Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Journal of Baltic Studies

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rbal20

Serfdom as entanglement: narratives of a social phenomenon in Baltic history writing

Linda Kaljundi & Ulrike Plath

To cite this article: Linda Kaljundi & Ulrike Plath (2020) Serfdom as entanglement: narratives of a social phenomenon in Baltic history writing, Journal of Baltic Studies, 51:3, 349-372, DOI: 10.1080/01629778.2020.1776349

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/01629778.2020.1776349

JOURNAL OF BALTIC STUDIES
2020, VOL. 51, NO. 3, 349–372
https://doi.org/10.1080/01629778.2020.1776349

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

ARTICLE

Serfdom as entanglement: narratives of a social phenomenon in Baltic history writing

Linda Kaljundi[a] and Ulrike Plath[b]

[a]Estonian Academy of Arts / Tallinn University, Tallinn, Estonia; [b]Tallinn University / Under and Tuglas Literature Institute, Estonian Academy of Sciences, Tallinn, Estonia

ABSTRACT
Serfdom narratives belong to the most prominent, emotionalized, and politicized elements of Baltic history writing. We are claiming in this article that serfdom narratives, although used mainly in national narratives, are regionally and globally entangled topics shared not only by historians from very different contexts but also created outside the historical canon in fiction and the arts. To analyze Baltic history writing as a form of entangled literature we are comparing serfdom narratives in Estonian and Baltic German history writing throughout the long nineteenth century.

KEYWORDS Serfdom; entanglement; history writing; transnationalism; Estonia; Baltic Germans

In the Baltic provinces of the Russian Empire, the nineteenth century was a period of major social transformations: 1816, 1817, and 1819 saw the emancipation of the peasantry and the following decades were characterized by ongoing debates on agrarian reforms, resulting in new laws (1849, 1856, 1863), which profoundly reorganized landownership and the legal status of the peasantry. This article departs from the assumption that these great changes had an impact on nineteenth-century Baltic history writing and analyzes representations of the area's most controversial social phenomenon, serfdom, in the period's historiography.

The entangled nature of the serfdom discourse forms the second focal point of this article, which focuses on the discursive entanglements of serfdom narratives between Baltic German, Estonian, and transnational history writing during the long nineteenth century, starting with the French Revolution and ending with the First World War and the collapse of the Russian empire. In the Baltic, the emancipation of the peasantry and the debates around it were bound to the abolition of serfdom and slavery in other parts of the world and the surrounding global debates. The representations of local, often very complicated social situations were based on a variety of transnational schemata; this concerns both the critics and the proponents of serfdom, as different ideological agendas could be based on a variety of transnational vocabularies, narratives, etc. On the one hand, there was a rich transnational vocabulary that could be used for representing local histories. On the other hand, the question arises of how much this kind of global, entangled vocabulary enabled the addressing of local issues. What aspects did it raise to prominence and what did it leave out?

CONTACT Linda Kaljundi linda.kaljundi@tlu.ee Institute of History, Archaeology and Art History, Tallinn University, Tallinn, Estonia

1. Serfdom and the entanglement

The discussion about serfdom and slavery as a part of history that is shared by most societies all over the globe has changed significantly lately. Instead of discussing the specific forms of unfree labor in different regional and social contexts, the view has broadened to comparative and even global histories of serfdom and slavery (Bales 2005; Eltis et al. 2017; Miller 2012; Vlassopoulos 2016), including different layers of physical, political, economic, and discursive entanglements. The most significant witness to this development is the *Journal of Global Slavery*, published since 2016. Concerning the Baltic region, there is still much to explore, for example, the pro-slavery discourse that seems to have interestingly similar forms in the American South, Great Britain, and the Baltic provinces during the long nineteenth century.[1] Next to the discourses, the social, physical, and legal practices of serfdom were equally strongly affected by various entanglements, but the analysis of the ways how the different forms of serfdom exercised in the Baltic related to the norms and practices of other regions remains outside the scope of this article.

In the Baltic, serfdom had an undeniable part in shaping power relations, societies, and mentalities over the whole early modern and modern period. Different forms of slavery and unfree labor were also present in the pre-Christian and medieval period (Selart 2014). In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, Baltic societies were profoundly reshaped by the crusades and colonization, which lead to the gradual domination of a new Christian and German-speaking elite. As the peasantry remained largely Estonian- and Latvian-speaking, this led to an increasing socio-ethnic divide that became sharper in the late Middle Ages. This development is also reflected in the spread of the term 'non-German' (*Undeutsch*) and its association with the peasantry (Johansen and von Zur Mühlen 1973; Kala 2012). Throughout the early modern period of wars and after the final subjugation of the Baltic territories by the Russian empire in 1721, the German-speaking nobility preserved its dominant position, also (re)gaining many privileges. The late medieval and early modern period were crucial for the development of serfdom, witnessing the gradual worsening of the legal status of the peasantry and an increase in exploitation.

The early modern period also saw the beginning of the conflict between the German-speaking Baltic nobility and the royal central power. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when the Baltics were part of the Swedish kingdom, the central administration and the crown strongly criticized the nobility for tyrannizing its peasantry. These debates once again point to the importance of transnational schemata and ideas for the serfdom discourse, as the arguments and strategies used in Livonia, Sweden, and the German territories are remarkably similar, especially concerning the emphasis on the tyranny of landlords (Seppel 2010). The conflicts concerning the nobility's domination over the peasantry also shaped much of the Russian imperial reign in the Baltics, beginning in the eighteenth century and becoming particularly strong in the nineteenth century. This meant that the treatment of the peasantry became one of the key topics in the rivalries between the nobility, the crown, and the central administration and that these debates also resulted in a rich discursive tradition. This enabled the targeting of criticism for serfdom either toward the central and royal administration or the nobility (which was more common, as we shall see). The differentiation between the distant virtuous monarch and the local immoral nobility is a widespread phenomenon, particularly in Finnish cultural memory (Kaljundi, Laanes,

and Pikkanen 2015, 32). In the Baltics, the development of colonial rule, the many changes in the dominion over these territories, and the historical and ethnic difference between the emperor and the Baltic nobility made the arguments concerning good and poor rule more complex: the local nobility was associated with the thirteenth-century conquest of Livonia and was German-speaking, but the central and royal administration resulted from the conquest of Baltic territories by the emerging early modern states of first Sweden and then Russia.

In this context, it is hardly surprising that serfdom is one of the most powerful topics in Baltic history writing. Serfdom and exploitation of the peasantry was discussed already in medieval texts, it was criticized and represented as very violent in early modern writings. Thereafter it was exaggerated even more and condemned during the Enlightenment, silenced in the Baltic German master-narratives of the nineteenth century, and appropriated in the Estonian and Latvian nationalist discourse emerging in the 1860s. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, it developed into one of the crucial concepts of Estonian and Latvian national history, being spiced with accusations against the Baltic Germans and appropriated in the fight for national sovereignty. Whereas the history writing of the interwar-period Estonian and Latvian young nation states preferred to focus on more glorious topics, serfdom became especially dominant in Soviet-era historiography.

Thus, as a topic of history writing and cultural memory, serfdom continued to grow in prominence also after its abolition, developing into one of the most influential and contested sites of memory for the different Baltic communities. As serfdom and slavery were not included in the Dictionary of Historical Concepts (Brunner, Conze, and Koselleck 1972–97), we still need to discover the historical and political layers of the terms in the German and Baltic context. As this article will concentrate on explaining how serfdom narratives were constructed in different traditions of Baltic history writing, we are not going to delve into the questions concerning the social reality and specifics of serfdom at different periods. While scholars tend to agree that Baltic peasants were serfs from the fifteenth century onwards (Kahk 1992, 164–179, 220–33; Selart 2012, 194–200), there is an ongoing debate concerning the developmental phases of serfdom in the late medieval and early modern period, particularly during the Swedish era.[2] The historiography on the Baltic emancipation laws is also remarkably diverse. As the period following the emancipation did not witness the bettering of the peasants' situation, there are different opinions about the impact of these laws on peasant-landlord relations in the nineteenth century (Lust 2013).

The complex question of how to define Baltic serfdom as a social and legal phenomenon is beyond the scope of this article: the social and legal practices of serfdom and the status of the peasantry varied in time, but also in different parts of the Baltic and in different types of manors. There is a considerable research tradition concerning the treatment of the peasantry and peasant-landlord relations.[3] We also are aware of the terminological variety and problems, as well as of the fact that in different languages multiple terms have been used for this and they are often difficult to translate. The concept traditionally used for Baltic serfdom is the German *Leibeigenschaft* (*pärisorjus* in Estonian) (Seppel 2006, 2005), which is particularly known for its fluctuating meaning and antagonistic interpretations (Seppel 2011). Next to this, slavery (*Sklaverei* in Germsn, *orjus* in Estonian) also features widely in various periods and even dominates in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In this article, serfdom is used as an umbrella term, as we

are chiefly interested in the formation of the core narrative of Baltic serfdom: what are the central elements used in different texts, how it is narrated and how does this narrative gain its socio-cultural weight.

Our analysis focuses on the discursive entanglements of serfdom narratives between Baltic German and Estonian history writing during the long nineteenth century. The historiography of this period was shaped by such transnational ideologies as Enlightenment, Romanticism, and nationalism, as well as by the professionalization of history as a discipline. The amount of Baltic German and especially Estonian history writing from that period is rather small. Even smaller is the number of texts included into the canon of nineteenth-century history writing. Moreover, the canonization of Baltic German and Estonian history writing appears problematic in itself, as it is in many ways very vague. At least partly, this seems to originate from the lack of comprehensive syntheses of Baltic German and Estonian historiography, as well as related studies and discussions.[4] This is not to say that Baltic historiography has not been studied, but to a great extent it has been addressed from the perspective of nation building, and the emergence of cultural memory and heritage culture. Contesting the existing canon, we also demonstrate how the canonization of certain works and the omitting of many others has helped to entangle and disentangle certain forms of history writing. Jaan Undusk (1997), for example, has demonstrated that the works of the Enlightenment author Johann Garlieb Merkel formed a link between Baltic German and Estonian historiography, his writings providing the corner stone of Estonian language histories written from a national perspective.[5] As we will show, there have been, however, many other Baltic German historians of the long nineteenth century whose connections with Estonian historiography have not been explored.[6]

To compare histories written about one region, but in different languages and from different national perspectives is just one way of approaching entanglements in historiography. Secondly, we can look for transnational or even global forms and elements in historical narratives. The third option would be to analyze the entanglements between history writing and other media of cultural memory: visual culture, literature, etc.[7] Baltic history writing can be analyzed as a thoroughly entangled phenomenon on all of these levels and its narratives of serfdom offer particularly good material for comparisons.[8] These have been much influenced by transnational schemata and motifs stretching from biblical histories to the story-worlds of the colonial slavery, as shown below. History writing has always been influenced by narratives and images coming from outside of the scholarly world, as other cultural media not only take up ideas and stories from academic history, but also feed into the scholarly historiography. As stressed in recent histories of knowledge and humanities, the entanglements between the non-academic and cultural media also do not lose their importance during the professionalization of history (and other humanities) in the nineteenth-century (Bod, Maat, and Weststeijn 2012). This particularly holds true for nineteenth-century Baltic provinces, where nonprofessional writings about history appear to have been more important in raising powerful master-narratives than the elaborated works of trained historians. Yet, how to define professional history writing and who are 'professional' historians in the nineteenth century Baltic context? Rolf Torstendahl argues, that one can distinguish between 1) historians who were employed and paid for writing history (up to the eighteenth century) and 2) professional academic historians, who formed an in-group accepting each other as 'good historians' (nineteenth century). Between these groups there is also a third group, historians who wrote for the wider public, the nation,

the children, and youth by mixing different styles (eighteenth and nineteenth centuries) (Torstendahl 2015, 13). We argue that for the Baltic history writing the re-opening of Tartu University in 1802 marks the border between unprofessional and professional history writing, as then for the first time professionalized and paid historians emerged who started to build an academic in-group. Not all Baltic German historians studied at Tartu University and not all of them even studied history, but the study and teaching of the subject at the university provided them with a new professional context and changed the overall situation of the study of history in the Baltics. Of course, only a small number of history students earned their income later as historians, nor did the authors of Baltic history writing accept each other automatically. Yet, they shared a new professional understanding of how to write history. Next to the university, we should also not underestimate the role of learned societies in the academic professionalization of the Baltic provinces, as elsewhere (Hackmann 2012).

Being aware of all these different forms of styles and entanglements, our analysis on transnational forms of serfdom narratives aims to answer the following questions: How were serfdom narratives constructed in nineteenth-century Baltic German and Estonian history writing? What were their main topics and agendas? What are the main texts shaping these narratives and do they challenge the existing canon of Baltic history writing? What were the forms of entanglement between Baltic German and Estonian history writing in this period? Which narratives and authors tended to entangle and to disentangle? How did the German Enlightenment shape Estonian serfdom narratives, and did this in return also have an impact on Baltic German historiography? How was the representation of serfdom influenced by the complicated legacies of colonialism in the Eastern Baltic and what was its role in colonial discourse? Serfdom narratives understood in that way are re-telling the story of Baltic transnational history that is not only unreachably passed as every past is, but with the resettlement of the Baltic Germans also ceased to exist as a social reality.

2. Entanglements in Baltic history writing

The quest for entanglements has become a new and global boom in studies of history (Cañizares-Esguerra 2007; Werner and Zimmermann 2006). In Europe, entangled history and other parallel concepts, such as *histoire croisée* or connected history have deep ideological roots, as they are linked with aims to overcome national histories and to develop pan-European and transnational history writing (Espagne 1988; Hackmann and Loew 2018). The study of entanglements was developed toward global history by connecting regions with no direct borders, but many other forms of connections, as one can find between Germany and Japan (Osterhammel 2009). For Baltic history, this concept has not been yet introduced in its full potential for area and diaspora studies. Yet, there appear special cross-overs between history and literature studies, which are typical for Baltic German studies in Estonia. In 2000, Jaan Undusk published his work on the 'meta-historical truth of history writing,' which can be seen as one of the first texts introducing the idea of non-verbalized entanglements between Baltic Germans and Estonians and Latvians. According to him, the idea of an independent region was the main point of Baltic politics, history writing, and cultural memory no matter the language used or the ethnic identity expressed (Undusk 2000). Later, he developed the idea of Baltic 'entangled literatures' that shaped the literary space in a multilingual way. For this concept he adopts

theories of cultural transfer and entanglements for Baltic literature studies, analyzing multilingual entanglements within the region. In our article, we are trying to develop Undusk's ideas of entangled, transnational region-building further and bringing it back (or forward, from a Baltic perspective) to history. Our source material, Baltic history writing, is perfect for this interdisciplinary approach as it stands between the two disciplines of literature and history.

We interpret history writing as a form of literary production, that has been canonized in a specific way. Considering serfdom-narratives we concentrate on the Baltic German-Estonian example, consciously leaving aside other forms of entanglements in Baltic history and history writing (for example Latvian–Estonian or Russian–Baltic German), and do not touch upon the Russian serfdom discourse and historiography of the Baltic provinces (Rosenberg 2005). The notion of entanglement helps us to define different layers of connections in multilingual Baltic history writing. 1) Up to a certain point, entanglements can be interpreted as intertextual entanglements, driven by citations and ongoing communication with prior authors. In interdisciplinary approaches that concentrate on the literary construction of history writing, intertextual entanglements of medieval Baltic chronicle writing have been analyzed in this way (Kaljundi 2005). Beside direct citation, entanglement can also take place by 2) negating prior understandings, or 3) by silencing demonstratively other approaches and understandings of history. We also have to take into consideration 4) entanglements between history writing and other forms of literary production, such as historical fiction (Kaljundi, Laanes, and Pikkanen 2015) or religious texts, the Bible and liturgy (Undusk 2011). Leaving the textual level, we also have to consider entanglements between other forms of art, for example, visual arts that could have a direct impact on history writing (Kaljundi and Kreem 2018).

We define entanglements in Baltic history writing as ways to create new narratives by taking over topics, motives, narratives from other texts, media, or cultures. By adopting stereotypes and meta-narratives created in other parts of the world Baltic authors showed their global aims. Entangling oneself is always an active step and so is disentangling oneself from given narratives. In the following, we also consider disentangling as a form of entanglement. Discourses created by entanglement never stayed on a textual (or visual) level, but transgressed the borders of their genres and tried to become social reality.

Our main hypotheses are:

(1) Although serfdom/slavery belonged to the most crucial topics in society and Baltic history writing, Baltic German history writing had problems in finding new narratives for it. This lack of concepts, words and visions is typical not only for Baltic German history writing but also for visual culture and literature.
(2) Global narratives, comparisons, and motifs filled the gap between social problems and cultural production in the Baltic provinces. They were, however, never able and never meant to depict local situation in a serious and balanced way. Global narratives often had their own political agendas.
(3) Creating a local serfdom narrative with citations of the Baltic German and the global context became the founding element of Estonian and Latvian history writing.

Our textual analysis follows a three-step model. First, we shall examine how Baltic serfdom narratives were created in Baltic German and Estonian history writing by using global or local perspectives. Next, we will discover the ways how slavery was appropriated, used, and explained in Baltic history writing, which metaphors were used and why. As a last step, we will discuss serfdom as a form of intertextual entanglement between Estonian and Baltic German history writing.

3. Establishing the serfdom narrative: local and global perspectives

How does one speak about serfdom when every word, term, and phrase is contested and politicized? How to speak at all about a social phenomenon that is as difficult and multidimensional as serfdom? Nineteenth-century Baltic German history writing has been the subject of research since Georg von Rauch's synthesizing anthology in 1986 (Rauch 1986). Thanks to this, we know about the crucial break in Baltic German history writing between the ideology of the Enlightenment with its political pro-abolition rhetoric and the conservative Biedermeier period, when Baltic Germans started to silence social problems. Can we state that Baltic German history writing lost its narrative with the emancipation, and thereafter had no words to describe the ongoing social problems of the nineteenth century, until it again found its voice in defending the Baltic German heritage, thereby leaving narratives of slavery and social problems within society to Estonians and Latvians? Is there really such a lack of ideas about how to conceptualize entangled Baltic history, and if so, how can one interpret this situation from a post-colonial or even psychological perspective?

But let us first take a step back and look more closely at Baltic history writing in the time of Enlightenment. Next to the other antiquarian and enlightenment authors such as August Wilhelm Hupel (Jürjo 2006) collected and compiled historical knowledge but did not create their own historical narratives, Garlieb Helwig Merkel's *The Latvians* (1976) has often been interpreted as the main text of Enlightenment history writing (Undusk 1997). Yet, neither was Merkel a historian, nor can his writings be easily interpreted as history writing. Nevertheless, they do have a prominent place in the unofficial canon of Baltic history writing. They have also had the strongest influence on Estonian historiography in the nineteenth century. Merkel stressed the brutality of Baltic German manor owners and blamed them for the region's bloody history mainly by comparing historical events and societies in the Baltic provinces on a European and even global level citing Rousseau and Hume (Merkel 1797, [1796] 1998; Plath 2011). There were others before him, who used global comparison as a method to interpret Baltic history. From the sixteenth century onwards, we can find colonial comparisons in different treatments of Baltic history (Donecker 2017; Plath 2011). Years before *The Latvians*, August von Kotzebue was bringing colonial topics to the theater and others were discussing the structural similarities of slavery and its ideologies in the Baltic provinces and the global colonial word (Arvelius 1786; Saagpakk 2016).

Although this way of argumentation was typical for the Enlightenment, it was not the mainstream Baltic German interpretation, which disentangled itself from such comparisons and argued solely on a regional level and from an upper-class perspective. The Enlightenment cannot be understood if we neglect the importance of anti-Enlightenment interpretations in the Baltic German discourse and the constantly sharpening ideologization of narratives in the public sphere. The more Merkel and others were claiming that serfdom leads to revolution and that only abolition can help to

create peace, the more we hear from the conservative side that serfdom still might be the right structure for the Baltic peasants. In this argument, abolition would result in unstable social relations, unrest, and a very dangerous split in society (which is what occurred as evidenced by the social and national history of the nineteenth century). Pro-serfdom voices, however, were seldom published; we can find them in private conversation, here and there in the political rhetoric of the time and in reactions toward pro-abolition publications. In history writing, balanced interpretations tend to dominate.

Gustav von Bergmann, who studied theology in Leipzig and also worked as a pastor and printer in Livonia, was the author of the first illustrated presentation of Baltic history. He argued that the Latvians were unable to accept freedom in 1561, as the 'the whole nation seemed not to be tired of serfdom and disprized freedom, which is such a high property for all human beings' (Bergmann 1776, 59). The argument that the Estonians and Latvians are not ready for freedom was one of the most dominant pro-serfdom arguments used both by radical pro-serfdom advocates and moderate enlighteners (e.g. Jannau 1786, 3, 119). Serfdom, however, had to be moderate to avoid uprisings (Bergmann 1776, 71). Clear structures were even more necessary to calm down the barbaric Estonians, who roasted captured Germans in 1210 and behaved as barbarians during the St. George's Night Uprising (1343–45) (Bergmann 1776, 21).[9] In his public *Handbook Livonian, Estonian and Curonian History* (1791–94) Wilhelm Christian Friebe avoids using the words slavery or serfdom for the eighteenth century. Instead, he speaks about 'pressure' (*Bedrückung*) to explain that peasants were bound to the manor owners as the manor owner were bound to the state power and the mediated power structures (Friebe 1794, 19, 29, 31). Highlighting the fight for freedom and independence and mechanism of bringing problems directly to the king (thereby avoiding hierarchies) are structures strikingly similar in Baltic German and Estonian history writing, as since the late nineteenth century Estonian national history also strongly relies on the narrative of freedom fighting (Tamm 2008). Both structures also are quite typical for the Enlightenment.

The problem of how to conceptualize Baltic history on a local or global level also continued in the second part of the nineteenth century from the Baltic German perspective. Very much known at his time, but mostly forgotten today was Oscar Karl Ernst Kienitz. Born in Curonia, Kienitz not only edited the influential journal *Das Inland* (The Inner Country), but also had the grand ambition to become a historian (Kienitz 1847, IX). In his estimation the first two volumes of his 24 books on Livonian history were the first 'real works' on Baltic history (Kienitz 1846, 177, 1847). Kienitz balanced between the history of mankind (*Menschheitsgeschichte*) and of Fatherland (*Vaterlandsgeschichte*), stressing the importance of history writing for contemporary political and philosophical thinking (Kienitz 1847, V, XI). According to him, the global importance of Livonian history reveals itself in connection to the rise and fall of peoples and cultures. Thus, he is repeating the ideas of Herder and Merkel, yet never giving a clear voice to Estonians and Latvians. Although he mentions power relations between the rulers and the ruled, and condemns the extinction of the local nobility by the German invaders in the thirteenth century in order to enslave the indigenous population (Kienitz 1847, 115–116), he is not contemplating on the global topic of slavery as a social problem. As he died early in 1859 he was not able to leave the mark in Baltic German historiography that he might otherwise have earned.

In Estonian-language texts, the concept of serfdom first emerged in a local and imperial context and was closely connected to the emancipation laws. Shortly after emancipation, in the 1820s, the Estonian-language audience gained wider opportunities to learn about history, as the peasants' calendars began publishing short texts on historical topics and lists of historical events. On these lists, the emancipation of peasantry appeared for the first time in 1823 (Masing 1823; Viires 2001, 24–26). The first school textbooks on history also highlighted emancipation, highlighting the role of the Russian monarchy in liberating the peasantry (Schwartz 1861, 312–313; Viires 2001, 30–31). In Estonian texts, a number of Russian monarchs are depicted as defenders of the peasants against the nobility, with a special emphasis on Alexander I who signed the decree of emancipation. Due to repeated commemoration, emancipation developed into one of the most significant Estonian sites of memory: for example, one of the key events of national movement, the first Estonian song festival was dedicated to its fiftieth anniversary in 1869. During the rise of nationalism in the 1860s, praising the emperor for emancipation remained present and even central in the writings of Estonian activists.[10] This can be explained as a pragmatic strategy: praising imperial rule for emancipation was useful for legitimizing nationalist-minded events and texts. Yet, the memory of emancipation must have also resonated with the Estonian audience, which largely comprised of the peasantry and urban dwellers with a peasant background.

This entangled the Estonian tradition with Russian imperial narratives. It is, however, interesting to note that nationalist authors did not put much emphasis on the emancipation of the Russian peasantry in 1861. In 1862, for example, the leading Estonian nationalist newspaper *Eesti Postimees* (The Estonian Postman) paid much more attention to the abolition of slavery in America than it had paid to the emancipation of Russian peasants one year earlier (Salupere 2017, 72). The favoring of global topics does not characterize only the selection of news, but also another medium that became crucial for Estonian-language representations of slavery: Estonian language historical short stories of the 1860s–70s.[11] Sometimes printed as books, they were mostly published in newspapers. Their global focus can be explained with the wish to avoid any blame for criticism of the Russian imperial regime, yet, it also reflects the unavoidably global dimensions of any discussions on slavery at that time. In addition, the genre of historical fiction, quickly gaining a major role in Estonian nation-building, was in itself very transnational (Kaljundi, Laanes, and Pikkanen 2015). Estonian authors were eager to narrate stories of slavery, but they relied on global story-worlds at first. Only gradually did they turn toward local histories and the legacies of Baltic serfdom in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Thus, the first Estonian historical short stories, authored by the leading national activist, writer, and poet Lydia Koidula in the 1860 and 1870s, focus on slavery and, yet, they are set in the Caribbean (Peiker 2015). In the 1880s, the focus moves to Estonia with the publication of the most popular and influential works of historical fiction authored by Eduard Bornhöhe (Laanes 2015). They also focus on slavery and revolt, but are set in a distant medieval past, which functions as a screen for working through the legacies of modern serfdom. Especially in *The Avenger* (Bornhöhe 1880), the manor is an important setting, and the short story shows medieval peasants to work in conditions that recall both the nineteenth-century Baltics and some colonial plantation. It is only around 1905, when Eduard Vilde's *Mahtra War* (Vilde 1902) became the first Estonian historical novel to discuss unfree labor in the modern context, as it focuses on the peasants' unrest in 1858.

The Estonian orientation toward the monarchy conflicts with the conservative Baltic German narrative of serfdom, which stresses the patronizing role of the nobility toward their peasants, although it might appeal for a special connection between the nobility and the emperor in other contexts (as explained above). This kind of a monarchical orientation, however, did not appear for the first time, but had also been present in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The critique of the nobility and the emphasis on the monarch's patronage of the peasantry was also present in the debates concerning Baltic agrarian relations during the Swedish era, especially in the late seventeenth century. The critique of the nobility's tyranny spread in history writing and other documents produced in support of the Swedish crown, as well as in the letters that the peasants had ordered and sent to the king (Seppel 2010, 9–11). As during the early modern period, the tyranny of the nobility was a heatedly debated topic across Europe, this provides yet another indication of how the representation of local Baltic conflicts between the peasants and their landlords were closely entangled with transcultural discourses and schemata from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries onwards.

4. Appropriating and explaining serfdom: metaphors and binary oppositions

In 1820 at the main celebration of the abolition of serfdom in the Baltic provinces, Karl Gottlob Sonntag, superintendent of Livonia, gave an impressive explanation about the history of serfdom in the Baltic countries. In his view the emancipation act of 1816/19 repaid the sins and the guilt of 600 years of serfdom and created in this singular historical moment a new society (Plath 2018, 125–126). Thus, liberation of the serfs was a redemption of the sins of their master. He denied the responsibility of the church for establishing serfdom in Livonia, an accusation that was widely spread during the Enlightenment and that associated the Catholic crusades and mission in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries with the founding of serfdom. It is in the religious feelings and narratives of the time where we can find the origins of the typical nineteenth-century inability of Baltic Germans to speak and discuss the social problems arising after emancipation. Although Sonntag prepared Baltic German society for ongoing work and sacrifices in order to build a new society after emancipation, most of the Baltic Germans preferred the idea of a single act with no further struggles (Plath 2018, 127).

Who was to blame for the sin of serfdom? How were emancipation and the ongoing social problems reflected in Baltic German history writing? As said above, the Baltic Germans had a fundamental problem to find convincing new master narratives after the end of serfdom. Professional Baltic German history writing firstly focused on Estonian and Latvian pre-history and archeology, as well as on legal history, in both fields stressing the *longue durée* of German culture in the provinces, while also integrating Estonians and Latvians as subjects into Baltic history writing. Friedrich Georg von Bunge, the most prominent Baltic legal historian during the nineteenth century, combined his interest in law and the peasantry, as he was researching serfdom in Old Livonia (Bunge 1838). Yet, Bunge's work failed to form a popular new master narrative.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, it was Alexander von Richter who became an author of books on general Baltic history after Friebe. In 1857, he published his 1,800-page long history that was based on vast source material, including Estonian folklore and folk songs in five volumes (Richter 1857). His *Geschichte* was interpreted as hard to read and outdated even shortly after it was published (Bosse 1986, 116). For our

analysis, Richter's work is much more interesting than it might seem at a first glance. Although written from a German national perspective, it reflects a lot on social questions in the Baltic provinces. Richter's interpretation of the Middle Ages highlights the negative effects of Catholicism, yet, still depicts as heroes medieval characters such as Bishop Albert of Riga, the founding figure of the German colony (Bosse 1986, 119). According to him, German colonization did not cause social problems, as it did not take land from the natives but was built up in the wilderness (Richter 1857, 121). In the second part of his book, Richter reflected on the harsh way of introducing personal freedom to peasants by arguing that this was the only possible way for the nobility to survive, facing its decline in Germany and France (Richter 1858, 173). Although being far from apologetic, Richter is explaining why the end of serfdom had to be made in the Baltic provinces exactly the way it was done. Although it offers no new narrative, we can find here the very first steps to speak about abolition and its influence on society as a new topic in history writing.

Around the same time in the second part of the nineteenth century, we can find more critical and political ways of discussing serfdom. For example, Otto von Rutenberg's 1859 *History of the Baltic provinces Livonia, Estonia and Curonia since the earliest times* was written mainly for a broader readership. As he is sympathizing with the Latvians, he was accused of being tendentious and 'under the spell of the Enlightenment' (Wittram 1942; Bosse 1986, 114). More interestingly, however, as a Curonian pastor, Rutenberg praised his province's quick developments, while stressing how bad the situation in Estonia and Livonia has been throughout history and even more after emancipation (Rutenberg 1860, viii). Blaming the other provinces for their social order and history is noteworthy, as he was willingly breaking down the myth of a general Baltic German identity and history that was constructed at that time in newspapers and magazines. The better status of Latvian peasants in Curonia was already the main argument for Georg Friedrich von Fircks, as he was fighting against Merkel's accusations in his *The Latvians*. For von Fircks, local history was a weapon against the Enlightenment's narrative of hate and revolution. He argued that on a local level, at least in Curonia, serfdom was much milder than Merkel's political exaggerations showed (Fircks 1803, 1804).

After 1870, the time of modern professional Baltic German history writing started with authors who gained their professional training in Dorpat and/or Göttingen University: among them, Theodor Schiemann and Leonid Arbusow are of primary importance (Lenz 1984, 228–229). In 1886–87, Theodor Schiemann published his *Russia, Poland, and Livonia up to the Seventeenth Century*, which however does not speak much about early modern Livonian history nor serfdom. In 1889 Leonid Arbusow's *Outline of the history of Livonia, Estonia and Curonia* appeared, which was reprinted four times between 1889 and 1904 and introduced cultural history (Arbusow 1890). This was followed in 1904 by Ernst Seraphim's popular *Handbook on Livonian history*. According to Seraphim, Baltic serfdom emerged as a part of the reduction of private freedom in early modern Europe (Seraphim 1904, 270, 276). He argued that travelers over-exaggerated the harshness of Baltic serfdom, as they compared this to ancient slavery (Seraphim 1904, 271, 272). He stressed the different social subgroups of peasants with different forms of serfdom and underlined normative sources speaking about different forms of luxury among peasants (Seraphim 1904, 272–273). By doing so, he aimed to reconstruct a 'true social history' to contest the false narratives (Seraphim 1904, 267). According to him the Baltic German manor owners and their Latvian

peasants had, at least in Curonia, very good social relations – all other interpretations about Baltic slavery are wrong (Seraphim 1904, 135, 360). Although the Curonian *Sonderweg* (special way) has to be taken serious (Lust 2013), the idea was not shared by all Baltic German historians from that region. Leonid Arbusow was much more critical concerning the fate of the peasants. Even though he does not deny the bad situation of Baltic serfs, he stresses that it was the wars that caused this unbearable situation for both the peasants and their landlords (Arbusow 1908, 231). He also emphasized that at no time did serfdom exceed the basic economic needs of the manors (Arbusow 1908, 256).

While most Baltic German historians ended up in debates over whether serfdom existed or not and how grave it was, things changed in the late nineteenth century with Carl Schirren (1826–1910). Although he is known as the most straightforward defender of Baltic German cultural identity against the so-called Russification politics with his *Livonian Answer to Yuri Samarin* (Schirren, 1869), we can find surprisingly concerned passages in his lectures on history held at Tartu University in 1868:

> We were accused not only for what Livonian became of, but also how it came there. And we can see before our eyes a field sprinkled and flavored with the blood of different families and tribes, filled with the bones of dynasties over centuries, of slaves, who passed away under the inexorable rule of their masters, masters who were smashed by the revengeful hand of the uprising slaves (Schirren 2011, 8).

In his fourth lecture on history he developed his ideas concerning Baltic history in an unforeseen direction, mentioning that in the Baltics for the first time, ideas of regional freedom were expressed, which were directed against every kind of global world domination (Schirren 2011, 18). Explaining Baltic history not as a history of slavery and serfdom, but as a unique history of freedom, is a switch we can earlier find in Karl Gottlob Sonntag's and later in August Seraphim's writings (Plath 2018, 37; Seraphim 1918, 30). Here, perhaps, we can find the most common Baltic German serfdom narrative, according to which the Baltic German fight for their rights and the struggle of the Estonian and Latvian peasants for their freedom should belong together in a joint force against Russia (Undusk 2000).

The situation of Estonian authors was quite different, as they wrote Baltic history from the perspective of serfs and hence could appropriate the serfdom topic for constructing narratives of resistance and liberation. Although this offered powerful stories and imageries, instrumentalization of serfdom for a national narrative can also be considered as a way of handling colonial humiliation. Instead of the guilt that the Baltic Germans had to deal with, the Estonians had to find a way of handling serfdom-related shame. The opening lines of the Estonian Declaration of Independence (1918) give a good example of the importance and use of serfdom-narrative for nation building:

> Never in the course of centuries have the Estonian people lost their ardent desire for independence. From generation to generation Estonians have kept alive the secret hope that in spite of the dark night of slavery and the violent oppression by other nations the time will come in Estonia … when "Kalev will come home to bring his children happiness." Now this time has arrived.

While recent analyses have rightly pointed to the importance that the narrative of the Estonians' centuries long fight for regaining the freedom had for nation-building (Tamm 2008), this text indicates the importance of serfdom in the national narrative. The

Declaration also illustrates well the key features of the Estonian serfdom discourse: the metaphor of the night of slavery; the opposition of serfdom and freedom; and the linking of ancient, pre-colonial freedom with the mythological golden past, embodied by Kalev, the hero of the national epic *Kalevipoeg*.

In order to trace the roots of this kind of conceptualization of serfdom in Estonian history writing and cultural memory, one should at first point to the importance of binary oppositions for representing serfdom. In Estonian national discourse, representations of serfdom are mostly based on opposition with freedom. While at first freedom was mainly associated with the period following the emancipation act (as discussed above), then along with the development of the nationalist movement and the emergence of a specifically Estonian discourse of history, freedom became more and more often linked with ancient, pre-colonial freedom. In both narratives, serfdom feeds into the historical period or phenomenon that is conceptualized positively: showing the post-emancipation and the ancient periods in an even more golden light. Representations of ancient glory first emerged in such genres as (pseudo)mythologies, legends, and epic poetry in the first half of the nineteenth century. These texts were also the first treatments of Baltic history from an Estonian perspective. Although produced by Estophile authors of Estonian origin (Friedrich Robert Faehlmann and Friedrich Reinhold Kreutzwald), they were originally written either in German or for a German-speaking learned audience.

Studies of Estonian national history writing usually point to the pioneering role of Kreutzwald's epic poem *Kalevipoeg* (1856/1862). The genre had its advantages, allowing more freedom in constructing a pre-colonial golden age, where the heroic epic is set (Undusk 1997, 730). Discussions about Estonian historiography have paid less attention to Faehlmann's legends that were first published in the Proceedings of the Learned Estonian Society (*Verhandlungen der Gelehrten Estnischen Gesellschaft*) in 1840–52. They represent not only the ancient glory, but also the servitude of the Estonians – a topic that the epic does not touch upon. It has been even argued that Faehlmann's critique of the crusades, the nobility, and serfdom is no less radical than Merkel's (Jansen 2004, 271–272). Describing the results of the crusades, Faehlmann claims: 'Germans who only chase profit, have cut down forests and harnessed Estonians to the plow in order to reap a golden harvest from golden sowing' (Faehlmann 1852, 75). As such, his legends present unprecedented criticism of German domination by an Estonian author. Indeed, such criticism could likely not have been published in periodicals or books intended for a wider audience, but scholarly publications were not subject to censorship (Salupere 2017, 128). Although Faehlmann's texts are not usually considered among the core narratives of Estonian nationalism and history writing, they reveal very finely the importance of fairy-tales and mythologies for nineteenth-century nationalist histories and identities, as well as the transnational use of these genres for expressing very political ideas (Leersen 2008, 197–203).[12]

Whereas Faehlmann was still mainly interested in studying and reconstructing the ancient glory, culture, religion, and language of the Estonians, in the 1860s, more detailed representations of serfdom began to emerge in the writings of national activists. Emblematic of the rise of the Estonian national movement were the metaphors of darkness and light, night and dawn, sleeping and awakening, which were spreading globally in nineteenth-century nationalisms (Anderson 2006, 195). The imagery of darkness was not unfamiliar to the earlier Estonian-language writings on history, but it had been associated with the darkness of paganism that ruled Estonia before the

crusades.[13] In contrast, in the 1860s the nationalists began to associate darkness, night, or sleep with the loss of ancient freedom to the crusaders, the following domination of the Germans and the serfdom of the Estonians. Usually this transformation is associated with the radical activist Carl Robert Jakobson, who takes a much more militant approach toward history. His *First Fatherland Speech: The ages of light, darkness and dawn of the Estonian people* from 1868 has been influential for conceptualizing national history, as it metaphorically divided the Estonian past into three periods: the age of ancient light, the darkness of slavery, and the present age of dawn.[14] Using numerous biblical citations and allegories, Jakobson represented history as a battle between the forces of light and darkness. These kinds of transnational, post-Reformation metaphors concerning the darkness of the Middle Ages also occur frequently in Baltic German history writing. The references to the new dawn for the Estonians and Latvians are, however, obviously less frequent. Even Merkel in his *The Latvians* only once expresses the hope that a new day will dawn for the Latvians (Merkel [1796] 1998, 221) and he is using a religious metaphor about the resurrection of the dead and not of an awakening that he also mentioned just once (Merkel [1796] 1998, 28).

Jakobson was not, however, the first nationalist to approach Estonian history metaphorically.[15] Already in 1864, Johann Köler had produced the allegorical history painting *Waking from Charmed Sleep*.[16] Coming from an Estonian peasant family, he had become a successful artist in St. Petersburg and also a national activist, inspired by the Italian national movement. *Waking* was the first visual manifestation of an Estonian perspective on the past. It depicts an allegorical story. In the thirteenth century, a German crusader falls in love with an Estonian maiden. While he is attempting to baptize her, the girl faints, is considered dead, and is buried in a chapel. Centuries later, a descendant of the knight discovers the girl, she awakens and accuses the young German and his forefathers for making her spend centuries asleep. Thus, the image opposes the young, future-looking, and rising Estonian nation and the Baltic German nobility, which was trapped in the distant past. This caused a scandal among the conservative Baltic German audience. (Kaljundi and Kreem 2018, 53–57.)

As such, the painting provides a good example of how legends and fairy tales were used for debating political issues, as well as the relations between different ethnic and social classes. The use of a female figure as the embodiment of the nation is typical to the period, and so is the image of an awakening maiden.[17] The latter was particularly prominent in German nationalism where stories of sleeping beauties spread widely in visual and literary formats.[18] Thus the popularity of the Grimms' *Sleeping Beauty* and other tales also relate to their association with hopes (and fears) about a national renaissance of the Germans (MacGregor 2016, 113–130). As these maidens were often represented to break not only the spell, but also chains, this seems to suggest that serfdom was used as a metaphor in nationalist discourses of the period, symbolizing limitations to national liberties and unification.[19] Thus, we suggest that the importance of serfdom for nineteenth-century Estonian national history is related to both the local legacy of serfdom as well as to the transnational prominence of the serfdom metaphor. As it is entangled with the more concrete representations of the Baltic peasantry, it both empowered and transformed the local history. Yet, the local legacies of unfree labor also fed into the lasting use of the slavery metaphor that does not seem to have become so dominating in countries that lacked the legacies of unfree labor in their recent past.

Instead of sleep, Jakobson used the metaphors of night and darkness, associating these with the serfdom of the Estonians that lasted from the crusades until emancipation, according to Jakobson. He associated the equally powerful metaphor of light both with pre-colonial freedom and the period following the emancipation act. Like the earlier mythologizing treatments, Jakobson's representation of serfdom was closely bound to binary opposition with the ancient golden age and indeed a large part of his speech was devoted to constructing the glories of pre-colonial freedom. Nevertheless, he also went into much more detail in representing serfdom. Significantly, however, Jakobson's conceptualization of serfdom relies strongly on the poems of the aforementioned Lydia Koidula. Today, Koidula is best known for her patriotic poetry praising the love of fatherland and its natural beauty, but she also authored many verses commemorating serfdom, and, therefore, seems to have had a pioneering role in shaping the Estonian serfdom discourse. In addition, due to her (mostly anonymous) work as the editor of the nationalist newspaper *Eesti Postimees* and the author of numerous fictive and historical short stories published in this paper, she seems to have played a great (and largely still unacknowledged) role in the shaping of the national narrative of Estonian history and the historical knowledge of the Estonians at large (Salupere 2017, 24, 276, 399).[20]

Koidula's poem *My Fatherland, They had buried* (Koidula 1867) includes in a nutshell the key elements of the Estonian serfdom discourse: it uses the metaphor of burying (an invariant of darkness and sleep), speaks of the 600-year period of serfdom, as well as praises Alexander I for freeing the nation.[21] Although her poetry collection *The Nightingale of Emajõgi* (1867) did not spread widely, many of Koidula's poems were made widely known through the highly popular textbook that Jakobson (1867) compiled for Estonian peasant schools.[22] In his *First Fatherland Speech*, Jakobson (1991, 23–24) quotes at length another of Koidula's poems, *Thoughts on Toomemägi* (Koidula 1867), which describes serfdom as an immediate result of the German crusades, and paints a tragic and violent picture of life for the Estonians.

The use of metaphors such as night or sleep, as well as the conceptualization of the whole period of German domination as a time of serfdom was likely of great importance to raising serfdom into one of the crucial elements of Estonian historical narrative and memory. Such vocabulary is by no means unique. As aforementioned, metaphors related to darkness and light, sleep and awakening, night and dawn spread widely in nationalist discourses. The appropriation of slavery metaphors for describing a national fight for freedom and liberty seems to be another tendency that spread in European nationalisms; and the same appears to hold true for the use of serfdom as a metaphor for foreign rule and domination. Both vocabularies have a biblical background – imageries of light and darkness are widely used in the Bible, and the Old Testament also offers the story of Egyptian slavery as the base narrative for national liberation. When, however, slavery vocabulary was adapted in the national liberation discourse in areas with a recent serfdom history, for example, such metaphors as a nation's night of slavery also became very closely linked with local and very complicated social legacies. This made them highly efficient for national agitation, as for the audience they did not remain merely abstract metaphors and the Estonian peasantry could affectively relate to the themes of serfdom and slavery. Next to this, the broad transnational appropriation, global resonance, and wide vocabulary available for using slavery-related metaphors appears to have fed into the Estonian activists' success in constructing the serfdom discourse as a crucial element of the national narrative. Yet, the appropriation

of serfdom for political aims and its representation through metaphors also raises the question of how much it actually allows us to speak about the relevant local social problems, experiences, and legacies. Although the Estonian and Baltic German treatment of serfdom are remarkably different, the question of how much the use of transnational schemata transforms the writing about the local situation is relevant for both of them.

5. Serfdom as intertextual entanglement/relationship

Considering Baltic German history writing, the main question was if and how to entangle it with pan-European or even global narratives of serfdom. As explained above, European narratives of serfdom that had mostly a clear pro-abolition agenda were interpreted as exaggerations that are unable to reflect the 'real' social relations between Germans and Estonians. To silence social problems of serfdom or to interpret the history of serfdom as a history of freedom was better than taking over false narratives. Concentrating in this article on history writing in the long nineteenth century, we were not able to find entanglements of Baltic German history writing with the Estonian history writing.

It is not surprising that we can find much more intertextual entanglements from the much younger Estonian history writing. Yet, early Estonian histories of serfdom entangle not with the contemporary Baltic German historiography, but a much older layer of the Baltic serfdom discourse – the early modern critique of the situation of the Livonian peasantry. This tradition was produced by German Humanists such as Albert Krantz and Sebastian Münster, as well as Livonian authors, such as Balthasar Russow, Dionysius Fabricius, and Christian Kelch (Raik 2004; Kaljundi 2016). Presenting not overly long but very vivid and detailed descriptions of the exploitation and maltreatment of the peasantry, and circulating considerably widely in the Baltic and German realms, these texts created the *topos* of the Livonian peasantry as the most miserable people in the world. Partly, the early modern authors relied on reports of Baltic conditions, but their increasingly sadistic representations can also be interpreted as a reaction the audience's demand for violent stories (Johansen 1963). Around that time, Livonia had become a reservoir of horror and excitement for the European reading audience also due to the perceived threat of Moscow, as the wars with the Russians resulted in the production of numerous descriptions of atrocities and created negative stereotypes of the ruthless violence and barbarity of the Russians. At the same time, these texts were also increasingly transnational, using various well-known motifs and stereotypes of otherness, which in the age of print and exploration circulated widely (Donecker 2017).

Above, we explained how Carl Robert Jakobson used poetry and metaphors to empower representations of serfdom, but his *Speech* also entangles with early modern literary tradition. Jakobson has appropriated well-known passages from the chronicle of Balthasar Russow (*Chronica der Prouinz Lyfflandt*, 1578, rev. ed. 1584), quoting his condemnation of the luxurious life of medieval Livonian elites, as well as of the exploitation and legally disadvantageous situation of the Livonian peasantry (Jakobson 1991, 27–29, 30). Russow's chronicle had enjoyed remarkable popularity in the late sixteenth century. By the nineteenth century, it had become one of the key texts for Baltic history and also for the Baltic German community, although it strongly criticized the medieval nobility. Jakobson adds to this Sebastian Münster's description of the misery of the Livonian peasantry that was published in his widespread

description of the world (*Cosmographia*, 1544; Kreem 1998). Having highlighted the peasants' lack of legal protection, their miserable living conditions and bad nutrition, Münster argued that 'this is the most miserable and saddest people, there is no other like it,' and 'this people live like animals' (Jakobson 1991, 29). These early modern passages continued to circulate in Estonian history writing throughout the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This also binds the Estonian narrative of slavery very closely together with early modern history writing.

The appropriation of Balthasar Russow's descriptions of the miseries of the Livonian peasantry also characterizes the second pioneering work on Estonian history, authored by a more moderate leader of the nationalist movement, Jakob Hurt. His *Images from the History of Fatherland* was at first published in the aforementioned nationalist newspaper *Eesti Postimees* in 1871 and in book format in 1879. Originally intended to be printed on the 50th anniversary of emancipation in 1869, its publishing was prolonged due to censorship. Six chapters of the book were dedicated to the precolonial period, but the last, the seventh, is dedicated to medieval history, starting with the year 1227 (traditionally considered the end of the German crusades and conquest) and ending with the Livonian War. Hurt quotes the same passages from Russow as Jakobson (Hurt 1879, 148–150) and adds to these yet another well-known early modern description of the miseries of the peasantry in Livonia, which comes from the chronicle of Christian Kelch (*Liefländische Historia*, 1695) (Hurt 1879, 150–152). The latter also includes Kelch's famous statement that medieval Livonia was 'a heaven for manor owners, a paradise for priests, a gold well for the foreigners and a hell for the peasants' (Hurt 1879, 152).

The use of these and other early modern representations has been emblematic not only of nineteenth-century Estonian history writing, but also of later times when both the interwar period nationalist and later Soviet Estonian historiography steadily quoted the same captions and mostly did not mention the original contexts of these violent descriptions. By highlighting this we do not wish to argue that the critique of the nobility's mistreatment of the peasantry was ungrounded, but to highlight the effect of these extremely violent stories. Recently, Marten Seppel (2012) has made a similar point concerning the tendency to interpret the relationship between the Livonian peasantry and landlords based on single court cases, which resulted from the use of extreme violence against the peasants. Violence no doubt was part of the relations between manor holders and peasants, but these examples of cruel violence gained attention and became well known namely because they were considered to exceed the norms and led to trials. Moreover, these radical cases were more efficient for criticizing the nobility and for constructing less unambiguous histories of serfdom.

Tellingly, we also see that the founders of the narrative of Estonian national history, Jakobson and Hurt do not move beyond the medieval and early modern periods and do not touch the sources or the specifics of eighteenth and nineteenth century serfdom. Similarly, Estonian historical fiction that initially had a strongly global and medieval focus, enabled a discussion of serfdom without opening up to the more recent and potentially more humiliating practices and experiences. So, it was only after the foundational myths had been created when the first Estonian historiographies appeared, which also treated modern serfdom. In 1891 and 1893 the writer and journalist Andres Saal published a two-volume history of the serfdom and emancipation of the Estonians (Saal 1891, 1893). This book was also based on the metaphors of light and darkness, as well as praised the Russian emperor for emancipation. In comparison to the earlier works it, however, also included a much more diverse intertextual entanglement, as it refers to and quotes from

different chronicles, studies and source editions by Baltic German authors. This work, however, failed to transform or leave any lasting impact on the Estonian discourse of serfdom, possibly also due to its strongly intertextual and complex format.

5. Conclusion

Baltic German and Estonian serfdom narratives were to a great extent constructed in a binary system. On the Baltic German side, we can read about guilt, sacrifice, redemption, barbaric savages, serfdom, and not less barbaric manor owners bound together in a history of constant wars and an endless fight for survival. On the other side, the noble Estonian savages, whose glorious future was spoiled by the German invaders in a 700 year-long 'night of serfdom.' It would however be misleading to understand the two traditions as only opposites. There are also remarkable connections and entanglements. One of the most striking links is the use of the metaphors of darkness and light. Perhaps the most interesting and complex similarity is the aim to organize Baltic German and Estonian histories around the narrative of freedom and slavery, respectively. Serfdom was and still is, however, the main link between both parts, a link that survived in narratives even after its abolition. The situation where the different parties are bound together no matter how much they try to escape might be typical for the colonial experience in general. Although never being a part of classical colonial structure, Baltic history forms a unique example of complex multiple colonialisms, where political and economic power and colonial discourses did not always overlap. Only recently the traces of the impacts of German colonial fantasies in eastern Europe became an object of research (Daija 2017; Plath 2011), although it is easy to find discursive traces in sources throughout the early modern and modern periods. Still, the question of the German colonial impact on eastern Europe is complex (Ingrao and Szabo 2008), and poses a challenge in the context of postcolonial studies. The complicated legacies of colonialism could also offer one of the explanations to the question of why it was so difficult to find convincing narratives for the local history of serfdom. Although new narratives of freedom and equality were available in Baltic German reflections about history, they did not lead to a real change in society, and, therefore, were overshadowed by Merkel's radical vision of history and a future society.

Coming back to our main theses and questions raised at the beginning of this article, we hope to have shown in brief that history writing must be further analyzed as a special transnational genre of literature with all its intertextual entanglements. Understood in this way, Baltic history writing has much in common. Looking closer into serfdom narratives we can, however, also see national differences in how exactly they were conceptualized.

Notes

1. We look forward to Andre Kruusmaa's PhD thesis at Tallinn University and several upcoming articles of his on this topic.
2. A recent debate concerning the conditions and conceptualizations of serfdom during the Swedish era gives a good overview of different arguments, as well as of relevant historiography (Küng et al. 2013).
3. This is based on the Baltic German scholarship and the interwar period studies from the first trained Estonian historians (Kruus 1930). Due to the focus on the history of economy, class struggle, and the exploitation of the Estonians by the Germans, the history of serfdom became one of the main topics of Soviet Estonian historians (for a synthesis, see Kahk and Tarvel 1992; Kahk 1999).

4. For the Estonian historiography of the period, we have considered Undusk (1997, 2000); Rosenberg (2001); Viires (2001); Raun (2003); Tamm (2008). There is an article-based treatment on the history of Baltic German historiography (Rauch 1986), but Estonian history writing so far lacks book-length treatments, with the exception of the comparative study by Kristi Kukk (2013).
5. Andrew James Blumbergs (2008) has stressed the importance of Baltic Enlightenment for Latvian nation building.
6. Save for a few notable exceptions, such Carl Schirren (Rosenberg 2013; Undusk 2000).
7. As cultural memory studies also tend to focus more and more namely on the significance of transfers between different media (Rigney 2012, 49–77).
8. A good example of this is the study about the emergence of the night of serfdom metaphor in Estonian cultural memory by Eneken Laanes (2009, 199–215).
9. According to the thirteenth-century founding narrative of Christian Livonia as presented in *The Chronicle of Henry of Livonia*, XIV:9 (Henricus Lettus 2003, 102).
10. It features frequently in the writings of such key figures as Lydia Koidula, Carl Robert Jakobson, and Johann Voldemar Jannsen.
11. For example, only one of Lydia Koidula's slavery-themed short stories is based on material related to the Russian Empire: Koidula's *Olesya* (1869) is based on the story *The Kozak Girl* (1857) by the Ukrainian writer Marko Vovchok via its German translation published in 1869 in the Riga-based journal, *Die Libelle: Zeitschrift zur Unterhaltung für alle Stände*.
12. Yet, the importance of Faehlmann's (pseudo)mythological heroes for the national movement is widely acknowledged (Jansen 2004). They were popularized by nationalist poetry and fiction, as well as school text books (especially Jakobson 1867).
13. As Ants Viires (2001, 27–31) has shown, the association of paganism with darkness spread in first Estonian language histories that were authored by Baltic Germans and published in calendars and newspapers; it was still present in the writings of the first and more moderate national activist, Johann Voldemar Jannsen.
14. Held in Tartu in 1868, the speech was published by the author in 1870. We have used the scholarly edition from 1991, which is based on Jakobson's manuscript and thus also includes parts that were censored.
15. Faehlmann had also used the metaphors of awakening and dawn, but he tended to view Estonian culture and language as something that was on the verge of extinction and belonged to the past (Jansen 2004, 271).
16. In the 1880s, the work disappeared under mysterious circumstances, but it is known through heliogravure reproductions.
17. The development of Marianne into a national symbol in post-revolutionary France is well known (Agulhon 1979), but around that time numerous other female figures spread widely (Bhreathnach-Lynch and Cusack 2003). Katrin Kivimaa (2009, 14–68) has demonstrated the importance of female embodiments for Estonian nationalism, also pointing to transfers from the Baltic German representations of Estonian women.
18. The male invariant of this story, telling of a sleeping hero or king asleep in the mountain, was also very influential, and associated with the legend of the medieval emperor Frederick Barbarossa (Flacke 2001, 108–111).
19. For example, the motif is used in Karl Russ' engraving *Hermann Frees Germania* (1813) and in Christian Köhler's painting *Awakening Germania* (1849). Chains can be seen also in Johann Köler's *Waking from Charmed Sleep*.
20. A recent study finely points to Koidula's role in introducing the French Revolution to the Estonian audience (Monticelli, Peiker, and Mits 2018).
21. According to Malle Salupere (2017, 128), the poem shows the influence of Faehlmann's approach to Estonian history, discussed above.
22. The text book was reprinted numerous times. Its selection of Koidula's poetry however did not include *My Fatherland, They had buried*, as censorship forbade its inclusion (Salupere 2017, 318).

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

This article was supported by institutional research funding [IUT (18-8), IUT (28-1)]; and personal research funding [PRG908] from the Estonian Ministry of Education and Research.

Notes on contributors

Linda Kaljundi is a Professor at the Estonian Academy of Arts, and a Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of History, Archaelogy, and Art History at Tallinn University. She holds a PhD from the University of Helsinki. One part of her research is concerned with medieval studies, focusing on the role of culture and writing in medieval processes of conquest, conversion, and colonization. She has also analyzed the entanglements and disentanglements between medieval and early modern concepts of otherness. The second major part of her research concerns cultural memory studies. She has written about Estonian and Baltic historical fiction and historiography, and performative and visual culture. In her current research, she has expanded this perspective and explores the remediation of cultural memory with a particular focus on the interaction of arts, science, and environmentalism in late Soviet Estonia and eastern Europe.

Ulrike Plath is a professor of Baltic German Studies and Environmental History at the Institute of History, Archaeology, and Art History at Tallinn University. She is also a Senior Researcher at the Under and Tuglas Literature Centre of the Estonian Academy of Sciences. She studied in Germany and Estonia and gained her PhD at the University of Mainz. Her main focus is Baltic German transnational and entangled history of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. She has published on many different aspects of cultural and environmental history including plant, food, animal, book history, and stereotypes. Between 2011 and 2018, she led the Estonian Centre for Environmental History.

ORCID

Linda Kaljundi http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7227-417X

References

Agulhon, M. 1979. *Marianne au combat. L'imagerie et la symbolique républicaines de 1789 à 1880*. Paris: Flammarion.

Anderson, B. 2006. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.

Arbusow, L. 1890. *Grundriss der Geschichte Liv-, Est - und Kurlands*. Jelgava: Behre.

Arbusow. L. 1908. *Grundriss der Geschichte Liv-, Est- und Kurlands*. Dritte umgearbeitete Auflage. Riga: Jonck und Poliewsky.

Arvelius, M. H. 1786. "Abhandlung über die Sklaverey, besonders in Rücksicht der Negersklaven, nach dem Französischen des Herrn Raynal." *Für Geist und Herz* 3: 240–269.

Bales, K. 2005. *Understanding Global Slavery*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bergmann, G. V. 1776. *Geschichte von Liefland, nach Bossuetischer Art entworfen*. Leipzig: Schwickert.

Bhreathnach-Lynch, S., and T. Cusack, eds. 2003. *Art, Nation and Gender: Ethnic Landscapes, Myths and Mother-figures*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Blumbergs, A. J. 2008. *The Nationalizations of Latvians and the Issue of Serfdom: The Baltic German Literary Contribution in the 1780s and 1790s*. Amherst: Cambria Press.

Bod, R., J. Maat, and T. Weststeijn, eds. 2012. *The Making of the Humanities*. Vol. 2: *From Early Modern to Modern Disciplines*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Bornhöhe, E. 1880. *Tasuja: Jutustus Eestimaa wanast ajast*. Brandt: Tallinn.

Bosse, H. 1986. "Geschichtsschreibung des baltischen Biedermeier". In *Geschichte der deutschbaltischen Geschichtsschreibung*, edited by. G. v. Rauch, 103–116. Cologne: Böhlau.

Brunner, O., W. Conze, and R. Koselleck, eds. 1972–97. *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*. Vol. 7. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.

Bunge, F. G. V. 1838. *Geschichtliche Entwicklung der Standesverhätnisse in Liv-, Esth- und Kurland bis zum Jahren 1561*. Tartu: Kluge.

Cañizares-Esguerra, J. 2007. "Entangled Histories: Borderland Historiographies in New Clothes?" *American Historical Review* 112 (3): 787–799. doi:10.1086/ahr.112.3.787.

Daija, P. 2017. *Literary History and Popular Enlightenment in Latvian Culture*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

Declaration of Independence: Manifesto to All the Peoples of Estonia. 1918. Accessed 29 February 2020. https://www.president.ee/en/republic-of-estonia/declaration-of-independence/index.html

Donecker, S. 2017. *Origines Livonorum: Frühneuzeitliche Hypothesen zur Herkunft der Esten und Letten*. Cologne: Böhlau.

Eltis, D., Engerman, S. L., Drescher, S., and D. Richardson. 2017. *The Cambridge World History of Slavery*. Vol. 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Espagne, M. 1988. *Transferts: Les relations interculturelles dans l'espace franco-allemand (XVIIIe et XIXe siecle)*. Paris: Éditions recherche sur les civilisations.

Faehlmann, F. R. 1852. "Die Sage von Wannemuine." *Verhandlungen der Gelehrten Estnischen Gesellschaft zu Dorpat* 2 (4): 72–76.

Fircks, G. F. 1804. *Letten in Kurland, oder, Vertheidigung meines Vaterlandes gegen die Angriffe von G. Merkel in dessen Letten: Kurlands Edlen gewidmet*. Hirschfeld: Leipzig.

Fircks, G. F. V. 1803. "Letten in Kurland, oder Vertheidigung meines Vaterlandes gegen die Angriffe von G. Merkel in dessen Letten." *Der Freimüthige* 201: 801.

Flacke, M. 2001. "Deutschland: Die Begründung der Nation aus der Krise." In *Mythen der Nationen: Ein Europäisches Panorama*, edited by M. Flacke, 101–128. Munich: Koehler & Amelan.

Friebe, W. C. 1794. *Handbuch der Geschichte Lief- Ehst- und Kurlands zum Gebrauch für Jedermann*. Vol. 5. Riga: Hartknoch.

Hackmann, J., ed. 2012. *Vereinskultur und Zivilgesellschaft in Nordosteuropa: Regionale Spezifik und europäische Zusammenhänge* [Associational Culture and Civil Society in North Eastern Europe: Regional Features and the European Context]. Vienna: Böhlau.

Hackmann, J., and P. O. Loew, eds. 2018. *Verflechtungen in Politik, Kultur und Wirtschaft im östlichen Europa. Transnationalität als Forschungsproblem*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Henricus Lettus. 2003. *The Chronicle of Henry of Livonia*. Translated by J. A. Brundage. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hurt, J. 1879. *Pildid isamaa sündinud asjust*. Tartu: K. Mattiesen

Ingrao, C., and F. A. J. Szabo, eds. 2008. *The Germans and the East*. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press.

Jakobson, C. R. 1867. *Kooli Lugemise raamat*. Vol. 1. Tartu: Laakmann.

Jakobson, C. R. 1991. *Kolm isamaa kõnet: Kriitiline väljaanne käsikirjast kommentaaride ja järelsõnaga*. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.

Jannau, H. J. V. 1786. *Geschichte der Skaverey und Charakter der Bauern in Lief- und Ehstland. Ein Beytrag zur Verbesserung der Leibeigenschaft. Nebst der genauesten Berechnung eines Liefländischen Haakens*. Riga: Hartknoch.

Jansen, E. 2004. "Muinaseesti panteon: Faehlmanni müütide roll eestlaste rahvusteadvuses." In *Vaateid eesti rahvusluse sünniaegadesse*, edited by Jansen, E, 268–284. Tartu: Ilmamaa.

Johansen, P. 1963. "Nationale Vorurteile und Minderwertigkeitsgefühle als sozialer Faktor im mittelalterlichen Livland." In *Alteuropa und die moderne Gesellschaft*, edited by A. Bergengruen und L. Deike, 88–115. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Johansen, P., and H. von Zur Mühlen. 1973. *Deutsch und Undeutsch im mittelalterlichen und frühneuzeitlichen Reval*. Cologne: Böhlau.

Jürjo, I. 2006. *Aufklärung im Baltikum: Leben und Werk des livländischen Gelehrten August Wilhelm Hupel (1737–1819)*. Cologne: Böhlau.

Kahk, J. 1999. *Bauer und Baron im Baltikum: Versuch einer historisch-phänomenologischen Studie zum Thema "Gutsherrschaft in den Ostseeprovinzen"*. Tallinn: Kivimäe.

Kahk, J., and E. Tarvel, eds. 1992. *Eesti Talurahva ajalugu*. Vol. 1. Tallinn: Olion.

Kala, T. 2012. "Gab es eine 'nationale Frage' im mittelalterlichen Reval?" *Forschungen zur baltischen Geschichte* 7: 11–34.

Kaljundi, L. 2005. "Waiting for the Barbarians: The Imagery, Dynamics and Functions of the Other in the Northern German Missionary Chronicles, 11th – Early 13th Centuries: The *Gestae hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum* of Adam of Bremen, *Chronica Slavorum* of Helmold of Bosau, *Chronica Slavorum* of Arnold of Lübeck, and *Chronicon Livoniae* of Henry of Livonia." MA diss., University of Tartu. http://hdl.handle.net/10062/576

Kaljundi, L., E. Laanes, and I. Pikkanen. 2015. "Introduction: Historical Fiction, Cultural Memory and Nation Building in Finland and Estonia." In *Novels, Histories, Novel Nations: Historical Fiction and Cultural Memory in Finland and Estonia*, edited by L. Kaljundi, E. Laanes, and I. Pikkanen, 26–75. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Kaljundi, L. 2016. "Pagans into Peasants: Ethnic and Social Boundaries in Early Modern Livonia." In *Reforming Texts, Music, and Church Art in the Early Modern North*, edited by T. M. S. Lehtonen and L. Kaljundi, 357–392. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Kaljundi, L., and T.-M. Kreem. 2018. *Ajalugu pildis – pilt ajaloos: Rahvuslik ja rahvusülene minevik Eesti kunstis* [History in Images – Image in History: National and Transnational past in Estonian Art]. Tallinn: KUMU Art Museum.

Kienitz, O. 1846. "Ueber den Charakter einer Geschichte der Ostseeprovinzen." *Das Inland* 8: 177–188.

Kienitz, O. 1847. *Vierundzwanzig Bücher der Geschichte Livlands*. Vol. 1. Dorpat: Laakmann.

Kivimaa, K. 2009. *Rahvuslik ja modernne naiselikkus eesti kunstis 1850–2000*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli kirjastus.

Koidula, L. 1867. *Emajõe Öpik*. Tartu: Laakmann.

Kreem, J. 1998. "Sebastian Münster and 'Livonia Illustrata:' Information, Sources and Editing." In *Festschrift für Vello Helk zum 75. Geburtstag: Beiträge zur Verwaltungs-, Kirchen- und Bildungsgeschichte des Ostseeraumes*, edited by E. Küng and H. Tamman, 149–168. Tartu: Eesti Ajalooarhiiv.

Kruus, H. 1930. *Talurahva käärimine Lõuna-Eestis XIX sajandi 40-ndail aastail: mit einem Referat: Die Bauernbewegung in Südestland in den 40-er Jahren des XIX Jahrhunderts*. Tartu: Eesti Kirjanduse Selts.

Kukk, K. 2013. *Väikerahvuste ajalookäsitluste genees ja narratiivid: Eesti võrdluses teiste Põhjala ja Baltikumi mittedominantsete rahvustega 19. sajandist kuni Teise maailmasõjani*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.

Küng, E., A. Loit, K. Kroon, A. Põldvee, and M. Seppel. 2013. "Eesti- ja Liivimaa talurahva olukorrast Rootsi aja lõpus." *Ajalooline Ajakiri* 3: 375–403.

Laanes, E. 2009. *Lepitamatud Dialoogid: Subjekt ja mälu nõukogudejärgses eesti romaanis*. Tallinn: Underi ja Tuglase Kirjanduskeskus.

Laanes, E. 2015. "Cultural Memory, Travelling Forms and the Boundaries of the Nation: The Free Man in Eduard Bornhöhe's the Avenger." In *Novels, Histories, Novel Nations: Historical Fiction and Cultural Memory in Finland and Estonia*, edited by L. Kaljundi, E. Laanes, and I. Pikkanen, 121–139. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Leersen, J. 2008. *National Thought in Europe*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Lenz, W. 1984. "Alt-Livland." In *Geschichte der deutschbaltischen Geschichtsschreibung*, edited by G. von Rauch, 203–232. Cologne: Böhlau.

Lust, K. 2013. "The Impact of the Baltic Emancipation Reforms on Peasant-Landlord Relations: A Historiographical Survey." *Journal of Baltic Studies* 44 (1): 1–18. doi:10.1080/01629778.2012.744610.

MacGregor, N. 2016. *Germany: Memories of a Nation*. London: Penguin.

Masing, O. W., ed. 1823. *Marahwa Kalender ehk Täht-ramat 1824 aasta peäle*. Pärnu: Masing.

Merkel, G. H. [1796] 1998. *Die Letten vorzüglich in Liefland am Ende des philosophischen Jahrhunderts: Ein Beitrag zur Völker- und Menschenkunde*, edited by T. Taterka. Wedemark-Elze: Hirschheydt.

Merkel, G. H. 1797. *Hume's und Rousseau's Abhandlungen über den Urvertrag nebst einem Versuch über die Leibeigenschaft den Livländischen Erbherren gewidmet. Pt. 1*. Gräff: Leipzig.

Miller, J. C. 2012. *The Problem of Slavery as History: A Global Approach*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Monticelli, D., P. Peiker, and K. Mits. 2018. "Jamaicast Pariisi ning sealt tagasi: Lydia Koidula maailmavaatest ja mugandamisstrateegiatest tema saksa eeskujude valguses." *Keel ja Kirjandus* 12: 915–941.

Osterhammel, J. 2009. *Die Verwandlung der Welt. Eine Geschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts*. München: Beck.

Peiker, P. 2015. "History, Politics and Myth: Lydia Koidula's Novella *Juudit, or the Last Maroons of Jamaica*." In *Novels, Histories, Novel Nations: Historical Fiction and Cultural Memory in Finland and Estonia*, edited by L. Kaljundi, E. Laanes, and I. Pikkanen, 98–120. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Plath, U. 2011. *Esten und Deutsche in den baltischen Provinzen Russlands: Fremdheitskonstruktionen, Lebenswelten, Kolonialphantasien 1750–1850*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Plath, U. 2018. "Politik als Erlösung. Überlegungen zu Karl Gottlob Sonntags Aufklärungstheologie." In *Politische Dimensionen der deutschbaltischen literarischen Kultur*, edited by L. Lukas, M. Schwidtal, and J. Undusk, 123–161. Berlin: LIT-Verlag.

Raik, K. 2004. "Talupojapilt Eesti- ja Liivimaa kohalikus humanistlikus ajalookirjutuses." In *Eesti- ja Liivimaa kroonikakirjutuse kõrgaeg 16. sajandi teisel poolel ja 17. sajandi alul*, edited by Raik, K, 221–244. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli kirjastus.

Rauch, G. V., ed. 1986. *Geschichte der deutschbaltischen Geschichtsschreibung*. Cologne: Böhlau.

Raun, T. U. 2003. "Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-century Estonian Nationalism Revisited." *Nations and Nationalism* 9 (1): 129–147. doi:10.1111/1469-8219.00078.

Richter, A. 1857. *Geschichte der dem russischen Kaiserreich einverleibten deutschen Ostseeprovinzen bis zur Zeit ihrer Vereinigung mit demselben*. Vol. 1: *Die Zeiten der eingermanischen Entwickelung*. Riga: Kymmel.

Richter, A. 1858. *Geschichte der dem russischen Kaiserreich einverleibten deutschen Ostseeprovinzen bis zur Zeit ihrer Vereinigung mit demselben*. Vols. 2: *Geschichte Liv-und Esthlands unter schwedischer Herrschaft 1629–1721*. Riga: Kymmel.

Rigney, A. 2012. *The Afterlives of Walter Scott: Memory on the Move*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rosenberg, T. 2001. "Ajaloo raiumisest raamatusse: Eesti ajaloo suurest narratiivist." In *Raamatu osa Eesti arengus*, edited by T. Tender, 66–81. Tartu: Eesti Raamatu Aasta Peakomitee.

Rosenberg, T. 2005. "Die russische baltische Historiographie in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. und zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts." In *Estland und Russland. Aspekte der Beziehungen beider Länder*, edited by O. Mertelsmann, 77–108. Hamburg: Dr. Kovač.

Rosenberg, T. 2013. "Die Rezeption Carl Schirrens in der estnischen Historiographie." In *Carl Schirren als Gelehrter im Spannungsfeld von Wissenschaft und politischer Publizistik*, edited by M. Garleff, 165–176. Lüneburg: Carl Schirren Gesellschaft.

Rutenberg, O. v. 1860. *Geschichte der Ostseeprovinzen Liv-, Esth- und Kurland von der ältesten Zeit bis zum Untergange ihrer Selbständigkeit*. Vol. 2. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann.

Saagpakk, M. 2016. "Die koloniale Liebe. Zur Darstellung der nicht-standesgemäßen Beziehungen in den Revaler Stücken August von Kotzebues." In *August von Kotzebue im estnisch-deutschen Dialog*, edited by K. Gerlach and K. Pappel, 75–86. Berlin: Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Saal, A. 1891. *Päris ja prii*. Vols. 1: *Eesti rahva pärisorjuse ajalugu 1215–1819*. Rakvere: Erna.

Saal, A. 1893. *Päris ja prii*. Vol. 2: *Eestlaste priiuse ajalugu algusest meie ajani*. Rakvere: Erna.

Salupere, M. 2017. Koidula: Ajastu taustal, kaasteeliste keskel. Tallinn: Tänapäev.

Schirren, C. 1869. *Livländische Antwort an Herrn Juri Samarin*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot.

Schirren, C. 2011. "Vorlesungen über livländische Geschichte: Nachschrift von Johannes Lossius." edited by C. Schirren, and W. Lenz. Online publication. N.p.: Baltische Historische Kommission. http://www.balt-hiko.de/online-publikationen/vorlesungen-von-carl-schirren (no longer available; superseded by print edition from 2013).

Schwartz, J. G. 1861. *Sündinud asjade juttustaminne*. Vol. 2. Tartu: Laakmann.

Selart, A. 2014. "Slavery in the Eastern Baltic in the 12th–15th Centuries." In *Schiavitù e servaggio nell'economia europea, secc. XI–XVII / Serfdom and Slavery in the European Economy, 11th–18th Centuries*, edited by S. Cavaciocchi, 351–364. Florence: Firenze University Press.

Selart, A., ed. 2012. *Eesti keskaeg*. Vol. 2 of *Eesti ajalugu*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli ajaloo ja arheoloogia instituut.

Seppel, M. 2005. "Die Entwicklung der 'livländischen Leibeigenschaft' im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert." *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung* 54 (2): 174–193.

Seppel, M. 2006. "Paternalistliku pärisorjuse idee Baltikumis." *Tuna* 3: 27–41.

Seppel, M. 2010. "Aadel ei või türanniseerida talupoegi nii nagu tahab. Mõisnike omavoli küsimus Liivi- ja Eestimaal." *Ajalooline Ajakiri* 1: 19–35.

Seppel, M. 2011. "Three Definite Conclusions on Indefinable Serfdom." *Chronica: Annual of the Institute of History University of Szeged* 9/10: 213–219.

Seppel, M. 2012. "Vägivalla piirid pärisorjuslikes suhetes Eesti- ja Liivimaal 17. sajandil." *Tuna* 2: 19–31.

Seraphim, A. 1918. *Deutsch-baltische Beziehungenen im Wandel der Jahrhunderte: Drei Vorträge*. Berlin: Würtz.

Seraphim, E. 1904. *Livländische Geschichte von der "Aufsegelung" der Lande bis zur Einverleibung in das russische Reich*. Vol. 3. Tallinn: Kluge.

Tamm, M. 2008. "History as Cultural Memory: Mnemohistory and the Construction of the Estonian Nation." *Journal of Baltic Studies* 39 (4): 499–516. doi:10.1080/01629770802468865.

Torstendahl, R. 2015. *The Rise and Propagation of Historical Professionalism*. New York: Routledge.

Undusk, J. 1997. "Kolm võimalust kirjutada eestlaste ajalugu: Merkel–Jakobson–Hurt." *Keel ja Kirjandus* 11: 721–734. 12: 797–811.

Undusk, J. 2000. "Ajalootõde ja metahistoorilised **ž**estid: Eesti ajaloo mitmest moraalist." *Tuna* 2: 114–130.

Undusk, J. 2011. "Sacred History, Profane History: Uses of the Bible in the Chronicle of Henry of Livonia." In *Crusading and Chronicle Writing on the Medieval Baltic Frontier: A Companion to the Chronicle of Henry of Livonia*, edited by M. Tamm, L. Kaljundi, and C. S. Jensen, 45–75. Farnham: Ashgate.

Viires, A. 2001. "Eestlaste ajalooteadvus 18.–19. sajandil." *Tuna* 3: 20–36.

Vilde, E. 1902. *Mathra sõda*. Tallinn: Vahtrik.

Vlassopoulos, K. 2016. "Does Slavery Have a History?" *Journal of Global Slavery* 1 (1): 5–27. doi:10.1163/2405836X-00101002.

Werner, M., and B. Zimmermann. 2006. "Beyond Comparison: *Histoire Croisée* and the Challenge of Reflexivity." *History and Theory* 45: 30–50. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2303.2006.00347.x.

Wittram, R. 1942. "Die livländische Geschichtsschreibung." In *Rückkehr ins Reich. Vorträge und Aufsätze aus den Jahren 1939/1940*, edited by R. Wittram, 145–172. Posen: Kluge & Ströhm.