

“LES ENTRÉES ROYALES”¹ IN TRANSYLVANIA AND THE BANAT (18th-19th CENTURY). DISCOURSE AND REPRESENTATION

Doru RADOSAV
Faculty of History
“Babeş-Bolyai” University, Cluj

Introduction

The historian Virgil Şotropa published in 1939 the work entitled *Visits, Entertaining and Praise in Former Times*², establishing a recurrent theme in our historiography³ connected to the visits of Emperors from Vienna in Transylvania and the Banat, studied mainly from the perspective of opportunities offered by the narration of royal visits which focussed on Romanian realities in the 18th-19th centuries. Consequently, visits in themselves or visits as events were in a way subsidiary to the historiographic interest, as the information supplied by these visits were recovered and treated mainly through the prism of the interest in recreating the past of the Romanians, to the extent in which these visits showed the claims of the Romanian population when meeting the king.

“Royal entrances”, exceptional events in the life of a Western medieval community (town or castle) turned into themes and motives in the discourse and representation circumscribed mainly to the *power* and secondly, to the *feast*, the *spectacle*. The

¹ “Les entrées royales”, a historiographic term, refers to royal entrances in this study.

² Cf. *Arhiva Someşană*, nr.20, Năsăud, 1936, pp.213-226.

³ Cf. V. Şotropa, *Împăratul Iosif II în Districtul Năsăudului*, in: *Arhiva Someşană*, nr.4, Năsăud, 1926; C. Sassu, *Jurnalul de călătorie al Împăratului Iosif al II-lea*, in: *Arhivele Olteniei*, nr.39-40/1928; I. Negru, *Contribuții la cunoașterea Banatului. Jurnalul de călătorie din 1773 al împăratului Iosif al II-lea*, in: *Revista Institutului Banat-Crișana*, XI, July-August, 1943; C. Feneșan, *Însemnări despre românii bănățeni într-un jurnal de călătorie din 1817*, in: *Banatica*, 12, Reșița. 1993

interpretation of these events was structured around at least three directions or analytical perspectives: history, historical anthropology and cultural anthropology. All of these interpretive directions validate the assertion that “royal entrances” produce a complex semiotic and semantic set in their historical and social manifestations¹. Discussions of “royal entrances” as historical events were generally surpassed by the analyses of the social and cultural phenomena triggered by them and accompanying them, beyond which we can obtain a series of historical, symbolic, political and religious meanings. J. Huizinga underlines the way in which “royal entrances” launch the spectacle and festive manifestations at the meeting point of “word and image”. These “royal entrances” were accompanied by “tableaux-vivant” and “personnages” as theatrical performances or allegorical stagings. These living pictures were created with great scenographic phantasy with the help of adjacent mechanic installations or equipment. In Paris, for example, at the “royal entrance” of Isabella of Bavaria, wife of King Charles VI, “a white stag with gilded horns and a crown round the neck stood on a throne raising a sword while an angel descended ‘par engins bien faits’ from the spires of the Notre Dame Cathedral... and placed a crown on its head, then disappeared.”² Royal entrances appear therefore as predominantly visual events in the collective memory and the impact of pomp enlightens the historiographic or memorialistic narrativism.

The visual theme of “royal entrances” was most often populated by characters and arranged in allegorical pictures which recompose a mythologic and legendary universe. At his entrance in Antwerp in 1520 Charles V was accompanied by nymphs and goddesses, and there were mermaids in the allegorical scenes at the entrance of Louis VI or Philip the Good in Ghent: naked mermaids swam in the river Lys. Royal entrances freed not only imagination but also the constraints of pudency at the end of the Middle Ages:

¹ L. Marin, *De la Représentation*, Gallimard, Seuil, Paris 1994, p.46.

² J. Huizinga, *Amurgul evului mediu*, Univers, București 1970, p.416.

naked nymphs, goddesses and mermaids accompanied them. Other examples of the surpassing of constraints were royal entrances accompanied by mythological figures in hypostases which convey irony, carnival and burlesque. At the entrance of Charles the Bold in Lille in 1848, there was “an obese Venus, a weak Juno and a hunch-backed Minerva with a golden crown on her head.”¹

The mockery and persiflage of these allegorical scenes show the infusion of the popular into the scenography of “royal entrances” and consecrate their extension into popular feasts, a social consumption of representations also modelled by public taste emanated by a “strange antithesis between an intense bashfulness and an amazing licentiousness.”² Therefore Huizinga analyses royal entrances as historical events through the reconstruction of ways of life and thought at the end of the Middle Ages.

Royal entrances may be treated along the same analytic lines but connected more closely to the *cultural anthropological* perspective³. They are moments which lead to feasts and games in the community and specify a certain cultural behaviour in the Western town at the meeting of kings and princes. Royal entrances with their feasty, ludic structure are sequences of the cultural agenda of the community which highlight cultural levels and models from the most popular to the highly elitist. The very moment of royal entrances occurs and reoccurs in a stable, syntagmatic cultural site of a certain community (holidays, feasts, games), but these moments also occur at irregular intervals and reactivate feasts or specific games in the community, moved by the springs of feasty potential or the propensity of the community towards feasts. Royal entrances not only provide for feast and, implicitly, collective feasty behaviour but they themselves are feasts equivalent with the ordinary feasts on the agenda of a

¹ J. Huizinga, *Amurgul evului mediu*, Univers, București 1970, p.492.

² *Ibidem*, p.491.

³ Cf. R. Muchembled, *Culture populaire et cultura des élites dans la France moderne (XV^e-XVIII^e siècle)*, Flammarion, Paris 1991; I. Quéniart, *Culture et Societé Urbaines dans la France de l'Ouest au XVIII^e siècle*, Klincksieck, Paris 1978

particular place. Royal entrances, just like any other feast are a *coming out of reality*, a double emergence in fact, from the quotidian to romance, from the everyday (real) to a symbolic world, being a resuscitation in the discursiveness of everyday life, of the alternation between working days and feast-days in a certain community.¹

Royal or princely entrances are preceded by a modelling of the social space of towns, an *ideal ordering* of this space in a feasty scenography. “Towns are adorned with all the attractions after they were cleaned, swept clean of their dirt, after pigs, tramps and paupers were expelled. Twigs and leaves are spread on the streets, houses and churches are also adorned with them. The town is lit throughout the night to avoid a sudden attack from enemies outside.”² This scenography also offers entertainment: “theatre companies were mobilised to entertain people; they presented ‘histories’ with or without words, games with rhymes and plays.”³

Besides these cultural and feasty offers people themselves often organise entertainments, spectacles which use royal and princely symbols specific to the theme of royal entrance in their arsenal and their anecdotic structure. In other words, *royal symbols are re-semantised* in these feasts. This taking over of the arsenal and of royal and princely symbols happens in the presence of the king, during royal entrances but sometimes in his absence, creating therefore a visible-invisible alternation of the royal person. The symbolic recovery of the king in popular feasts is in line with the definition itself of the symbol which is the “message of the unseen made visible and has a participating value.”⁴

A royal entrance is, first of all, a symbolic manifestation which takes place in a town or castle but reverberates in other places too, as “the symbol encompasses distance and difference”.⁵

¹ I.P. Daviet, *Simbolicul în atelierul istoricului*, in: *Mituri, simboluri în societatea contemporană* (coord. M. Segré), Amarcord, Timișoara 2000, p.224.

² R. Muchembled, *op.cit.*, p.173.

³ *Ibidem* cf. H. Biehn, *Les fêtes en Europe*, Paris 1963.

⁴ I.P. Daviet, *op. cit.*, p.224.

⁵ *Ibidem*

The royal entrance is reproduced and widely spread; it concentrates the mechanisms of paradigmatic feasty events. It produces feast, organises feasty space, it is symbolically distributed into characters which populate the feasty scene. “A feast of the Le Sauch district was organised in Valenciennes in 1520 at the return of Charles V to Brussels. Every district was led by persons wearing the name of ... Roi de la bête a deux dos... Prince, Sovereign, Marquiz, Count, Castellan... These titles imitated in a feasty frame the noble and ordinary titles of Toisson D’Or, particularly.”¹ The distance in space and time of “royal entrances” from feasts in another time and place is cancelled by the symbolic “royal and princely” connotation of these feasts. Consequently, the *real* presence of “royal entrances” is replaced by a *symbolic* one with similar feasty value. On the other hand, the symbolic undertaking of royal entrances in the community feasts is nourished by the physical presence of the king at more or less regular intervals during the “royal entrances” in the given communities. Royal entrances reactivate this symbolic undertaking and reinforce the feasty and ludic potential specific to urban popular culture. Thus the feast called the “Principality of Pleasure” held in Valenciennes between 12-14 May had an oligarchic and patrician character in 1548, imitating the triumphant entrance of Charles V in Valenciennes in 1540. The processions at the reception of foreigners in the town and the attitude of the Prince of Pleasure at the banquet on 13 May prove this. Only notable persons and theatre companies fulfilling certain “criteria of money and respectability”² could participate at the banquet. On the other hand, a Biblical archetype of the “mock king” was reactivated in these feasts: he was personified by Jesus Christ who was a “temporary king” at Palm Sunday, a carnival king, and was transformed into a sui-generis king at his crucifixion, wearing a mantle and a crown of thorns and ironically called INRI. This archetype creates a stratigraphy in the mythical and symbolic perception of the king and feeds on feasts which have as a topic

¹ R. Muchembled, *op. cit.*, p.169.

² *Ibidem*, p.187.

the “masquerade prince” in Roman saturnalia or feasts in Mesopotamia where disguise and mockery preceded the royal sacrifice.¹

The imitation of royal entrances follows a path with various meanings. It is known that the feast is an escape from reality, a *fictionalising of real life*; it cultivates excess, illusion, papier-mâché scenery and disguise. The imitation of the king, prince or count lies in this fictionalising process. Imitation takes place on the level of popular culture, in a parodic and ironic form, and the mockery of the persons imitated is one of the feasty recipies which symbolically construct royal entrances. “People’s participation in feasts in honour of princes or important personages strengthen submission to them allowing people to imitate models and ironise them at the same time.”² Fleeing through feasts into an illusory time and space, enriched with irony and mockery as people’s reflection in the long run on a world, that of royal and aristocratic order, is secondarily encouraged and initiated by the strategy of the ruling power to control the subjects through the mechanisms and functions of relief implicit in feasts. “The dream of happiness of the most humble comes true for a moment allowing them to face the dangers and difficulties of life with a renewed courage and bear submission and subordination more easily.”³

Closely connected to these meanings of the feast there is an interesting and significant process of symbolic negotiation of identity in communities: in the feasty script common people surpass their identity barriers from real, everyday life, through royal or princely disguise. This negotiation of identity transcribes the seduction of royal and princely power, a seductive force exercised over the powerless and perceived in a real, concrete manner in royal entrances and symbolically used during various feasts and carnevals. For example, at the Carneval at the beginning of Lent in Saint Quentin in 1586 there were “entertainment

¹ J.P. Roux, *Regele. Mituri și simboluri*, Meridiane, București 1998, p.267.

² R. Muchembled, *op. cit.*, p.173.

³ R. Muchembled, *op. cit.*, p.173.

companies” led by kings and princes: “Roi de la Jeunesse, Roi de Chapels, Prince du Plaisance, Prince d’Amours”.¹ The person of the king and prince calls forth submission, fear and veneration in people’s realm of imagination but also burlesque, licentiousness and ludicrousness in a feastly disguise which is, however, planned and controlled.

In the 18th century in Montpellier the symbolic repetition of the theme of royal emergence (the birth of the king, the entrance of the king, the coronation of the king) consecrated in the long run the popular games and feasts in which parody and the mockery of royal persons prevailed. The workers and craftsmen were gathered around a Chevalet, a straw horse mounted by the “king” of the people; the whole population of the districts danced around the king.”²

On the other hand, popular feasts in the proximity of the real or symbolic presence of the king periodically nourished the *legitimising discourse* of communities and towns which became “a famous ancient or biblical history” with a political overdetermination. For example, in the feastly procession on the first Sunday of the Lent “in 1511 in Metz the town notability were disguised into David, Hector, Julius Caesar, Charlemagne and Godefroy de Bouillon, who legitimise the power of the town and its oligarchy.”³ The display of such a disguise signifies the symbolic absorption of the king and royalty which indefeasibly determines a legitimising and founding potential counterpointing the tendencies of the royal, princely, real power to subordinate the towns. It is undoubtedly the symbolic expression of the assertion and preservation of a permanently endangered identity.

The feast as a symbolic manifestation of the social space inspired by royal visits is one of the analytic directions of the phenomenon of royal entrances while the *escort*, *procession* and *parade* corresponding to this phenomenon inscribe another set of

¹ *Ibidem*, p.178.

² R. Darnton, *Marele masacru al pisicii*, Polirom, Iași 2000, pp.117-118.

³ R. Chartier, *Lecturi și cititori în Franța Vechiului Regim*, Meridiane, București 1997, p.41.

symbolic meanings or readings. From an anthropological point of view the escort and the parades belong to a specific typology of ritual systems. They are either *syntagmatic*, belonging to a series or a periodical repetition corresponding to the chronologic axis of the calendar (escorts and processions connected to religious feasts) or *paradigmatic*, determined by occasional circumstances but with a process following a pattern of organisation specific to these occasions (processions in case of drought, royal entrances, etc.)¹

From a semantic point of view, the escort has a religious, civic, political and social message. The meanings of the escorts of royal entrances can be *transgressive* or *reinstalling* the order of the power and of its representatives.² The first type of meaning centres round a moment in the script of royal entrances, namely, the handing over of the keys and the opening of gates which expresses the “transgression of limits” between the two conflicting powers, the town and the king. The handing over of the keys is done “in *signum majoris obedientiae et subjectionis*” when there is peace and a pact between the king and the town.³ The second meaning of the escort of royal entrances consecrates and re-consecrates a type of political and social order displayed on two levels composing the script of these events. Every royal entrance reveals a reciprocity of scripts.⁴ On the one hand townspeople are spectators of the royal escort which, on account of its military, noble and religious composure is in fact a discourse of royal power. On the other hand, the king is a spectator of this urban, community escort displaying its social structure and hierarchy. These escorts used to present exponentially their “dignities, qualities, corps and states”

¹ L. Marin, *op. cit.*, p.49 cf. and J. Jacquot (ed.), *Les Fêtes de la Renaissance*, CNRS, Paris 1956.

² *Ibidem*, p.56.

³ L. Marin, *op. cit.*, p.49 cf. and J. Jacquot (ed.), *Les Fêtes de la Renaissance*, CNRS, Paris 1956.

⁴ R. Chartier, *op. cit.*, p.43, cf. *Entrées royales et Fêtes populaires à Lyon du XVIII^e siècle*, Lyon 1970.

through which they expressed themselves, the “consecrated, corporatist order of urban society”¹, in other words.

The structure, arrangement and order of the escort transmits a message about the order that these escorts wished to implant in public understanding and perception and similarly, in the royal perception. The escorts create a discourse about themselves, generating a narrativity² which displays representations of hierarchies and values in the community which have a well-defined purpose of social, political and cultural legitimation, as the escorts transmit socio-cultural behaviours and identities³ through their feasty pre-eminence.

In other cases, the escort incorporates a semantics which symbolically rememorates and reproduces a historical moment or event or celebrates the memory of a crucial historical event. The resurgence of this memory on the level of a “communitas” as a temporary and symbolic aggregation of the participants unmasks in its background a warlike message or a message of agonistic competition.⁴ Rememoration in the processions sustains an inherent, positive tension in a community, its dynamism being resuscitated at regular intervals (during religious processions, military parades, feasts, cavalcades.)

Beyond events such as escorts, processions, feasts and spectacles, royal entrances produced a specific literature with its own narrativity, structures and functions. This type of literature aims at the creation of a discourse of the power and a representation of power⁵ through the fictionalisation of history and the political pedagogy of the “tableau vivant”, with the clear

¹ R. Darnton, *op. cit.* pp.104-107.

² L. Marin, *op. cit.*, p.55 cf. and *Idem, Le portrait du Roi*, Minuit, Paris 1981.

³ Cf. N.Z. Davis, *Les Cultures du peuple. Rituels, servirs et résistances au XV^e siècle*, Aubier-Montaigne, Paris 1979.

⁴ Cf. L. Marin, *op. cit.*, p.60, V.W. Turner, *The Ritual Process*, Aldine, 1969; F. Yates, *The Art of Memory*, Routledge et Kegan Paul, London 1976.

⁵ I. Blanchard, *Les entrées royales, pouvoir et représentation du pouvoir à la fin du Moyen Âge*, in: *Littérature*, nr.50, Larousse, Paris 1983, pp.3-15; cf. also B. Guenée et F. Lehoux, *Les entrées royales francaises de 1328 à 1515*, CNRS, Paris 1968.

purpose of injunction and persuasion of the social corpus and public perception.

Discourse

1. The first royal entrance or “the coming of the Christian Empire”

The above considerations provide us with analytical and methodological points of reference in our study of royal or imperial Hapsburg entrances in the Banat and Transylvania during the 18th and 19th centuries. The entrance of kings from Vienna in the Banat and Transylvania can either be interpreted from the perspective of the classical, medieval matrix of these events or the matrix which focuses on the characteristics of these events in the context of the Romanian world in the 17th-19th centuries and the way in which collective memory preserved these events, the relationship of this world to the new imperial power. We will reveal the type of discourse characteristic to the meeting of the imperial power and the Romanian world, the way in which a ritual, a script or a scenography was received by the Romanian communities, the way in which collective and individual memory perceived these events and the representations which sensitized and “printed” people’s imagination in connection with the “show of the king”.

The entrance of the king in general makes its *début* in the context of the *reconquista* which values and particularises this phenomenon in a post-medieval world. The imperial entrance as the *founding, symbolic entrance* is that which emerges of repetition, the succession of ordinary entrances and is unique, unrepeatable “*ne varietur*” on account of its meanings. It is withdrawn from a referential system and is placed in a symbolic one. *The first imperial entrance* consecrates the *reconquista* of a Christian territory from the Ottoman military and political system and reintegrates this territory to a Christian Empire. However, this first imperial entrance can be subscribed to the set of meanings specific to royal entrances which show the “restoration of order, namely, the Christian order.”

The imperial entrance signifies in this case the “*coming of the Christian kingdom*” which symbolically marks the opening of gates towards the Christian world or the reopening of the communicating vessels between Central and South-Eastern Europe and the Christian West, which were being closed for a long time. It also marks the restructuring of the European Christian space. This generic entrance marks therefore the series of implied and deduced meanings as it is a symbolic moment, “the coming of the Christian empire”, on the one hand, and a referential moment, the victory of the imperials on the Turks, on the other hand. The dean Nicolae Stoica de Hațeg, eyewitness and narrator of events in the 18th-19th century, says: “God blessed the straight weapons of the good Christian Emperor Charles VI and the Banat, Serbia and Wallachia were reconquered from the Turks”¹ and, “In this year, 1716, besides the Banat, Wallachia and Bosnia, Timișoara which sighed under heavy Turkish rule for 164 years, has also awakened to a *new day* in good hope, thanks to the winning weapons of the great house of Eistrah.”²

The imperial victory as the entering in the possession of a territory recovered from non-Christians signifies the renewal of the world, a new beginning under the sign of the Christian gospel. In the context of the victory of reconquista, royal entrances and the coming of Christian kings refer, sometimes explicitly, to the Christian reordering of the world, drawn from the Biblical discourse. In an essential and symbolic way, royal entrances have their origin in the Christian archetype, the entrance of Jesus in Jerusalem³ as a significant moment of the foundation of the Christian world, the victory and glory of a new world. The kings and emperors of the world also have a “sacerdotal function”⁴ which recalls and officiates a *founding moment* in Christian

¹ N. Stoica de Hațeg, *Scrieri*, Facla, Timișoara 1984, p.47.

² Idem, *Cronica Banatului*, Facla, Timișoara, 1981, p.166; cf. also T. Nicoară, *Transilvania la începutul timpurilor moderne 1680-1800*, Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj-Napoca 1997, pp.364-365.

³ I. Blanchard, *op. cit.*, p.11.

⁴ *Ibidem*, p.3.

religion. Every royal or imperial entrance multiplies and reactivates therefore the entrance of Jesus in Jerusalem. The deductive equivalence between an imperial entrance and a victory in the fight against non-Christians is under the symbolic patronage of Jesus Christ, “rex invictus” and “rex immortalis et invisibilis”.

The royal entrance is preceded by the victorious battle against the Turks, the triumph in the name of Jesus Christ. “Let us remember the words of Charles VI addressed to Prince Eugene [Eugene of Savoy] in a battle: ‘My prince, said he, here I give you a general whom you can ask for advice, and do all your deeds in his name!’ Then the king handed him a bright cross; on the small chair, the footholder, there was the inscription ‘Jesus Christ, general, do not forget’. The king also told him: ‘do all your deeds for him who shed his blood on the cross for people. Under his godly advice... defeat his enemies and the enemies of his name!’”¹

18th-19th century royal entrances in the Banat and Transylvania greatly differ from the theme and formalism of medieval entrances. They draw away from a mainly symbolic scenography and medieval mysticism and transmit first of all *political, ethical* and *cultural values*. The king descends from a hieratic hypostasis into a *dialogic frame*. He initiates an ample and complex communication with his subjects during royal entrances and visits, listening to them, discussing, receiving requests, exchanging gifts, giving rewards and coquetting with disguises (his doubles) among the subjects and is entertained in various places. Imperial visits were components of a strategy which aimed at the institution of a social, institutional, political and ethical model in the community of the subjects, in the spirit of reformism.

Beyond the ritualistic initiation of the “political and institutional dialogue”² between the sovereign and the community, a common component of the order of imperial entrances, royal entrances in Transylvania and the Banat are politically overdetermined as they represent a game of the recognition of

¹ N. Stoica de Hațeg, *op. cit.*, p.167.

² L. Marin, *op. cit.*, p.56.

power, a competition between the imperial power and the power of the subjects or, more precisely, the pressure of social masses.

The Hapsburg power wanted to be recognised, imposed and legitimised through its frequent presence among the subjects. This type of consecration of the imperial power has been doubled by actions of ordering and superordering the world that it wanted to control, master and discipline. On the other hand, royal entrances were occasions for the expression of the pressure of the subjects on the imperial power through direct pleadings, complaints, written requests with the purpose of having certain rights recognised. The two powers regulated each other in a framework which was initially ritual and formalised. Consequently, royal entrances in the 18th-19th centuries had become coherent exercises of Vienna's political action and practice.

2. The emperor and his subjects: paternalism, dynasticism, authoritarianism

Different stages or steps in the community's perception of the emperor or in the type of image delivered by the emperor to the community are subjectively and diachronically developing in imperial entrances, such as *paternalism*, *dynasticism*, *authoritarianism*. These stages in perception correspond to the monarchic succession from Joseph II, the "bonus patronus" (good master)¹ to Francis Joseph I. They are constructed on the mirror image of the king and the community. The *paternalism* of the emperor has its origin in the Christian motif of the "good shepherd", transmitted by Jesus Christ as a pastoral message to Peter, his first successor and an earthly creature: "Feed my sheep"². This paternalism is objectivated in collective memory and perception in the variant called "the myth of the good king"³.

¹ M. Bernath, *Habsburgii și începuturile formării națiunii române*, Dacia, Cluj-Napoca 1994, p.257.

² J.P.Roux, *op.cit.*, p.273.

³ Cf. T. Nicoară, *op.cit.*, pp.339-380; M. Popa, *Aspecte și interferențe iluministe*, Editura de Vest, Timișoara 1997, pp.147-183; I. Cârjă, *Avram Iancu și "Bunul împărat"* in: *Buletinul Cercurilor Științifice Studențești*, nr.2, Alba-Iulia 1998.

Dynasticism as the next stage in the perception of the emperor is inscribed as the continuation and validation of paternalism in the circumstances of the first half of the 19th century, the political and national actions of Transylvanian Romanians. These actions aimed at the recognition of their identity and political, ethnic, national and religious status through an exercise of fidelity towards the Hapsburgs viewed as a court of appeal for the solution of Romanian desiderata. Royal entrances become a good opportunity for the display and expression of dynasticism and fidelity towards the reigning house. Thus, on the occasion of the 1852 visit of Francis Joseph I in the Western Carpathians, at the entrance of the imperial procession on Mount Găina, the Archdeacon Simion Balint speaks of dynastic fidelity in his welcoming discourse not only in symbolic, conventional and ideal terms but in a concrete and historical referential frame, mentioning the fidelity towards the Emperor during the Revolution in 1848. This people “will show even greater fidelity when he renews his faith, this priceless treasure-house, which he showed by deeds even in recent times [in 1848-1849]... we offer our hearts to you, Augustissime Cesare, our hearts which will always be devoted to the well-being of Austria.”¹

The assertion of dynasticism is at the same time the result of certain dynamics and metamorphosis within the stages or modalities of perception of the king within which royal entrances are not the only analytic reference points. The passage from paternalism to dynasticism incorporates a process of *de-personalisation* in the perception of the king. Therefore dynastic feelings are not directed towards the nominalised person of the king only, but, beginning with the first decades of the 19th century they are projected upon the monarchic institution represented by the *imperial throne*. Fidelity towards the throne is a modern form of

¹ Al. Șterca Șuluțiu, *Istoria Horii și a poporului românesc din Munții Apuseni ai Ardealului*, ed. N. Edroiu, Viitorul Românesc, București, 1995, p.173.
I. Cârja, Les Roumains de Transylvanie et l'Empire des Habsburgs dans le période 1848-1851. Entre réalité et imaginaire, in: Studii de istoria Transilvaniei, Accent, Cluj-Napoca 2000, pp.231-244.

paternalism. The mystical being of the king is redefined in favour of the monarchic function objectified in the idea and function of the throne. These perceptions of dynasticism appear mainly in the petitions addressed to the emperor. At first sight these seem to be outside the phenomenon of imperial entrance, lacking any direct connection with its discourse. However, they indirectly express a wish to meet the emperor, *force a meeting* with him or refer to a virtual meeting with the emperor and express the tendency towards a political and social *reordering* or *identity-reordering* of the society carried out by royal entrances which did not take place in that particular case. Petitions *substitute* potential meetings during royal entrances always postponed; they want to be a “*sui generis*” means of regulating and reinstating order in the social corpus and its relations with royalty. Communication during royal entrances is replaced by petitions addressed to the emperor. From the perspective of the long duration of royal entrances they are an “*in absentia*” dialogue with a clearly ordering purpose.

These petitions reveal the characteristics of dynasticism at the beginning of the 19th century projected on the king and the throne: both notions are redefined in this period, acquiring new meanings. In an appeal addressed by Moise Nicoară to King Francis I in 1819, the mystical and mythical being of the king is substituted by the person of the king who incorporates three laws: “the Godly law”, “the law of nature” and “wordly laws, civil and political laws”. On account of his “vow and word given” the emperor is obliged to guard those laws, not as a man, but as someone holding a high office. The throne as “the house of God”, “pervaded by divine spirit” in the sense that “the throne of Jerusalem is the throne of God”¹ is transformed into an institution in which power, beyond its divine origin, is wielded through and for the “citizens, the people or the subjects”. The concentration of the three laws, their “union in the person of the King is the throne”.² Therefore dynasticism points towards a monarchy of

¹ J.P. Roux, *op.cit.*, p.22.

² C. Bodea, *Moise Nicoară 1784-1861*, Editura Diecezană, Arad 1943, p.318.

divine law which cohabitates with a monarchy of secular, civil law. In the memorial addressed by Avram Iancu to Emperor Francis Joseph in 1851, in connection with the problem of the woods in the Western Carpathians, he expresses the dynastic fidelity of Romanians; as a “witness to the great sacrifices and devotion of the Romanians dwelling in the mountains” he submits his petition at “the stairs of the throne of Your Majesty”.¹

Authoritarianism as the third stage in the perception of the emperor in the Romanian world has slowly formed during 100 years reaching the form consecrated during the reign of Emperor Francis Joseph. It follows the consolidation of the imperial power in Transylvania and the Banat on a military, political and administrative level. The incipient and fragmentary perception of authoritarianism appears in public opinion after the Josephine periods. The positive perception of the reign of Francis Joseph I in the Romanian world introduces with a silent consent the establishment of authoritarianism. This can be traced in the notes of “the humble” on the margin of old religious books, notes written by clerks, priests and peasants. This shows the socially shared perception of authoritarianism. Beyond the precautious use of certain clichés and syntagms belonging to an iconic style in regard of the titles of emperors, the notes of “the humble” throw light on certain remarks characterising the metamorphosis in the perception of the imperial power. These remarks usually refer to clerics and layman (bishops and emperors) who lead the communities at the given time; they note the names and titles of the great people of a certain epoch. Generally the syntagms “his highness”, “enlightened”, “his very highness” and “most enlightened” are used as imperial titles. At the end of the 18th century there appeared also formulas which had the connotation of the unlimited, authoritarian power of the king, as compared to the usual titles. For example, a note on the margin of a book found in Saravale, a place in the Banat, dating from 1791, says that the book was written in the time of “our most enlightened, *almighty*

¹ F. Dudaş, *Avram Iancu în tradiția românilor*, Second edition, Editura de Vest, Timișoara, 1998, p.178.

Emperor Leopold II”¹. A note from 1817 has the following formulation: “our most enlightened and *governing* Emperor Francis I”². The increase of imperial power and authority conclusively consecrated under the badge of authoritarianism in the time of Francis Joseph can also be seen in a note dating from 1908 which unequivocally proves imperial plenipotence: “under the domination of our most enlightened and *all-powerful* Emperor and King Francis Joseph”.³

The leadership-manner and the way of political decision-making in the state adopted by Francis Joseph also shows the authoritarianism of his reign. He left the smaller tasks to his Ministers and took final decisions on his own. Also, on account of the inefficiency of the Parliament he took several decisions in legislation, intervening and deciding in most state issues.⁴ Authoritarianism, just like dynasticism, is revealed in the petitions addressed to the Emperor which can be estimated as the continuations of a virtual dialogue between the Emperor and the community, substituting, as we have mentioned before, the lack of direct dialogue during royal entrances.

In the 1892 Memorandum addressed to the Emperor by the Transylvanian Romanians asking for political and national rights, the Emperor is perceived in the framework of authoritarianism, partially overbid by the wish of the supplicants to have their demands satisfied. On the other hand, this act of supplication reveals that authoritarianism originates in the imperatives of state interest. Romanians claim that the dualist pact “does not respect the rights given by Your Majesty *in full monarchic power* and in conformity with the real interests of fortifying the monarchy.” They ask the monarch to avail himself of his authority because “as a real representative of the highest interests of the state he has the

¹ I. B. Mureșianu, *Cartea veche bisericească din Banat*, Timișoara 1985, p.246.

² V. Leu, *Cartea veche românească din bisericile eparhiei Caransebeșului*, Banatica, Reșița 1996, p.43.

³ *Ibidem*, p.242.

⁴ C.A. Macartney, *The House of Austria. The Later Phase 1790-1918*, University Press, Edinburgh, 1978, p.204.

constitutional vocation to intervene with the *holy authority and plenitude of his power* every time when the state is threatened from within its inner structure”.¹ The text of the Memorandum interprets the wielding of power within the framework of authoritarianism, especially the direct relationship between the Emperor and the throne. Unlike in the case of dynasticism, the Emperor is hypostatized in comparison with the throne; there is a subjectivization of the imperial power, a lack of poise between the throne and the Emperor, the monarchic institution and the throne being completely in the power of the Emperor.

Power is refigured so that the Emperor comes first, followed by the monarchy and the throne: “our parents, grandparents and great-grandparents... fully confident in the parently care of the Emperor readily shed their blood for the monarchy and the throne”.² The Memorandum raises again the issue of Emperor’s power wielded in and through his subjects, the citizens. This issue also appears in the appeal of Moise Nicoară addressed to the Emperor, which recounts paternalism, dynasticism and authoritarianism marking the perception of the Emperor in collective opinion for more than a century: “Confident of the *parently care* (paternalism)” of Your Majesty, the Romanians hope that their *traditional belief* (dynasticism) that the remedy of all evil comes from the throne will finally come true because their hearts beat for the Monarch and the hearts are the *plenitude of power* (authoritarianism)”.³

3. The official discourse of royal entrances

Imperial entrances and visits as new editions of Medieval “royal entrances” can be reproduced through an analytic process centred on their discourse and representation. There are three levels of analysis within the discourse. There is an *official* discourse which centres upon what is communicated from the

¹ *Memorandul 1892-1894. Ideologie și acțiune politică românească*, Second edition, Progresul Românesc, București 1994, pp.336-337.

² *Ibidem*, p.339.

³ *Ibidem*, p.341.

Emperor towards the community during imperial entrances and visits, more precisely, what the visit of the Emperor wants to “tell” through the elaborate program of the visit or the imperial notes on journeys. Imperial visits and entrances are a display of power oriented towards the community. On the other hand, they connote the way in which the Emperor defines himself during the meeting of his subjects, in a register delimited by the pragmatism of such visits, prescribed by Aulic policy and the pompousness of the ceremonial of royal entrances. A second level of the analysis of discourse reveals the discourse of the community addressed to the Emperor, the characteristics and components of this discourse which is under the badge of the *imaginary*. A third stage of the discourse can be traced in the field of historiographic and memorialistic literature, narrative sources the majority of which has an *ideologising* discourse which converges towards dynasticism and the myth of “the good emperor”.

The first level of discourse regarding imperial entrances, namely, the official discourse can be accessed first from the so-called Aulic literature which nourishes and creates the image of the Emperor. Didactic-moralising writings, odes, encomiastic writings and versifications about the coat of arms, project the image of an Emperor, symbol of unlimited power, justice and righteousness. This literature delimits an effort of writing in the spirit of a political philosophy which promotes submission to and veneration of an Emperor in conformity with the enlightened absolutism of the 18th century. This literature prepares the optimal reception of the monarch during his entrances in the community and his meetings. We must mention writers such as S. Micu, Gh. Şincai, S. Vulcan, P. Maior as well as unimportant rhymers and encomiastics.¹ This official discourse sustains the whole fabric of meanings and representations of the imperial power in the direct perception of the subjects at their meeting the Emperor. It introduces and also accompanies imperial entrances, its rhythm

¹ Cf. T. Nicoară, *op. cit.*, pp.349-374; M. Popa, *op. cit.*, pp.143-183.

and sequences being portioned beforehand by the same Aulic emitter.

The “display” of the imperial power in the community is theoretically grounded and premeditated by works which fix the *pact between Emperor and subjects* in the terms of a codification which regulates the behaviour and attitude of subjects towards the Emperor, signalling the monarchic institution in a symbolic and functional manner at the same time. Thus the work entitled *Datorințele supușilor către monarhul lor (The Obligations of Subjects Towards Their Monarch)*, “a book of typical philosophical inspiration” published at Buda in 1906, says that the monarch is “supporting, protecting and governing”¹ and the power of pardon of these functions of the monarchic institution which ensures, by virtue of a melioristic vision the happiness of the subjects is ensured if “the master is kind, gentle, merciful and Christian”.² On account of the same pact the subjects “owe their masters submission, faithfulness and love”, attitudes reverberated in an implied reciprocity, in the specific obligations of the Emperor towards his subjects: “the masters are merciful to the kind, faithful and deserving subjects, protect and raise them”.³ Starting from these formulations and obligations, the Emperor as a recognised authority gloriously appears in the social perception in the hypostasis of merciful and protecting, characteristics which are overbid in the text of the forementioned book. It is perhaps not accidental that in a note written in 1773 on the occasion of the visit of Joseph II in Transylvania, placed at the end of the chapter *On Mercy* in Ioan Zatoust’s book *Mărgăritare (Pearls, București, 1746)* we can read: “On 21 May 1773, Emperor Joseph passed through Zoltan (a parish in the Sighișoara district), on Tuesday, three days after Pentecost; I am vicar of Zoltan, priest Drăghici”. This note is doubled by another one placed at the end of the chapter *Let us not only hope in faith but have good deeds*: “On 21 May 1773, Emperor Joseph passed through Zoltan and *talked to*

¹ *Datorințele supușilor către monarhul lor*, Buda 1806, p.9.

² *Ibidem*, p.16.

³ *Ibidem*, p.17.

people, to village people; I am writing this, priest Drăghici".¹ The Emperor who talks to village people is a kind, merciful Emperor. We do not know the reason why this informal text of the note was attached to a text renowned for its authority and its famous religious moral, a text belonging to St John Chrysostom.

The official discourse of imperial entrances and visits depends on the way the monarch projects his descent to the subjects. There are differences in this respect between different emperors in different epochs. The imperial journeys and entrances of Joseph II between 1768-1788 are under the badge of political pragmatism, the need to solve various administrative, economic, military cases on the spot whereas the journeys of Francis I in 1817 were somptuous entrances as "he was used to the pomp of daily receptions."² On his journey in 1773 Joseph II is only accompanied by Duke Albert, Laudon and Nostitz and a few generals³ whereas Francis I enters Transylvania in 1817 with a great escort in 21 carriages and coaches, some 70 people such as the Lord Chamberlain and the Empress's ladies-in-waiting, marking a representation of the complex and pompous royal power.⁴

The journey of Joseph II incorporates the data of the so-called Aulic journeys (*Hofreisen*) which had as their aim the solution of certain state problems. His royal entrances were under the badge of attempts at getting acquainted with the situation of imperial provinces. The discourse of this entrance transmits a concrete message. Thus, in a letter written in Cluj on 26 June 1773 to his confidant Lacy, President of the Aulic War Council, the Emperor says: "I travel, see things, inform myself and make notes. This will be useful later on... and I do not mind that it takes me time to instruct myself and learn".⁵ The Emperor presents by these words his own royal entrances, not as a *display* of power but as a

¹ E. Mosora, D. Hanga, Catalogul cărții vechi românești din colecțiile B.C.U. "Lucian Blaga" Cluj 1561-1830, Cluj-Napoca 1991, p.60.

² C. Feneșan, *op. cit.*, p.191.

³ I. Negru, *op. cit.*, p.69 et sq.

⁴ C. Feneșan, *op. cit.*, p.195.

⁵ M. Bernath, *op. cit.*, p.226.

search for it in the space and communities of the Empire, a discovery of this power disseminated in the realities of the Empire. His royal entrances are atypical, therefore they are *continuously postponed* royal entrances.

In the case of Joseph II, royal entrances as discourses and representations of power are substituted by preliminary expeditions, preparatory, *paideic* experiences in view of a future royal entrance. By teaching himself Joseph II indirectly creates the hypostasis of the emperor who in his atypical entrances, gradually extending formalism and spectacle, consecrates the exceptional, legendary emperor. The emperor is not merely the main actor of the entrances, but he is also their “director”, imposing and transmitting a certain type of royal entrance. He presents himself as a legendary character encompassing the long duration of the mysticism of Medieval royalty as well as the modernity and efficiency of “state pedagogy”, reformism and enlightenment.

Royal entrances were under the badge of a symbolic, virtual and codified dialogue between the royal escort and the escort of the subjects whereas royal entrances in the time of Joseph II were an extended and real dialogue with the subjects. The legendary emperor is a product of this dialogic discourse; he defines himself and appears in this social dialogue as a “*praesentialiter*” emperor. The official discourse of royal entrances proves this by several examples. For example, the autobiographical notes of Heidendorff, a notary in Mediaș who accompanied the Emperor on his journey in 1773, mentions that “the Emperor stops whenever his subjects” address him, he “listens to people” and has “his own way of talking to his subjects”.¹ He has an unusual way of addressing his subjects which differs from the paradigmatic scene of royal entrances. It is determined by his demophile attitude (underlined and taken over, as we could see, by memoir writing and the aulic literature) and by the characteristics of communication between emperor, king and subjects. This communication is often blocked by linguistic

¹ *Izvoarele răscoalei lui Horea. Seria B. Izvoare narative*, vol.I, 1773-1785, Ed. Academiei, București 1983, pp.22-23.

barriers and the lack of standards or conventions which could ensure the coherence of a discourse produced by the people, the subjects of the emperor. Language is one of the sociological elements of defining the people “incapable of discoursing... of expressing a political opinion or judgement, or making a supplication; thus, the masses are depossessed of language, subjected to those who can speak in their name as *port-parol*”.¹

Henry IV, King of France, when meeting a man from the lower order told him that he does not want to hear his speech as he would “spoil all what he wants to say” because an ordinary man can only speak bluntly (*crûment*). People were therefore in a state of “linguistic infirmity”.² This lack or deficiency in the reciprocity of communication during royal entrances (where reciprocity presupposes an exchange of words between the emperor and his subjects), is substituted in the royal entrances of Joseph II by the dialogues conducted “in his own way”. He provokes his dialogue with his subjects by descending to the level of communication of the people.

In 1773, during his visit to Almăj in the Banat, Emperor Joseph II “arrived with his escort; the administrator, the princes and the people bowed” and he started a dialogue with the peasants, inviting them to join the borderline regiments. The way of addressing the peasants is underlined in the dialogue included in the narrative of the chronicle: “He asked them with pity” and “the Emperor *said with great pity*”.³ The peasants’ words were “*crûment*” formulated; they refused to enrol in the borderline regiments. There was no speech, no exchange of speeches, just a spontaneous, informal dialogue. The peasants took part in an ad-hoc dialogue; they did not enter the hypostasis of the orator. It is much later that the political power makes them part of the “series of speakers”, for populist reasons, during political and electoral

¹ P. Ronzeaud, *Peuple et représentations sous le Régime de Louis XIV*, Université de Provence, 1988, p.385.

² P. Ronzeaud, *Peuple et représentations sous le Régime de Louis XIV*, Université de Provence, 1988, p.389-391.

³ N. Stoica de Hațeg, *Cronica Banatului...*, pp. 200-201.

ceremonies or liturgies. The dialogue prompted by the emperor breaks a massive, anonymous silence characteristic to the peasant world.

Modesty and the demophile attitude of the Emperor, specific elements of royal entrances, can be analysed as the component of a discourse focussed on the community. These attitudes construct the intended, premeditated “self-presentation” of the Emperor. The type of emperor that Joseph II wanted to induce in the collective perception during his royal entrances and visits is an emperor who prepares himself for a constantly postponed entrance which will be, if not a real, than certainly a symbolic one. His visits and entrances between 1768-1788 are elements or sequences of the transitivity of a symbolic king which “is going to come”. They revert to a Medieval paradigm of the discourse about royal entrances, namely, the “metonymic fragmentation of the royal object”. Thus, the king is not seen immediately. He is first perceived through the components of the royal escort which is “the echo of his glory”. There is a “vaporisation of the subject in the space of visibility”. The king appears at the signal given by the mass of subjects whose cries (“vive le roi”) express their impatience to see the king and submit themselves to him. This “delayed entrance” practised during several previous visits remains the strongest spring of the symbolic and legendary transformation of the Emperor. The royal entrances of the Emperor in Transylvania and the Banat are characterised by the lack of pomp and glory which prepares the final entrance, the *glorious, eschatological, symbolic* one. All this can be supported by a text from Heidendorff’s biography making reference to royal entrances in 1773: “Between these two straight lines of onlookers, in the most beautiful weather the Emperor stood in the carriage as in a *carriage of triumph*, wearing a black hat without a rim and without feathers and a green waistcoat with small red distinctions... he all-gratiously greeted the people in both lines, *as the majestic icon* of the arrival of the *great Judge*”.¹ This entrance bears the archetypal marks of a royal entrance: “most beautiful

¹ T. Nicoară, *op. cit.*, pp.382-383.

weather” (the motif of spring is characteristic to entrances)¹, the “carriage of triumph”, “the great Judge” (the motif of Parousia). This royal entrance is an apparent one, an “as if” entrance, expressed and transmitted to the public by an aulic discourse written by Heidendorff to his contemporaries.

The royal entrances of Francis I in 1817 consecrate a discourse different from those in the 18th century. As we have shown above, they display the pompousness and grandiloquence of a monarchy in the flower of its power after the victory in the anti-Napoleonic wars. The imperial visits and ideas in this case took place in a triumphant milieu, haloed by these victories the consequence of which reverberated in the “process of formation of a pro-Hapsburg solidarity, a dynastic patriotism of the Romanians in Transylvania”.² The dynastic prestige is therefore multiplied, reproduced and consolidated for a long period. The visit of Francis I opens the series of royal entrances in the 19th century, articulates and particularises the discourse of long duration characteristic to this type of political and social events in the context of modernity. Royal entrances in this century adjudge to themselves a capital of monarchic prestige remanent in an epoch of “democratic levelling”. They still galvanize and fascinate the multitudes, and structure collective psychology. From the perspective of long duration royal entrances also remain a reification of the epiphanic prestige of the monarch in the perception of the masses. There is the example of the “presentation” of Emperor Wilhelm of Germany at the funeral of the King of England. He had “much impressed the masses. He walked majestically among the sovereigns and everybody observed him. Wilhelm has the feeling of being the *knight of God on Earth* (my italics)... This conviction conferred to Him an uncommon majesty which perplexed the masses.”³ Therefore the mechanisms of a collective psychology

¹ P. Zumthor, *Essai de poésie médiévale*, Seuil, Paris 1972, p.298 et sq.

² S. Mitu, Propagandă oficială și mentalitate țărănească în Transilvania în epoca războaielor napoleoniene, in: *Viață privată, mentalități colective și imaginar social*, Oradea-Cluj 1995-1996, p.248.

³ G. Le Bon, *Opiniile și credințele*, Ed. Științifică, București 1995, p.136.

are reactivated, a psychology inherent to the same long duration, as the masses' "need for adoration soon make them slaves of the individuals who fascinate them with their prestige. They adored their dominators with frenzy."¹

The visit of Francis I is a pleasure visit characterised by hedonic sensations inscribed by the discourse of royal entrances. These were taken over from the epoch of the "crisis of European conscience" centred on the "pleasure of travelling, the wonders and curiosities of travelling which triumphs".²

The travel and the royal entrances of Francis I in Transylvania and the Banat also point towards other meanings connected to certain themes and motives inscribed in the same long duration. From this point of view, a possible analysis of the discourse of his travels and royal entrances can be focussed on two sequences from his itinerary in 1817, namely, the episode in Bistrița and the episode in the Banat. In the first case the royal entrance had a specifically Medieval nature. It took place in a preeminently Saxon town, an urban space with strong Medieval characteristics. This royal entrance replaces a discourse and a representation specific to Western Medieval towns visited by the king or prince. The second episode of royal travelling to the Banat places the royal entrance in the context of the historical reality of a recovered, reconquered territory, a part of Europe re-dimensioned in the 18th century. This journey comprises meanings at the temporal extremities of a history starting from the classical Middle Ages and running up to the 18th-19th century.

In the Banat the Emperor visited Orșova veche, a place bordering on the Turkish territory. Here he received the Dervish Mustafa from Ada Kaleh. The encounter with the representative of a world which was in conflict with the Hapsburg Empire is presented in the travel-journal of Francis I. This can be considered an element of the discourse delivered by the Emperor through which he related to the people he met during his visits and royal entrances. He also defined himself in this text. "He is a pasha with

¹ *Ibidem*

² P. Hazard, *Criza conștiinței europene*, Univers, București 1973, pp.7-8.

two tufts from Filipopol, son of the pasha in Belgrad, who had been assassinated. The house where I received him had two entrances. The room where we met was divided in the middle by a table. I talked to him with the help of a translator, keeping my hat on my head. Afterwards one of the pasha's people placed shawls on the table for my wife. After my leave sweets and coffee were served in my name to the pasha. Then he also left."¹ These words express in fact a discourse about power: the Emperor remarks the low rank of his interlocutor, the pasha "with two tufts". He did not honour the pasha to a great extent; during their meeting he "kept his hat on his head" and closed the meeting unilaterally, after which sweets and coffee were served to the pasha. This was an expeditious protocol meeting which transmitted the plenitude and ascendance of the royal house at the meeting with the representative of a power in ineluctable regress.

A myth is consecrated in connection with this discourse on power in a precise moment of the imperial visit, namely, the myth of "Voyage en Turquie" which remained "a trump never played out"² and one of the ideals of knightly pledge in connection with the crusades. The meeting of Emperor Francis I with the Pasha from Ada Kaleh means the completion of a journey that has been planned for centuries, the symbol of a power that used to be the target of the crusades. The encounter between the two powers during the visit of Francis I marks on a symbolic level the dismissal of the "voyage to Turkey", a knightly obsession, commitment and duty.

On the other temporal extremity the journal of Francis I can be considered characteristic to a state of mind specific to 18th-19th century Europe, originating in the need and fervour of the journey. As we have seen in the case of Joseph II, travelling was "a school for Europeans" who "travelled to become more competent in their field" and travelling itself was "an

¹ C. Feneşan, *op. cit.*, p.192.

² I. Huizinga, *op. cit.*, p.148.

apprenticeship, a work, the completion of education”¹ and could be named in generic terms after the title of a book published in 1775, “The Voyage of Reason through Europe”.² This major theme of travelling coexists with the pleasure and curiosity aroused by journeys. Francis I extracts the pleasure and curiosity from his journey; the text of his journal abounds in descriptions of the exotic and the picturesque.

In the context of the same episode (the meeting with Pasha Dervish Mustafa) the Emperor as the actor in the ceremony of royal entrances describes the “mirror” image of the escort of the pasha during their meeting. The escort and ceremony of the “other” arouses curiosity which leads to the picturesqueness and visualisation of the description given by the Emperor. There are several hedonistic notes in the text as there is the pleasure of glance. Francis I cultivates the pompousness of royal entrances and visits, therefore he also includes in his journal the description of costumes, colours and the persons who belong to and signify the escort of the pasha: “Here in Orșova I received the pasha in a house situated on the Danube. There was a row of soldiers between the house and the Danube where the ship of the pasha floated, a big boat with a tent where he was sitting. The oarsmen of the pasha were Albanians wearing long blue trousers, shoes, dark blue sleeveless jackets and red turbans. The helmsman, a Turk, wore a purple fur-coat. The pasha was accompanied by two kitchen gardeners, each of them holding a stick and there were those who held the standards with horsetails, then other ten persons, nine of them wearing turbans and beautiful long red fur caftans, others wore green cloth caftans.”³

The discourse of Emperor Francis I delivered in the context of royal entrances is a *discourse on the discourse of “l’entrée royale”*. The Emperor represents himself in the unfurling

¹ P. Hazard, *Gândirea europeană a sec. XVIII-lea*, Univers, București 1981, p.424.

² *Ibidem*, p.421.

³ C. Feneșan, *op. cit.*, p.192.

of royal entrances as well as in the description of these events. Joseph II is outside the discourse of royal entrances and prepares himself for the “great royal entrance” while Francis I is in the interior of these royal entrances and presents himself as their main actor. He enjoys hedonically and to the full the honours of royal entrances and is in a perfect harmony with the discourse and representations of these entrances.

The chronicler Nicolae Stoica de Hațeg records the walks, receptions, entertaining, and the gifts given during the visit of a few days of the Emperor in the Southern part of Banat: “On 30 September he passed through Jupalnic, *visited* (my italics) Mount Alion, had dinner... On 1 October His Highness had an *excursion* (my italics)... where all those present walked for an hour along the Danube. They went to see fishing; a *huge sturgeon* (my italics) was caught with the help of the Emperor and the Empress... passing through Orșova veche the Turks sent green melons on a cart, some of them bigger than a barrell of half a pail... such that we had *never seen before*... On 2 October their Highness visited all the great buildings at Herculane and they *had a good appetite for brandy and food* (my italics)”.¹

Royal entrances bring about a re-dimensioning of the world through the “state of happiness” created and a re-dimensioning of objects and other things given to the Emperor. Thus the gifts received by the Emperor are unusual in their form and dimension. The perception of royal entrances is marked by a milieu where *reality flows into fiction*. There is a process of “maximisation”² of reality and of inducing fictional elements within the discourse of royal entrances. Therefore the emperor receives an unusually big sturgeon and unusually big melons.

The visits of Francis I also bring another novelty to the order of royal entrances in Transylvania and the Banat, namely, the presence of the Empress in the retinue of the Emperor. The royal entrance of the emperor and the empress was often separate in the Middle Ages. Louis XIII of France and Anne of Austria entered

¹ N. Stoica de Hațeg, *Scrieri, Facla*, Timișoara 1984, pp.53-54.

² J. Blanchard, *op. cit.*, pp.4-5.

Paris separately. There were two different ceremonies: the Queen entered two days later but was celebrated in the same ceremonial way as the King. In 1549, Catherine de Médicis entered Paris after a few days after the entrance of the King, but was celebrated with the same scenes and honours as the King. The entrance of the Queen took place either simultaneously with or after the entrance of the King. In the second case, the discourse of the town at the royal entrance paid the same homage to the King and the Queen, focussing on the “symbiotic entity of the two royal persons”. At the entrance of Louis XIV and Queen Marie Therese in Paris in 1661 it is mentioned that “Notre ville... n’apporte à nos pieds votre majeste Madame hommages qu’elle rend a son Roy”.¹ The recurrent themes of the royal entrance of the Queen in 17th century France were those specific to the symbolic “appearance” of the Queen: “marriage, peace and fecundity”.² In the 16th century the Queen was perceived as “wife, mother and pacifier”. Starting from these symbolic notes which represent a “maternal” instinct, she became a mediator between the people and the King. She had the role of “receiving and transmitting the requests that the representatives of the town addressed to the King”.³ “Political evolution” and the “new state attributes” changed this role in the 17th century. The Queen had been considered a “royal person” rather than a maternal one. On the other hand, the presence of the Queen besides the King during royal entrances was part of the royal receipt for etiquette or “decorum”. It was underlined that the royal couple belonged to a divine monarchy, and, secondly, the image of the King was *superhumanised* in the collective perception when he was accompanied by the Queen.⁴

Let us return now to the royal entrances of Francis I. The projection of the “two royal persons” can be pointed out in the

¹ F. Cosandey, “*Le blancheur de nos lys*”. *La reine de France au coeur de l’Etat royal*, in: *Revue d’Histoire moderne et contemporaine*, tom 44-3/juillet-septembre 1997, p.402.

² *Ibidem*, p.393.

³ *Ibidem*, p.403.

⁴ *Ibidem*, p.402.

discourse of the community during the royal entrance to Năsăud in 1817. The entrance of the royal couple is marked and accompanied by certain formulas or lines addressed to them: “May you live happy and reign with Queen Sarolta - we have long wished to see her”; “Francis we call him, sitting on his high throne, with Sarolta the Queen, his most beautiful wife”; “Long live Francis, with Queen Sarolta, your *wife chosen from a million women* (my italics)”.¹ Consequently, the Queen is assimilated to the King in the script of the ceremony. She embodies the monarchy just like the King. On the other hand, these words, formulas and lines addressed to the royal couple resemble folk tales with kings and queens. They are similar to *folk tale endings*, articulated by the “happening” of marriage. The end of the tale solves the conflicts through the hypostasis of happy marriage. This is an admirable example of an act of transgression, the shift from history to romance.

The royal entrances and visits of Francis I in 1852 are inscribed in a discourse which partially incorporates elements of the visit in 1817 but also formalises a message with a different purpose. These visits intensified the state interest and dynastic interest that accompanied royal entrances. First, the Emperor wanted to reactivate the dynastic pact with his subjects that was checked and validated during the Revolution in 1848: “In 1852, the Emperor thought that he should visit these places in order to be seen by his Romanian subjects and establish closer links with them.”² The visit of the Emperor in the Apuseni Mountains was part of the royal entrances specific to the “transgression” of limits between the Emperor and his subjects, facilitated by the precedents of dynastic fidelity as shown by the answer of the Emperor to the welcoming discourse of the community, namely, that he is convinced of the loyalty of the Romanian nation.”

The royal entrance and visit also had as its aim the solution of the problems of this nation, the consacration of certain

¹ V. Șotropa, p.223.

² N. Iorga, *Istoria românilor din Ardeal și Ungaria*, Ed. Științifică și Enciclopedică, București 1989, p.450.

“privileges and immunities”. Therefore the royal entrance was also a way of ordering and reordering the social space. This had been done by the presence and visibility of the Emperor (“in order to be seen by his subjects”). The appearance of the Emperor took place by virtue of the notion of “monstratio” or “monstrator”. Physical visibility is presupposed, but also the virtual visibility of “showing the way” of “indicating”. The Emperor transforms into a “monstrator” who shows people the “way of life” according to the Christian model. This explains the ordering action of royal entrances. The paradigmatic, ordering gestures of the Emperor can also be seen in concrete, exemplary actions: “he gave 60,000 florins to the Romanian churches that were looted and burnt by the rebels.”¹

4. The imaginary discourse

The imaginary discourse transmitted by the community to the Emperor, a discourse brought about and installed by royal entrances, centres around several topics which roughly display the qualities and personal attributes of the monarch, transmitted in a legendary manner. They refer to the epiphanic hypostasis of the Emperor who is generous, redeeming and administers justice. Elements of the imaginary discourse can also be found in the speeches made at the reception of the Emperor and in the ad-hoc verses written during royal entrances. However, this imaginary discourse also transmits the influences of an official discourse which creates a positive image of the Emperor in popular imagination. This is then taken over and transfigured by legendary anecdotes.

We will deal with some of these hypostases of the monarch displayed during royal entrances.

The *epiphanic hypostasis* of the Emperor is induced by the so-called “ambiguity of the sacred”, the tension between the visible and the invisible incorporated in the person of the king or emperor, the alternation between “roi vue – roi caché”, the

¹ Al. Șterca Șuluțiu, *op.cit.*, pp.155-156.

interdiction to see the king and his obligation to show himself. This hypostasis is built on famous Biblical and antique models. The sacerdotal function of the king by virtue of which he has the right to officiate in public has its origin in these models.¹ On account of the sacerdotal dimension and his sacred origin the Emperor transmits or mediates in the second place the showing of the divinity. The Emperor is an agent and a substitute in the maieutics of the divinity. The king was considered “*typus Christi*” (the image of Christ) in medieval Christology, called “*rex imago Christi*” or “*rex vicarius Christi*”.² The appearances of the king or emperor among the people acted as catalysts on the imaginary discourse: “the tales benefited from these appearances”.³

Starting from the idea that the field of the imaginary confirms a bunch of representations which go beyond the deductive constraints authorised by everyday experience, we can say that royal entrances, together with the feasts and the pompousness of weddings and funerals belong to this field, especially as the field of the imaginary is a “description of all that we cannot see.”⁴

The transcription of the epiphanic hypostasis in the popular discourse born during royal entrances creates a whole repertoire of perceptions and descriptive clichés. First of all there is a series of notes expressing the terse confession of the epiphanic perception of the emperor which summarises, on the one hand, the shock of perception and reactivates the physical perception of the divinity in the characteristics of the Biblical text. A record dating from 1773 says: “Everybody must know that Emperor Joseph came on the 27th of May and *I saw him with my own eyes* (my italics), Priest Ion Toader from the Șchei Church, in 1773”⁵ and a note ten years later says: “It must be known that the great and

¹ J.P. Roux, *op. cit.*, p.74; cf. also J. Blanchard, *op. cit.*, p.3.

² E.H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1997, pp.88-89.

³ I.P. Roux, *op. cit.*, p.75.

⁴ E.H. Patlagean, *L'histoire de l'imaginaire* în “La Nouvelle Histoire”, Complexe, Paris 1988, pp.304-315.

⁵ I. Corfus, *Însemnări de demult*, Junimea, Iași 1975, p.12.

powerful Emperor Joseph, German Emperor passed through Bucovina and Câmpulung Moldovenesc. *He did not pass secretly but everybody could see him. And all the people saw him with their own eyes and my unworthy person was also able to see him* (my italics) in the year 1783.”¹

There are also a series of more elaborate descriptions, making use of descriptive clichés which transmit the topics of the discourse of reception at royal entrances. Thus, in the supplication addressed to Emperor Joseph II by Maxim, son of the priest Gălan in Năsăud, in 1773, we can find the following introductory words: “Our venerated and all-high King, we thank God that *we can see the enlightened face of Your Highness* (my italics) and we praise the merciful God that he let Your Highness come to these places where we, poor, ignorant, unlearned people live.”² From a rhetorical point of view, this is a clearer perception of the showing of the Emperor, antinomically set against a background which expresses the humbleness and uncertainty of the multitude of subjects. This background outlines by contrast the revelation of imperial presence.

In other cases the presentation of the epiphanic perception of the Emperor within the imaginary discourse has a dialogic structure. The Chronicle of Nicolae Stoica de Hațeg speaks about the entrance of Joseph II in Orșova in 1787 in the following way: “...I went towards the Emperor who said, ‘what do women think, was it better with the Turks or is it better now?’ They answered that it is better with a Christian Emperor than with pagans. I told the women, ‘*His Highness, our Emperor Joseph is in front of you, see him!*’ (my italics) Let us pray to God to give him long life and health!”³ This text has certain symbolic meanings originating in the Biblical text. On the one hand, the royal entrance consecrates the founding of the Christian Empire on a territory held by pagans before, on the other hand, the appearance of the Emperor is

¹ G. Ștrempel, *Catalogul manuscriselor românești*, vol.II, Ed. Științifică și Enciclopedică, București 1983, p.11.

² V. Șotropa, *Împăratul Iosif II în Districtul Năsăudului*, in: *Arhiva Someșană*, nr.4, 1926, p.6.

³ N. Stoica de Hațeg, *Cronica Banatului...*, p.234.

transmitted in the tone of the Biblical text which resuscitates the leitmotiv “ecce homo!”

Sometimes the epiphanic sequence of royal entrances is fixed on the level of collective memory, reproduced in the succession of generations. Founding gestures in the history of the community are connected to this epiphanic sequence and the person of the Emperor. Thus, the village Poiana in Bistrița had been renamed with the occasion of the visit of Emperor Joseph II, receiving the name Sântiosif (Saint Joseph): “Our village *had the pleasure of seeing Emperor Joseph II in person in 1773* (my italics), when he came from Moldova, across the mountains and spent a day and a night in our village. *Old people say* (my italics) that the Emperor asked to be taken to a shelter where nobody commanded him (where there were no children in the house). Thus he was taken to Titiana... When the Emperor left the village he asked Titiana what would she like in return for the lodging. He told her that she could have as much land as she wanted. She answered that she had enough land... and asked him not to move her house from its old place which the Emperor promised.”¹ This text reveals the conjunction of two hypostases of the Emperor, the epiphanic and the generous, as the topics or structure of the discourse of royal entrances creates a referential, historicising and an imaginary level. This ambiguity in the discourse connected to royal entrances counterpoints the historical moment with the epiphanic one introduced by the syntagm “old people say” which is the legendary sequence included by the collective imaginary. The eponymic gesture, the legendary anecdote and the epiphanic clichés increase the mysticism of royal entrances.

Another type of epiphanic sequence can be found in the narrations which have as their subject the imperial disguise. The epiphanic moment is launched by the discovery or revelation of the “hidden”, disguised Emperor who develops a corresponding anecdotics. Thus, Emperor Joseph II arrived to the house of the Archpriest in Poiana accompanied by a single servant: “Both of them were strangers, simply clad and without an escort, thus the

¹ V. Șotropa, *op. cit.*, pp.4-5.

Archpriest did not know who they were. But it was warm in the house and the ruler had to unbutton his coat; *the Archpriest glanced on his chest the Order of the Hapsburg Class* (my italics) and began to speak in a reverent manner, in Latin language which he knew better.”¹ These epiphanic perceptions are the consequences of certain incidents which provide material for the anecdotes of the imaginary discourse. “It is told that there was a funny incident when Joseph passed on the road leading to Mount Cucureasa. He went towards the valley alone and entered the manor of the officers. When the kitchenmaid who was in the middle of cooking for the honourable guest saw the stranger who began to talk to her, she told him to help her turn the roast on the spit instead. The stranger did so, and his escort found him *near the kitchenmaid who became benumbed of fear* (my italics).”²

The discovery of the Emperor, his appearance magnetises other happy witnesses through the power of epiphanic irradiation: “On that occasion the few inhabitants who had their houses here on the field, *could also see the kind and popular Emperor* (my italics), about whom they had heard much; they could show their submission and homage. *They ran to the house* (my italics) where he had had dinner.”³ The arrival of the King and especially his showing himself “acts upon the subjects as a magnet on metal fillings”⁴, producing an irresistible convergence towards the monarch. On the other hand, we may say that the epiphanic moment presented above coincides with the moment when the Emperor began to eat, when he took part at the meal prepared for him. The inhabitants rushed to meet the Emperor, to see his physical presence “at the house where he had had dinner.” Both moments connect the *epiphanic* process to a *eucharistic* one which centres the mystic body of the royalty as the mystic body of the church.

¹ *Ibidem*, pp.5-6; cf. also P. Grapini, *Monografia comunei Rodna-nouă, Bistrița* 1903, pp.76-77.

² P. Grapini, *op. cit.*, p.77.

³ *Ibidem*

⁴ J. Blanchard, *op. cit.*, p.7.

The epiphanic moments determined by royal entrances also reverberate in the zone of the non-Christian alterity, a place where the Christian world neighbours the pagan one. Therefore in 1773, during the entrance of Emperor Joseph II in Orșova the Turk Omir Aga told the Emperor that he *thanks God for seeing a great king* (my italics).¹

The appearance of the Emperor as physical as well as symbolic presence among the subjects also determines a reflex in the surrounding nature, a *syntonía* of man with nature. A symbolic and a historical time in which the Emperor shows himself is connected to the astronomic time: “In 1817, his Highness the Emperor Francis visited his land and *brought a rich and blessed autumn* (my italics).”² The visit of Emperor Francis Joseph I in Transylvania in July 1852 was under the auspices of this favourable nature: “in a completely exemplary manner the journey of His Majesty was favoured by good weather and there was no scorching sun”³. The discourse of royal entrances reactivates and adjudicates itself the “springly motive of meetings”⁴ characteristic to medieval lyrics. In the case of royal entrances historical time is in a total, *exemplary harmony*, “*una tota simul*” with the weather and natural time.

Royal entrances reorder the social space through ritual and the semantics of escorts, resuscitating rules and hierarchies and, consequently, the king is ordering, reparatory, he is judge and redeemer. This is why in pre-Christian and Christian collective representations kings were offered the archetypal functions of cosmic axis, as “the sovereign has the role of regulating nature and the cosmos”. “When it is exercised with measure and in order, the royal power reflects the harmony and synthesis that the Creator conceived in the Universe”.⁵ This time and this weather, concentrated in an epiphanic manner, are defined in an extra-secular sublimity exceeding every measure, over every past and

¹ N. Stoica de Hațeg, *op. cit.*, p.202.

² Idem, *Scrieri: Cronica Mehadiei*, Facla, Timișoara 1984, p.73.

³ *Gazeta Transilvaniei*, nr.55, 11 July, Brașov 1852, p.211.

⁴ P. Zumthor, *Încercări de poetică medievală*, Univers, București 1983, p.373.

⁵ J.P. Roux, *op. cit.*, pp.306-307.

future, fixed in an intensity of the presence of eternal divine, that is, an “unrepresentable presence”.¹

Another feature of the epiphanic discourse created in the context of royal entrances is revealed by the manner in which the subjects communicate their impressions at the physical perception of the emperor, the way in which collective emotion projected by the view of the emperor articulates this discourse. The mass of subjects impressively communicate a series of appreciations which display the relationship between the ideal image of the sovereign and the real, physical one, the relationship between expectations and reality, the invisible and visible monarch. On the other hand, the same subjects send several reports in which they invoke by epiphonemas the divine blessing of the Emperor. Thus, during the visit of Emperor Francis Joseph I in Braşov in the summer of 1852, it is narrated: “Oh, what a young and handsome Emperor! How he rides the horse, how he carries himself! Look at his face of a Ruler, how serious he is and still there is a smile in his eyes and on his lips! Righteousness and grace can be found in the same person. This is *how the masses talked* (my italics).”² At the end of the imperial visit in Câmpeni on 10 July 1852, somebody exclaimed: “His Majesty passed along the masses, followed by sighs and good wishes. You could hear the people gathered in groups exchanging their impressions about His Highness the Emperor and also the epiphonema ‘God save the Emperor to make us happy’”³

Besides the epiphanic reception of the Emperor in the collective imagination, imperial munificence also sensitized the community of subjects to a great extent. The generous attitude of the Emperor in the context of royal entrances is inscribed in the long process of the perception of the Emperor by his subjects and this perception is connected to other exemplary and exponential hypostases of the monarch (pater, patriae, saviour, redeemer and justice-administering). In view of these hypostases the king had to

¹ L. Marin, *op. cit.*, p.291.

² *Gazeta Transilvaniei*, nr.55, 16 July, Braşov 1852, p.209.

³ *Gazeta Transilvaniei*, nr.55, 16 July, Braşov 1852, p.211.

exercise his authority harmoniously. He had a “great competence in presenting and withdrawing gifts according to his own will”; equally, he had to pay attention to the virtues of those who received them.

At the interference of the official and imaginary discourse on power the expectation or projection of royal munificence towards the subjects was first fixed by a series of rules and norms specific to the art of governing. In his work entitled *Le six livres de la république* (1577) J. Bodin wrote about the munificence expected by the subjects and the munificence standardised and formalised by rules and advices: “The king who wants to treat his subjects as a *good father* (my italics) is not constrained by human laws, still, he gives orders regarding the naming or dismissal of certain office holders; the honours and wages for the jobs are not distributed among all the subjects but only among those who deserve it. The *riches of the king* (my italics) belongs to the most *loyal* (my italics), the *army* (my italics) to the most *courageous* (my italics) and *justice* (my italics) to the most *honest* (my italics).”¹ Consequently, royal munificence is outlined by rules and expectations, services (the quality of the subjects) and rewards, royal paternalism and the loyalty of subjects, the rules of administering and distributing power and the predisposition and kindness of the king or emperor.

Imperial or royal munificence as gift or offering can be viewed in connection with reciprocal, total services offered by the emperor to the community of subjects and vice versa, in connection with the formal vision and the rituals of *potlatch*, “payment and counter-payment, gifts and counter-gifts”.² Power was obtained in exchange for gifts, in economic terms “richness is exchanged for power”.³ From another point of view, munificence can be placed in a discourse of royal or imperial power, paradigmatically connected to the establishment of the model of

¹ N. Zemon Davis, *The Gift in Sixteenth Century France*, Oxford University Press, 2000, p.165.

² M. Mauss, *Eseu despre dar*, Polirom, Iași 1997, p.16.

³ *Ibidem*

royalty at the beginning of the Christian Middle Ages. Thus, “piety, grandeur and *philanthropy* (my italics) are attitudes and gestures belonging to the Bizantyne imperial ideal beginning with the 6th century where the Emperor was reproduced through gestures which consecrate and re-consecrate him as “protector and distributor of gifts”.¹

The script and ritual of royal entrances provide two perspectives according to which we can characterise munificence, assuming the reciprocity of services between emperor and subjects. First of all munificence appears as a symbolic gesture, an expression of the exercise of power, a recognition of power. On the other hand it is centred on the magnanimity and “liberalness” of monarchs towards their subjects. Royal entrances bring forth the mechanism of munificence and of gifts which acquire political connotations first of all: the town or community presented and gave the sovereign gifts in exchange for the recognition of certain privileges obtained at that moment or conferred on them by previous sovereigns (exemption from taxes, the release or pardoning of prisoners, etc.)² Consequently, there is a double process of recognition, a reciprocal recognition, of the magnanimity of royal power and of the power of the town, its identity consecrated by privileges granted by the king. Closely connected to political connotations there was the practice of “reciprocal authority”³, circumscribed to the process of the delegation of authority.

On the other hand, reciprocal services such as gifts and privileges belong to the specific phenomenon of royal entrances mentioned above: the “transgression of limits”. These reciprocal services open up channels of communication which transcend the differences of “status and cultural level” because they are the expression of reciprocity between unequals within the social, political and economic order.”⁴ These reciprocal services lead to a

¹ J.P. Roux, *op. cit.*, p.311.

² N. Zemon Davis, *op. cit.*, pp.155-156.

³ *Ibidem*, p.156.

⁴ *Ibidem*, p.72

mutual pact between subjects and sovereigns. For example, the municipalities in France in the 16th century offered gifts to the sovereign in order to honour the king and “make him friend of the town” (“pour faire amy de la ville de luy”).¹ In other words, gifts “made relationships smooth”, nourished friendship and solidarity.

Royal entrances in the Banat and Transylvania reveal the typology of the munificent gestures of kings, structured by the essential themes of reciprocal gifts and services in the Middle Ages and also by those particularised by the political and social context of the imperial visits. The first category of generous gestures is the reward of the presence of the subjects around the emperor. This is a reward in itself, an “honouring” of those present. Thus Emperor Joseph II, when meeting his subjects from Mehadia in 1773, “took out a purse from his pocket and gave it to Papiliu, ordering his General Nostiț to count 100 ducats and bring them to Him. When he received them, he said, ‘Tell the footmen that I honour them with 100 ducats *trinkgeld* because they gathered together happily to see Me’. All the people in the crowd thanked him in high voice.”²

Other munificent attitudes were articulated by gestures transmitting religious and confessional connotations. The tolerant king who is attentive to the religious sensibilities of his subjects participates in restauring acts. Thus, Joseph II who visited Suceava in 1783, found out that the relics of St John of Suceava were in Poland. He ordered immediately that two monks from the Monastery of Putna should go there... and they brought the relics with honour and a great retinue and placed them in Târgul Sucevii.”³

There are also other philanthropic acts of the emperors, gestures with founding connotations connected to the ecclesiastical life of Romanians, gestures belonging to the same field of religious sensibilities, marking collective memory. In 1773, Joseph II visited

¹ *Ibidem*, p.143.

² N. Stoica de Hațeg, *Cronica Banatului...*, p.201.

³ G. Ștrempel, *Catalogul manuscriselor românești*, vol.II, Ed. Științifică și Enciclopedică, București 1983, p.287.

Rodna Nouă. “Seeing some houses he said, ‘I give the Church and the houses near it to the inhabitants of this place. Let them bring a resident priest.’ He also ordered that a painter should be brought to make an iconostas according to the Greek rite, and presented a set of surplices, a lead chalice, a plate and a star to the parochial church which still exist... This is how the place came to have its own church.”¹ At his entrance in 1852 in the Apuseni Mountains Emperor Francis Joseph I “gave 60,000 florins”, as shown above, to the churches destroyed in the 1848-1849 Revolution.²

Another type of munificent gestures performed by emperors came as a consequence of the services offered by their subjects. Their meaning converges with the concept of “reciprocity of gifts”. We must mention the gestures which reward the gifts brought to the Emperor, gifts which belong to an anedotics pointing towards the archetypal connotations of the practice and ritual of hunting and fishing.

When Emperor Joseph II entered the village Rodna Nouă, “a peasant honoured him with a huge wild boar. The name of the man was Ion Filipoiu. The Emperor and his suite looked at the boar with pleasure, asking the peasant how did he shoot it. Our man told them the details and said that he shot it only once with a flintlock. The Emperor was very pleased but said that he cannot accept the gift because he does not need it. He returned the boar and also gave the peasant two ducats.”³ This anecdote reminds us of the *ancient theme* in the Odyssey, Ulysses hunting a huge boar. The worst of the boar by Ion Filipoiu is the consequence of the ritualistic, legitimising transfer of the royal prerogatives of hunting to one of the subjects.⁴

In 1817, during his visit to Orșova, Emperor Francis I receives and offers gifts. One of the most remarkable gifts was a great sturgeon: “Pasha Der Vishi from Ostrov received the Turks in audience. The Turkish Voivode from Tăchia brought a huge

¹ P. Grapini, *op. cit.*, p.101.

² Al. Șterca-Șuluțiu, *op. cit.*, pp.155-156.

³ P. Grapini, *op. cit.*, p.77.

⁴ J.P. Roux, *op. cit.*, pp.151-152.

sturgeon as a gift... The Emperor sent the Pasha a golden snuff-box with stones and a pure gold snuff-box to the Voivode.”¹ The same Emperor visited Năsăud and presented the “dancers and musicians” who gave him a feasty reception. Many “needy people also received gifts”, “the guards were presented 224 florins and the Emperor gave 100 florins for the music of the regiment.”

There was also a less typical moment during the royal entrance to Năsăud in the presenting and reception of gifts. “Maria, the wife of corporal Ion Neagoș offered the Emperor a big red woollen rug made by her. She said that it was not a proper gift for such a high person, but she offered it as a proof of the peasant industry. The woman did not accept any gifts in exchange for the rug, only the thanks of the Emperor.”² This special case suggests that an untypical gift in the repertory of gifts does not oblige to reciprocity. Similarly, it can be stated that in the exceptional moment of royal entrances there is a phenomenon of maximisation of objects given as gifts. They become hyperbolic as the encounter between the Emperor and his subjects are remembered as unique moments, exceptional in the discursiveness of everyday life.

In other cases imperial munificence as reciprocity or reward for gifts or services done to the Emperor during royal entrances and visits takes the form of raising someone to nobility as recognition and reward: “The kind and great Emperor Joseph and his train have staid twice at those two brothers [Armeni Ioan and Avedic Kapri from Suceava], first in July 1783, and then in June 1875. The Emperor invited them to his table on both occasions and seeing their hospitality told them that when they would go to Vienna he would ennoble the Kapri family and he did so soon.”³ This example shows another type of munificence which, besides the reciprocal services involved, remains mainly an exercise of the imperial power, a specific manifestation of this

¹ N. Stoica de Hațeg, *op. cit.*, p.309.

² V. Șotropa, *Vizite, ospătări...*, p.224.

³ Șt. S. Gorovei, O veche cronică genealogică: Familia baronilor Kapri, in: Arhiva Genealogică, III (VIII) nr.1-2, Iași 1996, Ed. Academiei, București 1996, p.182.

power. This type of munificence belongs to the symbolical gestures of power with a strong political load.

On the other hand, there is a decentering in the mechanism of “reciprocal authority” (kings and subjects) and a shift of stress towards a concept of power represented by the royal authority. Munificent gestures in this context are connected to what was called “don royal d’office” or “king’s gift of office”¹ in the Middle Ages, or what was called “patrikios”² in the discourse of Byzantine imperial power. In both cases they signify the conferring of honours, distinctions, orders and functions and consecrate one of the attributes or expressions of imperial power.

These functions and honours conferred during or around royal entrances paradigmatically reproduce *an ordering of hierarchies and power*, an establishment of hierarchies consecrated by the king or the emperor. The distinctions, functions, honours conferred as part of the imperial munificence lend to the social group of subjects the mark of fidelity towards the emperor and hierarchically order society in virtue of this fidelity. During his entrance and visit in Sibiu on 2 August 1852, Emperor Francis Joseph I conferred a series of distinctions and functions to his subjects. Andrei Şaguna was named “intimate counsellor” of the Emperor, with exemption of taxes while Axente Sever and Simion Balint were offered the distinction of “Knightly cross of the Francis Joseph Order”. Imperial munificence or “the gracious act of His Majesty” consecrates hierarchies depending on the way in which the honoured persons meet the criteria of fidelity imposed by the political and ethical discourse of the imperial power: “Strong faith, undying devotion, eminent activity during the 1848-1849 Revolution, manliness and courage when facing the enemy”. The Imperial Order in 1852 reveals that besides orders, medals and functions the Emperor gave in some cases 50 or 100 florins “as a reward”. Besides the appreciations arising from imperial munifi-

¹ P. Zemon Davis, *op. cit.*, p.164.

² Cf. V.V. Munteanu, *Bizantinologie*, Timișoara 1992, p.203.

cence the Order of the Emperor asked that publicity should be made “for these decorated persons in German and Romanian journals”.¹

A public discourse of imperial munificence is set up and, on the other hand, social prestige is accumulated by those who earned a distinction. This publicity permanently and efficiently reproduces imperial munificence and becomes part of the *strategies of the public discourse of power*. Therefore royal entrances reveal, through the analysis of their discourse and representation aspects of political history, historical and cultural anthropology and show the reconstruction of the past from various angles.

¹ *Gazeta Transilvaniei*, nr.58/26 July, Braşov, 1852, p.221.