

HOWARD L. ADELSON

22 Brosca
Lazio Falzfer
6 Firenze

Legend has it that even in the modern world the holy lance of the mediaeval Roman Empire has played a significant role in reflecting the concepts of men. It has been reported that in 1914 the German Emperor Wilhelm II, as "Emperor of the World," wished to have a reconstruction of the labarum of Constantine, as a symbol of dominion in the East, and a copy of the holy lance, as a symbol of dominion in the West, carried before him under the Arc de Triomphe in Paris. In England in 1960 another legend arose which reported that in 1938, on the evening of Hitler's entry into Vienna, the holy lance was brought before the German Chancellor with the acclamation "Mein Führer! Der Schicksalspeer." During the height of the battles of the Second World War, Hitler supposedly had the sacred object brought to his personal headquarters as a talisman of victory, and when the tide turned against the Nazis he ordered it buried near Nuremberg where the American troops, according to this story recovered it. Lord Glentanar is reported to have uttered the cry of terror, "where is the holy lance? If the Russians get it, they will be the masters of Europe."¹ These are, of course, legends and inventions, but they do indicate the continuing hold on men's minds and emotions of the holy lance, the most treasured royal and imperial symbol of the Saxon and Salian period in German history. The difficulty, however, lies in discovering the iconographic significance of this symbol for the men of the tenth and eleventh centuries.

This can only be done, if it can be shown that despite conflicting evidence there is a creditable mass of contemporary data which can only be interpreted in one fashion. On the face of it, this should be a relatively simple task, but a closer examination reveals that such is not the case. Precisely because the lance, which was kept carefully guarded in the imperial treasury on the Trifels under the Hohenstaufen monarchs, was so well known and of such obvious importance that it was used in connection with a great number of different political and

ceremonial events, the evidence seems to point in many different directions. The holy lance was apparently a symbol which could be used to denote a number of different things, and until the present moment it has been impossible to discover precisely what use the emperors of the tenth and eleventh centuries made of it.

The literary, documentary, and most of the artistic references to the holy lance were collected as early as 1908 in a fundamental article by Hofmeister.² No large body of data has come to light since that time, and all of the later work may be conceived of as little more than a commentary on Hofmeister. In 1937, Brackmann added some precise material about events surrounding the connection between the holy lance and the honors paid to St. Maurice.³ Since the lance was at one point attributed to St. Maurice, the extension and patronage given to the cult of St. Maurice by the emperors was thought to be of significance. Finally, in 1955, Percy Ernst Schramm reviewed the entire problem.⁴ In his study Schramm pointed out, as had his predecessors, that the problem was complicated by the fact that mediaeval authors were apparently quite as divided as the modern ones in attributing a specific iconographic or symbolic function to the holy lance. Authors of the late eleventh and early twelfth century, following the Investiture Controversy, had described it as the symbol of the Empire, or of Burgundy, or even of Christianity against the pagan Slavs.⁵ In addition, its very early connection with the state of political affairs in Italy seems to point to the lance as the sign of overlordship within that peninsula.⁶ On the other hand, there were instances in which it seemed to be quite simply connected with the royal office in Germany and the ceremonials surrounding the German monarchy. Not only that, but in the mediaeval sources Constantine the Great was reputed to have been the earliest owner of the lance. In addition, there are a number of specimens or rather replicas of the so-called holy lance still

NB A bibliography of frequently cited sources, given short titles in the footnotes, will be found at the end of this article.

* The author wishes to express his appreciation to his former graduate student, Mr. Nunzio Pernicone, for assistance in checking some of the references, to Prof. Peter Berghaus, Prof. Arthur Suhle, Dr. Otto Mørkholm, and Mr. Philip Grierson for providing photographs or casts of the various coins, and to Mr. Michael Di Biase, photographer of the American Numismatic Society, for the preparation of the photographs.

1 Bühler, "Die heilige Lanze," 93f. Cf. Max Caulfield, "The Spear of Destiny," *Sunday Dispatch*, Nov. 6, 1960, cited by Bühler. The story about Wilhelm II is recounted by Arpad Weixlgärtner, "Die weltliche Schatzkammer in Wien (neue Funde und Forschungen)," *JKS*, n.s. 1, 1926, 83f. He cites several articles in the *Paris Figaro* and attributes the tale to F. de Mély. The holy lance and other regalia were returned to Nuremberg from Vienna by order of Hitler at the Tenth Party Congress. Haupt, *Die Reichsinsignien*, Mainz, n.d., 9f.

2 Hofmeister, "Die heilige Lanze," 96, 1-86. Hofmeister utilized all of the earlier works, particularly that of Mély, "Reliques de Constantinople," 1-11, 120-27, 287-302.

3 Brackmann, "Die politische Bedeutung der Mauritius-Verehrung im frühen Mittelalter," 279-305. Also see *idem*, "Zur Geschichte der heiligen Lanze Heinrichs I,"

Deutsches Archiv, 6, 1943, 401-11.

4 Schramm, "Die 'Heilige Lanze,'" 492-537.

5 Hugo Flaviniacensis *Chronicon* 2. 29 (MGH, SS, VIII, 401) calls it the lance of St. Maurice quod erat insigne regni Burgundiae. Bonizo *Liber ad Amicum* 4 (MGH, *Libelli de Lite*, 1, 581), speaks of it as the insigne scilicet imperii. Landulf *Historia Mediolanensis* 3. 31 (MGH, SS, VIII, 98) describes it as Romani imperii stabilimentum ab hostibus durissimis. Sigebert of Gembloux *Chronica* ad a. 929 (MGH, SS, VI, 347), calls it the insigne et tutamen imperii. In a letter written in the winter of 1008 to Henry II, St. Brun of Querfurt requests that the emperor send aid to the Poles against the pagan Lusatians, and says, Quomodo conveniunt Zuarasi vel diabolus et dux sanctorum vester et noster Mauritius? Quo fronte coeunt sacra lancea et, qui pascuntur humano sanguine, diabolica vexilla. The text of this letter is to be found in Wilhelm von Giesebrecht, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, 4th ed., Braunschweig, 1873, II, 691, and A. Bielowski, ed., *Monumenta Poloniae historica*, I, 223-38. It is, of course, based on a paraphrase of 2 Cor. 6:15.

6 Liudprand of Cremona *Antapodosis* 4. 25 (ed. J. Becker, MGH, *Script. rer. Germ. in usum scholarum*, 118f.). The evidence for the connection with Italy is discussed by Hofmeister, "Die heilige Lanze," 18-25. He rejects the views of Mély and Poupardin that the lance was the symbol of investiture with the kingdom of Italy.

extant, and the identification of the original has engendered further dissension among historians.⁷ From this it seemed clear to Schramm that no single function in the catalogue of symbols could be attributed to the holy lance. It was, in his view, simply the most sacred of the relics possessed by the emperors, and as such it was used in a number of different ways. The lance could be borne before him in solemn processions; it could be used to rally the army on the battlefield; and it could serve as the sacred object upon which the most solemn oaths might be sworn.⁸

Thus the problem has remained in a state of suspension. Only the addition of new data can make further speculation valuable. Such new data is presently at hand because of the study of some of the coins of the period which have previously been ignored. On the basis of these coins it can be shown that the lance certainly had one specific use, perhaps in addition to those already cited, but one which appears to have played the paramount role in the representations which were made of the lance during the early Middle Ages.

From the first mention of the holy lance to the last quarter of the eleventh century its association with the hereditary claims to the throne can be demonstrated. The first reference presents an unusual feature. It is now generally believed that the holy lance was acquired by the German monarch Henry I from Rudolf I, the King of Burgundy, either in 926 or 935.⁹ Liudprand of Cremona is the sole source for our knowledge of the acquisition of the holy lance by Henry I. All later accounts are merely borrowed from his story.¹⁰ The story of the acquisition of the lance does not appear in Liudprand's account of the

life of Henry I but as an insertion following the description of the events leading up to the Battle of Birten in 939.

In the course of describing the Battle of Birten, in which Otto the Great defeated Giselbert of Lorraine, Eberhard of Franconia, and his own rebellious brother Henry, who was claiming the throne, Liudprand says that Otto dismounted from his horse just before the fight and knelt in prayer before his lance in which was fastened the victory-giving nail from the hands of Christ.¹¹ He continues his narrative with the remark: "But since we have made mention of this holy lance, we shall insert here [an account] of how it came into his possession."¹² He then describes the origin of the holy lance, pointing out that it had once belonged to Constantine the Great and held one of the nails of the Crucifixion in its blade.¹³ The nail was believed to render its possessor invulnerable and victorious.¹⁴ Rudolf I, the Burgundian King who had ruled in Italy for several years, had received the lance as a gift from a certain Count Samson. Henry I, the German monarch, hearing that Rudolf possessed a gift of such inestimable value, tried to secure it for himself, so that he would have perpetual victory against both visible and invisible foes. Only by resorting to threats that he would ravage the Kingdom of Burgundy with slaughter and fire could Henry persuade Rudolf to yield the lance, in return for which he gave Rudolf great gifts of gold and silver as well as a sizable portion of the Duchy of Swabia. With the lance in his possession Henry was always victorious, and when he died, he left it by hereditary right, with his kingdom, to his son Otto. The Latin expression . . . *decedens cum regno simul hereditario dereliquit* is of vital significance for us.¹⁵

7 Mély, "Reliques de Constantinople," 1-11, 120-27, and 287-302, attempted to identify the Longinus lance. In that connection he discussed the German lance then kept in Vienna, the Cracow copy, the Echmiadzin lance, and the Roman lance. Hofmeister, "Die heilige Lanze," 1-86, treats, in addition to the German lance, the lance of Rudolf of Rheinfelden, which was later held by the Bohemians, the lance (?) of St. Olaf of Norway, the Hungarian royal lance, and the Cracow copy of the German lance. He holds (*ibid.*, 44-53) that the original holy lance was probably lost at some time between 1035/37-1099, and that it was replaced by a substitute. According to him, the Cracow replica is the closest model of the original. Schramm, "Die 'Heilige Lanze,'" 527-34, discusses the form of the lance in detail and arrives at the conclusion that the Vienna example was in existence by the 10th century.

8 Arnold *Libri de Memoria Beati Emmerami et eius Cultorum. Libri de s. Emmeramo* 2. 33 (MGH, SS, IV, 567); Gottfried of Viterbo *Pantheon* 23. 28; 26. 3 (MGH, SS, XXIII, 233, 273); Benzo of Alba *Ad Heinricum IV Imperatorem* I, p. 9 (MGH, SS, XI, 602); Bonizo *Ad Amicum* 4 (MGH, *Libelli de Lite*, I, 581); Liudprand of Cremona *Antapodosis* 4. 24 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 117); Widukind *Res gestae Saxonicae* 3. 46 (ed. G. Waitz and K. A. Kehr, MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 108); Thietmar of Merseburg *Chronicon* 3. 20; 5. 17 (ed. R. Holtzmann, MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, n.s., IX, 124, 241); Thangmar *Vita Bernwardi* 24 (MGH, SS, IV, 770); Landulf *Historia Mediolanensis* 3. 31 (MGH, SS, VIII, 98f.); *Annales Augustani* ad a. 1086 (MGH, SS, III, 132); Ekkehard of Aura, *Chronicon* ad a. 1089 (MGH, SS, VI, 207); *Annales s. Disibodi* ad a. 1089 (MGH, SS, XVII, 9); Donizonus, *Vita Mathildis*, 2. 7 (MGH, SS, XII, 393); *Vita Comitissae Mathildis* 12 (PL, 148, 1052); Radulf de Diceto, *Ymaginibus Historiarum* (MGH, SS, XXVII, 269); Henry IV, *Epp.* 37 to Hugh of Cluny in 1106 (ed. C. Erdmann, *Die Briefe Heinrichs IV* [MGH, *Deutsches Mittelalter, Kritische Studententexte des Reichsinstituts für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, I], 47).

9 On this problem see Hofmeister, "Die heilige Lanze," 4-17; Hans-Walter Klewitz, "Die heilige Lanze Heinrichs I," *Deutsches Archiv*, 6, 1943, 42-58; Brackmann, "Zur Geschichte der heiligen Lanze," 401-11; Holtzmann, *König Heinrich I*, 1-64; Martin Lintzel, "Zur Erwerbung des heiligen Lanze durch Heinrich I," *HZ*, 171,

1951, 303-10; Georg Waitz, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reiches unter Heinrich I*, 66f., who cites the Burgundian chronicles. Also see Reginald Lane Poole, "The Supposed Origin of Burgundia Minor," *English Historical Review*, 30, 1915, 51-56, who argues against accepting the trustworthiness of the account by Liudprand. According to him, the lance must have been transferred between April and November of 926. Widukind *Res Gestae Saxonicae* 1. 25 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 33) indicates that Conrad I possessed the holy lance as well as the golden arm-bands, the royal cloak, the royal sword, and diadem. Conrad supposedly gave them to his brother Eberhard to bring to Henry whom he designated as his successor. This has been recognized as an error by most modern historians though some have tried to salvage the reference by supposing a multiplicity of royal lances. Wegener, "Die Lanze des heiligen Wenzel," 56f., holds that Widukind was projecting the use of earlier royal lances into this event. See note 33 below. Among the various dates suggested for the transmission of the lance to the German monarchs 919, 926, 935, and 1032 are to be found. Uhlirz, "Zur Geschichte der Mauritiuslanze, der sacra lancea imperialis," 5, 100.

10 Liudprand of Cremona *Antapodosis* 4. 25 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 118f.).

11 *Ibid.*, 4. 24 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 117f.). *Rex denique tantam suorum constantiam non sine divino instinctu esse considerans, quoniam, fluvio intercedente, corporali praesentia subvenire suis non poterat, recordatus populi Domini, qui repugnantes sibi Amalechites orationibus Moysi servi Dei devicerat, protinus de equo descendit, seseque cum omni populo lacrimas fundens ante victoriferos clavos manibus domini et salvatoris nostri Iesu Christi adfixos suaque lanceae inpositos in orationem dedit; quantumque iusti viri secundum beati sententiam Iacobi, tunc valeret oratio.*

12 *Idem. Sed quia lanceae ipsius sanctae memoriam fecimus, hic qualiter ad eum pervenerit, inseramus.*

13 *Ibid.*, 4. 25 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 118f.). The connection with Constantine is repeated in the *Annales Zwifaltenses* ad a. 1032 (MGH, SS, X, 54) in the tale of a supposed transmission of the lance to Conrad II by the Burgundian King Rudolf III. The passage in the *Ann. Zwifaltenses* contains information derived from Liudprand of Cremona and Herimannus Augiensis *Chronicon* ad a. 1032 (MGH,

Three things now become apparent. In the first place this wonder-working relic was derived from Constantine the Great and contained the victory-giving nail of the Passion. In the second place, it was a gift from an Italian count named Samson, and, as Brackmann and others have shown, it probably was a gift of political significance because investiture with sovereignty by the passing of a lance was usual in Lombardy and was known elsewhere among the Germanic peoples.¹⁰ Finally, however, the most important aspect of the account preserved in Liudprand of Cremona is the fact that the lance and the kingdom passed to Otto the Great by hereditary right, and that the holy lance first appears in a historical context in connection with a dispute over Otto's right to the throne.

During the Saxon and Salian periods in German history there was a struggle between two opposing points of view, one of which declared the imperial office to be elective, the other that it was hereditary. The conflict over the nature of succession to the royal office had its roots in the antagonism between the ancient secular Germanic and the Carolingian and post-Carolingian clerical conceptions of the office.¹⁷ Among the Germanic peoples during the *Völkerwanderung* the royal office tended to be hereditary although legitimism in the form of divine right monarchy did not exist. Instead there was a belief in the hereditary right of all members of a given clan, usually one which claimed divine ancestry, to succeed to the throne. A great many individuals therefore might be concurrently considered worthy of ascending the throne. The choice of the people or their representatives, expressed by acclamation, determined precisely which of the candidates was to become the king. This choice of the people was largely deter-

mined by the suitability of the various candidates of royal blood as shown by political and military talent. Thus, though the king's son had a presumptive right to succession not dissimilar from a hereditary right, it was incumbent upon him to prove his capability as a leader in order to secure the royal office.¹⁸

Even though the strictest churchmen during the Merovingian period did attempt to define suitability for the throne in moral as well as in practical terms there was as yet no comprehensive religious formulation of a theory of succession.¹⁹ It was, in fact, only under the Carolingian dynasty, when the hereditary nature of the monarchy was strongly emphasized in secular society, that the Church took a stand not only in opposition to the claims of bastards and minors, but also in defining the suitability of a candidate for the royal office. It was because the Church now viewed the royal office as a duty given by God which demanded that the ruler govern in accordance with the law, which was the expression of right, that it could oppose the succession of bastards who were the products of the violation of the law even though they possessed the requisite royal blood within the context of the older Germanic view.²⁰

Within the theocratic conception of the royal office with its emphasis on suitability there was an implicit opposition to the Germanic view of an inherited kin-right to the throne.²¹ In the clerical view the candidate was selected by God through the election of the people or their representatives and received the "sacrament" of unction at the hands of the episcopacy—conferring upon the new monarch a special character.²² Theoretically, neither royal blood nor legal title were necessary.

SS, V, 121). The text of Siegbert of Gembloux, *Chronica* ad a. 929 (MGH, SS, VI, 347), is directly dependent on Liudprand and therefore contains the reference to Constantine. The attempt of the Germanist School of historians in the 1930's and early 1940's to reject the literary tradition associating the holy lance with Constantine must itself be rejected. The significant factor about the lance was clearly the inclusion of the nail. J. Deér, "Byzanz und die Herrschaftszeichen des Abendlandes," *BZ*, 50, 1957, 427-30, presents strong arguments for Byzantine influence.

14 This can be shown to have been an attribute of the nails of the Crucifixion as early as the 5th century. Theodoret *Hist. Eccl.* 1, 18 (ed. L. Pamentier, 64f.) specifically says that the nail in the helmet of Constantine was to preserve his head from the darts of his enemies. Cf. Gregory of Tours *In gloria martyrum* 5 (MGH, *Script. rer. Merov.*, I, pt. 2, 491).

15 Liudprand of Cremona *Antapodosis* 4, 25 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 119).

16 Paul the Deacon *Historia Langobardorum* 6, 55 (ed. G. Waitz, MGH, *Script. rer. Germ. in usum scholarum*, 238) in describing the coronation of Hildebrand in 735, says, *cui dum contum sicut moris est, traderent*. When a cuckoo perched on top of the lance it was understood as an evil portent. Also see *ibid.*, 1, 15, 20; 3, 32; 5, 10 (*loc. cit.*, 61, 67, 138, 190). Gregory of Tours *Historia Francorum* 7, 33 (MGH, *Script. rer. Merov.*, I, pt. 1, 313) describes how King Gunthram in 585 designated his nephew Childbert to succeed him and says: *Post haec rex Gunthramnus data in manu regis Childberti hasta ait: "Hoc est indicium quod tibi omne regnum meum tradedi."* Brackmann, "Zur Geschichte der heilige Lanze Heinrichs I," 407-09, discusses the role of the Church in changing the Wodan spear into the holy lance. Andreas Alföldi, "Hasta—Summa Imperii: The Spear as Embodiment of Sovereignty in Rome," *AJA*, 63, 1959, 1-27, has traced the significance and importance of the spear as a symbol among the Romans.

17 This antagonism was not apparent in the ancient world or in the Byzantine Empire. Only occasionally, as in the case of the early Julio-Claudians, the Flavians, or the Constantinians and Theodosians in the 4th and 5th centuries is there any evidence of the operation of a hereditary principle. In Roman law, as well as in fact, the imperial office never became purely hereditary even after the Theodosian dynasty.

18 Kern, *Gottesgnadentum und Widerstandsrecht*, 1-120, the basic work on the theory of monarchy in the early Middle Ages, has been followed in this discussion.

19 The first attack of the Church was levelled against the claims of illegitimate sons and minors to inherit a right to the throne simply by virtue of possession of royal blood. *Vita S. Columb.* 1, 29 (MGH, *Script. rer. Merov.*, IV, 87), illustrates that fact. At the same time, however, the popular belief in the mystical efficacy of royal blood was sufficient to create a legendary origin for the Merovingian dynasty which involved adultery and bastardy. Gregory of Tours *Hist. Franc.* 2, 12 (MGH, *Script. rer. Merov.*, I, pt. 1, 80). The Carolingians supported the hereditary claim which was most clearly stated at the election of Charles the Bald for Lotharingia. MGH, *Capit.*, II, 339. Nevertheless, as early as 741 there is evidence that the Franks had been deeply affected by the opposition of the Church to the claims of bastards. *Annales Mettenses* ad a. 741 (ed. B. de Simson, MGH, *Script. rer. Germ. in usum scholarum*, 32). Also see the *Ordinatio Imperii* c. 15, of 817 (MGH, *Capit.*, I, 273).

20 The Church thus gave an ethical role to the king and contended that the ruler had to possess the power to enforce the law. These were the guiding principles of Pope Zacharias when he assisted Pippin to seize the throne. *Annales Regni Francorum* ad a. 749 (ed. Fr. Kurze, MGH, *Script. rer. Germ. in usum scholarum*, 8f.).

21 Karl Brandt, "Erbrecht und Wahlrecht," *HZ*, 123, 1921, 226-30, points out how this shook the early mediaeval monarchies. It was his belief that the opposition to hereditary monarchy should be connected with the prior opposition to a hereditary priesthood and episcopacy. At the Council of Paris in 829, where it was clearly stated that royal power was not derived from man but from God, there was a further condemnation of hereditary claims. MGH, *Concilia*, II, pt. 2, 655.

22 Kern, *Gottesgnadentum und Widerstandsrecht*, 68-70, cites the texts supporting this special character of an anointed leader. A clear statement of the early ecclesiastical interpretation of unction is to be found in the coronation sermon of the Archbishop of Mainz during the consecration of Conrad II. Wipo *Gesta Chuonradi II*, 3 (ed. H. Bresslau, MGH, *Script. rer. Germ. in usum scholarum*, 17f.).

"The monarch who ruled piously, justly, and with compassion ruled through God without doubt."²³ Nevertheless, the attachment to blood-right continued to be strong and, indeed, to be a vital element in succession.

The operative elements of a concept of monarchy were therefore in existence in the ninth century, and the conflict between the ecclesiastical and secular views was apparent. The emphasis of the secular position on the hereditary nature of monarchy survived the demise of the Carolingians. In the tenth century some authors justified the transference of the German, French, Burgundian, and Italian crowns to others on the grounds that the Carolingian stock had died out.²⁴ Throughout the early Middle Ages the emperors fought manfully to preserve the hereditary principle, but they eventually met defeat during the Investiture Controversy because of the opposition of the Church. For the first time, at Forchheim in 1077, the German nobility, with the cooperation of the apostolic legate, met to elect an anti-king without taking hereditary right into account, and their choice, Rudolf of Rheinfelden, actually agreed that he was not founding a dynasty.²⁵ During the Hohenstaufen period, of course, it is well known that the papacy tried to enforce the view that membership in that royal family, the *genus persecutorum*, was actually a bar to the imperial office.

The first reference to the holy lance can be understood only in the light of the concept of monarchy current in the tenth century. Otto the Great was not the eldest son of Henry I. He had been preceded by Thankmar.²⁶ Despite the fact that Thankmar was supposedly illegitimate we know that he struggled against Otto, and that Otto took a grim satisfaction in the death of his rival. Thankmar's claim to the throne would, at best, have been of the very weakest sort.²⁷ Otto I, however, was not *natus in aula regali* or *porphyrogenitus*. He was born before his father ascended the throne of Germany. His younger brother Henry, on the other hand, was born after his

father had been crowned. Under these circumstances there was some question as to whether Otto or Henry had the better claim to the throne.²⁸ The choice was made by Henry I when he selected Otto, giving him both the lance and the kingdom by hereditary right.²⁹ Otto, before the Battle of Birten, was obviously appealing to that hereditary right when he prayed before the holy lance. The Battle of Birten was specifically fought to place Henry on the throne. Although he had been beguiled by Giselbert of Lorraine and Eberhard of Franconia, nevertheless, according to the account of Liudprand, it was Henry who was the prime mover at the battle. Finally, Liudprand informs us that during the battle Henry was struck so savagely on the arm that though his armor prevented the flesh from being cut the skin turned black and could not be cured by any of his doctors. In fact, this bruise remained with him throughout his life and caused him severe pain. His death was attributed to it.³⁰ The wounding of Henry in the account of Liudprand has almost the character of a divine punishment for raising one's hand against the legitimate king. That Otto also held the holy lance at the Battle of Lechfeld when he defeated the pagans in 955 and that it is specifically mentioned in connection with a number of battles in the eleventh century cannot be questioned. As a reliquary containing the wonder-working nail which would give victory over enemies both visible and invisible there was every reason for the monarch to carry the lance into battle.³¹ At no time, however, save just prior to the Battle of Birten, was the lance an object of prayer, and it was at that moment that Otto's hereditary right to the German crown was in question.

Given the importance of the lance to Otto I and to Henry I, his father, it would be remarkable if neither of them were represented in connection with this reliquary. The seals of the early monarchs of the Saxon dynasty are related in type to those of their Franconian predecessors, both including a representation of a spear. Both Conrad I (Fig. 4) and Henry I (Fig.

²³ MGH, *Concilia*, II, fasc. 2, 655.

²⁴ Regino *Chronicon* ad a. 888 (ed. Fr. Kurze, MGH, *Script. rer. Germ. in usum scholarum*, 129); *Continuatio Reginonis* ad a. 911 (*ibid.*, 155); Kern, *Gottesgnadentum und Widerstandsrecht*, 26.

²⁵ Bruno *Saxonicum Bellum* 91 (ed. H. E. Lohmann, MGH, *Deutsches Mittelalter. Kritische Studententexte des Reichsinstituts für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, II, 85f.): *Hoc etiam ibi consensu communi comprobatur, Romani pontificis auctoritate est corroboratum, ut regia potestas nulli per hereditatem, sicut ante fuit consuetudo, cederet, sed filius regis, etiam si valde dignus esset, potius per electionem spontaneam quam per successionis lineam rex proveniret; si vero non esset dignus regis filius, vel si nollet eum populus, quem regem facere vellet, haberet in potestate populus. His omnibus legaliter constitutis, Rodolfum electum regem Mogontiam cum magno honore deducunt et ei, dum consecrationem regis accipiebat, venerabiliter et fortiter, sicut mox apparebat, assistunt.* Kern, *Gottesgnadentum und Widerstandsrecht*, 60 n. 119, quotes Paul of Bernried *Vita Gregorii* 95 (ed. J. M. Watterich, *Pontificum Romanorum qui fuerunt inde ab ex saecula IX usque ad finem saeculi XIII vitae*, Leipzig, 1862, I, 530 = PL, 146, 84, where the reference is *Vita Greg.* 10), showing that Rudolf of Swabia repudiated any hereditary rights for his descendants.

²⁶ On the marriage of Henry to Hatheburg, the mother of Thankmar, whom he took from a convent, and the later recognition that the union was illicit see Waitz, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reiches unter König Heinrich I*, 15-17.

²⁷ Kern, *Gottesgnadentum und Widerstandsrecht*, 38-40, 87f. Thankmar's rebellion never won the acceptability of that of Henry of Bavaria.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 27 n. 62, notes the Byzantine parallel of those born in the Porphyra Palace (*πορφυρογέννητος*) as heirs of the throne from the reign of Basil I (867-886). Cf. Köpke-Dümmeler, *Kaiser Otto der Grosse*, 25, where it is suggested that Henry wished Otto, as the first born, to have the ancient family heritage of Saxony, whereas he, as the younger son born after his father was king, would have the Frankish realm which was more recently acquired. Cf. Liudprand of Cremona *Antapodosis* 4. 18 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 114); *Vita Mathildis Reginae Post.* 9 (MGH, *SS*, IV, 289); *Wolther, Vita Godehardi Episcopi Posterior* 3 (MGH, *SS*, XI, 199).

²⁹ A diploma of Sept. 16, 929, making a grant of five Saxon towns in favor of Mathilda indicates that as early as that date Henry I considered Otto his successor at least in Saxony. He made that grant *cum consensu et astipulatione filii nostri Ottonis*. MGH, *Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae*, I, 56, No. 20. It is most unlikely that Henry conceived of another heir for the kingship.

³⁰ Liudprand of Cremona *Antapodosis* 4. 24 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 118).

³¹ *Idem.* . . . *dum contra se insurgentes hoc victorifero praeiunte signo semper hostes terruit atque fugavit.* See note 14 above on the victory-giving character of the sacred nails.

³² Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, pl. 47, a (Ludwig the Child); pl. 55, a-b (Conrad I); pl. 56, a-b (Henry I). Holtzmann, *König Heinrich I*, 60-64, uses these

5) chose for their royal seals the variety which was used on the last seal of Ludwig IV the Child (Fig. 3), a later Carolingian, showing the emperor in profile with spear and shield.³² While it is true that there is a pennant on the spear and that it has thus been transformed into a *vexillum*, a standard or banner, there is no reason to identify this *vexillum* with the holy lance. The fact that Conrad I is represented with such a *vexillum* is absolute evidence that it cannot have been the holy lance, since his reign ended in 918, and the lance could not have been acquired by the German monarchs before 919. The statement in Widukind that Conrad I sent the holy lance along with the other royal insignia to Henry I through his brother Eberhard is simply false.³³

Representations of lances are, of course, quite common in mediaeval art, and the identification of a specific representation with the holy lance should take into account the physical appearance of the object itself. Since the lance itself, it is now generally agreed, is extant, we can have no doubt about its appearance (Figs. 1, 2). It is a simple early Germanic lance of the rather common type with wings or projections at the base of the head which have been broken off in the course of time and with a hollow point so that the nail of the True Cross might be fastened in the head.³⁴ Since this lance is not precisely like the one described by Liudprand, there was some dispute among historians as to this identification. The study by Schramm seems to clear up this problem. It should, however, be noted that the head has been broken and repaired with a silver banding inscribed: *Clavus Dominicus—Heinricus Dei Gratia tercius Romanorum Imperator Augustus hoc argentum iussit* and on the reverse: *fabricari ad confirmationem clavi Domini et lancee Sancti Mauricii. Sanctus Mauricius*. Charles IV later added a gold band which reads simply: *lancea et clavus Domini*.

The identification of a specific representation with the holy lance must also take into account the specific connections between the lance and particular individuals and concepts. The

silver band was obviously added by Henry IV, and it indicates that by his reign the holy lance, which had formerly been attributed to Constantine the Great, was derived from St. Maurice, the commander of the Thebaid Legion, who suffered martyrdom together with the entire legion near the town which bears his name in Switzerland. Brackmann has already demonstrated the political importance of the cult of St. Maurice and made a great deal of the connection between the cult and the holy lance. Nevertheless, the fact remains that this silver band is among the first references to the lance in connection with the martyred saint.³⁵ Before the Investiture Controversy there is no evidence to connect the holy lance with the cult of St. Maurice, and the importance of the lance lies in its connection with the royal family.

The constitutional significance of the holy lance as a symbol for the hereditary succession to the German throne begins with the reign of Otto the Great. It was his father who had acquired the lance and left it to his second son together with his kingdom. On the royal seal of Otto I (Fig. 6) which was used for the period 937–962 the king is shown in the usual pose, but the lance with attached pennant which he holds in his hand is somewhat different from those of his predecessors. If I have seen it correctly, there is a cross below the blade of the lance—probably the first representation of the holy lance.³⁶ I should not, however, like to put any emphasis on this. It is not a vital point. Nevertheless, our sources indicate that Otto's claim to the throne of Germany was based on his royal blood.

During the same period the holy lance, which was the symbol of a rightful hereditary claim to the German throne and conferred invincibility on the monarch, replaced earlier sacred objects under which the king entered battle. Henry I at the Battle of Unstrut had used a banner with an image of St. Michael to rally his troops. In describing the Battle of Lechfeld in 955, Widukind of Corvey made it clear that when Otto exhorted his troops and threw himself into the fray against the

seals as evidence that the spear was an attribute of sovereignty. He contends that Henry I wished to have the holy lance primarily because Christianity was relatively new among the Saxons, and they believed in such wonder-working instruments. It is uncertain that the imperial bulla of Wido of Spoleto (891–94) shows such a winged lance. Schramm, "Die 'Heilige Lanze,'" 529 n. 1, claims that it is clearly visible on the seal of Berengar I. Cf. Holtzmann, *op.cit.*, 14f., for a discussion of the appearance of winged lances on seals or bullae of Berengar I or Wido of Spoleto. Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, pl. 48, b (Berengar I as King of Italy), pl. 49, b (Wido of Spoleto as Emperor), gives the pieces in question. Another example of Berengar's seal is to be found in the *Catalogue of Seals in the British Museum*, VI, pl. IX, No. 21642. In the case of Berengar and that of Wido the lances are not pennanted. Later Italian rulers used scepters. The seals of Conrad I and Henry I do not show winged lances. Among the Carolingians and early Capetians the lance apparently had no political significance and was used simply as a glorification of the ruler as a military commander.

³² Widukind *Res gestae Saxonicae* 1. 25 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 33). Mély, "Reliques de Constantinople," 291f., suggested that perhaps Henry was bequeathed the lance by Conrad I, but that it was not actually transmitted until a later date. Hofmeister, "Die heilige Lanze," 5 n. 1, rejected Mély's explanation and pointed out the anachronism. Schramm, "Die 'Heilige Lanze,'" 502, points out that it is evident from this passage that one generation after the acquisition of the lance, the circumstances surrounding its transfer to Henry I were unknown in Corvey.

See note 9 above.

³⁴ On the physical appearance of the holy lance and the suggestion that it may not be the one described by Liudprand see in addition to Schramm, "Die 'Heilige Lanze,'" 527–34; Haupt, *Die Reichsinsignien*, 12, 35; Hofmeister, "Die heilige Lanze," 48, 74; A Weixlgärtner, "Die weltliche Schatzkammer in Wien (neue Funde und Forschungen)," *JKS*, n.s., 1, 1926, 15–84; Brackmann, "Die politische Bedeutung der Mauritius-Verehrung im frühen Mittelalter," 288 n. 2, 295–97; Holtzmann, *König Heinrich I und die heilige Lanze*, 7–12; and Joseph Hörle, "Die sogenannte 'Beschreibung der heilige Lanze' bei Liutprand von Cremona (Antapodosis, IV, 24 und 25)," *Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte*, 14, 1962, 63–80.

³⁵ The only pertinent literary references are those of Benzo of Alba *Ad Heinricum IV Imperatorem* 9 (MGH, *SS*, XI, 602) in the late 11th century and the Gallus Anonymus *Chronicae Polonorum* 1. 6 (MGH, *SS*, IX, 429), and Hugo of Flavigny *Chronicon* 2. 29 (MGH, *SS*, VIII, 401), both of the early 12th century. The letter of St. Brun of Querfurt to Henry II in 1008, cited in note 5 above, does not attribute the lance to St. Maurice. A similar contrast between Christian and pagan battle cries can be found in Liudprand of Cremona's description of the Battle of Merseburg. Liudprand of Cremona *Antapodosis* 2. 30 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 51).

³⁶ Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, pl. 59, a. This seal was used throughout Otto's royal period.

Magyars he bore the holy lance which was the guarantee of victory. Thietmar of Merseburg says: *sumpsit rex clipeum lancea cum sancta*, which is given in another manuscript as *sacramque lanceam*.³⁷ In either case the meaning is clear, and the Latin provides no difficulty.

Although during the reign of Otto I the holy lance had replaced the sacred banner, it was not, and it could not, be used to indicate hereditary succession to the imperial office when Otto reestablished the Roman empire.³⁸ His ancestors had been dukes of Saxony, and his father had been king of Germany, but he did not claim imperial lineage. Thus, if it is true that the holy lance appeared on the first seal of Otto I as king, it was certainly removed from the first imperial seal which was used after 962 (Fig. 7). It did not reappear when the second imperial seal was designed (Fig. 8). The imperial seals show first a scepter and then a staff.³⁹ The assumption of the imperial office was merely a continuation of the policy of the German monarchs which had been established before the reign of Otto. Widukind's account of the Battle of Unstrut in 933 tells us that after the victory Henry I was acclaimed as emperor by the troops: *Deinde pater patriae, rerum dominus, imperatorque ab exercitu appellatus, famam potentiae virtutis cunctis gentibus et regibus longe lateque diffudit*.⁴⁰ On the battlefield of Lechfeld in 955, several years before his imperial coronation, according to the same author, Otto I was similarly hailed as emperor: *triumpho celebri rex factus gloriosus ab exercitu pater patriae imperatorque appellatus est*.⁴¹

During the latter part of the tenth century, however, as Otto II and then Otto III succeeded to the throne of their fathers, there was an increasing tendency to convert the imperial office into a hereditary post. The heir presumptive enjoyed that role because of his august lineage and blood-right. Within that context, of course, it was important that the imperial blood remain undiluted, so that God might view the legitimate emperor with favor. It has been pointed out that the

marriage policy of the Saxon emperors was connected with the attempt to convert the imperial office into a hereditary post,⁴² and that it resulted in the marriage of Otto II to the Byzantine Princess Theophano, with a consequent sharp increase in Byzantine influence. Within the framework of Byzantine imagery the idea of legitimate rule under divine grace was easily expressed. An ivory, which bears the names and imperial titulature of Otto II and Theophano, demonstrates this in clearly Byzantine style though it is probably of south Italian workmanship.⁴³ The imperial couple, garbed in the Byzantine fashion, stands on either side of Christ who is crowning them as the legitimate rulers while a vertical inscription placed between the emperor and Christ contains the Byzantine formula imploring divine aid for His servant (Fig. 9).

Otto II and Otto III used a number of different imperial seals, but the holy lance can be found on none of them.⁴⁴ When Otto III in 997/8 created the imperial seal showing the enthroned emperor, which became the model for most mediaeval seals (Fig. 10), he also reintroduced the bulla (Fig. 11). The bulla which he used had an obverse which was copied from the bulla of Charlemagne, but the reverse showed a very clear representation of a winged, pennanted lance in the hands of a figure whom Schramm has identified as Roma.⁴⁵ Schramm considered the long hair decisive for his identification. For our purposes it is important to note that this Roma holds a perfect representation of the holy lance and that the bulla was used during those years when Otto's ambition was at its peak and the concept of hereditary imperial succession seemed most powerful. About that time Otto III had taken the title: *Servus Jesu Christi et Romanorum Imperator Augustus secundum voluntatem Dei salvatorisque nostrique liberatoris*⁴⁶ in imitation of similar titles used in reference to Constantine or Moses and for the acclamation of the Basileus in the Hippodrome. The phrase *secundum voluntatem Dei* can easily be given significance in a hereditary sense though such a meaning is not absolutely necessary. Otto's grandmother, Adelheid, had al-

37 Thietmar of Merseburg *Chronicon* 2. 10 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, n.s., IX, 48f.). Cf. Widukind *Res gestae Saxonicae* 3. 46 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 108).

38 The reestablishment of the Roman Empire by Otto I could not be based on any hereditary claim and was probably conceived as a restoration of the empire of Lothair I. G. Barraclough, *The Origins of Modern Germany*, Oxford, 1949, 53f.

39 *Ibid.*, pl. 59, b-c. In much of Carolingian art the ruler is portrayed with scepter or staff.

40 Widukind *Res gestae Saxonicae* 1. 39 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 50).

41 *Ibid.*, 3. 49 (*loc. cit.*, 109).

42 Otto I had a son named Wilhelm by a well-born Slavic captive in 929. Widukind *Res gestae Saxonicae* 3. 74 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 124); Thietmar of Merseburg *Chronicon* 2. 35 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, n.s., IX, 82); *Continuatio Reginonis ad a. 928* (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 158). This led Henry I to insist upon Otto's marriage in the same year to Edgitha, who was of the purest Saxon blood. Hrotsvitha *Gesta Ottonis* 70 (ed. P. de Winterfeld, MGH, *Script. rer. Germ. in usum scholarum*, 206) points to the fact that this was a suitable alliance. Edgitha was a descendant of Oswald, King of Bernicia, a martyr, and the daughter of King Edward, who died in 924, as well as the sister of Aethelstan, Edmund, and Edward, who ruled successively. Köpke-Dümmeler, *Kaiser Otto der Grosse*, 9-11, cited the evidence to support this. Also see the evidence for such marriage policies cited by Kern, *Gottesgnadentum und Widerstandsrecht*, 29f.

43 Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, pl. 65 (Musée Cluny, Paris, No. 1035). In his text (p. 191) Schramm discusses the parallel pieces and the problems surrounding this ivory. This ivory is also discussed by Franz Dölger, "Die Ottonen-kaiser und Byzanz," *Karolingische und Ottonische Kunst. Werden-Wesen-Wirkung (Forschungen zur Kunstgeschichte und christlichen Archäologie, III)*, Wiesbaden, 1957, 49-59.

44 Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, pl. 62, a-c, 68, a-e.

45 Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, pl. 69, a-b. Erdmann, "Kaiserliche und päpstliche Fahnen im hohen Mittelalter," 25, 10, discusses the representations of Roma, Constantinopolis and Ecclesia with banners. For the Carolingian prototype see Schramm, *loc. cit.*, pl. 3, a-1. On the identification as Roma see *ibid.*, 90. The reverse of this bulla is in imitation of the seals of Conrad I and Henry I. See note 32 above, and Schramm, *Rom und Renovatio*, 154-60.

46 For this and similar titles such as *secundum voluntatem Jesu Christi Romanorum Imperator Augustus sanctarumque ecclesiarum devotissimus et fidelissimus dilator, or Romanus, Saxonicus et Italicus, apostolorum servus, dono Dei romani orbis Imperator Augustus*, see Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, 157-60.

47 *Ibid.*, 141-46, where the evidence is cited.

48 Uhlirz, "Zur Geschichte der Mauritiuslanze, der sacra lancea imperialis," 99-112. Uhlirz distinguishes between an original East Frankish royal lance, which the Saxon Duke Henry received when he took over the German monarchy in 919, and

ready been called: *Servorum Dei ancilla, ex se peccatrix, dono Dei imperatrix*, according to Odilo. Obviously all of these titles are to be related not only to Byzantine usage but to that of the papacy which from the time of Gregory I utilizes *Servus servorum Dei*.⁴⁷

It is clear that with the attempted extension of hereditary succession to cover the imperial as well as the royal throne during the Saxon dynasty the holy lance gained in importance because of its symbolic value. The holy lance was a unique weapon which conferred singular powers upon its possessor. When used iconographically it had to be distinguished from all other lances, and great care must be taken in identifying it.⁴⁸ Weapons of all sorts apart from the holy lance served as attributes of the upper classes of society.

Arnold of St. Emmeram tells us that in 996—a year before the issuance of the new bulla—when Otto III went to Rome for his imperial coronation he brought with him the *sancta et crucifera imperialis lanca*.⁴⁹ Although Hofmeister claimed that the use of the word *crucifera* meant that the lance could not have been the holy lance which was kept in Vienna in modern times and Schramm would correct the text to read *clavum crucis ferens*,⁵⁰ as we shall see, the passage is both relevant and accurate.

During the eleventh century the importance of the holy lance as an imperial symbol increased immeasurably. It now began to be described as the *stabilimentum, tutamen, or insigne imperii*.⁵¹ According to Thangmar's *Vita Bernwardi*, Otto III brought the holy lance with him to Rome in 1001 when he was surprised by the Roman revolt, sickened and died.⁵² The Germans under Archbishop Heribert of Cologne brought it back to Germany with the body of the dead emperor. Henry, Duke of Bavaria, whose hereditary claim to the throne was not as clear as that of his two immediate predecessors—he was only a fourth generation descendant of Henry I—sought to obtain possession of all the *insignia regalia*.⁵³ Archbishop Heribert, however, had sent the lance on ahead.

It is obvious that the symbolic significance of the lance was already very great, and that Heribert hoped to exercise a dominant role in the selection of the new emperor because of his possession of it. Thietmar of Merseburg tells us:

Those, moreover, who were present at Otto III's death kept this fact secret until the army, which was widely dispersed at that time, was informed and collected. Then the mourning army escorted the beloved lord's body for seven days under continuous heavy attack from the enemy. The enemy did not leave them undisturbed until they came to the city of Verona. When they came to the court of Polling of the Bishop Siegfried of Augsburg, they were received by Duke Henry, and their tears flowed violently once again. He urged them individually, with great promises, to elect him their lord and king. And he took the body of the emperor and the imperial insignia with the exception of the lance [cum apparatu imperiali, lancea dumtaxat excepta] which Archbishop Heribert had [brought back] and secretly sent ahead. The archbishop, however, after having been taken into custody, was allowed to depart, leaving his brother as a hostage, and soon sent back the holy lance [ac sacram mox lanceam remisit].⁵⁴

Clearly the lance had by this time become one of the most important symbols, perhaps even surpassing the crown, since it was a reliquary as well, and we know that the imperial crown itself was seldom shown.⁵⁵ The lance was the symbol of the transmission of royal power and a sign of divine protection.

There are, of course, numerous portrayals of bannered lances on the *Wendenpfennige* or *Sachsenpfennige* and on many other German issues of this period, but they cannot be identified with the holy lance.⁵⁶ Nevertheless, it should be noted that lances were used among the upper classes of society in a manner conceptually related to the symbolism of the holy lance. As Schramm has pointed out, a simple bannered lance

the St. Maurice lance, which he received in 935 at the latest. See notes 9 and 33. The view that there were several sacred symbolic lances is held by others such as Klewitz, "Die heilige Lanze Heinrichs," 54; Brackmann, "Zur Geschichte der heiligen Lanze," 409; and O. Höfler, "Das germanische Kontinuitätsproblem," *HZ*, 107, 1938, 18. Also see Mathilde Uhlirz, "Zu den heiligen Lanzen der Karolingischen Teilreiche," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, 68, 1959, 197-208.

49 Arnold of St. Emmeram *Libri de memoria Beati Emmerami et eius cultorum. Libri de S. Emmeramo* 2. 33 (MGH, SS, IV, 567): *Quo dicto, psalmis et canticis Domino commendatus piissimus augustus, ex more precedente sancta et crucifera imperiali lanca, exiit de civitate ista [Regensburg], petiturus Italiam, . . .* This passage is in the *Dialogus de memoria Beati Emmerami*, which exists in a single 15th century manuscript, and is not completely trustworthy. The original was written about 1035.

50 Hofmeister, "Die heilige Lanze," 49f. Hofmeister connects this with the lance described by Liudprand which, according to his interpretation, had crosses on the lance head. He claims that this lance was lost at some time between 1035/7-1099. Cf. Schramm, "Die 'Heilige Lanze,'" 502 n. 2.

51 See note 5 above.

52 Thangmar *Vita Bernwardi Episcopi et Confessoris* 24 (MGH, SS, IV, 770).

53 As early as the death of Otto II, when the question of the guardianship of Otto

III arose, Duke Henry the Wrangler of Bavaria, a first cousin of Otto II, obtained custody while Theophano and Adelheid were still in Italy. Henry the Wrangler attempted to set himself up as a co-regent on the Byzantine model, but failed largely because of the efforts of Adalbero of Laon. Cf. F. Lot, *Les derniers Carolingiens*, Paris, 1891, 131-34. Henry II was the son of Henry the Wrangler, and he was most anxious to publicize his blood relationship to the earlier monarchs.

54 Thietmar of Merseburg *Chronicon* 4. 50 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 185f.). On this text and other reports of this incident see Mathilde Uhlirz, "Zur Geschichte der Mauritiuslanze, der sacra lanca imperialis," *Ostdeutsche Wissenschaft*, 5, 1958, 99-112.

55 Schramm, "Die 'Heilige Lanze,'" 503. On the other hand, Schramm (p. 507) points out that there are virtually no representations of the monarch with a lance. He suggests on the basis of Adalbold's statement about Henry II (*ut . . . de vexillo extolleretur in solium hereditarium*), that the pennant was the symbol of the nobility. See Adalbold of Utrecht *Vita Heinrici II Imp.* 1 (MGH, SS, IV, 684). The imperial seals with the seated figure of Otto III express the meaning of *in solium*.

56 The pertinent numismatic material is cited by Schramm, "Die 'Heilige Lanze,'" 506f. See particularly Vera Jammer, *Die Anfänge der Münzprägung im Herzogtum Sachsen (10 und 11 Jahrhundert)*, Hamburg, 1952, 65f. and Table I.

had already become a symbol of investiture among the German nobility. Thietmar of Merseburg records at least two instances of the use of a lance in that fashion,⁵⁷ and we have already cited the evidence for the practice among the earlier Franks and Lombards. That this practice would be easily understood as a form of investiture is clear because the Triclinium mosaic of the Lateran (796–800) showed such scenes.⁵⁸ The scenes at either end of the mosaic, which was badly ravaged by time and underwent several restorations in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, show Christ giving the keys to Pope Sylvester I and a cross with a banner to the Emperor Constantine while St. Peter at the opposite side of the mosaic gives a *pallium* to Pope Leo III and a pennanted lance to Charlemagne (Fig. 12). The bannered lances in the hands of the two nobles in the middle register in the illumination in the Aachen Gospels of Otto II apparently are also symbols of investiture (Fig. 13).⁵⁹

The use of lances to establish claims is clear and is simply emphasized and raised to a higher degree by the addition of the hereditary principle in the case of the holy lance. We know that the Saxons, who were not present at the coronation of Henry II, used the holy lance to indicate their acceptance of his rule when they gathered. Thietmar says: "Thereupon Duke Bernhard [of the Saxons], having taken the holy lance in his hand, faithfully committed [to Henry], in the name of all, the care of the kingdom."⁶⁰ In addition, it should be noted that since Henry II was obviously not on the best terms with Archbishop Heribert, his coronation could not be held at Aachen, and he was unable to take his seat on Charlemagne's stone throne. Therefore Henry went to Mainz where, after his election on the 6th or 7th of July, 1002, Archbishop Willigis gave him the *dominica hasta* and invested him with the *regimen et regiam potestatem*.⁶¹ The Mainz *Ordo* of about 960 says that the king receives the sword from the prelate *et cum ense totum sibi regnum fideliter ad regendum . . . sciat esse commendatum*.⁶²

On the dedication page of the Sacramentary of Henry II we have a scene depicting in symbolic terms this coronation of the emperor. Henry II, shown with his head reaching into the mandorla, is being given a lance and a sword while he is crowned by Christ. St. Ulrich of Augsburg and St. Emmeram of Regensburg are depicted supporting the arms of the emperor as he is invested with the regalia by angels (Fig. 14).⁶³ The lance in this illumination is of the utmost importance, for it can be recognized as the holy lance. The fact that it is replete with mystical power is shown by the garlands springing from the shaft. They recall the representations of the *virga virtutis* of the *Kohen Gadol* Aaron, the *arbor vita*, or the staff of the Good Shepherd.⁶⁴

The miniature from the Sacramentary of Henry II recalls immediately the similar theme in the illumination in the Psalter of Basil II from the Marcian Library in Venice (Fig. 16). The miniature in the Psalter is accompanied by a poem which is translated by Ševčenko as follows: "A strange marvel is to be seen here: from Heaven, Christ, in his life-giving right, extends the crown, the symbol of power, to Basil, the pious and mighty Ruler. Below are the foremost <two> of the incorporeal Beings: one of them has taken <the crown>, brought it down, and is joyfully crowning <the Emperor>; the other, adding victories to the <symbol of> power, is placing the sword, a weapon that frightens the enemies away, in the ruler's hand. The martyrs are his allies, for he is their friend. They smite <his enemies> who are lying at his feet." Ševčenko comments: "Christ above, archangels below: Basil crowned and given a sword, martyrs; enemies at the Emperor's feet; we dismiss some inexactitudes (a sword is not a lance; 'martyrs' is too vague for military saints); we recognize that the 'marvel' (*θαύμα*) to be seen 'here' (*ὧδε*) occurs on the full-page miniature (fol. iiii) of the Psalter." The psalter is generally dated ca. 1019, and the Sacramentary of Henry II must be dated 1002–1014. The connection between the two representations is somewhat reinforced by the fact that in the poem

57 Thietmar of Merseburg *Chronicon* 5. 21 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 245), tells us that when the Alsatian Count Gerhard had the *lancea signifera* stolen by the recalcitrant inhabitants of the town that had been given in fief to him, *tristis abiit tam vacuus a beneficio quam a militari signo*. Also see *ibid.*, 6. 3 (*loc.cit.*, 276f.). Cf. "Die Lanze des heiligen Wenzel," 62f.

58 Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, pl. 4, a–m. Also see *idem*, "Die Anerkennung Karls des Grossen als Kaiser, Ein Kapitel aus der Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Staatssymbolik," *HZ*, 172, 1951, 468–71; and *idem*, "Die 'Heilige Lanze,'" 496; as well as *idem*, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Fahnen und ihrer Verwandten, Fahne, Banner, Wimpel, Feldzeichen," *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik*, II, 650. According to Schramm's interpretation the banner passed from St. Peter to Charlemagne is not a royal banner but the *vexillum urbis Romae* which Pope Leo III sent to the Frankish monarch in 796. Erdmann, "Kaiserliche und päpstliche Fahnen im hohen Mittelalter," 2–15, discusses the report of gifts of banners to the early Carolingians.

59 Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, 81–84, pl. 64. Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies. A Study in Medieval Political Theology*, Princeton, 1957, 61–63, fig. 5. Kantorowicz cites the pertinent earlier literature and gives a complete explanation of this illumination. Adolph Goldschmidt, *Die deutsche Buchmalerei*, II. *Die ottonische Buchmalerei*, pl. 1, is a very fine reproduction of this miniature.

60 Thietmar of Merseburg *Chronicon* 5. 17 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 241): *Bernhardus igitur dux, accepta in manibus sacra lancea, ex parte omnium regni curam illi fideliter committit*. The Saxons were not present at the coronation in Mainz on the 6th or 7th of July 1002. It was only on July 25, 1002 that Duke Bernhard swore the oath of fidelity.

61 Thangmar *Vita Bernwardi* 38 (MGH, *SS*, IV, 775): *Omnibus ergo pari voto in electione illius concordantibus, Willegisus archiepiscopus et Bernwardus praesul cum caeteris regni principibus domnum Henricum Mogontiam cum summo honore ducentes, dominica octava pentecostes regimen et regiam potestatem cum dominica hasta illi tradiderunt; ac deinde rite omnibus peractis, cum maximo tripudio universarum sollempniter illum Dei gratia unxerunt*.

62 Schramm, "Die Krönung in Deutschland bis zum Beginn des salischen Hauses (1028)," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, Kan. Abt., 24, 1935, 317; and "Die 'Heilige Lanze,'" 504f. Also see Hofmeister, "Die heilige Lanze," 30.

63 Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, 110–12, pl. 85, a; *idem*, "Die 'Heilige Lanze,'" 507f. *Idem*, "Das Herrscherbild in der Kunst des frühen Mittelalters," *Vorw.*, 1922–23, pt. 1, 209ff., analyzes this illumination and discusses the iconography. The miniature is to be found in Cod. Monac. lat. 4456, Cim. 60, fol. 11r.

64 Schramm, "Die 'Heilige Lanze,'" 508f.

the word used to describe the weapon in Basil's hand is *rhomphaian*. In Greek this word cannot actually be used to mean a lance. In Latin it is rarely used, and then means a missile weapon like a javelin.⁶⁵ Under the circumstances it is strange, to say the least, that this very word *rhomphaian* is precisely the one used by Liudprand of Cremona in his description of the holy lance, and that it is repeated in the poem in the Psalter of Basil II.

These early eleventh century illuminations depicting the coronation theme establish the close connection between the actual coronation and the symbolic use of a lance. In the case of the coronation of Henry II the lance in question is undoubtedly the holy lance. The lance head in the Sacramentary of Henry II, which is surmounted by a crucifix, is reminiscent of the expression *sancta et crucifera imperialis lancea* which we noted as occurring in Arnold of St. Emmeram (Fig. 15). Schramm also noted this point, but he rejected any such connection and held instead that it was a stock example of the *totum pro parte* variety to indicate a reliquary. Hofmeister suggested that the crucifix in the miniature was a precious container which fitted the head of the lance.⁶⁶ What is most important is that the lance has not been replaced by a cross but is simply surmounted by one. Clearly this is meant to indicate its sacred character and to differentiate it from all other similar weapons.

In the Pontifical of Seon in Bavaria we have a similar representation of Henry II of contemporary date, but this time with his arms supported by two archbishops (Fig. 17).⁶⁷ This is probably also a coronation scene for the emperor appears in full regalia. In this case the right hand appears to have grasped

something which is no longer recognizable. Schramm thinks that it was probably a scepter. From the position of the hand it seems more likely that it was the holy lance. The archbishops would then be Willigis of Mainz and another who assisted in performing the ceremony.

The death of Henry II led to the election of Conrad II in 1024, and Wipo tells us that after the election the Dowager Empress Cunigunde brought the insignia to Conrad.⁶⁸ Thus there was no need for a repetition of the ceremony carried out for Henry II when, later in 1024, Conrad was crowned at Mainz. Indeed, only in the version of Adhemar of Chabannes of the twelfth century is there mention of investiture with scepter, crown, and lance after the coronation of 1024.⁶⁹ By the twelfth century Landulf in the *Historia Mediolanensis* even recorded that in 961, during his coronation in Milan as King of Italy, Otto I placed on the altar *omne ragalia, lanceam, in qua clavus Domini habebatur, et ense regalem*.⁷⁰ Obviously both accounts have transferred twelfth century practice to an earlier period. Conrad II's only claim to the throne, which he won by election, lay in the fact that his distant ancestor was Conrad I.⁷¹ Since the Saxon dynasty intervened between the two Conrads, there was not much room to play the hereditary theme for the new monarch personally.

Nevertheless, the lance had assumed an even greater role during the early eleventh century than has been indicated above. Coins rather than the immobilized seal types are our chief evidence for this. In 1008 St. Brun of Querfurt had written to Henry II about his *Drang nach Osten* against the Lusatians and Poles, and he contrasted the *sacra lancea* with the

65 The psalter illumination is Marcianus Gr. (N.C. 421), fol. 3r. The best discussion of it is to be found in Ihor Sevcenko, "The Illuminators of the Menologium of Basil II," *DOPapers*, 16, 1962, 272. O. Papaconstantinou in Μεγάλη Ἑλληνική Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια, s.v. ῥομφαία, says that on the basis of the account of the Battle of Pydna the word must mean a spear at least two meters long used by the Thracians. H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford, 1940, s.v. ῥομφαία, quote Plutarch's account of the battle (*Aemilius Paullus* 18) and translate it as sword. C. T. Lewis and Charles Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford, 1958, s.v. *rhomphaea*, indicate that the word is borrowed from the Greek. The pure Latin form is *rumpia*. Lewis and Short define the word as "a long missile weapon," citing Aulus Gellius 10. 25, 2, 4; Livy 31. 39, 11; and Valerius Flaccus 6. 98. The word occurs in several passages in the New Testament, and it is translated in the Vulgate as *gladius*. It should be pointed out that the Middle Ages in the West apparently knew of the *romphus* as a missile weapon, perhaps a javelin. Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis*, ed. 1883-87, s.v. *Rhomphus*, citing the pertinent texts, supports that translation.

66 Hofmeister, "Die heilige Lanze," 49. Also see Schramm, "Die 'Heilige Lanze,'" 508f.; and Bühler, "Die heilige Lanze," 95.

67 Cod. Bamb. Lit. 53, fol. 2v. See Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, 109-11, pl. 83, where this miniature is discussed and reproduced.

68 Wipo *Gesta Chuonradi II* 1 (*MGH, Script. rer. Germ. in usum scholarum*, 9), records the dissension which arose when Henry II died without a son. *Ibid.*, 2-3 (*loc.cit.*, 13-24), records the election and consecration of Conrad II in some detail. Cunegunda delivered the insignia as a *corroboratio* for the election.

69 Adhemar of Chabannes *Historia* 3. 62 (*MGH, SS, IV*, 144f.). In the 12th century version the *lanceam sacram* was transformed into the *lanceam sancti Mauricii*. On the traditions concerning Conrad's election and Adhemar of Chabannes see Bresslau, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs*, I, 347.

70 Landulf *Historia Mediolanensis* 2. 16 (*MGH, SS, VIII*, 53), which was written in 1136, claims that in 961 Otto I deposited on the altar of St. Ambrose in Milan

omnia regalia, lanceam, in qua clavus Domini habebatur, et ense regalem, at his coronation as King of Italy. Actually, Otto I was not crowned separately at this time, and Landulf has simply transposed a later practice. Köpke-Dümmler, *Kaiser Otto der Grosse*, 327 and Schramm, "Die 'Heilige Lanze,'" 502 n. 1, have pointed this out.

71 Conrad II was a fifth generation descendant of Conrad I. Great attention was paid to this hereditary claim. Otto of Freising *Chronica sive Historia de Duabus Civitatibus* 6. 33 (ed. A. Hofmeister, *MGH, Script. rer. Germ. in usum scholarum*, 297), records the fact that with the reign of Henry IX, the son of Conrad II and Gisela, there was a return of the imperial office to the Carolingian line. Otto of Freising (*loc.cit.*) gives Conrad II a fine lineage, tracing his mother's ancestry to the most important Gallic princes, who, of course, were descendants of the Trojans and were converted by St. Remigius. He quotes Wipo *Gesta Chuonradi II* 4 (*MGH, Script. rer. Germ.*, 24f.), to the effect that Gisela was the fourteenth in descent from Charlemagne. The genealogy of Gisela is traced back through the Burgundian royal house to Carolingian ancestors. Wipo *Tetralogus* 5. 157-60 (ed. H. Bresslau, *MGH, Script. rer. Germ. in usum scholarum*, 80), is the source of all later statements regarding the Carolingian ancestry of Gisela. On the importance of such returns to the Carolingian dynasty see Kern, *Gottesgnadentum und Widerstandsrecht*, 25f. Hugo Flaviniacensis *Chronicon* 2. 29 (*MGH, SS, VIII*, 401); Hugo of Fleury, *Modernorum regum Francorum actus* (*MGH, SS, IX*, 388); and the *Annales Zwifallenses minores* ad a. 1032 (*MGH, SS, X*, 54), record the tradition that Conrad II received the holy lance after the death of Rudolf III of Burgundy, the brother of the Empress Gisela. Hofmeister, "Die heilige Lanze," 56-64; and Schramm, "Die 'Heilige Lanze,'" 514-16, have shown that these passages do not reflect actual fact. Brackmann, "Die politische Bedeutung der Mauritius-Verehrung im frühen Mittelalter," 294 n. 4, 296, holds that the Burgundians of the 11th century had a replica of the holy lance. When Burgundy was transferred to Henry III in 1038 there was no coronation and no mention of the lance. Wipo *Gesta Chuonradi II* 38 (*MGH, Script. rer. Germ.*, 58).

diabolica vexilla of the pagans.⁷² Such a royal symbol of mystical quality could not have been allowed to pass unnoticed. Indeed, early in his reign Conrad II issued a coin from Regensburg showing a bannered lance in the hand of a man with the inscription LANCEA REGIS (Fig. 18 a-b).⁷³ Dannenberg called the piece counterfeit but of excellent workmanship. Professor Peter Berghaus of Münster has shown it to be authentic.⁷⁴ He identified the type quite properly with the holy lance because of the inscription.

At this point we must discard the other sources virtually entirely to deal with the coins. According to Schramm there is no new information about the meaning of the holy lance from the reigns of Conrad II and Henry III. The continued significance of the lance, however, is reflected in the history of the eastern neighbors of the Germans. From the reign of Henry IV, and later, contemporary documents again yield data about the lance.⁷⁵ In fact, however, some of the most vital evidence concerning the meaning and significance of the holy lance is to be found in the period which Schramm described as a void. The evidence comes from coins. There is a coin minted at Speyer during the reign of Conrad II and Henry III, his son, which, when considered in the light of the relationship between the design on the reverse and the Byzantine model, demonstrates quite conclusively that the significance of the holy lance lay in the fact that it was the symbol of hereditary succession in the period before the Investiture Controversy. This coin has never been discussed with that in mind. The piece was published by Dannenberg, discussed as part of the

Ludwiscze hoard by Gaetens, and used to illustrate imperial portraiture by Schramm, but all have failed to notice the essential element.⁷⁶ The obverse shows the frontal busts of the two emperors separated by a lance surmounted by a cross with branches extending from the shaft of the weapon. The inscription on most of the examples reads CHVONRADIP HEINRICIP. The reverse, which bears the inscription SANCTA MARIA, shows the Virgin *orans* with a medallion of Christ on her breast (Fig. 18 c-d).⁷⁷ An enlargement of the specimen from the Ludwiscze hoard shows all of the detail with perfect clarity (Fig. 18 f).

As early as 1868 C. A. Hølmboe had noted the Byzantine origin of this type.⁷⁸ A solidus of Basil II and Constantine VIII (975-1025) may easily have been the model of the obverse (Fig. 18 g-h).⁷⁹ They were the two sons of Romanus II who ruled jointly. This type can be shown to have been used by much earlier monarchs such as Basil I and Constantine. There are, however, significant variations. The Byzantine emperors hold a simple patriarchal cross. Historically, the normal use of the double bust type⁸⁰ is restricted to the emperor and his young son who may be associated with him as co-ruler. The meaning of the type is clear from a solidus of Heraclius and Heraclius Constantine (Fig. 18 i-j).⁸¹ On coins of Constans II we find his oldest son Constantine IV Pogonatus represented with him on the obverse while his younger sons, Heraclius and Tiberius, share the reverse with a long cross between them (Fig. 18 k-l).⁸² Finally, on the coins of Justinian II the obverse is dedicated to Christ while the reverse is shared by Justinian

72 See note 5 above.

73 Dannenberg, *Die deutsche Münzen*, II, 684, No. 1706a, pl. 86.

74 Peter Berghaus, "Beiträge zur deutschen Münzkunde des 11 Jahrhunderts," *Hamburger Beiträge zur Numismatik*, n.s., 2 pts. 6-8, 1952-54, 61. The coin described by Berghaus was derived from a hoard. He dated the piece as ca. 1025/30 on the basis of comparison of the reverse architectural type with similar representations on other Regensburg coins. He cites other examples of lances on 11th century German coins from Goslar, Magdeburg, Dortmund, Hiltagesburg, and Aachen. These examples, however, are not in any way identifiable as the holy lance. The apparent reason for the earlier view that this piece was a forgery illustrates the perils of numismatic epigraphy. The reverse inscription reads: +REGIA·CIVITAS (Royal City) in place of *Regina Civitas* (Regensburg). If he had not thought that this coin was a forgery, Dannenberg would have attributed the piece to Henry II.

75 Schramm, "Die 'Heilige Lanze,'" 512: "Aus der Zeit Konrads II und Heinrichs III erfahren wir sonst nichts Neues über die Heilige Lanze, spüren aber ihre anhaltende Bedeutung in den—später zu verzeichnenden—Reflexen in der Geschichte der östlichen Nachbarn. Von Heinrich IV an gibt wieder die zeitgenössische Annalistik Auskunft."

76 Dannenberg, *Die deutsche Münzen*, I, 315-17, No. 829, pl. 36 = R. Gaetens, "Der Fund von Ludwiscze," 131, No. 323 = Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, 121, pl. 92, o. In his commentary on this piece (p. 203) Schramm says, "... und die Mitherrschaft des Sohnes ist ja schon auf italienischen Königssiegeln des 10 Jahr. durch Zufügung eines zweiten Kopfes zum Ausdruck gebracht. Stehfiguren sind zwar für byzantinische Münzbilder typisch, aber die der Bulle sind auch aus der abendländischen Entwicklung verständlich." W. Harster, "Versuch einer Speierer Münzgeschichte," *Mitteilungen des Historischen Vereines der Pfalz*, 10, 1882, 98, discusses the legends and cites the earlier numismatic commentators.

Bresslau, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs*, I, 241 n. 4, indicates the connection between this coin and the coronation of Henry III in 1028. Dannenberg, *Die deutsche Münzen*, II, 656, Nos. 1635-36, pl. 81, reveals that this obverse type was struck in at least three varieties and was continued into the reign of Henry III as Emperor. No. 1635 has the inscription *Heinricus Imperator*. No. 1636 simply indicates the mint in the obverse inscription.

77 The five specimens in the collection of the American Numismatic Society and the nine from Berlin permit us to reconstruct it in detail. An enlargement of the well preserved specimen from the Ludwiscze hoard shows the lance surmounted by a cross while two leafy arches spring from the shaft to form a sort of arbor over the heads of the two emperors.

78 C. A. Hølmboe, "Brøholtfundet. Mynter fra 10de og 11te Aarhundrede," *Forhandlinger i Videnskabs-Selskabet i Christiania Aar 1868*, Christiania, 1869, 194-236.

79 Wroth, *BMC, Byz.*, II, 485f., pl. LVI, Nos. 5-8 = Sabatier, *Description des monnaies byzantines*, II, 147f., Nos. 1-5, pl. XLVIII, Nos. 10-14.

80 In its origin the two bust type goes back to a dual portrait type of Justin II and Sophia. It was a provincial type from Africa used on bronzes. *BMC, Byz.*, I, 99f., pl. XIII, Nos. 6-11 = Sabatier, *Description des monnaies byzantines*, I, 226f., pl. XXI, Nos. 13-17.

81 *BMC, Byz.*, I, 186-88, pl. XXIII, Nos. 4-8 = Sabatier, *Description des monnaies byzantines*, I, 274, pl. XXIX, No. 18.

82 *BMC, Byz.*, I, 260f., pl. XXX, Nos. 19-21 = Sabatier, *Description des monnaies byzantines*, II, 5f., pl. XXXIX, Nos. 16-18.

83 *BMC, Byz.*, II, 354f., pl. XLI, Nos. 1-3 = Sabatier, *Description des monnaies byzantines*, II, 34, pl. XXXVIII, No. 9. Also see James D. Breckenridge, *The Numismatic Iconography of Justinian II (685-695, 705-711 A.D.)* (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 144), New York, 1959, 28-62.

Constantine IX Monomachus (Fig. 18 q-r), a second of Theodora, the daughter of Constantine VIII, and a third of Michael VI, show the bust of the Virgin facing front, *orans*.⁹³ These pieces identify the figure as the Blacherniotissa in the inscriptions, and the specimens from the reigns of Constantine IX Monomachus and Theodora show a small circular ornament in the lower portion of the bust. This is probably the buckle of a girdle. Sabatier produced a line drawing of this coin of Constantine IX Monomachus, but he transformed the small circular ornament into a pectoral cross. A more complete representation of the icon is found on another coin of Constantine IX Monomachus, and in the iambic trimeter inscription, which reads *δέσποινα σώζεις εὐσεβῆ μονόμαχον* from the obverse representation of the Virgin to the reverse representation of the emperor, the role of the Virgin is presented with absolute clarity (Fig. 19). Clearly the coin from Speyer has a reverse modeled on the icon from Blachernae which depicted the Virgin as the saviour of the imperial city and the emperor. The enlarged reverses of other contemporary German pieces from Speyer showing the combination of the medallion of Christ with the Virgin *orans* demonstrate quite clearly that this popular Speyer reverse was borrowed directly from the Byzantine prototype (Figs. 20-22).

Gaettens simply noted the beauty of these German coins and their apparent Byzantine origin. Their significance, however, lies in the political message conveyed by the selection of the obverse and reverse types. The obverse, by substituting the holy lance for the Byzantine patriarchal cross indicate succession to the imperial throne, was a clear statement of Conrad's dynastic pretensions. The reverse type placed the emperors and their supposedly hereditary throne under the protection of the Virgin in precisely the same fashion as at Constantinople.

It is important to note that Conrad II was most anxious to found a dynasty. In 1028 he arranged for the coronation of his son Henry by Archbishop Pilgrim at Aachen. A series of coins

from Regensburg exemplifies this interest in establishing the dynasty because they bear the legend HEINRICVS REX circumscribed by CHVONRADVS IMP.⁹⁴ The line drawings will illustrate the variety of types with greater clarity than the coins themselves (Figs. 23-25). The actual inscriptions are very difficult to read. Another piece from Speyer, however, from the same mint as the chief piece of evidence, portrays Henry III with the holy lance and *orbis cruciger* with the legend HEINRICVS REX (Fig. 26).⁹⁵ Once again a line drawing shows the details with greater clarity (Fig. 27). These coins can only refer to the period 1028-1039. It is, indeed, extremely likely that they refer to the events of 1028 and were struck at that time. In 1027, Bishop Werner of Strasbourg was sent on a mission to Constantine IX Monomachus, the successor of Basil II.⁹⁶ Since the elderly Constantine was the last male of the Macedonian dynasty, his daughters, Zoe and Theodora, were the most important eleventh century heiresses. Conrad was obviously interested in such a marriage which would support his imperial position. His son Henry had been designated as his successor in 1026 at Augsburg.⁹⁷ The establishment of the new dynasty with the strongest possible ties to imperial blood was of the utmost significance to Conrad II. At Easter 1028, Henry, who was eleven years old and had been recognized as the heir of the Burgundian realm by the Basel pact of 1027, was elected king by the assembled princes with the consent of the people. On Easter Sunday he was anointed and crowned by Archbishop Pilgrim of Cologne.⁹⁸ The bulla used on a document dated August 23, 1028, shows a bust of Conrad II on the obverse and a full-length figure of Henry on the reverse with the inscription HEINRICVS SPES IMPERII (Fig. 29).⁹⁹ Bresslau noticed this seal and connected it with the Speyer coin with two busts and the coronation of 1028. Schramm has identified the object in the hand of the standing Henry III as the holy lance. The iconographic significance of the holy lance can hardly be clearer. It is associated with the hereditary succession to the imperial office. Conrad II used another bulla somewhat later in his reign which shows the two

93 BMC, *Byz.*, II, 503, No. 23, pl. LIX, No. 5 = Sabatier, *Description des monnaies byzantines*, II, 159, No. 9, pl. XLIX, No. 12 (Constantine IX Monomachus). Also see Frederic W. Madden, "Christian Emblems on Coins of Constantine I the Great, His Family and His Successors," *NC*, n.s., 18, 1878, 183, 207. In the lower part of the bust there is a small circular ornament, which I would have liked to regard as an abbreviation for the medallion of Christ, but Prof. Alfred Bellinger has pointed out to me that it should probably be thought of as a buckle. For the coin of Theodora, which is not as well preserved and was unknown to Sabatier, see BMC, *Byz.*, II, 506f., pl. LX, No. 5. The earlier literature about it is cited there. The third coin was published by T. Bertelè, "Un riflesso numismatica dello scisma d'orientale," *EPANOS*, *Raccolta di scritti in onore del Prof. Casimiro Adami*, Verona, 1941, 218-21. Grierson, "A Misattributed Miliarion of Basil II," 115 n. 15, says of these coins: "They must be dated to the years 1054-56, and probably celebrate the sixcentenary of the founding of the church of Blachernae, which had been begun by the Empress Pulcheria early in the reign of Marcian (450-57), and completed by her husband after her death (453)." If Grierson is correct in dating these coins to 1054-56, the German coins, which must be dated prior to 1046, when

Henry III took the imperial title, must be borrowed from Byzantine nomismata of Zoe and Theodora discovered in the Akcacoa hoard or seals of an earlier date. The German coin was found in the Brøholt hoard, which was deposited in 1054-55, which hardly gives enough time for it to be derived from a series of Byzantine coins dated 1054-56. On this hoard see Hans Holst, "Brøholtfunnene Revidert, Omarbejdet og Supplert Beskrivelse," *Nordisk Numismatisk Aarskrift*, 1957-58, 89-114. This reference was very kindly called to my attention by Dr. Kolbjørn Skaare. The inscription on the German coin is closest to that on a solidus of Leo VI the Wise (886-912), which shows the frontal bust of the Virgin *orans*, but without the medallion. BMC, *Byz.*, II, 444f., No. 1, pl. LI, No. 8. The type of the Virgin standing (BMC, *Byz.*, II, 502, Nos. 16-17) bears the iambic trimeter inscription.

94 Dannenberg, *Die deutsche Münzen*, I, 420f., Nos. 1094, 1094a, 1094b, pl. 48.

95 *Ibid.*, I, 318, No. 831, pl. 36. Dannenberg describes the object held by Henry as a scepter, but from its form it appears to be the holy lance.

96 Bresslau, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs*, I, 234-36. The sources are cited there.

97 Wipo *Gesta Chuonradi II* 11 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 32). Also see Bresslau,

monarchs holding orbs and scepters on the obverse and bears the inscription HEINRICVS REX down the center where the patriarchal cross would be on a Byzantine coin (Fig. 30).¹⁰⁰

It is clear from the evidence already presented that in the entire period from the accession of Otto I to the German throne to the accession of Henry III the holy lance served as the symbol which denoted hereditary succession. It was the object before which Otto I prayed at Birten when that hereditary right was in question. It was the most important symbol used in the coronation of Henry II when he tried to establish his hereditary claims. It was the device used by Conrad II and Henry III to indicate the transfer of the throne from father to son. It is therefore not surprising that when Henry IV's right to the throne was called into question during the Investiture Controversy precisely this object—the holy lance—was utilized to emphasize the hereditary nature of the monarchy.

The accession of Henry IV, the son of Henry III, was sudden and resulted in a long regency which was far from untroubled. The holy lance was in some measure connected with at least one incident during this period. As early as 1062, when Archbishop Hanno of Cologne kidnapped the young monarch, it is noted in the sources that he also seized the holy lance and other insignia.¹⁰¹ When Henry III died unexpectedly in 1056, his son was not yet six years old. There was no opportunity to utilize the holy lance as a symbol, for there was a regency which intervened. After Henry IV reached his majority that opportunity presented itself. The new emperor was not the cleverest of men, but he intended to continue the policy of his predecessors and to control the empire through his control of the appointments within the Church. In 1067, when Bishop Einhard of Speyer died, Canon Henry of the church of Saints Simon and Judas in Goslar was appointed to succeed him. Lampert of Heresfeld tells us that he was underage for such a high post, and that he owed his appointment not so much to election as to the indulgence of the king, for he had been a very trusted friend of Henry IV when both were children.¹⁰²

This eleventh century Bishop of Speyer contributed a vital part of the new data which we are presenting about the holy lance. As Bishop of Speyer he issued a coin which is obviously borrowed from that of Conrad II (Fig. 28). Harster read the obverse legend as *Heinricus Rex* and the reverse as *Heinricus Episcopus* with a bust of Henry of Speyer.¹⁰³ The obverse of this coin cannot refer to the future ruler, for Henry IV is here given the title of king which would be improper after 1084 when he received consecration as emperor in Rome. In addition, his oldest son Conrad was not designated as his successor until 1087, while Henry V, the second son, was not so designated until 1098, and Henry of Speyer, who issued this coin, was dead by 1075. Therefore, this coin must bear reference to the hereditary succession of Henry IV from his father Henry III. Were it not for the facts just stated, we might have attempted to date this piece in 1098 or 1106.¹⁰⁴ As has been pointed out, in 1098 Henry V was designated as his father's successor, taking an oath of fealty on the holy lance, and in 1106 Henry IV was forced to surrender the imperial insignia, including the holy lance and the imperial cross, which had been acquired during the reign of Conrad II, to his rebellious son. The scene has been depicted in the *Universal Chronicle* of Ekkehard of Aura in an illumination.¹⁰⁵ Our coin, however, can have no relevance to that event. It must refer to the succession from Henry III to Henry IV. On this coin the Byzantine iconographic formula for indicating succession to the imperial throne, first used in the West by Conrad II, was repeated. The presence of the holy lance between the heads of the two emperors underscored the dynastic claim.

Henry IV, it will be remembered, of course, fought the Investiture Controversy largely on the grounds of his hereditary claim to the throne. In Henry IV's deposition of Gregory VII of January 24, 1076, the emperor refers to himself in the salutation as "Henry, king not by usurpation, but by the holy ordination of God, to Hildebrand, not pope, but false monk."¹⁰⁶ In that deposition he chastises Pope Gregory VII and says, "But you understood our humility to be fear, and therefore

Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs, I, 117.

⁹⁸ Bresslau, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs*, I, 240f. The sources are cited there.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, I, 241 n. 4. Also see Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, 120f., pl. 95, a-b.

¹⁰⁰ Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, 121f., pl. 95, c-d.

¹⁰¹ *Annales Altahenses Maiores* ad a. 1062 (ed. E. von Oefele, MGH, *Script. rer. Germ. in usum scholarum*, 59): *crucem et regiam lanceam ex capella auferunt*; Bertholdus *Annales* ad a. 1062 (MGH, *SS*, XIII, 732): *cum lancea et aliis imperii insignibus*.

¹⁰² Lampert of Heresfeld *Annales* ad a. 1067 (ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH, *Script. rer. Germ. in usum scholarum*, 104): *Einhardus Spirensis episcopus obiit; qui Heinricus successit, Goslariensis ecclesiae canonicus, tantae dignitati vixdum per aetatem maturus, et non tam electione principum ad hanc proventus quam indulgentia regis, qui in puerili aetate fuerat familiarissime assentatus*. Also see Gerold Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reiches unter Heinrich IV und V*, Leipzig, 1890, I, 567f.

¹⁰³ W. Harster, "Versuch einer Speierer Münzgeschichte," *Mitteilungen des Histori-*

schen Vereines der Pfalz, 10, 1882, 104, No. 19 = Dannenberg, *Die deutsche Münzen*, I, 320-22, No. 841, pl. 36. J. Menadier, "Der Münzschatz der St. Michaeliskirche zu Fulda," *ZfN*, 22, 1900, 148f., No. 90. In a later article I shall treat the other coins in this hoard of similar character.

¹⁰⁴ Hofmeister, "Die heilige Lanze," 30f. n. 6, quotes the reference for the surrender of the lance in 1106. Henry IV complained about it in his letters which are also quoted by Hofmeister. Another possible date would have been 1099. The letter of Henry IV to Hugh of Cluny in 1106 states that after his designation as successor Henry V swore fidelity on the holy lance. Henry IV *Epp.* 37 (ed. C. Erdmann, *Die Briefe Heinrichs IV*, MGH, *Deutsches Mittelalter, Kritische Studentexte des Reichsinstituts für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, I, 47).

¹⁰⁵ Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, pl. 123 a. The lance is not shown with the other regalia in this miniature.

¹⁰⁶ Henry IV *Epp.* 12 (*Die Briefe Heinrichs IV*, MGH, *Deutsches Mittelalter*, I, 15): *H. non usurpative, sed pia dei ordinatione rex Hildebrando iam non apostolico, sed falso monacho.*

you did not fear to rise up against the very royal power granted to us by God, which you dared to threaten to take away from us, as though we had received kingship from you, as though kingship and imperial office were in your hand and not in the hand of God. Our Lord Jesus Christ has called us to kingship, but had not called you to the priesthood." Gregory VII in his later deposition and excommunication of Henry IV attacks the hereditary principle and says, "Thus, relying on this assurance, on behalf of the honor and defence of Your church, in the name of the Omnipotent God, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, through Your power and authority, I deny to King Henry, the son of the Emperor Henry, who has risen up against Your Church with unheard of pride, the government of the whole realm of the Germans and of Italy, and I absolve all Christians from the bond of the oath which they have made or will make, and I forbid that anyone should serve him as king."¹⁰⁷ Pope Gregory VII implicitly rejected the hereditary principle. The full significance of these passages was understood at the time and is commonly recognized among mediaevalists.

The coin which recalled that hereditary principle was therefore very much to the point in the years 1067–1075, but why should the Bishop of Speyer issue it? Bishop Henry owed his appointment to the episcopacy to the intervention of Emperor Henry IV. The legitimacy of Bishop Henry's position depended in large measure on the legitimacy of the rule of Henry IV. This coin utilizing the holy lance in conjunction with the Byzantine type indicating succession recalled the hereditary claims of Henry IV to the imperial throne. Thus, in effect, it gave a degree of legitimacy to Bishop Henry's appointment.

The death of Pope Alexander II in 1073 marks a *terminus post quem* for the issuance of this coin. While it is true that shortly before his death Alexander II, who was a reformer of the Cluniac school, had excommunicated five of Henry IV's advisors and threatened Henry himself with the papal ban, a final rupture had been avoided.¹⁰⁸ Faced with a rebellion in Saxony while his armies were engaged in Poland, Henry IV chose the path of reconciliation with the papacy. In a letter of 1105 Henry IV pointed to the normally amicable relations that

he enjoyed with Alexander II.¹⁰⁹ In the interval between Alexander's excommunication of his advisors and the full reconciliation between the emperor and the papacy, Alexander died. The Roman mob promptly placed Gregory VII on the throne of St. Peter in violation of the Papal Election Decree of 1059. Gregory ascended the papal throne without the prior approval of the Roman emperor which had been customary practice. Instead, the letter which was sent by Gregory to Henry IV announcing the death of Alexander II also brought Gregory's account of his own selection.¹¹⁰ Nevertheless, after some negotiations, Gregory managed to calm the emperor, and at the consecration of the pope the Dowager Empress Agnes as well as the emperor's aunt, Countess Beatrice of Tuscany, joined a personal envoy of Henry IV as his representative.¹¹¹ The end of June 1073 found the emperor and the papacy in cordial relations, and the Bishop of Speyer had no cause to issue this coin.

This happy state of affairs was altered abruptly. The summons to the Lenten Synod of 1075 issued by Pope Gregory VII in 1074 to Archbishop Siegfried of Mainz and six of his suffragans, including Bishop Henry of Speyer, made it clear that there would be an inquiry into the appointments and lives of those bishops.¹¹² At that synod (February 24–28, 1075) the Bishop of Speyer and others were deposed and excommunicated.¹¹³ The reform of the German church was taken in hand by the pope. Naturally, no one expected the papal decree to be immediately effective, but the hand of God intervened, and on February 26, 1075, perhaps the very day on which his sentence was pronounced in Rome, Bishop Henry of Speyer died. Lampert of Heresfeld surrounds the death of Bishop Henry with a tale of wondrous prophetic vision which was experienced by one of the clergy of the cathedral who was to become the bishop in place of Henry of Speyer.¹¹⁴ The sudden death of Bishop Henry of Speyer was used as evidence by the papal reformers that God was on their side. It was widely recounted by the friends of the papacy.¹¹⁵

The coin issued by Bishop Henry may now be dated to the end of 1074 or the first two months of 1075 when the opening guns of the Investiture Controversy were fired in a figurative

107 Gregory VII *Registrum* 3. 10a (ed. E. Caspar, MGH, *Epistolae selectae in usum scholarum*, II, 270): *Hac itaque fiducia fretus pro ecclesie tue honore et defensione ex parte omnipotentis Dei Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti per tuam potestatem et auctoritatem Heinrico regi, filio Heinrici imperatoris, qui contra tuam ecclesiam inaudita superbia insurrexit, totius regni Teutonicorum et Italię gubernacula contradico et omnes Christianos a vinculo iuramenti, quod sibi fecerunt vel facient, absolvo et, ut nullus ei sicut regi serviat, interdico.*

108 G. Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrbücher*, II, 452f.

109 Henry IV *Epp.* 34 (*Die Briefe Heinrichs IV*, MGH, *Deutsches Mittelalter*, I, 43).

110 G. Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrbücher*, II, 203–13, esp. p. 210. Liudprand of Cremona *Historia Ottonis* 8, 22 (MGH, *Script. rer. Germ.*, 164, 174), twice records the prom-

ise of the Romans to get Otto's approval before the election of a new pope. It should also be noted that Henry III had taken the title of *Patricius* in 1046, in imitation of the Crescentii, and thus had power over papal elections. In the letter of the German bishops to Gregory VII (ed. C. Erdmann, *Die Briefe Heinrichs IV*, MGH, *Deutsches Mittelalter*, I, 67, App. I) the bishops pointed out that Gregory himself had promised that no individual would ascend the papal throne without the consent of Henry III, while he lived, and later of Henry IV, while he lived. This is also mentioned in the decree of the Synod of Brixen of 1080 (ed. C. Erdmann, *Die Briefe Heinrichs IV*, MGH, *Deutsches Mittelalter*, I, 71, App. C).

111 G. Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrbücher*, II, p. 221.

112 Gregory VII *Registrum* 2. 29 (ed. E. Caspar, MGH, *Epistolae selectae in usum*

sense. Gregory VII had taken strong measures against certain sinful clergy, and among them was Bishop Henry of Speyer. The emperor, with his Saxon victory already achieved, was now prepared to engage the papacy in open combat. The Bishop of Speyer owed his position to imperial intervention. Only by supporting the hereditary claims of Henry IV to the imperial office could the bishop strengthen his own claims to legitimacy. Henry IV, indeed, as has been shown, was at that very moment propagandizing on his own behalf the concept of his hereditary claim to the throne. Everything, the emperor's right to the throne and consequently the legitimacy of Bishop Henry's appointment to the see of Speyer, depended on the hereditary claim to succession to the imperial office. At that

point this coin was issued to establish the hereditary claim. The holy lance, used in association with the double-bust type adopted from the Byzantine iconographic formula used to indicate succession, served that purpose admirably. The presence of the holy lance reinforced the symbolism of the dual bust type. It proclaimed the hereditary succession of Henry IV to the imperial throne. Thus all of the evidence shows that for the Saxon and Salian emperors to the time of the Investiture Controversy the holy lance was an iconographical symbol of hereditary succession.

City College of New York
American Numismatic Society

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF FREQUENTLY CITED SOURCES

- Brackmann, Albert, "Die politische Bedeutung der Mauritius-Verehrung im frühen Mittelalter," *SBBerlin*, 1937, 279-305.
- "Zur Geschichte der heilige Lanze Heinrichs I," *Deutsches Archiv*, 6, 1943, 401-11.
- Bressler, Heinrich, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter Konrad II*, Leipzig, 1879, 1884, 2 vols.
- Bühler, Albert, "Die heilige Lanze, Ein ikonographischer Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen Reichskleinodien," *Das Münster*, 16, Nos. 3/4, 1963, 85-116.
- Dannenberg, H., *Die deutsche Münzen der sächsischen und fränkischen Kaiserzeit*, Berlin, 1876-1905.
- Erdmann, C., "Kaiserliche und päpstliche Fahnen im hohen Mittelalter," *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, 25, 1933, 1-48.
- Gaetgens, R., "Der Fund von Ludwiszcze," *Blätter für Münzfreunde*, 6, 1934-36, 121-35, 140-50, 160-68, 172-82, 195-206, 224-29, 240-46, 258-71, 289-96, 317-27.
- Grierson, Phillip, "A misattributed Miliarion of Basil II," *Receuil des travaux de l'Institut d'Études byzantines (Mélanges G. Ostrogorsky, I)*, 8, Belgrade, 1963, 111-16.
- Haupt, Georg, *Die Reichsinsignien, ihre Geschichte und Bedeutung*, Mainz, n.d.
- Hofmeister, Adolf, "Die heilige Lanze, ein Abzeichen des alten Reichs," in Otto Gierke, ed., *Untersuchungen zur deutschen Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte*, 96, Breslau, 1908, 1-86.
- Holtzmann, Walter, *König Heinrich I. Kritische Untersuchungen zur Aussenpolitik in den Anfängen des Deutschen Reiches und die heilige Lanze*, Bonn, 1947.
- Kern, Fritz, *Gottesgnadentum und Widerstandsrecht im frühen Mittelalter. Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Monarchie*, 3rd ed., Darmstadt, 1962.
- Knonau von, Gerold Meyer, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reiches unter Heinrich IV und V, I-VII*, Leipzig, 1890-1909.
- Köpke, Rudolf and Dümmler, Ernst, *Kaiser Otto der Grosse*, Leipzig, 1876.
- Laurent, V., *Documents de sigillographie byzantine. La Collection C. Orghidan*, Paris, 1952.
- Mély, F. de, "Reliques de Constantinople. La sainte lance," *RAC*, 4th ser., 8, 1897, 1-11, 120-27, 287-302.
- scholarum, II, 161f.), dated Dec. 4, 1074. Cf. *ibid.*, 2. 30 (*loc.cit.*, 164). Also see G. Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrbücher*, II, 305 and 439.
- 113 Gregory VII *Registrum* 2. 52a (*MGH, Epistolae selectae in usum scholarum*, II, 196); *Heinricum Spirensem suspendit*, *Bertholdus Annales* ad a. 1075 (*MGH, SS, V, 278*). G. Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrbücher*, II, pp. 451-53, summarizes the evidence.
- 114 Lampert of Heresfeld *Annales* ad a. 1075 (*MGH, Script. rer. Germ.* 227f.). See G. Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrbücher*, II, pp. 452, *infra*, and 484, n. 54, for further evidence on the sudden demise of Bishop Henry of Speyer. Different accounts are given by *Bertholdus, Annales* ad a. 1075 (*MGH, SS, V, 278*), who says that immediately upon arising from the table on the same day and hour on which the sentence was pronounced in Rome, the bishop felt a sharp pain in the throat, and that he suffered and strangled through the following morning, dying after the noon hour. This he saw as a proof of Matthew 16: 19. *Bernaldus monachus s. Blasii Chronicon* ad a. 1075 (*MGH, SS, V, 430*), simply says that on the very day on which his case was examined at Rome, Henry of Speyer became ill, and two days later he died wretchedly thus escaping the sentence of condemnation pronounced by Pope Gregory.
- 115 *Bernaldus monachus s. Blasii De Innocentia Sacerdotium, Ep. 5* to Alboin (*MGH, Libelli de Lite*, II, 26 = *PL*, 148, 1104). Cf. *Bernaldus Chronicon* ad a. 1075 (*MGH, SS, V, 430* = *PL*, 148, 104), and *Bertholdus Annales* ad a. 1075 (*MGH, SS, V, 278*). Also see G. Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrbücher*, II, 484 n. 54, 706.

Sabatier, J., *Description générale des monnaies byzantines frappées sous les empereurs d'Orient depuis Arcadius jusqu'à la prise de Constantinople par Mahomet II*, Paris, 1862.

Schlumberger, Gustave, *Sigillographie de l'empire byzantin*, Paris, 1884.

Schramm, Percy Ernst, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige in Bildern ihrer Zeit (751-1152)*, Leipzig, 1928.

——— "Die 'heilige Lanze,' Reliquie und Herrschaftszeichen des Reiches und ihre Replik in Krakau. Ein Überblick über die Geschichte der Königslanze," in *idem*, ed., *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte vom dritten bis zum sechzehnten Jahrhundert (Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae historica, XIII²)*, II, 492-537.

——— *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio. Studien zur Geschichte des römischen*

Erneuerungsgedenkens vom Ende des karolingischen Reiches bis zum Investiturstreit, 2nd ed., Wiesbaden, 1957.

Uhlirz, Mathilde, "Zur Geschichte der Mauritiuslanze, der *sacra lancea imperialis*," *Ostdeutsche Wissenschaft, Jahrbuch des ostdeutschen Kulturrates*, 5, 1958, 99-112.

Waitz, Georg, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reiches unter Heinrich I*, 3rd ed., Leipzig, 1885.

Wegener, Wilhelm, "Die Lanze des heiligen Wenzel. Ein Versuch zur Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Herrschaftszeichen," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germ. Abt.*, 72, 1955, 56-82.

Wroth, Warwick W., *Catalogue of the Imperial Byzantine Coins in the British Museum*, London, 1908.