

Summaries Zusammenfassung

Niels Refskou

The legal contents of the Ottonian diplomas to the Danish dioceses

In 1931 *Scandia* published an article by Sture Bolin, “Denmark and Germany under Harald Gormsson. Basic lines of Danish history during the 10th century”, in which Bolin took to task earlier historians’ interpretations of Otto I’s and Otto III’s diplomas to the Danish dioceses of the year 966, DO I 294, and the year 988, DO III 41,¹ and especially the interpretation of DO I 294. Since then, the views which Bolin set forth in his article have been determinant for the treatment which Danish his- in his interpretation, they have nevertheless yielded to his authority on a decisive point: they have accepted, without further examination, his consideration of the diplomas as letters of immunity whose contents as well as formulations lay completely in line with the other letters of immunity to dioceses of that period.

It is remarkable that Bolin does not include a single diploma in his analysis in support of this claim, and instead refers only to Waitz’s *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte* and Stengels’s *Die Immunität in Deutschland* as well as chronicles and annals. Nor does Bolin try to determine more closely the legal contents of the two diplomas. Rather he is satisfied merely to ascertain that the diplomas are letters of immunity, which he thus interprets to mean that Otto I must have had sovereign rights in Denmark. The lack of a closer analysis of the diplomas’ legal contents is all the more severe inasmuch as no later Danish historian has undertaken such an analysis. This means that one has effectively used these two diplomas as sources to illuminate the relationship between Denmark and Germany without knowing what is really in them. As an extension of Bolin’s argument one has also adhered to the formulations *in marca vel regno Danorum* in DO I 294, which was changed to *in regno Danorum* in DO III 41, and has discussed the German emperor’s right to issue letters of immunity in Denmark, which, given the diplomas’ legal contents, is completely erroneous.

Our analysis, which tries to remedy this error of omission, focuses on the three most important formulations in DO I 294 – *ab omni censu vel servitio nostri iuris absolvimus, absque ulla comitis vel alicuius fisci nostri exactoris enfestatione* and *sub nullius banno vel disciplina illos nisi sub illarum ecclesiarum advocatis esse volumus* – since it is these formulations which indicate the nature and extent of the privileges granted. Afterwards, we then go on to discuss the newly issued privileges in DO III 41. It is first necessary, however, to come to some decision about Bolin’s assertion that the diplomas are letters of immunity as well as about his interpretation of DO I 294’s formulation *in marca vel regno Danorum*, which takes the use of *marca* to imply the establishment of a markgraviate including part or possibly all of Denmark.

The analysis of DO I 294’s legal contents shows, in the first place, that contrary to what has earlier been assumed, the diploma is not a letter of immunity, since all the formulations necessary for that to be true are lacking. Secondly, the formulation *in marca vel regno Danorum* does not provide a basis on which to assume that a markgraviate was established between Denmark and Germany. Thirdly, it is clear from the most important formulations that Otto I did not have jurisdictional rights or sovereignty in Denmark. Fourthly, Otto I’s renunciation of *census* and *servitium*

regis shows that he recognized Harald Bluetooth's sovereignty over the Danish dioceses, and consequently that he considered Denmark to be a sovereign state. Inasmuch as Otto I's renunciation of *census* and *servitium regis* is also, however, tantamount to a formal detachment of the Danish dioceses from the German state church, it would mean that as of the 26th June 965 the Danish church was officially recognized as an independent national church whose temporal sovereign was the Danish king.

The analysis of DO III 41's legal contents shows that the newly granted privileges are unique among Ottonian diplomas. Since they were valid only in the empire, one has to assume that the Danish bishops were compelled to leave Denmark, and the reason is presumably the fight between Harald Bluetooth and Sven Forkbeard. The fact that DO III 41 was not drawn up by the chancellery suggests that these events took place in the period May 987 to March 988, and if this is true, then Harald Bluetooth died the 1st November 987, which is tantamount to having the building of Ravingbroen and the Trelleborg fortifications fall within his reign. Finally, the two diplomas, considered as historical sources, offer us the possibility of seeing a shift in Denmark's foreign policy from the European continent to England in connection with Sven Forkbeard's assumption of royal power, since Harald Bluetooth accepted the bishops who sat in the Danish episcopal residence without further ado, while Sven Forkbeard removed those of German origin and introduced a bishop from England. This policy was continued by Canute the Great, and it is clear from the latter's peace treaty with Conrad II that it was only at that point that one recognized Hamburg–Bremen's sovereignty over the Danish dioceses.

Bo Gräslund

Cnut the Great and Sweden. New light on the Battle at the Holy River

The battle at the Holy River was fought, probably in AD 1026, between king Cnut of England and Denmark and, on the other hand, Anund Jacob of Sweden and Olav Haraldsson of Norway. According to the E-manuscript of the Anglo-saxon chronicle, the Swedes had control of the field ("Sweon heafdon weallstowe gewæld"). However, as Moberg has shown, the phrase "Sweone haefdan weallstowe" in the F-manuscript probably reflects a lost common source to E and F, saying that the Swedes, i.e. their bodies, remained on the battle-field, with other words, that the Swedes were defeated (Moberg 1941). This is precisely what is told by William of Malmesbury, who probably made use of the same source.

Lagerqvist discussed in detail the coinage in Cnut's name at Sigtuna in Eastern Sweden in the late 1020's (Lagerqvist 1968). Now 11 coins with the legend CNUT REX SV, i.e. "king of the Swedes" (fig. 1), and about 20 coins with Cnut's name but with blundered legends are known. Most of the latter and all of the CNUT REX SV-coins (which are struck by the same obverse die) bear the name of Thormodh, king Anund's moneyer. Lagerqvist pointed out that the obverse of the Cnut REX SV-coins shows no sign of blundering, and that it has no counterpart in England or Denmark. He also demonstrated that this coinage in Cnut's name is related to Anund's Sigtuna-coinage by die-linking. According to the present author the distribution of the coins clearly shows that the Sigtuna-coins of Cnut circulated primarily in the North (fig. 2). Other leading numismatists have concurred to Lagerqvist's conclusion that Cnut's Sigtuna-coinage is genuine, and that Cnut must have controlled Eastern Sweden after the battle at the Holy River. Cnut's Sigtuna-coinage must be regarded a first-class independent contemporary source, which confines the truth of the title *rex partis suanorum*, "king of parts of the Swedes" which Cnut gave himself in his famous letter from Rome in AD 1027.

The Holy River has traditionally been identified with the Helgeå river in Scania in present southern Sweden. However, the contemporary sources are silent as to the localization of the battle, and this geographical interpretation is made only in the saga-literature of the early 13th century. Cnut's political supremacy in Eastern Sweden can hardly be explained as a direct effect of a battle fought within a border of Denmark 500 kilometers further south.

Arguments are presented for the view that this battle took place at quite another Holy river, namely *Helgå* in south-east Uppland in Eastern Sweden. This tiny river fell out into a long arm of the Baltic not more than 20 kilometers from Sigtuna and 40 kilometers from Uppsala. (Figs. 3 and 5). In the Medieval Period a village called *Holm* was situated near the mouth of this river. It is suggested that this name corresponds to the *Holm* mentioned in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

While the topographical description of the battle, given in the saga-literature, is incongruous with the topography in the Helgeå area in Scania it fits quite well with the topography at Helgå in Uppland. In addition, several place-names mentioned in the saga-literature can be fit into a logical geographical pattern only if the battle is located to Eastern Sweden.

The author suggests that the expression *rex partis suanorum* corresponds to his political control of the districts *Uppland*, *Södermanland* and *Västmanland* around the Mälaren Lake (fig. 4) for a period of 2-4 years after the Battle of the Holy River.

Gunnar Annell

Wie Gustav Vasa zum König von Schweden gemacht wurde

Am Mittwoch, dem 3. Juni 1523 traten in Strängnäs zwei lübische Sendboten mit dem schwedischen Reichsrat zusammen. Es ging ihnen vor allem darum, eine seit langem von den Lübeckern betriebene Forderung nach Handelsprivilegien zu erörtern. Nachdem diese Frage für den Augenblick fertig beraten war, hielt einer der Lübecker eine Rede, in der er die Schweden ermahnte, die Zeit zu nutzen, um so schnell wie möglich einen langen, beständigen Frieden zu erreichen. Der Sinngehalt dieser Rede wurde bisher nicht befriedigend geklärt: der von einem Forscher erwogene Gedanke, sie habe eine Mahnung an die Schweden enthalten, baldigst einen eigenen König zu wählen, wurde mit guten Gründen abgelehnt.

In dem vorliegenden Artikel wird vielmehr die Auffassung vertreten, die Lübecker hätten mit ihrer Rede die Schweden zu einem Versuch ermahnt, die Union wieder aufzurichten. Diese Interpretation findet auch eine Stütze in einem anderen Bericht darüber, was bei einer vor der Königswahl abgehaltenen Zusammenkunft der lübischen Sendboten mit dem Reichsrat vorgebracht wurde.

Ferner wird hier eine durch mehrere Indizien gestützte Theorie vorgelegt, dass gerade diese als eine Drohung aufgefasste Ermahnung zu einem Beschluss führte, der Gefahr einer Wiedererrichtung der Union dadurch zu begegnen, dass man Schweden schleunigst einen eigenen König gab. Möglicherweise beschloss man ferner, die Möglichkeiten, welche die herrschende Lage bot dafür auszunutzen, Lübeck an ein schwedisches Königtum zu binden.

Am Freitag trat der Herrentag in seiner Gesamtheit zusammen, um einen König zu nominieren. Der einzig denkbare Kandidat, Gustav Vasa, weigerte sich jedoch, die Kandidatur anzunehmen. Trotzdem verrichtete man am Morgen des folgenden Tages die Königswahl in möglichst enger Übereinstimmung mit den Vorschriften des Landesgesetzes und wählte dabei Gustav Vasa zum König. Dieser war aber nicht anwesend, und als er eingeladen wurde zu kommen und die Wahl anzunehmen, begab er sich stattdessen zu den lübischen Sendboten um sie zu fragen, ob sie meinten, dass er König von Schweden werden sollte. Vor eine in Wirklichkeit vollendete Tatsache gestellt, bejahten jene diese Frage, und damit hatte Lübeck die Auflösung der Union nahezu offiziell anerkannt. Noch offizieller wurde die Stadt an das neue schwedische Königtum gebunden, als ihre Repräsentanten am folgenden Tag den angebotenen Ehrenplatz zu Seiten des neugewählten Königs bei dessen feierlicher kirchlicher Einführung in sein Amt akzeptierten.

Hiermit hatte Gustav Vasa zweierlei erreicht: er war König von Schweden geworden, und man hatte verhindert, dass Lübeck in Zukunft die dänischen Ansprüche auf die schwedische Krone stützen würde. Nachdem dann aber die Freundschaft mit Lübeck ein Ende gefunden hatte, versuchte Gustav Vasa die für Schweden peinlichen Ehrenbezeugungen gegenüber der Hansestadt in Vergessenheit geraten zu lassen, und das gelang ihm so gut, dass sie praktisch bis zum heutigen Tage unbeachtet blieben.

Tom Ericsson

Shopkeepers, Master Artisans and Social Mobility in Nineteenth Century Europe: Problems and Research

The article discusses some of the problems connected with social mobility and the petit bourgeoisie in nineteenth century European society. The author indicates that the petit bourgeoisie, more than any other class in society, was affected by the increasing social mobility and the consequences this had. The social recruitment to the petit bourgeois economic activities, retail trade and artisanry, took place within a broad social spectrum of occupations in which workers, former shop employees, artisans and farmers' sons composed the great majority. This created a complex social world within the petit bourgeoisie, where the different groups' social backgrounds hindered the development of a distinct social consciousness. Social mobility could also take other forms. Within the petit bourgeoisie inheritance, marriage and the dowry were of importance for being able to acquire a store or workshop.

The article also discusses what is meant by social mobility and how it is to be interpreted in research on the petit bourgeoisie. The most important element in this discussion is that a change-over from an occupation associated with the working class to an occupation such as shop owner or artisan was not necessarily understood at the time as upward social mobility. The immediate change was a transition from dependent wage labor to an independent occupation. This was not followed by a change in social identity or social milieu. In many areas of European cities the social milieu of the petit bourgeoisie was a part of a larger popular milieu, which was characterized by the fact that the petit bourgeoisie and the working class lived side by side. This analysis shows that the notion of an hierarchic society of sharply drawn class boundaries may be questioned. The dividing line between the petit bourgeoisie and the working class was often unclear and in many areas of Europe the transition from working class to petit bourgeois did not mean a change in social identity or social milieu.

Katarina Mollner

Two Ways to Portray People in History.

A Comparison of Natalie Zemon Davis's *The Return of Martin Guerre* and Per Anders Fogelström's *Krigens barn* (The Children of Wars)

The two texts which form the basis of my study have as their goal to depict ordinary people's lives and thoughts in former times. We know relatively much about the material conditions under which these people lived, but our knowledge of their inner life, their thoughts, dreams, norms and values, is more limited.

Natalie Zemon Davis is a professor of history at Princeton University in the USA. Per Anders Fogelström is a well-known Swedish author. *The Return of Martin Guerre* and *Krigens barn* resemble each other in so far as they are both written in an easily readable form able to attract a broad public. Fogelström's book is an historical novel equipped with extensive footnoting, while Davis's text is a more strictly scholarly historical portrait with literary qualities. The object of my analysis has been to consider the important differences which exist between the two texts as concerns the respective authors' source critical methods, theoretical awareness, and the texts' literary qualities.

In a comparison of the sources which form the basis of the texts, we find that where Davis seeks her historical figures in the minutes of old court cases and other archive material, Fogelström chooses to work with completely fictional novel figures. While Davis really does try to see history from the perspective of the ordinary person, Fogelström produces only a very traditional popular historical depiction, which is primarily constructed from general historical works and testimony left by the upper social classes: memoirs, diaries, letters, etc. A true connection between his invented figures and the surrounding society or the "great" course of historical events never exists.

Davis discusses and criticizes the sources she uses. In Fogelström such critical examination hardly occurs. While Davis is aware of the holes in her source material and always clearly indicates where the border lies between verifiable facts and assumptions, Fogelström shows amazingly little knowledge of basic source critical methods.

Davis's research is connected to the French *Annales* tradition, particularly to the school which deals with *mentalité* research. Fogelström's work, on the other hand, is traditional and individual fixated. He justifies the fact that he chose the historical novel as a mode of expression instead of making a popular historical portrait of his material on the grounds that the source material concerning average people is so deficient that one is forced to make use of pure fiction to give them life. As have other *mentalité* researchers, Davis points to historically more well-founded ways than the purely literary to reach the thoughts of people of earlier times. Davis's solution to the problem which meager source critical material constitutes means that "reality" and "possibility" are smelted together. On the other hand, Fogelström presents an "absolute" portrait of historical developments, without the least alternative or hesitation concerning the historical "truth". In addition, Fogelström reveals an apparently unconscious tie to his own contemporary values, which considerably obstructs an unbiased treatment of the people of the past.

The study also treats the relationship between fiction and historical scholarship, in which particular importance is given to history writing's literary sides. It then describes both Davis's and Fogelström's different ways of drawing their figures' characters. The presentation ends with a few literary views on both the texts.

John Lind

St Cnut IV's Seal – an Authentic Seal of Pretension?

Peringskiöld as Seal-Designer

The article reviews the arguments put forward by Tue Hejlskov Larsen against the authenticity of King Cnut IV's seal of 1085 (*Scandia*, vol. 51, pp. 19–32, German summary, p. 277). The seal itself presumably burned in the Stockholm Castle fire of 1697, and its contents are known only from drawings made by Johan Peringskiöld or his associates before the fire.

From a typological and functional point of view, Hejlskov Larsen finds the seal's contents both anachronistic and unique, and he suggests that the seal must have been fabricated in the 14th century.

Some elements are, however, anachronistic only in Hejlskov Larsen's interpretation – like his “crowned helmet”, which is actually the gabled crown with pendants known from contemporary coins like Cnut's own, or are not anachronistic at all: the folding chair appears not only in Louis VI's seal but in Philipp I's seal, which is contemporary with Cnut's seal.

The major flaw in Hejlskov Larsen's “quellenkritische Analyse der ältesten *Abzeichnung des Siegels*” (italics JL) is, however, that he has not actually analyzed his source material. We find no discussion of Peringskiöld's, or his associates', methods in reproducing the originals: the indication of defects or lacunae, if and how they replace such missing parts. Do the drawings, in short, reproduce the originals faithfully?

Such an analysis can be performed on the basis of drawings of many of the original seals which are still extant. It demolishes Hejlskov Larsen's argument. In these drawings, entire seals are reconstructed from insignificant fragments, the missing parts freely supplied from other seals or pure imagination. Thus, one of the significantly anachronistic elements on the representations of Cnut IV's seal, the rowel-spurs which, according to Hejlskov Larsen, would seem to indicate a fabrication of not earlier than the 14th century, is also found on the drawing of Karl Sverkersson's († 1167) seal, which exists today. On this seal, however, we find only the prick-spur we would expect from a 12th-century seal. The presence of the rowel-spurs carries no weight in the argument against the authenticity of the Cnut seal.

The only one of the elements to which Hejlskov Larsen refers which reasonably certainly formed part of the original seal is the falconer-horseman on the reverse. To this representation Hejlskov Larsen ascribes hereditary connotations in accordance with the legend “HIC NATUM REGIS MAGNI SUB NOMINE CERNIS”. However, he finds absurd its combination with the majestic representation on the

obverse although similar representations are found among extant seals. Furthermore, the possibility ought to be considered that a sealer could wish to communicate different messages in using a double seal. Thus it could be more than a coincidence that Cnut IV's double seal, if genuine, was used in the spring of 1085, precisely when extravagant preparations for his expedition to conquer England in alliance with his father-in-law, Robert I le Frison, count of Flanders, must have been underway. From Adam of Bremen we know that Cnut's father, Sven(-Magnus) Estridson, considered himself to have hereditary rights to the English throne. By not claiming the extension of his royal domain in the legend to the obverse's majestic representation, and, on the reverse, including a representation with hereditary connotations in combination with a legend tracing the paternal heredity, Cnut IV's double seal may well have been an expression of his claim to the English throne. The Flemish connection points to a possible source of inspiration for the representation.

Seen in this context, the seal's contents are comprehensible: as a 14th-century fabrication the seal is too exotic. Why did the supposed forger not rely on readily-available symbols commonly used on contemporary Scandinavian royal seals, rather than risk disclosure by including elements, like the falconer horseman, otherwise never found in the Scandinavian arsenal of sfragistic symbols?

