern part of Estonia, the Swedes were foreign and illegitimate workers who had illegally entered this particular part of the Lord’s vineyard, which had up to now been ministered to by the Rigan Church. Furthermore, Henry states that Bishop Albert of Riga had appointed his own brother, Hermann, as bishop of this particular area, which was now wrongfully occupied by the Swedes—and that was an appointment that already had been approved by the pope, according to Henry.

The Swedes in Rotalia were soon punished for their wrongdoings. When the main part of the Swedish army had left, the remaining crusaders and clerics (among them also a bishop) were besieged in Leal by maraud-
ing Oselians, who viciously killed nearly everyone and captured the castle. Only a few escaped and sought refuge in a nearby Danish castle. And, even if Henry notes that the dead Swedes hopefully “entered the company of martyrs” (in martyrum ... consorcium transmigravit) he still considers their fate to be a heavenly punishment for their wrongdoing toward the Church of Riga. In a later chapter, Henry praises the Virgin Mary for guarding Livonia against any evildoers who wrongfully enter her land. Among those, Henry specifically mentions the fate of the Swedes and the troubles of the Danish king: “Might I not speak of the Swedes, who entered the Rotalian province which was subject to the banner of the blessed Virgin—for were they not slaughtered by the Oselians? Did she not, if one may say so, trouble the king of the Danes with a long and marvelous captivity in the hands of a few people, when he wished to trouble Livonia with his rule?”

In my opinion, these descriptions by Henry of the equally ill-fated attempts to convert the Semgalls by the Rigan Church, the Danish invasion of Estonia—both in 1219—and the Swedish campaign into Rotalia in 1220, should be understood as part of the same narrative, as they are most likely an attempt from the chronicler’s side to confer the greatest possible legitimacy on the work of the Rigan Church, while condemning the attempts by Danes and Swedes to encroach on the rights of the Germans in Riga. In this particular setting, the narrative about Segehard’s martyrdom among the Semgalls creates a counter against the incursion of the secular and ecclesiastical powers from Denmark and Sweden, thus rendering legitimacy to the Rigan Church. The chronicler also demonstrates through these narratives that there was in fact a sanctified beginning for Livonia and Estonia, whose primary agents were the German clerics who were the true tillers of this vineyard of the Lord.

Some Final Remarks

The examples presented above of the various depictions of martyrdom in the chronicle of Henry of Livonia are not exhaustive—there are other examples to be found in the text. The cases brought forward in this chapter, however, are the most comprehensive examples found in the text, and they enable us to study how Henry uses these events in his construction of a sanctified beginning for Livonia and Estonia. As pointed out in the article, some scholars have stressed the importance of saints and saints’ lives in this process of medieval historiography and early Christian myth
making. In this chapter, I have suggested that Henry seems to have used a slightly different approach, inasmuch as he found his champions of the faith not among local or universal saints, but rather among those individuals who proved themselves to be the true tillers of the Lord’s vineyard in Livonia and Estonia, eventually watering the ground with their own blood through martyrdom. In Henry’s eyes, they were the true champions of the faith, creating an important link between this part of the world and those regions that had long since taken up their place within Christendom.

Henry is especially concerned with those martyrs who came from the ranks of the clerics. In the chronicle, these clerics (both secular priests and monks) are presented as if their lives and deaths were a reiteration of the biblical narratives, thus constructing a genuine Christian myth that would grant this particular region a place within Western Christendom, and at the same time promote the development of new identities among the local people. In this process, Henry relies heavily on the authoritative texts he has at hand, mostly the Bible and various other Christian religious texts. This dependence on well-known and authoritative literary sources is not to be taken as the evidence of a mediocre chronicler unable to form a readable narrative in his own words; rather it demonstrates Henry’s eagerness to place his narrative firmly within the overall history of Christendom by adapting old authoritative texts to a new cultural and religious milieu.
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