

Gunhild's Cross: Seeing Romanesque art through Denmark.

This essay discusses a process spanning about 150 years, during which art and architecture in Denmark ceased to be primarily Scandinavian and pagan in orientation and instead became European and Christian. As examples, I will focus on 'inscribed objects', images accompanied by words, since it seems that the combination of the visual and the verbal was regarded as particularly potent in this process, both complementary and mutually reinforcing. Until the early twelfth century the initiative was primarily royal, with the institutional support of the Church, mostly channelled through the papacy and clergy in neighbouring countries. Thereafter bishoprics, monasteries and colleges of priests in Denmark gradually acquired the endowments and institutional organisation to contribute to the project – a term chosen carefully – in important ways, especially after the creation of the Archbishopric of Lund in 1104.

First, the essay sketches out parts of this reorientation process in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, and then the focus turns to three objects. They are the great seal of King Cnut 'the Saint' of 1085, a walrus ivory cross made for his sister Gunhild perhaps around 1110, and an ivory seal matrix for Roskilde cathedral (adjacent to the royal palace) engraved around 1120. Not surprisingly, given the date range, the three objects can be understood as monuments of Romanesque art and, as such, representative of the first pan-European Christian 'style'.¹ In other words, although they are Danish in some senses, what they represent is an internationalism rooted in politically contentious but increasingly shared religious contexts.

[Subsection here: 'Viking into Christian?']

The conversion of Denmark to Christianity is documented by a great and famous work of art: the Jelling stone (fig.1). Its text is written in Old Norse in runes:

King Harald ordered this stone to be raised in memory of Gorm his father and Thyra his mother: that Harald who won all Denmark and Norway and made all the Danes Christian.²

Its images, on adjacent sides of a great boulder some 2.4 metres high, consist of a 'great beast' and a figure of Christ crucified, both entwined in interlace. Hints of the impact of art from Latin Europe are slight. Some of the interlace has foliate terminals of a loosely Carolingian kind and the body of Christ conforms to some degree with the canons of human proportion used in neighbouring polities to the south and across the sea to the west. But the artwork is still a very long way from the classicising modes employed in countries that had once been within the Roman empire. The Jelling stone may be seen as a monument in which style and content come from different worlds. It probably well represents the tension between King Harald Bluetooth's claim that the people of Denmark had followed him into the Christian fold and the actuality that the process had begun and was the ruler's aspiration, but little more.

The form of the 'textual document' is significant in many ways. It is not a book or a charter or chronicle; as far as can be established, such things were unknown locally at the time. Its immediate inspiration was another smaller stone on the site, with runes but no figures, erected by Harald's father, Gorm, in honour of his wife. The use of a great boulder for the 'Christian' stone – enduring and almost immovable (weighing an estimated 10 tonnes) – speaks volumes, and so does the combination of words with images to give audiences two ways of understanding the content. The exact location of the rock is also crucial. Jelling was the ancient royal centre of Jylland (or Jutland). It was Christianised by a small wooden church founded by Harald midway between two great burial mounds.³ As part of the

transformation the mortal remains of his father, initially interred under the north mound, were brought inside the church and thus into line with the new dynastic God. The church, like the memorial stone, was located on the axis of a great stone ship at least 350 metres long; the gunwales of the ship are marked out in slabs around the perimeter. If, then, the stone served as a metaphoric mast, the church was the virtual cabin of this vessel. But, despite these adjustments, the enclave remained and still remains a huge and permanent reminder of the ship burials of earlier centuries, such as that at Sutton Hoo in East Anglia (early seventh century) or Oseberg in Vestfold in Norway (first half of the ninth century).⁴ Nevertheless, the repurposing of Jelling signalled the start of what was to be an increasing royal determination to adopt, adapt and create an art and architecture that was visibly part of the European mainstream.

A good indicator of this intention was the implementation of a form of silver coinage based closely on designs used in England. Indeed, the introduction of minted money with Latin inscriptions and ruler 'portraits' involved bringing an English moneyer, Godwine, to Denmark during the reign of Sweyn Forkbeard.⁵ This, too, must have helped to cement the idea that words and images could work together to authenticate value. A concomitant was the deployment of the Latin language and script, a development that necessarily involved clergy – using the term here in its technical sense to mean literate people – and they were mostly churchmen, even if only in minor orders.⁶ Pennies marked out the polities that used them as sharing a common culture of centralised control, ensuring quality in matters of size, weight and purity of metal. Like the promotion of Christianity, a monarchical coinage implied strong and stable government. In this, Denmark was not a special case. Secular rulers had played similarly central roles in the introduction of Roman Christianity and coinage elsewhere: recently in Poland (Duke Mieszko c.963, and his son King Boleslaw Chrobry) and Hungary (Duke Geza c.985 and his son King (Saint) Stephen).⁷

Nevertheless, the process of conversion was always gradual. For example, in England it took 400 years; as late as the 1010s Archbishop Wulfstan of York was preaching sermons against ‘heathenness’.⁸ In Wulfstan’s view, backsliding by the nominally Christian English had brought the wrath of God upon them in the form of Scandinavian – largely Danish – pirates, who were murdering, despoiling and demanding protection money: the Danegeld. In time the Danes under their Kings, Sweyn and his son Cnut, became invaders and conquerors. Thus it was that soon after his father’s death Cnut found himself King of England and Denmark, instigating a relationship that had ramifications for generations to come. It remains central to understanding religious art through Denmark in the period from circa 1020 to 1120.

Cnut the Great’s activity as a Christian royal patron and European statesman were critical in the early decades. A crucial episode as regards his perceived status was his journey to Rome in 1027 to attend Conrad’s coronation as Emperor by Pope John XIX. By this action he tacitly acknowledged papal authority and a diplomatic wish to be friendly with Europe’s most powerful ruler, whose northernmost border marched with that of Denmark. All had not previously been so amicable. Cnut’s Scandinavian realms fell within the Archdiocese of Hamburg, based in imperial territory, and he began a process of sidelining its authority by sending to Denmark bishops who had been consecrated in England, though he later softened his stance.⁹ In addition, Cnut cemented allegiances by gift-giving designed to show his wealth and his Christian orthodoxy. The author of the *Encomium Emmae Reginae* (a volume dedicated to Cnut’s wife) enquired hyperbolically ‘What church does not still rejoice in his gifts? But to say nothing of what he did for those in his own kingdom, Italy blesses his soul every day, Gaul begs that it enjoy good things, and Flanders, above all, prays that it may rejoice in heaven with Christ. For he went to Rome by way of these countries’.¹⁰ This seems to have been Cnut’s policy from the outset. For example, Bishop Fulbert of Chartres, writing to thank the King for a donation towards the rebuilding of his cathedral destroyed by fire in

1020, declared ‘You whom we had heard to be a prince of pagans we acknowledge not only to be a Christian but a most generous benefactor to churches and to the servants of God’.¹¹

In England, too, Cnut had a point to prove after two decades of Viking depredations. His response was once again gift-giving – illuminated books, shrines of gold, silver and gems – and the foundation of churches.¹² The first such structure was raised in memory of the fallen at Assandun, the site of a bloody battle between Cnut and Edmund Ironside in 1016, as though to stress that both sides in the conflict were at least Christians. The consecration was recorded in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle under 1020, and a Canterbury marginal addition stresses the point that it was ‘built of stone and lime’.¹³ The construction of stone churches was optional, and in Denmark wooden churches remained the norm, so this was a very deliberate construction of a self-evidently enduring monument. Establishing a manuscript culture was, however, equally essential: Christian liturgy and learning quite simply required books. Incoming churchmen will have brought many of these with them, but they are likely to have been workaday productions. In contrast, for lavishly illuminated books employing gold, expensive pigments and fine parchment, wealthy patronage was implicit. A good example is the English gospel book now in Copenhagen, probably made in Peterborough for Cnut and his Queen to present as a gift (fig. ??).¹⁴ When it arrived in Denmark is unclear, as is where it was housed, but the recent royal foundation at Roskilde on the island of Sjælland (or Zealand) would have been a suitable recipient. The earliest extant Danish production in the genre, the eleventh-century Dalby Gospels, partly depends on an English book with initials and Evangelist portraits generally similar to those in the Peterborough manuscript (fig. ??).¹⁵ The two versions of St Matthew are closely comparable: both have tilted heads turned three-quarter to the viewer, hunched shoulders and long curling fingers holding the pen. However, one notable shift in the Danish manuscript is the placing of the opening letters of the Gospels on the author-portrait page, close enough to the evangelist that he can be

shown in the process of making the initials with his own pen. Temporal distinction is thus eroded between the writing of the Gospel a millennium ago and the writing of it now; what we have in front of us is the divinely inspired text actually being written by Matthew himself.¹⁶ Lettering has rarely been accorded higher status.

By such means, the project to Christianise and Europeanise art in Denmark gradually gathered momentum during the reign of Cnut, and then of his nephew Sweyn Estrithson (r. 1047-74), five of whose sons ruled in succession. Of these, three were especially significant in the present context: Cnut, Eric and Niels. Central to the story is Cnut ‘the Saint’, who was assassinated at Odense in 1086. The early medieval rhetoric around his character, cult and politics stresses his generosity to the Church, in terms of tithes, donations of land and the establishment of ecclesiastical courts. These transfers of wealth and power from local lords, as well as his attempt to undertake a fresh invasion of England, were ultimately his undoing.

For that ill-fated expedition he commissioned a large two-sided seal, the only known impression of which was attached to a charter for Lund, issued in 1085. Although the original is lost, fortunately there is an engraving of the seal (fig. ??) and the text of the charter is also preserved. The design of the seal is remarkable for its inscription, images and indeed its scale. It was equal in diameter to the largest seal yet made in Europe, for William of Normandy after he became King of England in 1066. Cnut, however, did not set out to imitate but to critique. The legend stressed his royal credentials: ‘By the present sign know King Cnut; Here you see one born under the name of a great king’.¹⁷ As the reference back to his namesake suggests, and as the twelfth-century historian Saxo Grammaticus explains, ‘Resolving to display his great-uncle’s spirit ... he believed that England, lost through misfortune, must be regained, on the grounds that he should have inherited it’.¹⁸ William of Normandy could make no such claim. As regards imagery, Cnut rejected the blatant militarism of William’s seal, abandoning the armour, sword and spear and substituting a

hawk – a sign of lordly recreation for which William’s predecessor, King Harold Godwinsson (a close ally of Cnut’s great-uncle), was well known. The source of the design was however not English but Eastern Mediterranean, as exemplified in three Byzantine enamel roundels now on the lower frame of the Pala d’Oro of San Marco in Venice. One in particular has a very similar pose of horse and rider and, perhaps most tellingly, there is a plant growing beneath the horse which has long forking stems like those on the seal (fig. ??). So, just as William adopted a Byzantine image, probably based on a Constantinian model, so too Cnut looked to the Eastern empire. The enamels have been dated to the third quarter of the eleventh century, though not all commentators agree.¹⁹ In any case, point by point, Cnut’s seal refers to William’s and manifests alternatives: royalty by birth not just aristocracy, peace rather than war, a return to the benign rule of King Harold in place of the harsh control of William. As propaganda, it is subtle and inventive in text and image and in the way that the two work together.

[Subsection here: ‘Gunhild’s Cross?']

In 1098, King Eric ‘the Good’ of Denmark travelled to Rome and went on to attend the Council of Bari, where he would have met Pope Urban II and St Anselm among many others.²⁰ The two most significant achievements of his visit were the papal agreements to the canonisation of Eric’s elder brother, Cnut, and to the creation of a Scandinavian archdiocese on Danish territory at Lund.²¹ In both cases, pontifical approval was more-or-less assured by the ongoing struggles between papacy and Empire. Prior to the elevation of Lund as an archbishopric, Denmark had been the responsibility of Bremen and to weaken the power of that See was to undermine the control of the German emperor, Henry IV.²² Further, during a period when formal canonisations were unprecedented, seeking papal approval in effect helped establish the rights of the Pope in the whole process.²³ These years were propitious in

another respect too, coinciding with the fall of Jerusalem to the First Crusade in summer 1099, itself a result of the initiative of Pope Urban II: ‘It set the pope in place of the emperor, at the head of Europe, and assured the papacy a moral leadership’.²⁴ In this climate, soon after King Eric’s return to Denmark, he and his Queen, Boedil, set off on pilgrimage to the Holy Land, though both died in 1103 in the course of the journey. Remarkably, Eric was the first reigning European monarch to attempt a visit to the cradle of Christianity and, no doubt, like his earlier trip to Rome, it was calculated to showcase both his piety and commitment to Church reform and, more broadly, to the mechanisms of human salvation thought to function through deference to Christ crucified.

Like Cnut ‘the Saint’ and Eric ‘the Good’, their successor Niels was also a son of Sweyn Estrithson. Among Sweyn’s other estimated twenty children was Gunhild, whose very existence is known only because her name appears inscribed on a work of art: a processional cross made of walrus ivory. It is remarkable in many ways – heavily textual, programmatic and beautifully carved (figs).²⁵ It systematically opposes binary concepts: Life or ‘Vita’ with Death or ‘Mors’, and Church with Synagogue. On the reverse are the saved and the damned, poor Lazarus in Abraham’s bosom, and the rich man Dives tormented by demons. It is a unique conception, bringing together Christ’s victory over death and the triumph of the Church on the front with a form of Last Judgement on the reverse. That it was made for Gunhild by a man called Liutger is explained as part of the extensive inscriptions; but when was it made?

The estimates of art historians have varied from before 1075, based on a misreading of basic data (it was her father who died in 1074, not Gunhild),²⁶ to the second half of the twelfth century, partly on the implausible argument that she was not the daughter of Sweyn the Great, but of Sweyn III Grathe, who ruled from 1146 to 57.²⁷ While the Romanesque style of carving on the cross would be very precocious anywhere in Europe before about

1090, at any time after 1130 it would seem stiff and stilted. That said, the difficulty of dating works of art on the basis of style in this period has been and remains a challenge to our discipline, not least because of a prevailing tendency to wish to see some artistic centres as more advanced and innovative than others. Thus Gunhild's cross has fallen victim to the 'time-lag' assessment of Denmark's place in Romanesque art, but perhaps it really is not possible to determine what date the object in question 'looks'. As an alternative mode of assessment, I propose two factors, already implicit in the preceding paragraphs. One is politics and the other rhetorical expression: in early medieval Europe they are, in fact, inseparable. It is not just what someone says but also the terms in which they say it that make an object a recognisable intervention in the debates of any given moment, as is so clearly the case for the combination of words and imagery on Cnut's seal discussed above. Of course, interventions can be almost irrelevantly 'too late'. But in the case of Gunhild's cross, the crispness and urgency of the combined imagery and text does not suggest a revisiting of old and well-worn arguments. Closely tied into my analysis is thus an estimate of the quality of the conception and its realisation: this is evidently the work of a creative intelligence not a jobbing craftsman.

One indication of precise thinking is the location of the inscriptions. They are on four different kinds of support: books, scrolls, a 'legend rim' around Christ enthroned, and the plain edges of the ivory cross. Each is chosen with purpose. Scrolls unfurl from speakers towards their audiences. Books reference laws (the Old and New Testaments perhaps) and registers: 'Vita' holds the Book of Life in which the names of the saved are written (Revelation 21.27). Above Christ enthroned, the legend starts with a cross as though the words were around the edge of a seal, just as Christ is authenticated by his wounds. Finally, Gunhild herself is documented on her cross, as is its maker, so the object thus documents its own origins in pious deeds of royal patronage.

These inscriptions are all fundamental, especially on the back where there is a central image of Christ displaying his wounds: ‘See my hands and my feet, said the Lord’.²⁸ The text (Luke 24.39) comes from Christ’s appearance to the Apostles after his resurrection, not from the Apocalypse. Yet the image works by way of contrast, showing Christ in heaven, proclaiming his authority as the vanquisher of death to judge mankind at the end of time. So Christ is speaking in one context while being represented in another. The same occurs with the saved and the damned, who are parted with the imperatives that Christ used even before his Passion: ‘Come to my father, you blessed ones’, ‘fall into the fire you condemned’.²⁹ These prescriptions are recorded in the Gospels as the basis of the judgement to come, which is directly referred to: ‘When the Son of Man comes in his glory, escorted by all the angels, then he will take his seat on the throne of glory’. Moreover, in Matthew’s Gospel (25.34-43), the commands to the blessed and the damned frame Christ’s injunction to charity: ‘I was hungry and you never gave me food, I was thirsty and you never gave me drink, I was a stranger and you never made me welcome ...’ concluding that ‘in so far as you neglected to do this to one of the least of these, you neglected to do it to me’. The seven works of corporal mercy set out here by Jesus constitute the grounds for separating the saved from the damned, but on Gunhild’s cross they are characterised concisely by a single parable: Lazarus and the rich man (Luke 16.19-25). Poor Lazarus sat ignored at the rich man’s gate, but found his place in Abraham’s bosom, while the uncharitable ‘Dives’ was eternally tormented in the flames.

The words on the vertical axis begin within the top roundel showing Lazarus in Abraham’s bosom and descend into the place where Dives, in the lower roundel begs for a drop of water to slake his thirst.³⁰ The scroll physically connects the two sets of figures: a conversation whose protagonists were linked by words even though they were ‘a long way off’ (*vidit ... a longe*). ‘What good have you done in your life’ is the response of Father

Abraham, alluding to feeding the hungry, clothing the poor, visiting the sick and welcoming the stranger, all of which Dives had ignored in the case of Lazarus. On Gunhild's cross, the criticism is enhanced by Christ's own semi-nakedness and openly displayed wounds, for Lazarus with leprosy sores is a type of Christ stripped and beaten and given bitter gall to drink when he himself thirsted on the Cross. Such is the acuteness of those who conceived the programme, but the execution is also carefully orchestrated. Christ in judgement, with both arms outstretched, clearly references Christ on the Cross.

The word 'Mors' (death) is written on a sarcophagus from which a figure is rising; drops of blood from Christ's feet are implicated in this resuscitation. So death is not represented as finality; at the end of time there is a chance of eternal life (or suffering) beyond it. Equally precise are the differences between Church and Synagoga (figs xx). Ecclesia is crowned and clothed; so too is one of the women among the saved on the reverse. Church militant holds a war leader's banner, topped with a cross. Her upright pose and commanding serenity indicate nobility and confidence. Synagoga could not be more different, head bowed, shoulders hunched, naked from the waist up and tugging at her hair. These are conventional medieval signs of extreme grief, as seen in the weeping mothers at the Massacre of the Innocents. Synagoga, her eyes closed rather than confronting the truth, does not beat her breasts but reveals them, apparently by pulling off her own clothing. Apparently, she too has lost her children, for whom she lived, implicitly in combat with the Church. Her pose and some of her behaviour are echoed among the damned on the reverse of the cross, where a half-naked woman bows her head and tugs at a tress of her hair. In effect this equates damnation with Synagoga, constituting the most overtly ideological aspect of the visual rhetoric. Alternative interpretations may be possible, but there is a clear pictorial consonance between Synagoga's defeat and the damned being sent to their doom, where the figures also have naked torsos and a sense of condemnation beyond recall. One man looks back to Christ

in Majesty displaying his wounds as if to check that the judge has jurisdiction and his judgement must indeed be accepted.

The unrelenting ideology of Gunhild's cross finds a close, contemporary parallel in a sermon by Honorius Augustodunensis in his *Speculum Ecclesiae* 'commissioned' between 1100 and probably 1109.³¹ The sermon refers to and expounds the gospel reading for the first Sunday after Pentecost, which is the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. Honorius begins with some definitions. The bosom of Abraham is the place where the assembly of saints awaits Christ. There is no punishment there even though it is in the lower world, because before Christ's redemptive death everyone necessarily descended *ad infernum*. How then could Dives see Abraham and Lazarus, albeit at a distance, when he raised his eyes? The answer Honorius gives is that the inferno has two parts, upper and lower, and it is only in the latter that the souls of those in need of reproof (*reprobarum*) are tested. He further notes that there are four classes of people: the wealthy saved, the wealthy damned, the poor saved and the poor damned, and gives examples. In the first category Abraham and Job are saved but Pharaoh and Nebuchadnezzar are not; among the poor Lazarus and monks (sic) are saved, whereas Judas [and implicitly Dives] are damned. But the key development in the sermon is that Dives represents the Jewish people taking pride in the kingship and priesthood of the Old Testament – whereas among the poor are the gentiles whose wounds are metaphorically licked by the apostles, who instruct them in the new law of God. The perfidious Jews are thrown into outer darkness 'for they did not believe in Christ resurrected from the dead'.³² The final turn in Honorius's argument is the extension of these categories to Ecclesia and Synagoga, and it is made with reference to the opening of the first Book of Samuel. Elkannah had two wives: Hannah, for long barren, and Peninnah who had children. They stand for the two brides of God: fruitful Synagogue brought forth the Jews for 'carnal ceremony', Ecclesia, once barren, brought forth a faithful son – that is the Christian people, in effect Ecclesia. The

rhetoric could scarcely be starker, and is extreme in its anti-semitism even for the years following the first Crusade.³³

The closest visual parallel from the period can be found in the *Liber Floridus* of Lambert of St Omer, completed in 1120, a work replete with crusading ideology.³⁴ It shows Christ between Ecclesia and Synagoga, the former crowned, standing upright and holding her banner, the latter being pushed downwards towards a mouth of Hell. She is however fully clothed so she is not yet fully exposed to torment. This image is a version of the marriage of Christ and his Church, which includes his repudiation of the rejected bride. The figures of the two personifications on the front of Gunhild's cross can be read in a similar way, especially in the light of St Augustine's commentary on Psalm 45 (Vulgate XLIV), the royal wedding song. He quotes verse 9 of the Psalm: 'Upon Your right hand stood the Queen', continuing 'She which stands on the left is no Queen. For there will be one standing on the left also, to whom it will be said, "Go into everlasting fire". But on the right hand she shall stand to whom it will be said, "Come, you blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world".'³⁵ The fact that these words are cited on the back of Gunhild's cross further ties together the visual and verbal rhetoric of front and back.

The points of political and doctrinal reference on this relatively small object are impressively complex, the more so as one pursues other comparators for Gunhild's cross. The basic characteristics of the form, with roundels at the end of each arm and circular projections at the various junctions, can be found in Byzantine crosses, such as that on the repoussée silver reverse of the Holy Cross Reliquary at Limburg an der Lahn, which dates from the 960s.³⁶ On the grandest such crosses, rather than relief representations, the projections are pearls or gems; Liutger may not have known this. Telltale details such as the incised lines around the edge and on the face of the interstitial projections suggest that one of the artist's models may indeed have been metal foil, as at Limburg. A fragment of the Holy Cross, acquired by

Cnut's brother Eric around 1102, was brought from Constantinople and donated to the church at Slangerup, and may have been similarly encased.³⁷ A small, cast silver Byzantine reliquary cross of the late eleventh century with the same format was discovered in Denmark, at Gundslevmagle, and is now in Copenhagen, so we can be sure that the formula was familiar.³⁸ However, even though such objects helped determine the overall form, the imagery on Gunhild's cross has no parallels in anything from Byzantium.

Instead, the four personifications, Life, Death, Church and Synagoga, find their closest precedent on the Crucifixion page of the Uta Codex, a book of pericopes (or gospel readings) made for the nunnery of the Niedermunster in Regensburg around 1025 (fig.).³⁹ There, in addition are also Sun and Moon (eclipsed at Christ's death) and two events, the resurrection of the dead and the veil of the Temple being rent asunder. It is a highly complex and (perhaps overly) sophisticated image, much discussed by modern commentators. However, the tenor of the content is distinct. The manuscript shows a quietly triumphant Church, with Synagoga stumbling off, as it were defeated, out of the picture, her eyes hidden behind or obscured by the frame. It is quite a contrast, but not as stark as that on Gunhild's cross, where bewilderment in defeat is replaced by abject despair. Furthermore, the arms of the cross from the Uta Codex represent good works and above Christ's head is written 'hope is the reward of good works'. Clearly these texts refer to the relationship between charity and a positive outcome at the Day of Judgement. But this is provisional rather than certain: there is no direct correlation offered, as there is on Gunhild's cross, between virtue and salvation.

Apart from Christ enthroned on the rainbow (the sign of the covenant between God and mankind: Genesis 9.8-17 and see Ezekiel 1.28-2.8), the most readily identifiable element on the reverse of Gunhild's cross is the two angels with scrolls directed to the Blessed and the Damned. Angels with scrolls bearing versions of the same biblical texts can be seen in the Bamberg Apocalypse of the early eleventh century and on the Vatican Last Judgement

Dossal, datable 1061-71 (fig. x).⁴⁰ On the latter too, Christ's torso is naked to reveal his wounds and the works of mercy are depicted. In so far as it seeks to recreate an apostolic mission, envisaged in the Gospels and especially in Acts, this is a papal reformist rhetorical position, and primitivist too. The power to bind on earth and after death was given to Peter, and from him, as the first pope, this authority descended to his, and Christ's, successors. Like Uta's codex, the Vatican Dossal is from a nunnery, in this case S. Gregorio Nazianzeno in Rome.

Clearly, there are close parallels between the imagery of Gunhild's cross and works of art produced in Italy and Germany during the eleventh century. But visual sources alone do not provide motivation – there should be an ideological dimension. In fact, there are aspects of the cross's rhetoric that seem to fit the circumstances of Gunhild and her family around 1100. Symptomatic is the representation of her brother, Cnut the Saint, as the antithesis of Dives, the uncharitable rich man, as developed by Ailnoth of Canterbury in his *Passio* of Cnut:

on the regular and special Lent days and every Friday of the week, when he sat at the royal table, and his guests thought he enjoyed wine or honeyed liquor, he drank pure water, something that only his faithful servants knew, and He that watches secretly. And the precious dishes of the royal meal he simply led to his mouth, but then let them carry on to those around him or be distributed to the poor, while he only enjoyed dry bread with salt, by which nourishment he did not so much support his body, accustomed to well-being, as he submitted it to a strict lifestyle.⁴¹

In this formulation, Cnut equates with the 'rich saved' Abraham and Job. The association is made explicit by Ailnoth's, 'the precious martyr Cnut, delightful to God in the manner of Abraham, having been received into the bosom of Abraham enjoyed the happiness of eternal peace as shown by manifest signs'.⁴² The origin of this rhetoric probably goes back to Cnut

himself. In his charter for Lund of 1085, the King warns in an anathema that anyone breaking the terms of his gift ‘will be cursed by the Lord’s return’, continuing ‘he will be condemned to eternal punishment, where the worm does not die and the fire does not go out. His table in front of him shall be a snare, to a retribution, and a stumbling block for those who said to God the Lord “Depart from us, knowing your ways is not our desire”’.⁴³ It is easy to understand the snare of the table in relation to the rich man’s lack of charity. But in his death at Odense Cnut also imitated Christ, for when after the confession of his sins he was

strengthened with the sacraments of the Lord’s body, and in front of the altar, with arms widespread on the ground in the form of a cross had been stung with a lance on July 10, the sixth weekday, having suffered death for Christ he rested in Him.⁴⁴

That these ways of presenting Cnut’s life and death seem to have eyewitness veracity is a part of the plot, and Ailnoth claims to have interviewed reliable people who knew him. Also significant is the location, in a church dedicated to the English (*recte* British) protomartyr, St Alban, whose relics Cnut had recently acquired, and St Oswald, the first Anglo-Saxon martyred king.⁴⁵ The connections between Ailnoth’s presentation of the character and death of Cnut and the imagery and texts on Gunhild’s cross are clearly close – perhaps close enough to suggest a direct connection of patronage.

Unfortunately, the medieval provenance of Gunhild’s cross is not known, but a case can be made for Odense or its neighbourhood. Its first documented post-Reformation owner was Sophie Axelsdatter Brahe, born in 1578 at Elvedgård, less than 15 miles west of the city. There were three religious communities in Odense from which the cross might have come, most obviously what is now the cathedral where Cnut’s relics may still be visited. Around 1095 a Benedictine priory dedicated to St Alban was created less than 100 yards to the north east, on the site of Cnut’s death. The priory was founded by King Eric for twelve monks from the English Abbey of Evesham.⁴⁶ A third possibility is an emergent convent for women, on

Nonnebjergert just across the river in a former Viking enclosure of the Trelleborg type, probably built for King Sweyn Forkbeard between 980 and 1000.⁴⁷ The nuns later moved to Dalum, three miles south west of Odense and probably survived, though in straightened circumstances, into Sophie Brahe's lifetime. Sophie herself was devout – a portrait shows her wearing an IHS (Ihesus) monogram jewel – and the inscriptions on Gunhild's cross would doubtless have appealed to her religious convictions.⁴⁸ It is also pertinent that Sophie's father, Axel Ottesen Brahe, held the lands of St Cnut's Kloster (presumably the former priory) from the King in the 1580s and from 1602 the lands of the convent of Dalum, where he died in 1616. He would thus have had access to and notionally rights over the property of the two monasteries. While gold and silver liturgical objects had material value and might have been turned into money in the period after the Reformation, a walrus ivory cross was of interest only to those who could construe the significance of its Latin inscription – especially its naming of an otherwise unknown daughter of King Sweyn Magnus. Of course, these can be no more than tentative suggestions, but they would bring together the patronage of a pious medieval princess and her family's promotion of her brother's cult at Odense and the aristocratic ownership of her cross five hundred years later.

The artist's name was Liutger: on one side of the cross is written 'May those who believe in Christ crucified pray in memory of Liutger, who carved me at the request of Helen, who is also called Gunhild'. The nature of this and the other inscriptions is central to any assessment of Liutger's abilities. They are beautifully tailored to fit the available spaces, requiring careful but easily intelligible contractions of some words. Most are fairly standard conventions: XPM for Christum and IHS for Jesus. A short horizontal line is placed over U or A to signal that N or M has been 'suspended'. Suspended US is indicated by [?] and UR by a suprascript 2. Two other techniques are used to accommodate letters to available space: *litteri inscripti* and ligatures. So, for example, I is written inside Q for *qui* (the U is assumed), above

the lower stroke of L or beneath the top stroke of T. As another strategy to accommodate the wordage, E occurs in ligature with the upright of T, the second uprights of H, N or M; D is also joined to N and A to M. Critical to the exercise of laying out the texts is the writer's comprehension of Latin, but there are other issues too. For the sake of legibility, the letters should not be too small, but made too large they simply would not fit. Experience and careful judgement were necessary to succeed in this, and to undertake it at all suggests that Gunhild chose an artist who could achieve what was wanted. Liutger's lettering also shows his knowledge of design. In addition to quite standard Roman capitals he uses alternative forms to add variety: square C and G, uncial a, e, d, h and m. The approach is uniform throughout, so an earlier scholarly suggestion that they were not all conceived and executed by one person at one time seems perverse.⁴⁹ Rather, the careful integration of texts, images and available space implies a deliberate programme from the outset.

[Subtitle: Luitger, the Roskilde seal and dynastic devotions?]

Liutger may indeed himself have been an ecclesiastic; a man of that name, recorded as a canon and deacon of Roskilde, is entered twice around 1140 in the necrology of Lund cathedral.⁵⁰ Roskilde cathedral was adjacent to the royal palace, one of the principal residences of the kings of Denmark, and where many of them are buried. Appointing a suitably educated and talented artist to the staff as a deacon would make perfect sense. That this Liutger was such a man is perhaps indicated by his commemoration at Lund despite his quite lowly ecclesiastical rank. His name appears for a third time, commemorated on 25 March – the day of the Crucifixion, in the slightly later *liber daticus* of Lund.⁵¹ There is also the possibility that a surviving work from Roskilde is by his hand. This is the cathedral's walrus ivory seal matrix, now in Copenhagen (fig. x).⁵² The lettering forms are very similar

to those on the Cross, including the contraction marks and central dot punctuation. Figure style is harder to compare because of the different technique – intaglio on the matrix, upstanding relief on the Cross – but the proportions and general composure of St Lucius on the seal and the frontal portraits on the cross are alike. However, as with the cross, the matrix has so far been assigned various different dates, up to seventy-five years apart.⁵³

The dedication of Roskilde cathedral is to the Holy Trinity, and this is noted in the legend on the rim of the seal: SIGIL.S.TRINITATIS.DOM⁹ (fig. x). What is omitted, however, is the place name indicating which of numerous European churches dedicated to the Trinity this is. Such an omission is rare after the middle of the twelfth century. The identification is, however, resolved by the inclusion of St Lucius, whose name is inscribed around the half-length, haloed figure in the centre of the matrix. He was a third century pope whose relics were brought to Roskilde from Rome. It is possible that the occasion of their acquisition was King Eric's journey in 1098 or that they were brought by the papal envoys mentioned by Ailnoth of Canterbury.⁵⁴ Ailnoth further notes that the cathedral is dedicated to St Lucius and the Trinity, and as he was probably writing between 1110 and 1113, that should be the latest that the relics could have arrived in Denmark.⁵⁵ In any case, the matrix is unlikely to be earlier than that as it combines architectural features and a figure, a hybrid of two different eleventh-century traditions not attested on seals until the second decade of the twelfth century. The earliest datable instance was made for the city of Cologne probably between 1114 and 1119 (fig. x).⁵⁶ It shows a crenelated 'city wall' at the base of the image, a motif with very limited diffusion on seals before 1100. For instance, it occurs on the imperial bullae, where it alludes to Rome – it is inscribed AUREA ROMA which was probably part of the attraction in Cologne. The seal legend stresses that Cologne is 'the faithful daughter of the church of Rome' and depicts St Peter, whose name is written around him, much in the way that Lucius's is at Roskilde.⁵⁷ However, perhaps the key point is that Roskilde cathedral had

both an enclosing wall and twin towers. On other words, the seal shows Pope Lucius within the enclave and church at Roskilde, but with an elegant nod towards Rome. The form of the matrix, with the legend inscribed on a quite steeply bevelled rim, is characteristic of early matrices from Flanders and the Rhineland, whence it migrated to England around 1100.⁵⁸ It never became widespread anywhere and the decision to use it at Roskilde may have been practical: it exploited the curvature of the walrus tusk and maximised the available surface for carving. That said, the engraver was surely aware of the tradition from other examples in circulation at the time. Like Gunhild's cross, the Roskilde seal exemplifies an awareness of compositional options and attendant allusions from well beyond the borders of Denmark.

As already argued, the form and content of Gunhild's cross reference material from Byzantium, Italy, Germany and England (especially if one includes Honorius's *Speculum*). The carving itself has been seen as having English connections, though the name Liutger makes his origin there unlikely.⁵⁹ It is international in outlook and in that sense characteristically Romanesque. The organisation of the programme around the arms of the cross encourages a diagrammatic arrangement of material, in this case constituted by symmetries and antitheses. This mode of presentation is at once didactic and memorable, integrating personified concepts (Life and Death, Church and Synagoga) with narrative (the parable of Lazarus) and the fact of Christ's Passion and Resurrection. The alliance achieved by these means finds a political echo in the especially close relations between the Kingdom of Denmark and the papacy around 1100, a turning point in European history, which saw Latin militaristic expansion in the eastern Mediterranean, the large-scale persecution of Jewish communities, and the battle for supremacy between popes, emperors and kings. Accordingly, Henry IV in Germany, William II in England and Philip I in France all regarded papal power as a threat to their autonomy. Yet to newer Christian polities such as Denmark the relationship could be mutually supportive: the Pope provided Denmark with its own

archbishopric and the royal family with a dynastic saint, officially approved. It is symptomatic of what was to come that Edward the Confessor and Charlemagne were canonised sixty years later, again by the pope or, failing that, an anti-pope. The days when kingly saints could be proclaimed locally, as Edward the martyr in England, Stephen in Hungary and Olaf in Norway, were long gone and St Cnut began the transformation.

That Gunhild herself played an active role in all of this is very likely, not least because she is named four times on her cross: twice as Helena and twice as Gunhild – one of these being written in runes. The fact that her Christian namesake was the Emperor Constantine's mother, Helena, who discovered the True Cross in Jerusalem is also significant. The echoes on Gunhild's cross of her saintly brother Cnut's life as it was constructed and developed from his own charter of 1085 through to Ailnoth's *Passio* of around 1110 to 1113 suggest a close personal relationship between them. Cnut's victories on his eastern frontier early in his reign and the success of the first crusade in 1099 chime with Christ's triumph on the Cross and the damnation of Synagoga. The stress on the rich man who gives to the poor connects Cnut with the salvation of those who, unlike Dives, obey Christ's injunction to acts of charity as the road to heaven. Finally, the rhetoric against Synagoga that emerges so forcefully in Honorius's sermon in the first decade of the twelfth century registers a new level of intensity in the condemnation of those who cannot see the truth of salvation through Christ. Placing the making of Gunhild's cross around 1110 catches the tide, as it were, the high-water moment when these issues were fresh and pressing.

While it is not prudent to extrapolate from one very special artwork to a general statement about Romanesque art through Denmark, Gunhild's cross represents the culmination of a sophisticated royal patronage that aligned itself closely with the authority of the papacy at a time when others were keeping a critical distance. It demonstrates that a fundamentalism espoused by no kings, and only very few churchmen, in the heartlands of

Latin Europe could be warmly embraced by secular authorities in still-emergent Christian monarchies such as Denmark. If the focus of this essay had been one of those countries with already well-established traditions of Christian art, the degree of doctrinal openness and assertiveness would hardly have been so necessary or so apparent, even allowing that Romanesque art is a phenomenon profoundly linked with the Latin Church.

¹ I follow the formulation of Eric Fernie, *Romanesque Architecture: the First Style of the European Age*, New Haven and London, 2014, 1: ‘A style is a socially constituted idea comprising the common characteristics of a large number of instances’ and 27: ‘A connection between the Latin Church and the Romanesque style is indicated by the boundaries of the two remaining almost exactly coterminous’. Of course, Fernie is writing from the perspective of architectural history, but the social and chronological parameters are no different for the figurative arts.

² David M. Wilson and Ole Klindt-Jensen, *Viking Art*, London, 1966, 119-23. For the larger context, Richard Fletcher, *The Conversion of Europe, from Paganism to Christianity 371-1386*, London, 1988, 405-10.

³ Agnes Stefánsdóttir and Matthias Malück, eds, *Viking Age Sites in Northern Europe A transnational serial nomination to UNESCO’s World Heritage List*, 83-88, 143-46; (accessed 14.10.2018 from <https://brage.bibsys.no/xmlui/handle/11250/176142>).

⁴ Anne-Sofie Grasland and Michael Muller-Wille, ‘Burial Customs in Scandinavia during the Viking Age’, in Else Roesdahl and David M. Wilson, eds, *From Viking to Crusader: Scandinavia and Europe 800-1200*, New York, 1992, 186-7.

⁵ Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonisation and Cultural Change*, Harmondsworth, 1994, 280-3. Similar initiatives were taken almost contemporaneously in Poland and Hungary; Philip Grierson, *Coins of Medieval Europe*, London, 1991, 73-77. Lars

Lagerqvist, 'Scandinavian coins', in Roesdahl and Wilson, *Viking to Crusader*, 220-21 and cat. 423.

⁶ Michael Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, London, 1979, 177-85.

⁷ Fletcher, *Conversion of Europe*, 425, 431-33.

⁸ Audrey L. Meaney, "'And we forbeodað eornostlice ælcne hæðenscipe": Wulfstan and Late Anglo-Saxon and Norse "Heathenism"', in Matthew Townend, ed., *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, Turnhout, 2004, 461-500.

⁹ Adam of Bremen, *History of the Archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen*, Bk2, Ch.IV, (Francis J. Tschan, trans.), New York, 2002, 92-3. Cnut later relented and his nephew King Sweyn continued friendly relations with Bremen.

¹⁰ Alistair Campbell, ed., *Encomium Emmae Reginae*, Cambridge 1998 (with a supplementary introduction by Simon Keynes), 36-7.

¹¹ Frederick Behrens, ed., *The Letters and Poems of Fulbert of Chartres*, Oxford, 1976, 66-69, where however the editor dates the letter (no.37) shortly before the cathedral burnt down on 7-8 September 1020 (ibid., xx). The content make it virtually certain that Cnut's 'munus' is occasioned by news that has reached him. Since Fulbert says Cnut is a man 'who does not know our language and who is separated from us by a great expanse of land and sea' (p. **number required?**) it seems the donation was sent from Denmark. Fulbert wrote to the French king, Robert (twice), and Duke William of Aquitaine reminding them he was in need of funds. In the case of Duke William he was successful.

¹² T. A. Heslop, 'The production of *de luxe* manuscripts and the patronage of King Cnut and Queen Emma', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 19, 1991, 151-95.

¹³ A-SC F.

¹⁴ T. A. M. Bishop, 'The Copenhagen Gospel Book', *Nordisk Tidskrift för Bok- och Biblioteksväsen*, 1967, 33-42; Heslop, 'Cnut and Emma', 165-9.

¹⁵ Erik Petersen, ‘Manuscripts and Latin literary culture’, in Roesdahl and Wilson, *Viking to Crusader*, 216-17 and cat.509.

¹⁶ Michael Gullick, ‘Self-referential portraits of artists and scribes in Romanesque manuscripts’, in *Pen in Hand: Medieval Scribal Portraits, Colophons and Tools*, ed. Michael Gullick, Walkern, 2006, 97-114. Gullick identifies Dalby as the earliest extant example of this phenomenon but proposes a possible lost German exemplar on the basis of later instances from Werden and Helmarshausen (110).

¹⁷ Grimm J. Thorkelin, *Diplomatarium Arnemagnaeum exhibens Monumenta Diplomatica*, 2 vols, Copenhagen 1786, pl. 1 no 1: + PRESENTI REGEM SIGNO COGNOSCE CNUOTONEM + HIC NATUM REGIS MAGNI SUB NOMINE CERNIS; see T. A. Heslop, ‘Medieval Seals as Works of Art’, in *Seals and status: the power of objects*, eds John Cherry, Jessica Berenbeim and Lloyd de Beer, London, 2018, 26-34 at 30-1.

¹⁸ Saxo Grammaticus, *The History of the Danes [Gesta Danorum]*, 2 vols, ed. Karsten Fris-Jensen and trans. Peter Fisher, Oxford, 2015, 840-41.

¹⁹ Jaminka de Luigi Pomojšac, *Les Emaux Byzantine de la Pala d’Oro de l’eglise de Saint-Marc a Venise*, 2 vols, Zurich, 1966, I, 60-2, II, 84-5 (nos 117, 121, 122). See further Hans Hahnloser and Renato Polacco, *La Pala d’Oro: Tesoro di San Marco*, 1, Venice, 1994, 65 (no. 149); Henry Maguire, ‘“Signs and Symbols of Your Always Victorious Reign”. The Political Ideology and Meaning of Falconry in Byzantium’, in Angeliki Lymberopoulou, ed., *Images of the Byzantine World: Visions, Messages and Meanings: Studies Presented to Leslie Brubaker*, Farnham, 2011, 135-46.

²⁰ Markus Skeggjason, *Eiriksdrapa*, stanzas 10-12 incorporated verbatim in the mid-thirteenth-century Knytlinga Saga, trans. Hermann Palsson and Paul Edwards, Odense, 1986, 109-10. The composition is contemporary – Markus died in 1107. The visit date of 1098 is deduced from the fact that the Council of Bari was held then. It seems also a suitable moment

in Eric's reign. Saxo, *History of the Danes*, 879, envisages two visits to Rome and does not mention Bari, but it is likely that Eric would have stayed in the eternal city on both inward and outward journeys. For *Eiriksdrapa* as Saxo's source see Bjarmi Guðnason, 'The Icelandic sources of Saxo Grammaticus' in *Saxo Grammaticus, a Medieval Author between Norse and Latin Culture*, ed. Karsten Friis-Jensen, Copenhagen, 1981, 79-93.

²¹ A. E. Christensen, 'Archbishop Asser, the Emperor and the Pope', *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 1, 1976, 25-42. Asser, the first archbishop of Lund, was a nephew of Queen Bodil and thus first cousin to King Eric's son, Cnut Lavard, a potential claimant to the throne.

²² Archbishop Liemar of Bremen (died 1101) was an ardent supporter of the emperor and an opponent of papal reform: Ian S. Robinson, *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest, the polemical literature of the late eleventh century*, Manchester, 1978, 159-60, 163 and 169-70.

²³ E. W. Kemp, *Canonisation and Authority in the Western Church*, Oxford, 1948, 70. Gabor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses: Dynastic Cults in Medieval Central Europe*, Cambridge, 2007, 151-2.

²⁴ Geoffrey Barraclough, *The Medieval Papacy*, London, 1964, 91.

²⁵ Harald Langberg, *Gunhildkorset* [Gunhild's Cross and Medieval Court Art in Denmark], Copenhagen, 1982; Elizabeth C. Parker and Charles T. Little, *The Cloisters Cross, its art and meaning*, London, 1994, 120-21, 129-31 and passim for the role of such crosses; 142-3 for Gunhild's Cross.

²⁶ Tage Christiansen, 'Ivories: Authenticity and Relationship', *Acta Archaeologica* 46, 1975, 119-33, at 127 n.12; Adolph Goldschmidt, *Die Elfenbeinskulpturen aus der romanischen Zeit, XI-XIII. Jahrhundert*, 3 (Berlin, 1914-26), 35-6 (no. 124), 'around 1075'; Parker and Little, *Cloisters Cross*, 16 'from before 1074 or possibly from the mid-twelfth century'.

²⁷ Pace Langberg, *Gunhildkorset*, **PAGE**, Gunhild is called the daughter of King Magnus, which refers to Sweyn Estrithson, just as her brother Cnut the Saint called himself ‘Canute the fourth, son of King Magnus’ at the opening of the Lund charter of 1085 [Cnuto quartus magni regis filius]: <http://www.alvin-portal.org/alvin/imageViewer.jsf?dsId=ATTACHMENT-0010&pid=alvin-record%3A14714&dswid=2370>.

²⁸ Videte manus meas et pedes meos dicit dominus. The Vulgate reads ‘Videte manus meas et pedes, quia ego ipse sum’. The intrusion of the present tense ‘dicit’ (not ‘dixit’) implies the words are being spoken now to the viewer of Gunhild’s cross.

²⁹ Venite benedicti patris mei; Dicedite a me maledicti in ignem. The first is as the Vulgate, in the latter the Latin reads ‘discedite’.

³⁰ Pater Habraham miserere mei et mitte lazarum ut intinguat extremum digiti sui in aquam ut refrigeret] (Vulgate continues ‘linguam suam’): Fili recordare quia recepisti bona in vita tua.

³¹ J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologia Latina*, 172, cols 813-1108 at 1037-42. For Honorius’s career, Valerie I. J. Flint, *Honorius Augustodunensis*, Medieval Authors 6, ed. Patrick Geary, Aldershot, 1995. He composed *Speculum Ecclesiae* in response to a request from ‘fratres cantuarienses’ following his recent visit to Canterbury, where the eastern arm of the cathedral was being massively extended and lavishly decorated. For that reason, *Speculum* was represented metaphorically as a building adorned with pictures painted by the doctors of the Church (T. A. Heslop, ‘St Anselm and the Visual Arts at Canterbury Cathedral, 1093-1109’ in *Medieval Art Architecture and Archaeology at Canterbury*, ed. Alixe Bovey, British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions 35, Leeds, 2013, 59-81). Honorius probably came to England c.1100, in the entourage of Anselm. Flint suggests that he left soon after Anselm’s death in 1109, accompanying the little princess Matilda to Germany, where she was to marry the king, later emperor, Henry V.

³² Which is the point of “see my hands and my feet”, says the Lord’ inscribed on Gunhild’s Cross – they prove that Christ the judge and Christ crucified were one and the same.

³³ For the pogroms of the period, Jonathan Riley-Smith, ‘The First Crusade and the Persecution of the Jews’, in *Persecution and Toleration*, ed. W. J. Sheils, *Studies in Church History* 21, 1984, 51-72.

³⁴ Mayo, ‘The Crusaders under the Palm’, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*.

³⁵ I owe the connection between *Liber Floridus* and Augustine’s commentary to Jo Partridge, ‘Representations and Transformations of *Synagoga* in Latin Christendom c.1050-1250’ (unpublished PhD dissertation, University of East Anglia, 2010), 200.

³⁶ John Beckwith, *The Art of Constantinople*, London, 2nd edn 1968, fig. 116.

³⁷ Saxo, *History of the Danes*, 891.

³⁸ Roesdahl and Wilson, *Viking to Crusader*, cat. 488.

³⁹ Adam S. Cohen, *The Uta Codex: Art, Philosophy and Reform in Eleventh-Century Germany*, University Park PA, 2000, 53-75.

⁴⁰ Serena Romano, *La pittura medievale a Roma, 312-1431*, vol. IV: *Riforma e tradizione 1050-1198*, Milan, 2006, 45-55.

⁴¹ Ailnoth of Canterbury, *Gesta Swenomagni regis et filiorum eius et passio gloriosissimi Canuti regis et martyris*, in *Vitae Sanctorum Danorum*, ed. Martin Gertz, Copenhagen, 1908-1912, 77-136, at 95-6. Sollemnibus etaim et privatis ieiuniorum diebus sextaque sabbati mense regali assidens, cum convivantibus vino seu melle mixtis uti putaretur liquoribus, ministri solum fidis cum occultorum inspectore scientibus pura utebatur aqua, regaliumque deliciarum dapibus, ori tantum appositis delatisque, partim circumsedentibus partim pauperibus distributis atque transmissis ipse pane sicco, sale apposito, corpus deliciis assuetum non tam sustenebat quam et his non ad sufficientiam sumptis cruciabat. The English

translation is based on <http://www.dandebate.dk/eng-dk-historie27.htm> accessed 15.10.2018.

The sections in italics are my alternatives.

⁴² Ailnoth, *passio Canuti*, 132, Et pulchre martyr preciosus ac deo dilectus Canutus ad instar Abrahe vocabuli amplification insignitur, qui eiusdem Abrahe sinu exceptus eterne quietis felicitate perfrui signis evidentibus approbatur. And compare *ibid.* 81, Abrahe sinu reconditu.

⁴³ Text from the earliest extant transcript c.1123: Lund University Library, Medeltidshandskrift 6, *Necrologium Lundense* fol. 2r: <http://www.alvin-portal.org/alvin/imageViewer.jsf?dsId=ATTACHMENT-0010&pid=alvin-record%3A14714&dswid=7000> Sit supplicio deputatus aeterno ubi vermis non moritur et ignis non extinguatur. Fiat mensa eius coram ipso in laqueum et in retributiones et in scandalum cum eis qui dixerunt domino deo recede a nobis scienciam viarum tuarum nolumus'. Translation from <http://www.dandebate.dk/eng-dk-historie27.htm> both accessed 15.10.2018.

⁴⁴ From the *Tabula Othiniensis*, in *Vitae Sanctorum Danorum*, ed. Gertz, 60-62. Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers*, 152, calls this instance of imitation 'more unequivocal than any ever used in connection with a martyr king'.

⁴⁵ *Tabula Othiniensis*, ed. Gertz, 60, and Ailnoth, *passio Canuti*, 107, where the Christian protomartyr Stephen is killed by the Jews.

⁴⁶ David Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England 940-1216*, 2nd edn, Cambridge 1963, 163-4, noting long-established links between Evesham and the Danish royal house.

⁴⁷ Henrick Thrane, et al., *Fra boplads til bispeby: Odense til 1559*, Odense 1992.

⁴⁸ The portrait of Sophie Brahe is in the Frederiksborg Museum:

https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/d/db/Sophie_Brahe_%281578%E2%80%9931646%29.JPG

⁴⁹ Langberg, *Gunhildkorset*, 61. Gabor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses: dynastic cults in medieval central Europe*, Cambridge, 2002, esp. 150-53.

⁵⁰ *Necrologium Lundense, Lunds domkyrkas nekrologium*, ed. Lauritz Weibull, Lund, 1923, 268, 20th October, 'Item Liutgerus diaconus et canonicus sancti Lucii', and 291, 16 November, 'obiit Liutgerus, Roscheldensis canonicus'. These entries come from a group that can be assigned to the years 1123, when the manuscript was started, and 1145 when entries were largely discontinued. <http://www.alvin-portal.org/alvin/imageViewer.jsf?dsId=ATTACHMENT-0010&pid=alvin-record%3A14714&dswid=2370>

⁵¹ *Libri Datici Lundenses*, [Details from Margit] 71, 25 March 'Eodem die obit Lyudgeirus, diaconus, sancti Lucii canonicus'. The extent of his commemoration in Lund suggests he might have played a part in the rebuilding or furnishing of the cathedral, where the crypt altar was consecrated in 1123.

⁵² Roesdahl and Wilson, *Viking to Crusader*, cat. 604, where it is dated 1150-1200. Goldschmidt, *Elfenbeinskulpturen*, 4, 19 (no. 57) simply gives 'twelfth century'.

⁵³ Casts in the Roskilde cathedral museum are dated c.1125 (the matrix) and 1125-50 (a modern impression). The label in the National Museum in Copenhagen gives 1150.

⁵⁴ Ailnoth, *passio Canuti*, ed. Gertz, 131-2.

⁵⁵ For the date, M. H. Gelting, 'Two Early Twelfth-Century Views of Denmark's Christian Past: Ailnoth and the Anonymous of Roskilde', *Historical Narratives and Christian Identity on a European Periphery: Early History Writing in Northern, East-Central, and Eastern Europe (c. 1070-1200)*, ed. Ildar Garipzanov, Turnhout, 2011. 33-55, at 38-9.

⁵⁶ Toni Diederich, *Rheinische Städtiesiegel*, Neuss, 1984, 261-65 at 263.

SANCTA COLONIA DEI GRATIA ROMANAE ECCLESIAE FIDELIS FILIA. The name SCS PETRUS is written vertically, to be read up the left side and down the right, with the figure between, whereas Lucius is written LU PA

CI⁹ PA.

⁵⁸ T. A. Heslop, 'English Seals from the mid-ninth century to c.1100', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 133, 1980, 1-16 at 13 and pl. iiiA and B.

⁵⁹ Margaret Longhurst, *English Ivories*, London, 1926, 8, followed by John Beckwith, *Ivory carvings in Early Medieval England*, London, 1972, 57-8 and 127. Beckwith's comparison with the Judgement of Solomon capital from Westminster abbey, c.1100, is apposite. It is dated c.1120 in *English Romanesque Art 1066-1200*, eds George Zarnecki, Janet Holt and Tristram Holland, London, 1984, cat. 110, but is more likely c.1100. However, Beckwith's suggestion that Gunhild's Cross was 'exported from England' makes too much of the connection. St Liutger (d. 809) was Frisian by birth, educated at Utrecht, founded the monastery at Werden (where his relics are housed) and became bishop of Munster. The likeliest place of origin for someone of that name would be between the River Elbe and the North Sea.

<https://wikihost.uib.no/medieval/index.php/Ailnothus>

Ælnoth's exhortation to Niels to show generosity to Knud's resting place presumably predates Pope Paschal II's confirmation in 1117 of Niels' privilege to the church in Odense. Moreover, Ælnoth refers to the episcopal dignity of Gerold (Jerald) [bishop of Ribe] (Gertz, p.95).

According to the early thirteenth-century Chronicle of the Church of Ribe, this bishop sold

the possessions of his church and fled; he was probably in Germany by April 1113. It is unlikely that Ælnoth would have referred to Gerold in flattering terms after this point. In this case, Ælnoth would have written his work between 1110 and 1113, probably 1111/12 (see GELTING 2011, 38-39). If it was written in 1111, Ailnoth would have come to Denmark in 1087 – i.e. there is a likelihood that he fled thither from England after the failure of Cnut's invasion.

<http://www.dandebat.dk/eng-dk-historie27.htm>

Ælnoth writes: *"Thralls, who were released or even had redeemed themselves with the funds, they had acquired by their own arduous work, he by public declaration awarded with their freedom. Strangers and foreigners, wherever they came from, only they had not been guilty of anything, he gave equal rights with the natives, even this was the Danish a cause of hatred and annoyance."* Following his own statement, he had his information from both men and women, who had knowledge of the events from their own lifetime: *"But, what I from information from credible people of both sexes and both classes have learned about the pious prince and godloving martyr's deeds, I have now with eager support of the monks, who serve Jesus Christ and the glorious victor at the same place as I, handed over to the remembrance of the after-world."* = ed. Gertz, 79?