IN SEARCH OF THE THREE CROWNS:

Conserving, Restoring, and Reproducing Cultural Memory in Early Modern Sweden[1]

By Matthew Norris

Among the disputes concerning political, historical, and cultural priority that beleaguered Swedish-Danish relations during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the quarrel over the provenance of the heraldic emblem of the Three Crowns played a central role. In Sweden the dispute led directly to the formation of an expansive, state-managed heritage industry that remains largely intact today. This article discusses Swedish efforts to establish the antiquity and domestic origin of the emblem through the lens of early modern theories of memory and shows how these efforts were bound together with developing strategies for the conservation, restoration, and reproduction of historical monuments.

In the middle of the sixteenth century, the Swedish national emblem of the Three Crowns (*Tre Kronor*) became the subject of a heated dispute when the Danish king Christian III added it to his coat of arms. As a matter of state honor, it was cited by Swedish regents as a motive for armed conflict. As a question of historical pedigree, it spawned a domestic research industry funded by the state and administered by scholars who characterized themselves as antiquaries. Indeed, the dispute was a driving force in the formation of the Riksarkivet (National Archives) and the Riksantikvarie-ämbetet (Bureau of the Antiquary of the Realm, today the Swedish National Heritage Board), as well as in the emergence of state-sponsored antiquities collections and protected heritage sites. The question of the origin and history of the emblem was such a powerful impetus that it remained a focus of Swedish antiquarian scholarship long after the political dispute that had spawned it was officially resolved through the Treaty of Knäred in 1613. For more than a century, scholars ransacked the Swedish landscape in search of evidence testifying to the origin, meaning, and use of the emblem in the past.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

And in some cases, whenever monument-sized gaps appeared in the material record, they conjured the evidence itself into being.

This article argues that perspectives developed in the field of memory studies in recent decades can help to unravel what the history of historiography has long treated as a thorny paradox: namely, the persistent coexistence of empirical and imaginative approaches to material evidence in early modern research on the distant past. In practice, research on the Three Crowns centered on the study of what scholars regarded as *monuments*, including inscribed stones, illustrated manuscripts, plaques, coins, seals, paintings, and sarcophagi. Etymologically — and for early modern antiquaries, *essentially* — the *monumentum* was something that served to remind (*monere*); it was a prompt fashioned for the sake of preserving memory (*memoriae causa*).[2] Classical theories of memory drew a distinction between the thing remembered as either perceived originally by the senses or conceived by the intellect and the anachronistic likeness or copy (*eikon*) that allows us to recall it in the present. Moreover, they discriminated between remembrance (not forgetting something) and reminiscence (recalling something forgotten), the latter operation developed by Renaissance Neoplatonists into a theory of *anamnesis*, in which memories of things never remembered could be produced through a form of intuition directed by intellectual inquiry and imagination.[3] Plotinus had described this process as an intellectual operation in which the image-making power (*phantastikon*) of the soul granted access to the Ideas present in Mind (*nous*).[4] For Renaissance humanists like Marsilio Ficino, who were eager to distance the Platonic theory of reminiscence from the theologically problematic notion of the transmigration of souls, this Mind was synonymous with the mind of God, conjunction with which granted access to a kind of universal understanding of all things past, present, and future.[5] Indeed, in some cases memory could be equated with God himself. The Franciscan cabalist Pietro Galatino, in a passage read with great interest by one of the central protagonists in this story, held that Moses' perplexing account of the creation of the world by the plural Elohim in Genesis 1 represented the Holy Trinity through "three powers of the soul," namely, memory, understanding, and will. Memory (God the Father) gave rise to understanding (the Son), and the conjunction of these engendered will (Holy Spirit). That God had created man in his own image

---

[2] Varro 1938, 6.49.
[3] Nikulin 2015; Clucas 2015.
[4] Catana 2005, 74–75.
[5] Hankins 2005; Corrias 2012.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

entailed that humanity had been granted access to the limitless power of divine memory.[6]

This simultaneously psychological and metaphysical view of memory could be adapted to the material orientation of antiquarianism when monuments were perceived as the shared icons of communal or cultural memory. Antiquaries were capable of appreciating old artefacts as the products of particular times and places, but they were also obsessed with origins, the vaguely perceived precedents lying behind historical particulars. The comparative approach that often characterized antiquarian research on the distant past laid emphasis on continuity rather than difference, prompting the enquirer to look through historical types as instantiations of primordial archetypes. In Sweden and elsewhere, the old trope of the *mundus senescens* was combined with the Renaissance notion of a *prisca theologia* in a scholarly sensibility that viewed historical time as the gradual dissolution and fragmentation of an originally unified Urzeit in which cultural expressions emanated directly and necessarily from the divine mind.[7] Through this process of dissolution, historical time was split into two trajectories, the profane and the sacred, the contingent and the non-contingent, and accordingly icons situated along these trajectories called for different methods of analysis. Glossing Iamblichus, Ficino held that "just as we reach things temporal and contingent through knowledge which is temporal and contingent, so we have to attain things necessary and everlasting through a knowing which is necessary and everlasting, and this precedes our inquiring just as rest precedes motion."[8] While the decorative imagery bordering a runic epitaph could be viewed as contingent, reflecting the tastes of the time and the genius of the artist, the form and layout of an ancient church, used to commemorate the tenets of the true faith, were perceived to be essential. For

---

[6] Galatino 1550, 68; glossed by Johannes Bureus c. 1609 in Linköping, Stiftsbiblioteket, MS N 24, fol. 48ᵛ. See also fol. 61ᵛ, where these powers are described as "intellectualium creaturarum potentiae." Cf. Augustine 2002, X.11–12.

[7] A concise history of this process of fragmentation was given in the opening chapters of the popular *Aurora philosophorum*, attributed pseudepigraphically to Paracelsus, and first published in 1577. On the Renaissance view of ancient theology, see Walker 1972; Yates 2002; Schmidt-Biggeman 2004. The notion of the *prisca theologia* and its connection with sacred history played an important role in Swedish interpretations of domestic antiquity in the early decades of the seventeenth century. Although the *prisca* tradition began to fall out of favor by the middle of the century, the idea of a kind of primordial Golden Age followed by centuries of decline nevertheless persisted in the form of Gothicism. This structural continuity allowed a general conception of the relation between objects and archetypes to remain relatively consistent, even if the metaphysical and spiritual bases for this conception in Neoplatonic philosophy and theologically charged interpretations of the *Historia sacra* were downplayed or absent. On Gothicism in general, Nordström 1934, ch. 2.

[8] Ficino, 2004, 51.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

many Swedish scholars, the emblem of the Three Crowns represented an instance of the latter. The heraldic emblem was by its very nature anachronistic; its representation on a medieval coin or seal was viewed as a replication, an icon pointing backwards through a continuous tradition to a lost archetype located in the depths of sacred history. The sacred monument — and if one directed one's gaze far enough back in time, all monuments were sacred — bore an essential relation with its mental image in the divine mind. Here image and icon were one and the same. The thing itself was innate in the idea of the thing. If one could tap into the mental image, it was possible to restore the missing icon, the monument that no longer existed in physical space.

These remarks naturally run the risk of overstatement. By no means all — or even most — Swedish antiquaries were Neoplatonists, and the Aristotelian view of memory as belonging to the lower sensory faculties was well represented in the philosophical dictionaries of the time.[9] Moreover, although the ongoing Reformation had placed the question of religious heritage at the forefront of all scholarly inquiry, particularly in Sweden where Catholic claimants to the throne on the other side of the Baltic posed a constant threat, it would be mistaken to suggest that antiquaries were uninterested in charting profane history. Yet while the more down-to-earth scholars of the late seventeenth century could scoff at Neoplatonism's exaltation of intellective memory as a quasi-miraculous form of henosis, they nevertheless remained able to perceive monuments as icons that bore a non-contingent relation to earlier icons in a chain that issued from a set of primordial and most often mythical archetypes. Throughout the early modern period, as Alexander Nagel and Christopher Wood have shown in their studies of Renaissance anachronism, the boundary separating the contingent and the necessary, *what may have been* and *what must have been*, remained moveable, adapting to encounters with objects and the questions asked of them.[10] In general terms, Swedish antiquarianism was characterized by the often amicable if increasingly uneasy coexistence of two modes of perceiving the relation between things and time — schematized by Nagel and Wood as the opposition between the principles of *performance*, in which the artifact or artwork was linked to the specific event of its creation, and *substitution*, in which the identity of the artifact was linked to a conceptual archetype and

---

[9] Clucas 2015, 133–139. Another line of influence stems from Petrus Ramus, who argued for the status of memory as an intellective faculty, and whose influence on late sixteenth-century and seventeenth-century Swedish thought was profound.

[10] See above all Nagel and Wood 2010.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

remained constant across a chain of material substitutions.[11] The Neoplatonic theory of memory can perhaps be viewed as an extreme expression of a more widespread and enduring scholarly mentality in which the traces of former things (*vestigia*) were bound together so tightly with the search for them (*vestigare*) that the process often proved capable of producing the premises.[12]

In the context of early modern Swedish antiquarianism — and as is particularly evident in research on the national emblem, as the examples in this article have been selected to demonstrate — this process took the form of a set of complementary practices: *conservation*, the directed preservation of cultural artefacts that had survived intact; *restoration*, the renovation of cultural artefacts that had survived in part (e.g. a partially effaced inscription, a collapsed shrine); and *reproduction*, the (re-)creation of cultural artefacts that had been lost altogether. These practices were reflected in contemporary theories of memory. As the German theologian and philosopher Johann Heinrich Alsted put it in 1612: "The character of intellective memory is twofold: faithfully conserving [*retinere*] intelligible species, and readily restoring [*reddere*] them when the need arises."[13] For Alsted, importantly, memory was twofold because the process of *redditio* encompassed the latter two categories (i.e. restoration and reproduction). Similarly, early modern Swedish antiquaries employed words such as *instaurare*, *restaurera*, and *förnya* to signify a wide range of practices that the modern historian (who has long abandoned the belief in non-contingent history) would describe at the extreme ends as either conscientious restoration or conscious forgery. In the following pages, I will explore how these principles and practices were employed in representative instances by examining the ways in which two antiquarian scholars at the opposite ends of the seventeenth century, Johannes Bureus (1568–1652) and Johan Hadorph (1630–1693), dealt with the problems of origin and provenance in their research on the history of the Three Crowns.

Christian III's appropriation of the Three Crowns into the Danish royal arms was justified as a commemoration of the Kalmar Union, the personal union of the kingdoms of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden that had been in effect between 1397–1523.[14] The Danes held that the emblem had been used

---

[11] I would stress that the principle of "performance" played a more pronounced role in seventeenth-century Swedish scholarship than in the earlier historical contexts studied by Nagel and Wood.

[12] On the etymology of *vestigia*, see Isidore of Seville 2006, 15.16.13.

[13] Alsted 1612), 137: "Memoriae intellectivae duplex est virtus: retinere fideliter species intelligibiles; & eas, si quando opus est, reddere promte."

[14] Whether this was Christian's own motive is unclear, as the Danish motivation only came to light with the onset of the feud after Christian's death in 1559. See Landberg 1925, 235–243.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

to symbolize the union since the reigns of Margaret I and Eric of Pomerania, as was clear from their coins and seals. Gustav Vasa, whose rise to power ran parallel with the dissolution of the union, interpreted the action as an official statement that the Danish Crown continued to claim jurisdiction over the Swedish kingdom.[15] The Swedish position was that the emblem had never been used to signify the union, but had been a central element in the coat of arms of Sweden long before its formation in 1397.[16] Tensions between the neighboring kingdoms soon reached the boiling point, and the right to bear the emblem became a focal point in the Northern Seven Years' War (1563–1570) initiated by Christian's and Gustav's heirs, Frederick II and Erik XIV. The Danes and Swedes both agreed that the emblem functioned as a monument, but were at odds on the question of what it had been intended to memorialize.

From the beginning, the Swedish court recognized that the conflict had to be contested with antiquarian weapons. Writing from his cell in Gripsholm Castle in the early 1570s, the deposed king Erik XIV gave vent to his grievances against the Danes in the margins of a copy of Marcantonio Sabellico's *Opera*, recalling how his father Gustav Vasa had drawn on material evidence to disprove the Danish claims:

> No one is unaware that our Illustrious Father and Master demonstrated with the clearest evidence that the Three Crowns had been the emblem of Sweden prior to the ostentatious reign of Queen Margaret [i.e. Margaret I, founder of the Kalmar Union]. And no one should doubt that I, too, satisfied them [i.e. the Danish calls for proof]: he [i.e. Frederick II] was convinced by the letters, seals, reliefs, and paintings of the kings Erik Knutson, Magnus Ladulås, and Albert of Mecklenburg, the Duke of Finland Bengt Algotsson, and many other rulers that the Three Crowns are the possession of the Swedish Kingdom.[17]

---

[15] See for example Gustav Vasa's letter to Jöran Gylta, 30 December 1557, in Almquist (ed.) 1913, 207–211. For an overview of the sixteenth-century dispute, see Landberg 1925, 234–259; Skovgaard-Petersen 2009.

[16] Swedish scholars consented that the emblem had been used by the union monarchs, but insisted that this appropriated emblem symbolized authority over the Swedish kingdom rather than the union as a whole. See for example Bureus' explanation in Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket, MS Rål. 9 8º, 95, where beneath an illustration of the emblem on the seals of Margaret I and Erik of Pomerania he noted: "Däd är achtandes uti Regenternes Insiglen at så ofta som Tre kronor stå aftrykta inne uti Skiölden, Så finnes altid Swea Rikes Namn uti Omskriften." Modern scholarship has shown that the emblem was in fact used to symbolize the union. See Bartholdy 1997.

[17] Erik XIV 1828, 113: "Nemini autem ignotum […] fieri, Dominum Patrem illustrissi-mum testimoniis ostendisse evidentissimis, ante Regine Margarate superba gubernacula Regni Suetie insignia 3 coronas fuisse. Ne quis dubitet, me etiam illis satisfecisse; convictus

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

Viewed from the perspective of the political feud, it was only necessary to demonstrate that the emblem had been in use in Sweden prior to the formation of the Kalmar Union. This aim appears to have suffced entirely for Gustav Vasa, and largely for his son Erik, who drew up an extended list of evidence in the midst of the Seven Years' War.[18] In the official statement on the dispute he commissioned from the theologian Petrus Michaelis Fecht, Erik's brother and successor John III appears to have been content to trace the use of the emblem back to Birger Magnusson (r. 1290–1318).[19]

The Swedes had more than enough evidence to prove the point that the Three Crowns had been used by Swedish monarchs prior to formation of the union. The royal seal and coins of King Albert (r. 1364–1389), cited repeatedly by Swedish rulers and scholars throughout the debate, suffced on their own to make the case. Moreover, earlier authentic examples, such as the three crowns on the counter-seal of Magnus Ladulås (r. 1275–1290), should be viewed as compelling evidence in the context of the early modern debate, although modern scholarship has interpreted the emblem in these instances as a decorative device without conscious heraldic intent.[20] And yet the desire of Swedish leaders to drive home the point quickly turned into an obsession. John III assembled a collection of medieval coins and seals in the recently renovated Stockholm palace (newly rechristened the "Castle of the Three Crowns"), effectively constituting the seed of collections today housed in the Royal Coin Cabinet and the National Museum. He employed the chronicler and genealogist Rasmus Ludvigsson to travel the country collecting documents and sketching memorial inscriptions, a commission that would lead to the formation of the National Archives. He dispatched agents to Rome to search the Casa di Santa Brigida in search of documents that could be used to support the Swedish claim.[21] At bottom, he set in motion a potent, focused, state-funded antiquarian enterprise whose momentum could not easily be

---

est litteris Regis Erici Canuti, Regis Magni Ladulos, Regis Alberti Megalopolitani, Ducis Benedicti Finlandiae & multorum aliorum Regum litteris, sigillis, sculpturis & picturis, ad Regnum Suetiae pertinere 3 coronas."

[18] Erik XIV, "Excerptum ex Dissertatione belli Sveci-Danici anno 1563," in Schefferus 1678, 263–279.

[19] Petrus Michaelis Fecht, "Des Reichs Schweden Beweis wegen der Drey Chronen" (c. 1574), in Schefferus 1678, 286. There were exceptions of course. The Catholic archbishop and historian Johannes Magnus, whose aversion to Gustav Vasa's reformation was only outweighed by his patriotic contempt for Danish claims to historical priority, asserted that the origin of the emblem could be traced back to the seventh century AD, when it had been used in the coat of arms of the otherwise undocumented Swedish king Arthus. The claim was based on the author's reinterpretation of the iconography of King Arthur in medieval depictions of the Nine Worthies. Johannes Magnus 1554, 8,31.

[20] See for example H. Hildebrand, 1888, 21–26.

[21] Willers 1937; K. Hildebrand 1898, 217 ff.; Gillingstam 1995–1997, 700.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

slowed even after the political dispute had been resolved through the Treaty of Knäred in 1613.[22] If anything, the stakes of the matter would prove to intensify. For seventeenth-century Swedish scholars, who were occupied with conjuring a domestic history that reflected the self-identity of a country that had recently emerged as a European superpower, it was not enough that the emblem was old. It had to be primordial.

One question sixteenth-century research on the Three Crowns left open for the scholars of the following century bore on the emblem's original meaning. Although Olaus Magnus had suggested in the middle of the century that the emblem signified "the inscrutable size of the dominions of Sweden, its magnificent military accomplishments, and the inexhaustible bounty of its mineral deposits,"[23] the explanation was glibly dismissed by later Swedish scholars.[24] The question remained tantalizingly open, and it fell perfectly in line with the sensibility of the first protagonist in this story, Johannes Bureus, Sweden's first *antiquarius regni*.[25]

Bureus began his career in 1590 as a clerk in the chancellery of John III, and gradually emerged as an intellectual luminary and scholarly jack-of-all-trades during the regency of Duke Charles (later Charles IX). His *Runtavla* (completed 1599) established him as Sweden's leading expert in domestic antiquities by default. Charles supplied him with funding and a letter of passage to collect and document antiquities in the northern provinces in 1600–1601, and during the following two years he was appointed to serve as an expert in heraldry during border negotiations with the Danes.[26] Although his journal entries give little indication of the evidence he presented during these occasions, it is likely that the backbone was comprised of the same medieval coins and seals that had been forwarded in the preceding decades.[27] Yet from the beginning his investigations were driven by a greater scholarly ambition. As a keen student of material remains, he placed an even greater store than his predecessors in an undated stone engraved with the emblem found among the Stones of Mora, identifying it as the *Morasten*, the stone upon which the kings of Sweden had been elected from time immemorial.[28]

---

[22] Jensen 2014.

[23] Olaus Magnus 1555, 88: "Nunc vero Suecorum Principes tribus aureis coronis in campo coelestini coloris, ob inscrutabilem dominiorum amplitudinem, magnifica bellorum gesta, & inexhaustam minerarum ubertatem, utuntur."

[24] Messenius 1612, ch. 12.

[25] On Bureus' life and work, H. Hildebrand 1910; Håkansson 2014; Norris 2016.

[26] Bureus 1883, 15–28.

[27] See for example Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket, MS Rål. 9 8º, 94–97.

[28] Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket, MS F. a. 3, 6–7. This and the following note refer to the first section of an unpublished prospectus on Swedish antiquities (*Antiquitates*

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

As a bibliophile (he was later named head of the Royal Library), he pointed out that early Danish books printed during the Kalmar Union — such as the Danish *Rimkrønike* (1495) and Saxo Grammaticus' *Gesta Danorum* (1514) — included woodcuts which made clear that Danes had recognized the Three Crowns as the heraldic device of the Swedish kingdom prior to the dissolution of the union.[29] If Christian III had forgotten the provenance of the emblem, his ancestors Hans and Christian II certainly had not.

Yet all the while that Bureus was accumulating the kind of hard evidence that could be used effectively in international negotiations, he was hard at work reconceptualizing the cultural significance of the emblem for the original inhabitants of Sweden, eventually settling on three concurrent explanations.

1. In the beginning Sweden, which was coterminous with the province of Uppland, had been divided into three folklands, Attundaland, Fjädrundaland, and Tiundaland, as was testified by medieval legal texts.

2. Religious worship in Uppsala, the secular and spiritual capital of ancient Sweden, had been directed at a triumvirate of deities: Thor, Odin, and Freyja.

3. The primordial ruler of Sweden — the "Ättefader" or "Pater Patrum familiarum termaximus" — held the three offices of King, High Priest, and Chief Magistrate.[30]

For Bureus, these historical circumstances were not to be understood as arbitrary human inventions, but rather as having issued necessarily from a primordial, sacred mindscape in which the concept of the ternary had played a formative role. They were thus joined at the hip with the metaphysical triads elaborated in Neoplatonic philosophy, the *mundus triplex* (Intellectual, Celestial, Physical) and the *homo triplex* (Spirit, Soul, Body), as well as Paracelsus' three alchemical principles (Mercury, Sulphur, Salt), Plato's tripartite division between God, Idea, and Matter, and Heinrich Khunrath's discussion of the three books of Scripture, Nature, and Human Consciousness.[31]

Scanzianae). Although the undated text was drafted in the years around 1610, the opening section on the Three Crowns was likely drafted earlier (c. 1604). See Lindroth 1943, 96.

[29] Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket, MS F. a. 3, 8; *Then danska krønnicka* (Copenhagen: Gotfred af Ghemen, 1495), colophon; Saxo, *Danorum regum heroumque historia* (Paris: Jodocus Badius, 1514). Bureus' reference to the Saxo edition concerns the historiated initials at the beginning of the book divisions, such as the initial on fol. 1ʳ.

[30] Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket, MS F. a. 3, 11; MS Rål 9 8°, 85–93.

[31] Bureus' notes and reflections on ternaries are spread throughout his surviving manuscripts. See especially Linköping, Stiftsbiblioteket, MS N 24, passim.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

The genealogical basis for this chain of associations was Bureus' theory, inspired by Renaissance notions of the *prisca theologia*, that Sweden had been colonized in deep antiquity by Noachidean settlers led by Gether, grandson of Shem, and known to the gentile historians as Zoroaster. The first inhabitants of Sweden (a Semitic people in this revision of postdiluvian genealogy) were thus the inheritors of an all-encompassing divine wisdom that had been granted by God to Adam, inscribed by his descendants on two steles,[32] rediscovered by Noah after the Flood, and passed along to his son Shem.[33] The theory fueled Bureus' attempts to produce a syncretic reconstruction of ancient Swedish culture based on Oriental models. He viewed the three offices of the Swedish patriarch as akin to documented Eastern prototypes, the *munus triplex* (King, Priest, Prophet) of the Hebrews as described by Eusebius, and Ficino's interpretation of the epithet of Hermes Trismegistus as referring to his status as "the greatest philosopher and the greatest priest and the greatest king."[34] A devoted Christian cabalist, he held that the underlying significance of the three crowns was reflected in the original division of the fifteen-letter runic futhark into three groups of five,[35] and his intensive study of ancient writing systems led him to recognize that the three Hebrew "mother letters" Aleph, Mem, and Shin described by Abraham in the *Sefer Yetzirah*[36] were each topped with a three-pointed crown when transliterated back into Samaritan, a script held by Guillaume Postel and Joseph Scaliger to have been the predecessor of Hebrew.[37] It perhaps comes as no surprise, then, that he interpreted the worship of three deities in the Uppsala Temple not as a token of pagan superstition but as a conceptualization of the Christian Trinity: Thor conceived as God the Father, Odin as a prefiguration of the Son, and Freyja as the Holy Spirit.[38]

Bureus understood his lifelong project to rememorialize the spiritual culture of ancient Sweden as wholly commensurate with the ongoing Reformation's attempt to restore the original and true form of Christian belief and practice. His scholarship can best be understood as a form of

---

[32] Bureus followed a pseudo-Paracelsian reinterpretation of the story of the pillars of Seth relayed by Josephus. See Dorn 1581, 154–155.

[33] Norris 2016, 103–107, 558–562.

[34] Eusebius 1926, 3.1; Ficino 1576: "philosophus maximus, & sacerdos maximus, & rex maximus extitit." See for example Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket, MS F. a. 12, fol. 743ʳ.

[35] Bureus was aware that the Younger Futhark contained sixteen letters, yet argued that one of the two R-runes — Reið and Yr — had been a later addition.

[36] Early in his career, Bureus ascribed to the medieval tradition that the *Sefer Yetzirah* had been written by Abraham, and was therefore older than the Pentateuch.

[37] Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket, MS F. a. 3, 95; Norris 2016, 534–549.

[38] This interpretation is presented most thoroughly in the various manuscripts of the *Adulruna rediviva* composed around 1640, for example Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket, MS Rål. 9 8º.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

ecclesiastical antiquarianism in which the Swedish past was mobilized to satiate the spiritual needs of the present. Yet if Protestant historiography had found it difficult to unearth solid documentation bearing on the first centuries of worship after Christ, Bureus, who dedicated a half century of his life to the search for material remains, recognized that nothing tangible had survived from the age of domestic proto-Christianity. Although he was no less prone than his contemporaries and successors to overestimate the age of artifacts (particularly runic inscriptions), he held consistently to the view that the earliest surviving material traces originated from a later time already subjected to historical corruption. It was thus necessary to excavate deeper historical strata than could be elucidated through mere autopsy. Historical forms had evolved, or rather devolved, from an original ideal form.[39]

Bureus' method was honed through his early and intensive study of Renaissance Neoplatonism, particularly the writings of Ficino, whose endeavor to extract a reformed version of Christian theology from Platonic philosophy served as a kind of template for Bureus' attempts to Christianize the ancient Swedish past.[40] For antiquaries throughout Europe the paradigm of the sacred artifact was the ancient temple, which could be subjected to analyses based on Neoplatonic theories of architecture.[41] Discussing architectural beauty in the *Enneads*, Plotinus interpreted the well-designed structure as "the inner idea stamped upon the mass of exterior matter, the indivisible exhibited in diversity."[42] And turning to the subject of temples (*hiera*) in particular, he explained that the ancient wise men had designed such structures to function as an image, or representation, or reproduction of the Soul.[43] Ficino, treating architecture more broadly in the *De amore*, held that the material edifice as "body" (*corpus*) existed solely in a subordinate relationship of similitude to the edifice as *incorporea idea*. "Remove the material" (*materiam subtrahe*), Ficino urged, and the edifice remained as a pattern or plan (*ordo*) in the intellect. Its true form was entirely independent

---

[39] Norris 2020.

[40] Linköping, Stiftsbiblioteket, MS N 24, passim.

[41] Hendrix 2004, ch. 4.

[42] Plotinus 1956, 1.6.3: "But what accordance is there between the material and that which antedates all Matter? On what principle does the architect, when he finds the house standing before him correspondent with his inner ideal of a house, pronounce it beautiful? Is it not that the house before him, the stones apart, is the inner idea stamped upon the mass of exterior matter, the indivisible exhibited in diversity?"

[43] Plotinus 1956, 4.3.11: "I think, therefore, that those ancient sages, who sought to secure the presence of divine beings by the erection of shrines and statues, showed insight into the nature of the All; they perceived that, though this Soul is everywhere tractable, its presence will be secured all the more readily when an appropriate receptacle is elaborated, a place especially capable of receiving some portion or phase of it, something reproducing it, or representing it, and serving like a mirror to catch an image of it."

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

of matter.[44] Platonic archaeology induced its practitioners to excavate the monuments of the mind.

In a Christian context, a similar logic was often applied to those three structures whose design was attributed to God himself — Noah's Ark, the Mosaic Tabernacle, and Solomon's Temple — which were the subject of a profusion of scholarly reconstructions throughout the early modern period. Bureus pointed out that no less a spiritual authority than Yahweh himself, speaking to Moses, explained that the Tabernacle and its contents had existed as a *tabnith* (form, pattern, likeness, copy) accessible as a vision before it existed in physical space.[45] From this, Pseudo-Justin argued in the *Exhortation to the Greeks* that the whole of the Platonic theory of Forms should be understood as a partially corrupt derivation of this account, which Plato had become acquainted with in Egypt, though he had been unable to fully comprehend it.[46] Bureus argued that sacred monuments embodied a principle of unity that preceded the later conceptual division between *naturalia* and *artificalia*: the Tabernacle, read correctly, was a blueprint for the "Composition of the World" (*Dispositio Mundi*), an instruction book in Mosaic Physics that should replace the Aristotelian *Physica* read at universities.[47] Here Bureus was operating within a tradition of exegesis implemented by Pico della Mirandola in the introduction to the *Heptaplus*, where the Tabernacle was analyzed as a diagram of the threefold cosmos,[48] and more recently by the Spanish Jesuit Juan Bautista Villalpando, who in the second volume of the *Ezechielem explanationes* (3 vols., 1596–1604) offered a meticulous reconstruction of Solomon's Temple based on a combination of biblical exegesis, comparative archaeology, and Neoplatonic philosophical

---

[44] Ficino 1944, V. 5, 70: "Quod si quis quaesierit, quonam pacto corporis forma, animae, mentisque formae, et rationi similis esse queat, is, oro, consideret aedificium architecti. Principio architectus aedificii rationem, et quasi ideam animo concipit. Deinde qualem excogitavit domum, talem pro viribus fabricat. Quis neget domum corpus existere, eamque ideae artificis incorporeae, ad cuius similitudinem effecta est, esse persimilem? Porro propter incorporalem (f) ordinem quendam potius, quam propter materiam est architecto similis judicanda. Age igitur materiam subtrahe, si potes; potes autem cogitatione subtrahere; ordinem vero relinque. Nihil tibi restabit corporis, nihil materiae. Immo vero idem erit penitus, qui ab opifice provenit ordo, et qui remanet in opifice. Idem in quovis hominis corpore facias. Reperies illius formam animi rationi quadrantem, simplicem esse, materiaeque expertem."

[45] Exodus 25:40; cf. Exodus 26:30, "mishpat"; Hebrews 8:5: "typos"; Linköping, Stiftsbiblioteket, MS Spr. 1, fol. 6r: "Och ser til at tu gör efter den Eftersyn, som du på berget seedt hafwer."

[46] Justin Martyr [pseud.] 1870, ch. 29.

[47] Linköping, Stiftsbiblioteket, MS Spr. 1, fol. 22r. On Mosaic Physics, Blair 2000.

[48] Pico della Mirandola 1506, sigs a2ᵛ–a3ʳ. Bureus glossed Pico's exegesis of the Tabernacle in Linköping, Stiftsbiblioteket, MS N 24, fol. 150ᵛ.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

analysis, and come to the conclusion that it had been constructed to function as a microcosm of the universe.[49]

For Bureus, memory was not something passively received, but something to be actively pursued through intellectual inquiry and spiritual (at times, mystical) contemplation. Sacred monuments that had ceased to exist in the archaeological landscape persisted in the eternal Mind, which could be accessed through the noetic ascent (*ascensus*) of the soul, in which the temporally bound human intellect was able to unite with the omniscient and omnipresent consciousness of the One, the godhead of Christianity.[50] God had created man in His image, as a microcosm of the whole of creation, and endowed him with the divine gifts of understanding (*intellectus*), wisdom (*sapientia*), and memory (*memoria*).[51] For Bureus, the last of these was associated with *dianoia*, discursive reasoning, which Plato had placed above conjecture (*eikasia*) and belief (*pistis*) in a scale of cognition that terminated in *noesis*, immediate apprehension.[52] *Dianoia* was the mental faculty that allowed man to proceed from a knowledge of sensible particulars to an apprehension of intelligible forms. In a similar way, memory was capable of functioning in the field of sacred antiquities as a bridge or intermediary between particular material remains and monumental archetypes. Bureus' research into the origin of cultural signifiers was directed at the retrieval of a primordial space prior to historical contingency in which Idea and Phenomenon, Referent and Icon, Memory and Monument, were one and the same.

The method proved capable of leading to striking and sudden epiphanies, as it did on the morning of 1 December 1610, when a detailed model of the primordial home of religious worship in Sweden suddenly took shape in his mind. His hastily executed sketch depicts a three-tiered garden complex, which he labeled the "Hyperborean Gardens concealed from the common people" (*Hyperborei Horti absconsi vulgo*), echoing the Renaissance view of the ancient theology as an occult wisdom administered by an intellectual elite.[53] Eager to stress that this mental reconstruction was capable of granting access to a lost physical edifice, he added that such gardens had truly existed

---

[49] Morrison 2015. Bureus was well acquainted with Villalpando's work.

[50] Bureus' conception of noetic ascent is treated thoroughly in Lindroth 1943, ch. 2.

[51] Cf. 2 Esdras 14:40: "et accepi et bibi, et in eo cum bibissem cor meum eructabatur intellectum et in pectus meum increscebat sapientia. nam spiritus meus conservabat memoriam."

[52] Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket, MS F.a. 9, unpag. chart headed "ΜΙΚΡΟΚΟΣΜΙ-ΚΟΝ." The triad *intellectus*, *sapientia*, and *memoria* is equated with heart (*kardia*), soul (*psykhe*), and discursive reasoning (*dianoia*). Cf. Matthew 22:37; Plato 2013, 509d–511e.

[53] Linköping, Stiftsbiblioteket, MS N 24, fol. 131[r]. On the association of Sweden with Hyperborea, Nordström 1934, ch. 4.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

in Sweden.[54] At the center of the complex, the Holy of Holies was represented by a tent, modeled on the Desert Tabernacle whose features and proportions had been dictated by God to Moses in the book of Exodus.[55] And within the tent, in place of the Ark of the Covenant (which had yet to exist according to his chronological reckoning), a throne inscribed with the Three Books (Scripture, Nature, and Human Conscience[56]), the Three Crowns, and an emblematic representation of the tripartite runic alphabet.[57] The noble primitivism of the complex as a whole expanded upon antiquarian deliberations on the origin of Christian architecture forwarded already in the Quattrocento, when humanists like Lorenzo Valla and Leon Battista Alberti contrasted the simple austerity of early Christian shrines with the excessive decadence of Renaissance cathedrals.[58] Here as elsewhere, Bureus' ultimate aim was to restore the tenets of the true faith to an international Christian community that had forgotten them, and in order to do so he was obliged to reproduce, or rememorialize, the monumental archetypes that underlay them. Luther, he believed, had posed critical questions rather than supplied definitive answers. Taken together, the *Horti*, the tent, and the throne embodied that answer in the form of a monumental setting, an accretion of cultural memory that existed somewhere in the blurry middle-region between the material and the conceptual. In the framework of secular history, the Swedes had the right to bear the arms of the Three Crowns through the criterion of priority. But in the far more important context of sacred history, the emblem stood as a divinely sanctioned standard in the ongoing war of religion doctrine, culminating a decade later in the Swedish intervention in the Thirty Years' War.

In 1630 Bureus was appointed head of the newly formed bureau of the Antiquary of the Realm (*antiquarius regni*), a state-funded research agency that would gradually evolve into the modern Swedish National Heritage Board (still called Riksantikvarieämbetet).[59] Among the initiatives he sought to introduce was a practical ordinance for the conservation and restoration of antiquities. Already in 1602 he had discussed with Duke Charles measures to restore (*förnyia*) the all-important Stones of Mora, which had fallen into

---

[54] Ibid.: "Sådana nogh i Sverike." It should be pointed out that in the early seventeenth-century the adverbial *nog* meant "verily" or "truly."

[55] Bureus drew not only on the biblical account but on a long tradition of exegetical commentary stretching from Josephus and Philo of Alexandria to Pico della Mirandola and Juan Battista Villalpando. Cf. Linköping, Stiftsbiblioteket, MS Spr. 1, fols 22r–28r. Lindroth 1943, 201–204.

[56] Drawing on Khunrath 1609.

[57] Linköping, Stiftsbiblioteket, MS N 24, fol. 171ᵛ; Norris 2016, 255–268.

[58] Grafton 2019, 21–22.

[59] Gödel 1930, 11–31; Schück 1932–1944, I:120–145; H. Hildebrand 1910, 127 ff.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

disrepair, and in 1631 he and his assistants petitioned the court for a royal decree that would compel landowners to treat monuments as the property of the state.[60] But Bureus lacked the administrative acumen and practical focus to see the majority of his projects through to completion, and upon his death in 1652 he left to posterity a pile of unpublished manuscripts and a collection of loose threads.

These omissions would be remedied a decade later with the rise to prominence of the focused and determined Johan Hadorph, who became the driving force behind the enactment of early legislation for the conservation of antiquities (*Placat och påbudh, om gamble monumenter och antiquiteter*, 1666), the commencement of a comprehensive inventory of domestic cultural heritage (*Rannsakningar efter antikviteter*, 1666–1693), and the inauguration of the Collegium Antiquitatum (1667), a state-funded research institute charged with processing, documenting, synthesizing, and disseminating the information attained through the inventory.[61] Hadorph's motive for these interventions could not be clearer: Because monuments (a broad category that included written texts as well as orally transmitted myths, beliefs, and traditions) were the bearers of cultural memory, their conservation was crucial to fending off the cultural amnesia that was the product of time and human neglect. No one defined the antiquarian project as a battle against oblivion more decidedly than Hadorph, who tended to use the word *påminnelse* (reminder) to signify what we would term historical evidence. While memory recorded in even the truest of written histories could be called into doubt, memory embodied in physical monuments was unassailable given its ability to bridge the distance between image and icon.[62]

On the question of the antiquity of the Three Crowns, he held that the emblem had its origin in the distant past with the cultic worship of Thor, Odin, and Freyr, noting on one occasion that he had discovered an engraving of the emblem on a pagan rune stone in the village of Säby.[63] But he was above all

---

[60] Norris 2016, 368–369.

[61] Schück 1933.

[62] See for example Hadorph's letter to Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie, 9 March 1666, qtd. in Leijonhufvud 1910, 146, where he frets that if conservational measures are not taken posterity will "få orsaak till att hålla dhe sanneste wåre historier för osanning, när dhe see ett och annat uthi slijke saker, som förfäderne så mycket omtaldt hafwa, nu inge vestigia meer quarlempna."

[63] Hadorph 1678, 324; cf. Peringskiöld 1710, 306: "Åfwan på wårt Monument, hwarest i stenen är af naturan såsom en Altarefoot eller afsätning / finnes tre hielmar i rad med try kors uthhuggne / hwilke på thetta sättet ritade / äfwen wäl kallas Aegis Hielmar / hwarigenom betecknas the tre krönta Afgudars minne. Thetta wisar Stenen wara i hedendomen uprättad / och dess ålder til efwentyrs wara ifrån konung Ödmundz / then elliest så kallade Bröt-Omunds tid / i den siette hundra åhrige tiden efter Christi födelse / då en dehl här i landet under högbemälte Ödmundz Fader konung Ingvar, woro Christne / men en tid ther efter åter

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

interested in extending the documentary chain of icons backwards from the thirteenth century through the study of medieval coins, seals, and (his own specialty) memorial stones. It proved to be no simple task. According to a reliable sixteenth-century eyewitness — the historian, genealogist, and royal secretary Rasmus Ludvigsson — the ledger stone over the grave of King Sverker the Elder (d. 1156) at Alvastra Abbey Church had been engraved with the emblem, "but now," Hadorph sighed, "ever since the church was ravaged by fire, its fractured remains are missing" (*men nu sedan kyrkian är affbränd / aldeles sönderslagen och borta*).[64] He had given more extensive vent to his frustration in an earlier "Brief Report Concerning the Discovery and Conservation of Antiquities in the Kingdom" (*kort Upsatt om Antiquiteternes uppfinnande och conservation i Rijket*) appended to a letter to Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie (25 September 1666), where he noted that a great number of royal tombs and funereal monuments had been

> squandered and destroyed, as has occurred in Alvastra, Varnhem, and other places, so that not even the scantest trace is to be found of the kings, queens, and royal families who lie buried there, but through the violent decimation and unchristian pillaging carried out by the locals all [of these monuments] have been so completely obliterated that if the Histories did not inform us of the names of those who lay buried there, no one today would have knowledge of their resting places. And so every respectable Swedish man bears a great displeasure and empathy for the fate of those Swedish kings who, […] not receiving the same compassion from posterity that they demonstrated through the many solicitudes they performed in the service of the fatherland, were unable to rest in peace and have their gravestones and burial places remain unmolested.[65]

---

afföllo /som wi tilförene pag. 253 antecknat hafwa." The stone in question (U 951) had been erected by Christians, and the image Hadorph referred to appears to have been intended to depict the steeples of contemporary churches.

[64] Hadorph 1678, 322.

[65] Qtd. in Leijonhufvud 1910, 145–146: "[…] förkompne och ruinerade, såsom i Alwastra, Warnheem och flerstädes skedt ähr, hwarest icke dhet ringeste tekn finnes till dhe Rijksens konungar, konunga Barn och drottningar som dher begrafne liggia, uthan alt sammans igenom dhe närboendes wåldhsamme niderbrytande och ochristelige afförande så förstördt att hwar Historierne icke underwiste oss om dheras nampn, som dher begrafne liggia, skulle dheras grafplatzer ingen i denna dag kunnig vara, dher till hwar redelig swensk man bär ett stort misshag och medymkan öfwer dhe swenske konungar, som fordom wid Landh och Rijke sutit hafwa, sådanne kloster och klosterkyrkior till Guds ära, sina åminnelse och Lägerstellen upbygdt och uthwaldt, men icke nutit den barmhertigheet af sine efterkommande att dhe hade för alla sine welgerningar emoot fäderneslandet fått liggia i fredh och niuta sine grafstenar och lägerstellen omolesterade."

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

Fortunately, Hadorph could report that other early royal memorials had enjoyed a more agreeable fate, managing to survive destruction by the skin of their teeth. At times his progress reports were marked by a gleeful optimism, whenever the diligent fieldwork of the antiquaries and the early fruition of the inventory project appeared to promise auspicious results: "Many antiquities that have not been observed formerly still exist. […] In Skara, Varnhem, and other places we have discovered numerous *monumenta sepulchralia* which Messenius does not make note of in his *Tumbae*, instead complaining that none exist."[66] Indeed, he was happy to report that the gravestones of Inge the Younger (r. 1118–1125) and Ragnvald Knaphövde (r. ca 1130) in the abbey church at Vreta had managed to escape destruction, to which he added a curious caveat: "Though it is likely that their stones were engraved some time after their deaths, it nevertheless occurred in old monkish times, long before the dispute with Denmark concerning the provenance of the Three Crowns."[67]

Here Hadorph's prevarication was warranted, albeit grossly misdirected. Stylistically the royal memorials bore nothing in common with twelfth-century memorial monuments inscribed with Latin epitaphs known to Hadorph, such as the mid-twelfth-century grave marker for the brother of Saint Botvid in Botkyrka Church. The gothic miniscule used for the inscription was adopted from late medieval codices rather than early Christian epigraphy, clearly the work of an individual more at home with manuscripts than monuments. And there was no need to dig deep in search of a cause for these discrepancies. Indeed, the aforementioned Rasmus Ludvigsson — playfully characterized by his contemporaries as a muddleheaded genius, "Sapientia in confusione" — had designed the ledger stones in 1580 as part of an extensive renovation project carried out by King Johan III.[68] The project, which had been carefully documented in the state archives, was well known to the antiquaries of the seventeenth century. Johannes Messenius reported that the inscriptions in the church had been "a serenissimo rege Iohanne III perbelle paucos ante annos renovatis" (very handsomely restored by that most serene king Johan III not many years ago), which — depending on how one interpreted the action signified by *renovatis* — suggested that the inscriptions had perhaps been copies of then existing originals.[69] While this may have been true for some of the later non-royal inscriptions, it certainly

---

[66] Hadorph, letter to Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie, 17 December 1669, qtd. In Leijonhuf-vud 1910, 145, n. 1: "Fast många Antiquiteter finnas ännu, som förr aldrig observerade ähro. […] wij uthi Schara, Warnhem och flerestädes funnit åthskillige Monumenta Sepulchralia, som Messenius i sina Tumbis intet omrörer, uthan beklagar att på dhe rum inga finnas."

[67] Hadorph 1678, p. 322.

[68] On the renovation project, Martin Berntson, "Vreta kloster och reformationen," in Göran Tagesson et al. ed., *Fokus Vreta kloster* (2010), pp. 375–379.

[69] Messenius 1611, 34.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

was not in the case of the royal epitaphs, which were selected from a number of suggestions devised in Ludvigsson's own hand and executed by the stone-cutter Hans Edler the same year, a fact Hadorph could have discovered in the same set of documents from which he had learned of the lost Alvastra inscriptions.[70]

Hadorph was not only a passive participant in this process, allowing himself to taken in by the pseudo-antiquities fabricated by his predecessors, but could also play an active role in the production of anachronistic artifacts. In 1666, as we have seen, Hadorph lamented that the medieval burial monuments in the abbey church at Varnhem had been willfully pillaged by the local population to the extent that not even the "scantest trace" (*icke dhen ringeste tekn*) remained. Three years later he could report that "monumenta sepulchralia" were still to be found in the church, despite the false reports of earlier antiquaries. And in a later letter to Johannes Schefferus, published in the latter's *De antiquis verisque regni Sueciae insignibus* (1678),[71] he specified that these were the ledger stones of the kings Inge the Elder (d. ca 1110),[72] Knut Eriksson (r. 1167–1195/96), and Erik Knutsson (r. 1208–1216), all of which — as luck would have it — were inscribed with the all-important emblem of the Three Crowns.[73] Comparing these reports leads one to assume that Hadorph managed to discover medieval ledger stones during an investigation of the church at some point between 1666 and 1678. But this was not the case, at least not exactly. In this instance, Ludvigsson's reproduction of the burial monuments in Vreta functioned both as an invisible window onto the past, and a concrete and conspicuous exemplar worthy of emulation.

Lord High Chancellor Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie, for decades Hadorph's most devoted sponsor, had received Varnhem Abbey as a donation from Queen Christina in 1647. From the beginning it was his desire to restore the abbey church to its former glory, which took shape as a comprehensive, long-term renovation project that after a number of false starts was set fully in motion in 1668. As part of the project de la Gardie ordered that grave markers — including effigies and epitaphs — were to be erected honoring the medieval kings who were held to be buried there. This raised a problem. Not

---

[70] Curman and Lundberg 1935, 166–171; Toll 1922.

[71] It should be noted that while the title page of the book gives the date of publication as 1678, it was first published posthumously in late 1679 or early 1680. It is therefore uncertain whether Schefferus would have assented to the inclusion of Hadorph's letter. See Schück 1932–1944, III:276.

[72] Hadorph was following the information given in Johannes Magnus 1554, 584.

[73] Hadorph 1678, 322.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

only did no such monuments exist in the church,[74] entailing that they could not be "restored" in the strict sense, but de la Gardie was himself unsure which kings were interred there. He addressed a letter to the Collegium asking for "a precise account (as far as can be extracted from the documents at hand and those who have knowledge of the times) concerning the foundation of the church in question and the lives and exploits of those old Swedish kings who lie buried there," adding that "I have at one time had some little knowledge of the subject, but nowhere near as thorough and precise as I expect to receive from you, dear sirs."[75] Within a short time the Collegium responded with a formal list — whose unusually elegant formatting and calligraphy give it the sheen of an official certificate of authorization — detailing the rulers who, according to domestic histories, archival documents, and tradition, had been buried in the church. Alongside the list, the Collegium attached a number of suggested designs for the royal monumental settings stylized in typical Baroque fashion. But soon after it was decided that the monuments should be carefully fashioned to appear as though they had been produced in the thirteenth century.[76]

Although the sources do not give a clear indication of who the instigator of this shift in direction was, Hadorph's hand is unmistakable. He had been hired by de la Gardie to serve as something of an expert consultant entrusted with overseeing the project, a task to which he applied himself with a fastidiousness best described as pathological. A Latin elegy composed by Schefferus to commemorate the church's renovation explained that the broken fragments of the burial chapels' arched vaults were meticulously sifted from the rubble one by one and re-pieced together during the construction.[77] Although we should read a degree of Baroque exaggeration into this account, it nevertheless gives a glimpse into the underlying mentality that governed the work. When it came to the missing ledger stones, however, Hadorph had to turn to different tactics. Indeed, we know that Hadorph knew how to date a medieval ledger stone because he knew how to make one when the need arose. He composed Swedish epitaphs for the walls of the chapels, and entrusted Schefferus with designing the Latin inscriptions and effigies "in a more antique fashion" (*antiquiori modo*) than the imaginative and anachronistic woodcuts found in Johannes Magnus' *Historia*.[78] By early 1671

---

[74] Raised empty burial vaults without lids appear to have been erected in the 1570s during an earlier restoration commissioned by John III. See Hahr 1905, 131.

[75] De la Gardie to the Collegium antiquitatum, 15 July 1668, in Schück, 1932–1944, III:453; Edenheim and Rosell, 1982, 79; Leijonhufvud, 1910, 144–145.

[76] For an overview of the restoration project, Edenheim and Rosell 1982, 71–108.

[77] In Leijonhufvud 1910, p. 143.

[78] Letter from Hadorph to Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie, 18 October 1669, in Leijonhufvud 1910, 149.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

the designs for the stones were finished, and Hadorph turned his attention to their physical forms, specifying the type of stone to be quarried and the precise dimensions in which the slabs were to be cut, noting that they should be finished "in the ancient manner" (*antiquo more*).[79] He was worried that the engravers would be unable to scale up the gothic majuscule script Schefferus had designed for the inscriptions accurately, and instructed the Collegium's artist to produce a full scale copy that could be used as a template. The monuments were completed and placed in the royal chapels no later than 1674.

There is a temptation to conclude that Hadorph's judgements were the products of ignorance or waged in bad faith. Clearly his own warmhearted patriotism and *horror vacui* converged to allow him to see what he wanted to see, or indeed make what he wanted to see, which in the more extreme instances appears to have crossed the boundary separating self-delusion and conscious deception. According to Sigrid Leijonhufvud, who identified Hadorph as the agent responsible for the decision to style the Varnhem stones as antiques: "Hadorph's eagerness to sweep all traces of his ancestors' vandalism under the rug makes him suspect of having offered such a suggestion with the conscious intention to deceive posterity."[80] Yet in neither of the two instances does deception appear to have been a reasonable motive. Not only did Hadorph *know* that the Vreta ledger stones were not particularly old, he knew that others knew as well, including those like Messenius who had written on the topic. And yet he nevertheless *believed* that they were medieval. In the case of the Varnhem stones, he did not act in secrecy, but rather directed a large team of scholars, copyists, artists, architects, stone masons, and engravers to see the work through to completion, all of it carefully documented through detailed progress reports and itemized accounts.[81] Indeed, upon completion of the project, a series of memorial plaques were installed in the church detailing the structure's history, where it was stated in plain terms that by the time work had begun in 1668 all the royal choirs had collapsed and fallen into ruin.[82] The readers of Hadorph's account in Schefferus' *De insignibus* knew that the ledger stones were new, and yet it was believed that these same readers would perceive them as old. Indeed, at some point between 1674 and 1678 the already thin line between restoration and reproduction became blurred, and Hadorph himself appears to have viewed his own creations as genuine antiques.

---

[79] Letter from Hadorph to Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie, 10 February 1671, in Leijon-huvud 1910, 159–160.

[80] Leijonhufvud 1910, 148.

[81] Edenheim and Rosell 1982, 243–244.

[82] Johan Peringskiöld, *Monumenta Sveo-Gothorum*, vol. 9, Stockholm, Kungliga biblio-teket, MS F. h. 9, fols 245v–246r.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

The paradox that presents itself here is likely all too familiar to anyone who has spent time studying early modern antiquarianism, and in a fascinating series of books and articles Christopher Wood and Alexander Nagel have offered a compelling solution.[83] They argue that the well-known material turn in early modern scholarship not only gave rise to a new culture of criticism in which things were allowed to challenge the received testimony of texts and traditions, but at the same time, established an intellectual space in which the *factuality* or *historicity* of things emerged first within a framework of meaning regulated by written history, myth, tradition, and belief. Old objects did not, or at least *not only*, stand as barriers to the imagination; just as often they spurred creative and fanciful ways of thinking about the relation between things and time. Antiquarian credulity can in many cases be viewed as the effect of a complex state of mind in which

> all artifacts — not just statues but also chairs, panel paintings and even churches — were understood […] to have a double historicity: one might *know* that they were fabricated in the present or the recent past but at the same time value them and use them *as if* they were very old things. This was not a matter of self-delusion or indolence but a function of an entire way of thinking about the historicity of artifacts repeatedly misunderstood by the modern discipline of art history.[84]

The ledger stones in Vreta and Varnhem functioned as legitimate substitutes for missing originals that were known to have been real. They served to redress the accidental absence of their prototypes. Hadorph was able to look through the contingent features of their recent production in order to see the missing originals of which they stood in lieu. Their referential meaning merged with what was taken to be their true meaning. Through this act of suspension the boundary between reproduction and original was dissolved, and the retroactively fabricated monuments became, for all intents and purposes, authentic antiquities. Antiquarian scholarship, as Wood notes, "often drifted into a disorienting middle ground where the fabricated supplements to fact could cycle back and become corroborating testimony to their own reality."[85] Anachronism was a way of engaging with the past.

Importantly, the empirical perspective never fell by the wayside. Theories of Swedish antiquity were extrapolated from surviving monuments, and yet the same theories folded back onto and predetermined the monumental landscape in a circular movement with no clear point of origin. It is typical that Olof Rudbeck could devote an early chapter of the *Atlantica* to

---

[83] See above all, Nagel and Wood, 2010; Nagel 2011; Wood 2008.
[84] Nagel and Wood 2005, 405.
[85] Wood, 2012, 152.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

establishing a testable scientific method for the accurate dating of excavated artifacts, and several chapters later cite the evidence of an ancient wooden escutcheon inscribed with the Three Crowns alongside a serendipitous runic gloss, an "antiquity" that had either never existed or been manufactured for the occasion.[86] Here as elsewhere, the difference was not the moral discrepancy between good and bad faith, but an outcome of the adaptability and variability of epistemological approaches and practices that characterized the antiquarian encounter with things. Hadorph's acceptance of the authenticity of the Vreta stones, together with his admission of their anachronistic form, demonstrates that although the friction between the contingent and non-contingent features of the object had become more pronounced in the second half of the seventeenth century, he was still able to understand them "as belonging to more than one historical moment simultaneously."[87]

Strategies of conservation, moreover, were not aimed merely at securing monuments from damage and destruction, but at allowing them to realize their proper mnemonic function. Just as practitioners of the *ars memoriae* sought to preserve individual memory through the mental fabrication of images (*imagines*) situated in places (*loci*), antiquaries sought to conserve cultural memory through the systematized arrangement of artifacts in collections, whether physically in the form of cabinets, museums, and archives, or virtually in the form of sylloges, inventories, and albums. The collection served as the catalogue raisonné of a people, registering the achievements that had managed to elude oblivion, and revealing through their conspicuous absence those that had not. Swedish antiquaries sought to provide a functional blueprint of the memory palace of domestic antiquity through the inductive processes of collection and documentation. And the expertise they acquired along the way gave them sanction to furnish the empty rooms and corridors by means of deductive intervention.

In a number of important ways, Hadorph's scholarship represented a break from that of Bureus. The metaphysical and mystical underpinnings of Bureus' project to recover a lost Swedish proto-Christianity appear to have been entirely alien to his successor. Yet in some respects Hadorph went even further. Bureus, it should be stressed, never presented his pseudo-antiquities as anything other than conceptual reconstructions. Indeed, he tended to sign them, allowing his authorship to animate the interplay between past and present that was the overarching point of his scholarly enterprise. That they existed solely as ideas did not make them any less *real* than the authentic runic inscriptions he spent his life documenting. The far more down-to-earth

---

[86] Rudbeck 1679, ch. 6 and p. 732.
[87] Nagel and Wood 2005, 407.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

Hadorph, who liked to style himself a "Materialist" (in a non-philosophical sense), envisioned cultural memory as a vast archaeological treasury in which things could speak for themselves, even if things sometimes required a helping hand to speak correctly, or indeed at all. The Swedish past was filled with memories that had been dislodged, unfairly, from their monumental envoys through the destructive forces of time and human neglect. Conservation and restoration were procedures used to manage icons of memory that had come down to the present either in whole or in part. Reproduction was a complementary strategy used to rectify the clefts and intervals that inevitably followed in the wake of autopsy. Significantly, the examples cited in this article were far from isolated. Viewed from the perspective of modern historiography, much of the evidence supporting the antiquity of the Three Crowns forwarded by Swedish antiquaries in the seventeenth century can be described as the anachronistic products of heated imaginations, externalizations of the hopes and dreams of individuals eager to secure the identity of the present on the foundations of the past. This suffices to make "monuments" like the Hidden Gardens and the Varnhem memorials historically important. Yet just as important, if exceedingly more difficult, is to remember that for a time they possessed a realness, authenticity, and solidity that the same perspective of modern historiography has compelled us to forget.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

Bibliography

Almquist, Johan Axel (ed.) 1913, *Konung Gustaf den förstes registratur*, vol. 27, Stockholm.

Alsted, Johann Heinrich 1612, *Philosophia digne restituta*, Herborn.

Augustine 2002, *On the Trinity*, ed.: Gareth B. Matthews, trans.: Stephen McKenna, Cambridge.

Bartholdy, Nils G. 1997, "De tre kroner og korset: Unionssymbolik, ambition og rivalitet", *Heraldisk Tidsskrift* 76, 233–260.

Berntson, Martin 2010, "Vreta kloster och reformationen", *Fokus Vreta kloster: 17 nya rön om Sveriges äldsta kloster*, eds.: Göran Tagesson et al., Stockholm, 369–383.

Blair, Anne 2000, "Mosaic Physics and the Search for a Pious Natural Philosophy in the Late Renaissance", *Isis* 91:1, 32–58.

Bureus 1883, "Anteckningar af Johannes Thomae Agrivillensis Bureus", ed.: Gustaf Edvard Klemming, *Samlaren* 4, 12–43, 71–126.

Catana, Leo 2005, *The Concept of Contraction in Giordano Bruno's Philosophy*, Aldershot.

Clucas, Stephen 2015, "Memory in the Renaissance and Early Modern Period", *Memory: A History*, ed.: Dmitri Nikulin, Oxford & New York, 131–175.

Corrias, Anna 2012, "Imagination and Memory in Marsilio Ficino's Theory of the Vehicles of the Soul", *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition* 6, 81–114.

Curman, Sigurd & Erik Lundberg 1935, *Vreta klosters kyrka*, Stockholm (*Sveriges kyrkor: Konsthistoriskt inventarium* 2).

Dorn, Gerhard 1581, *Congeries Paracelsicae chemiae de transmutationibus metallorum*, Frankfurt.

Edenheim, Ralph & Ingrid Rosell 1982, *Varnhems klosterkyrka*, Stockholm (*Sveriges kyrkor: Konsthistoriskt inventarium* 190).

Erik XIV 1828, "Responsum contra Danos", *Handlingar rörande Skandinaviens historia*, vol. 14 [cont. from vol. 13], Stockholm.

Eusebius 1926, *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 1, trans.: Kirsopp Lake, Cambridge, MA (*Loeb Classical Library* 153).

Ficino, Marsilio 1576, "Argumentum Marsilii Ficini Florentini, in librum Mercurii Trismegisti, ad Cosmum Medicem, patriae patrem", *Opera Omnia*, Basel, 1836.

Ficino, Marsilio 1944, *Marsilio Ficino's Commentary on Plato's Symposium*, ed.: Sears Reynolds Jayne, Columbia, MO.

Ficino, Marsilio 2014, *Platonic Theology*, vol. 4, ed.: James Hankins, tr.: Michael J. B. Allen, Cambridge, MA.

Galatino, Pietro 1550, *Opus de arcanis catholicae veritatis*, Basel.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

Gillingstam, Hans 1995–1997, "Rasmus Ludvigsson", *Svenskt biografiskt lexikon*, vol. 29, 700.

Grafton, Anthony 2019, "Past Belief: The Fall and Rise of Ecclesiastical History in Early Modern Europe", *Formations of Belief: Historical Approaches to Religion and the Secular*, eds.: Philip Nord, Katja Guenther, & Max Weiss, Princeton, 13–40.

Gödel, Vilhelm 1930, *Riksantikvarieämbetet*, Stockholm (*Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens handlingar* 41:1).

Hadorph, Johan 1678, "Påminnelser om de 3. Cronor", Schefferus 1678, 308–325.

Hahr, August 1905, *Konst och konstnärer vid Magnus Gabriel de la Gardies hof*, Uppsala.

Hankins, James 2005, "Marsilio Ficino on *Reminiscentia* and the Transmigration of Souls", *Rinascimento* 45, 3–17.

Hendrix, John 2004, *Platonic Architectonics: Platonic Philosophies and the Visual Arts*, New York.

Hildebrand, Hans 1888, "Heraldiska studier I: Det svenska riksvapnet", *Antiqvarisk tidskrift för Sverige* 7:1, 1–98.

Hildebrand, Hans 1910, "Minne af riksantikvarien Johannes Bureus", *Svenska Akademiens Handlingar* 23, 57–435.

Hildebrand, Karl 1898, *Johan III och Europas katolska makter 1568–1580*, Uppsala.

Håkansson, Håkan 2014, *Vid tidens ände: Om stormaktstidens vidunderliga drömvärld och en profet vid dess yttersta rand*, Gothenburg & Stockholm.

Isidore of Seville 2016, *The "Etymologies" of Isidore of Seville*, trs.: Stephen A. Barney, W. J. Lewis, J. A. Beach, & Oliver Berghof, Cambridge.

Jensen, Ola W. 2014, "*Antiqua serva*: Några brottstycken ur den tidiga minnesvårdens rättskultur", *Med hjärta och hjärna: En vänbok till professor Elisabeth Arwill-Nordbladh*, eds.: Henrik Alexandersson, Alexander Andreeff, & Annika Bünz, Gothenburg (*GOTARC Series A. Gothenburg Archaeological Studies* 5), 127–144.

Johannes Magnus 1554, *Historia de omnibus Gothorum Sueonumque regibus*, Rome.

Justin Martyr [pseud.] 1870, *Hortatory to the Greeks*, tr.: Marcus Dods, *Ante-Nicene Christian Library: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*, vol. 2, eds.: Alexander Roberts & James Donaldson, Edinburgh.

Khunrath, Heinrich 1609, *Amphitheatrum sapientiae aeternae*, Hanau.

Landberg, Georg 1925, *De nordiska rikena under Brömsebroförbundet*, Uppsala.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

Leijonhufvud, Sigrid 1910, "Kungastenarna i Varnhem", *Fornvännen* 5, 138–165.

Lindroth, Sten 1943, *Paracelsismen i Sverige till 1600-talets mitt*, Uppsala & Stockholm.

Messenius, Johannes 1611, *Tumbae veterum ac nuperorum apud Sveones Gothosque regum, reginarum, ducum, aliorumque heroum et heroidum*, Stockholm.

Messenius, Johannes 1612, *Specula, ex qua inclytam Svecorum et Gothorum conditionem, manifesto atq; prolixo contemplari licet quaquaversum prospectu*, Stockholm.

Morrison, Tessa 2015, "Villalpando's Sacred Architecture in the Light of Isaac Newton's Commentary", *Architecture and Mathematics from Antiquity to the Future*, vol. 2, eds.: Kim Williams & Michael Ostwald, Basel, 183–196.

Nagel, Alexander 2011, *The Controversy of Renaissance Art*, Chicago.

Nagel, Alexander & Christopher Wood 2005, "Interventions: Toward a New Model of Renaissance Anachronism", *The Art Bulletin* 87:3, 403–415.

Nagel, Alexander & Christopher Wood 2010, *Anachronic Renaissance*, New York.

Nikulin, Dmitri 2015, "Memory in Ancient Philosophy", *Memory: A History*, ed.: Dmitri Nikulin, Oxford & New York, 35–84.

Nordström, Johan 1934, *De yverbornes ö: sextonhundratalsstudier*, Stockholm.

Norris, Matthew 2016, *A Pilgrimage to the Past: Johannes Bureus and the Rise of Swedish Antiquarian Scholarship, 1600–1650* (*Ugglan, Lund Studies in the History of Ideas and Sciences, Minerva Series* 19), Lund.

Norris, Matthew 2020, "The Cross before Christ: Ecclesiastical History and Esotericism in the Antiquarian Scholarship of Johannes Bureus", *Faith and Knowledge in Late Medieval and Early Modern Scandinavia*, eds.: Karolina Kjesrud & Mikael Males, Turnhout, 243–267.

Olaus Magnus 1555, *Historia de gentibus septentrionalibus*, Rome.

Pico della Mirandola, Giovanni 1506, *Omnia Opera*, Reggio Emilia.

Plato 2013, *Republic*, vol. 2, eds. and trs.: Christopher Emlyn-Jones & William Preddy (*Loeb Classical Library* 276), Cambridge, MA.

Plotinus 1956, *The Enneads*, tr.: Stephen MacKenna, rev.: B.S. Page, London.

Rudbeck, Olof 1679, *Atland eller Manheim*, vol. 1, Uppsala.

Schefferus, Johannes 1678, *De antiquis verisque regni Sveciae insignibus*, Stockholm.

Schmidt-Biggeman, Wilhelm 2004, *Philosophia Perennis: Historical Outlines of Western Spirituality in Ancient, Medieval, and Early Modern Thought*, Dordrecht.

MEANINGFUL MEMORIES
NJRS 17 • 2020 • www.njrs.dk
Matthew Norris: In Search of the Three Crowns

Schück, Henrik 1932–1944, *Kgl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien: Dess förhistoria och historia*, 8 vols, Uppsala.

Schück, Henrik 1933, *Johan Hadorph: Minnesteckning*, Stockholm.

Skovgaard-Petersen, Karen 2009, "Political Polemics in Early Modern Scandinavia", *Negotiating Pasts in the Nordic Countries: Interdisciplinary Studies in History and Memory*, eds.: Anne Eriksen & Jón Viðar Sigurðsson, Lund, 79–88.

Toll, Hans 1922, *Kungagravarna i Vreta kloster*, Stockholm.

Varro, Marcus Terentius 1938, *On the Latin Language*, vol. 1, tr.: Roland G. Kent, Cambridge, MA (*Loeb Classical Library* 333).

Walker, Daniel Pickering 1972, *The Ancient Theology: Studies in Christian Platonism from the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century*, London.

Willers, Uno 1937, "Myntsamlande i samband med trekronorstvisten", *Nordisk numismatisk årsskrift*, 101–105.

Wood, Christopher 2008, *Forgery, Replica, Fiction: Temporalities of German Renaissance Art*, Chicago.

Wood, Christopher 2012, "The Credulity Problem", *Antiquarianism and Intellectual Life in Europe and China*, eds.: Peter N. Miller & François Louis, Ann Arbor.

Yates, Frances 2002, *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition*, Abingdon.