

World-Heritagization, Bureaucratization, and Hybridization in Two Religious Heritage Sites in Denmark

Sofie Isager Ahl, Rasmus Rask Poulsen, and Oscar Salemink

Introduction

In this chapter we explore how the authority of heritage and church policies are balanced in practice with the relative autonomy of individual Protestant congregations inside the Evangelical-Lutheran state Church of Denmark (Folkekirken), based on ethnography in two of the three World Heritage Sites with living church congregations: the Jelling Mounds, Runic Stones and Church (inscribed in 1994), and Roskilde Cathedral (1995).¹ We examine the multilayered and intertwined organization of the churches and their management as cultural heritage, as the growing number of visitors, who may not be primarily motivated by religious considerations, require the careful management of different uses of the churches. Well before World Heritage inscription, both Jelling and Roskilde were considered iconic sites in Danish history as monuments of the uniquely Danish convergence of state, nation, Lutheran state church, and royalty. As Lutheran churches, Jelling and Roskilde were since the Reformation subject to state governance in Denmark's undivided state-church nexus and were the object of cultural preservation policies since the nineteenth century.² Following their late-twentieth-century World Heritage status, both sites have been subject to different forms of what Chiara De Cesari calls "World-Heritagization" (2012: 409), which imposes additional layers of national and international heritage oversight to what are now considered heritage sites and hence complicates their management. As a complication of the simultaneous secularizing and sacral-

izing aspects of heritagization (see the introduction to this volume), the idea of World-Heritagization affords more analytical purchase than its companion term “UNESCOization,” used by De Cesari (2012: 400) but also by David Berliner (2012: 776).

The growing literature on the relations between state, cultural heritage, and World Heritage shows how tensions arise when the grand ideals and costly requirements of UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee are implemented locally in various political, social, and cultural contexts (Harrison and Hitchcock 2005; Waterton and Watson 2011; Brumann and Berliner 2016). A central topic in heritage studies is the relation between state authorities and local stakeholders, because, as formulated by Salemink (2016: 319), “heritage claims invariably bring in the state as the arbiter, guarantor, and protector of heritage. The global model for heritage practices is given by UNESCO, which assigns special responsibilities to the state.” Given the appeal to national identity, states have a seeming institutional monopoly to both define heritage values and manage them based on present-day imaginaries of a national past (Herzfeld 2015: 531). Rosemary Coombe and Lindsay Weiss (2015) argue that the recent emergence of various local entities of authority complicates our view of heritage management as primarily an intertwined state-society or central-decentral relationship. Instead, local heritage management is an amalgamation of international policies of UNESCO and ICOMOS, national legislation about heritage preservation, and local practices and configurations. This casts nation-states as entities that distribute governmental powers over various local government agencies, boards, and joint or cooperative programs tasked with heritage management in what Coombe and Weiss (2015: 45–46) term “heritage governmentality.” In this chapter, we operationalize this local-cum-global governmentality through the concepts of heritage purification, hybridization, and institutional proliferation.

In their chapter for this volume, Ulla Kjær and Poul Grønder-Hansen conclude that the management of the church buildings of the Danish state church is done through a hybrid institutional entwinement of (religious) church and (secular) state authorities, with simultaneous bottom-up self-governance by local congregations and top-down oversight and funding on behalf of the central state. In line with other scholars, they simultaneously emphasize the—perceived and enacted—unity of people, nation, state, and church in Denmark (Kjær 2013; Schütze 2013; Warburg 2013). This union represents a vision of national identity where, as Cecilie Rubow writes, “Christianity is an integral part of the foundational myth Danes live by, blossoming from time immemorial, the earth, and from the generations” (Rubow 2011: 98). This chapter takes these observations as points of departure while investigating in more ethnographic detail the church-congregation-state-heritage nexus in Jelling and Roskilde, respectively.

Purifying the Jelling Monuments

This section shows how the management of the Jelling Monuments resulted in a partial spatial cleansing motivated by heritage purification. In 1994 the Jelling site was inscribed on the World Heritage List as the first Danish site. It presents an example of the professionalization of heritage management against the backdrop of World Heritage inscription, drawing in not just state and church in Denmark, but also the local parish council and various religious and secular authorities as advisory or supervisory representatives on heritage management councils.

The Jelling site is a monument complex, which consists of Jelling Church, two runic stones, two large mounds, as well as the recently discovered remains of a stone ship setting and palisade wall, which in turn largely defines the perimeter of the monument site. Established in the late tenth century, the bigger runic stone marks the foundation of Denmark as a unified Christian nation and people, popularly known in Denmark as the “baptism certificate” of the Danish nation. The mounds and runic stones were erected by King Gorm the Old (c. 950) and his son King Harald Blåtand (c. 965). Nationally, the site holds unique value in Danish history because it monumentalizes the formation of the unified Danish nation under the rule of King Harald and because it marks the conversion from Norse Pagan religion to Christianity in Denmark. The site contains two almost identical mounds situated on either side of a twelfth-century Romanesque parish church built in limestone. By the entrance of the church, and coincidentally at the midpoint between each mound, stand the runic stone erected by King Harald and the one of King Gorm, which was moved there as well. Harald’s stone heralds his achievement as the king who unified Norway and Denmark and who christened the Danes.³

Jelling town is administratively governed by Vejle Municipality, but the Agency for Culture and Palaces (Slots- og Kulturstyrelsen) under the Ministry of Culture is responsible for the protection of the ancient monuments, while the National Museum of Denmark conducts research, advises, and operates the Kongernes Jelling (Home of the Viking Kings) visitor center adjacent to the monuments. The heritage site is in principle open to the public, and visitors are not charged admission fees for the site nor for the visitor center. The center offers tourists various modern exhibits on Jelling’s history, the Viking Age, and the monuments’ central position in Danish history, as well as—for a fee—professional guided tours and lectures for visitors. The visitor center on the site receives a growing number of tourists, now over two hundred thousand per year, many of whom also visit the small church, but as a regular parish church it also holds regular religious services and cultural events for the local congregation.⁴ However, the cost of hosting the church

visitors falls to the parish, even though the usage by tourists dwarfs the use by local parishioners. In cooperation with Kongernes Jelling, the parish council has arranged for daily guided tours within the church around noon for a sum of DKK 30 (EUR 4), facilitated by the visitor center. This arrangement to secure a balance between the interests of tourists and parishioners has meant that private guided tours are not allowed within the church, in order to alleviate tension between religious uses (local churchgoers seeking peace) and secular uses (as a tourist attraction). The balance between different uses of the church is maintained by the church sexton, who stops tourists in the church portal who try to enter during Sunday service, but on at least one occasion we observed tourists visiting the church during a baptism.

During the twentieth-century reevaluation of Jelling as the birthplace of the Danish nation, antiquarian preservation resulted in attempts to make the monuments stand out and hence more conspicuous in a process of what we call heritage purification—that is, the removal from a designated heritage site of everything that detracts from an undisturbed heritage gaze by reminding of other human activity. This purification was physically enacted by clearing a large number of houses in the immediate environment of the mounds, including some of the oldest in the town and one listed building (Christensen 2016), through what Michael Herzfeld called spatial cleansing:

This term incorporates an intentional allusion to the notion of ethnic cleansing, since . . . both entail the disruption of fundamental security, and especially of ontological security, for entire groups of people. Spatial cleansing means the conceptual and physical clarification of boundaries, with a concomitant definition of former residents as intruders. (Herzfeld 2006: 142)

A series of archaeological excavations from 2006 and onward led to significant discoveries around the UNESCO site. A team of archaeologists uncovered remnants of a stone ship structure, a burial form from the Viking Age, and of a surrounding wooden palisade wall, which suddenly enlarged the perimeter of the monument area to twelve hectares (see figure 4.1). These discoveries led to a concentrated effort to present the existing World Heritage Site within an enlarged setting of the palisade, stone ship, and Viking dwelling remnants (Jessen et al. 2014). By 2009 a steering committee was founded by Vejle Municipality along with church authorities, the influential A. P. Møller Foundation,⁵ the Jelling Tourist branch, the Agency for Culture and Palaces, the National Museum, and local museums. It sought to develop and improve the visitor experience of the site in order to live up to its World Heritage status. This resulted in a large-scale spatial clearing of the monument site and surrounding areas and the visible marking of the underground archaeological remains, lasting several years. Its completion coincided with the 2015 reopening of the Kongernes Jelling visitor center. The emergent



Figure 4.1. View of a field cleared of houses (left of the footpath) next to the northern mound, on a so-called Jelling Music Day, which brought together many spectators. In the distance one can see the white poles that follow the contours of the former palisade wall. © Sofie Isager Ahl, 2017.

professionalization of the Jelling site was cemented in 2013, when UNESCO asked that a site manager to be appointed. In line with official Danish church governance, this position was to be filled by the parish council.⁶

Management of the Jelling Monuments is formally organized between a steering committee, a cooperation council, and the UNESCO site manager. The last position is filled by the parish clerk of Jelling Church, employed by the Jelling parish council, who acts as the daily caretaker and monitor of the site. Thus, the daily management rests with Jelling parish council, as one of two primary site owners, along with Vejle Municipality. Supervision of the World Heritage Site therefore rests with church authorities (deanery and diocese) in cooperation with the National Museum. The reason for the divided supervision has to do with the composite nature of the monument complex, with both (secular) cultural-historical and religious (church) elements. The central non-church authorities that the site manager deals with are the Danish Agency for Culture and Palaces, Kongernes Jelling, and Vejle Municipality, all three government entities, while the Danish Lutheran Church remains undivided from the state as well. While the local parish council

enjoys a great deal of autonomy, the church is largely funded by the taxes paid by its members and some additional state funding and is institutionally governed by the state, through the Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs. And as Kjær and Grønder-Hansen make clear elsewhere in this volume, buildings of the Danish Lutheran Church are subject to a system of preservation directed by the church authorities, with input from the National Museum when it comes to heritage preservation.

In short, World Heritage management of Danish churches is divided into three levels of governance. Nationally, the general responsibility for protection and management rests with the Danish Agency for Culture and Palaces, which coordinates relations between the site, the national state, and UNESCO. Locally, the site itself is managed by the parish council in Jelling and by Vejle Municipality in consultation with the National Museum (which operates the local visitor center), church authorities, the local municipality, and local museum authorities. Due to the nature of the site as an active church, a churchyard, and a national monument, the daily monitoring happens by the site manager employed by the parish council, in cooperation with staff at the local visitor center operated by the National Museum. Lastly, management is further formalized as a partnership in two different councils, for whom the site manager act as secretary and liaison. In 2013 the previous steering committee for the restoration of the monument site was transformed into the Cooperation Council (*Samarbejdsgruppen*), with local, regional, and national partners, also known as “the primary partners” of the UNESCO site. This council is made up of representatives from state and government institutions: Danish Agency for Culture and Palaces, the National Museum, Vejle Municipality, the Vejle Museums, Jelling local council, and church authorities from Jelling parish and Vejle deanery. The role of this co-operative council is to coordinate general management of the monument area. The council revises the management plan every four years and distributes information about events and construction projects relevant to the UNESCO site. In practice, the council negotiates and coordinates all the various practical issues that emerge because the monuments are a World Heritage Site, including answering inquiries about the usage of the monument site. Officially, these sorts of questions from the public are the resort of the local government, Vejle Municipality, but in order to lessen bureaucracy this was subsumed in the council’s area of competence.

In 2017, the Cooperation Council was supplemented by a new steering committee consisting of representatives from the same organizations but with specified representation from the National Museum, Vejle Municipality, a local council, and the Haderslev diocese, but without the A. P. Møller Foundation (as the major funder). The new Steering Committee strove to manage the World Heritage values of the Jelling site according to the man-

agement plan, which is continually revised and approved. In this sense, the group overlooks the *big-picture* aspects of Jelling as a UNESCO site. The group discusses potential nomination alterations and is responsible for the strategic development of the site (such as a plan for sustainable tourism management) as well as construction projects in the surrounding area. Together with the Cooperation Council and the Steering Committee, the site manager seeks to manage the Jelling Monuments according to the standards of UNESCO. In effect, these groups represent an amalgamation of interested parties from local, regional, and national levels of government, church, and civil society. In spite of this institutional proliferation, the core of everyday management, the practical and operational unit of running the Jelling Monuments as a World Heritage Site, rests with an employee of Jelling parish council, in line with the Danish law on church buildings and churchyards; the parish council is an autonomous, locally elected body. In other words, the only way that local citizens of Jelling could exercise any influence over the World Heritage Site in their backyard was through the parish council, and that naturally applied only to members of the Danish state church (*Folkekirken*), who make up almost 75 percent of the national population.⁷ As we shall see in the next paragraph, the institutional proliferation was a way to deal with mounting local tensions over the management of the rising tourist numbers.

Localizing World Heritage

In this section we will show how these conflicts occurred against the backdrop of the inevitable professionalization and bureaucratization attending the World-Heritagization, resulting in a sense of underrepresentation and disenfranchisement among many local residents. Since the reopening of the Kongernes Jelling visitor center, many Jelling residents felt that the town was overrun by tourists and that something had to be amended in the local management of the World Heritage. Indeed, in 2016, 2017, and 2018 a number of conflicts erupted involving the relations between parish and local citizens over the use of the church and the heritage area. In 2016, Vejle Municipality and the local council (*lokalrådet*) of Jelling town proposed the establishment of a Viking-themed playground near the site of the remains of the palisade wall, now marked with concrete poles. This was then rejected by the parish council which—as a local chapter of the state church—is responsible for the church and partly for the World Heritage. The chair of the parish council offered that “the ancient palisade walls of Harald Blåtånd should not be plastered over with a theme park. . . . When you own land that is World Heritage you have to be careful, and then you should build a playground somewhere

else.” In a similar vein, the UNESCO site manager, who is also the secretary of the parish council, opposed plans for a solar panel plant in town, saying, “We think ICOMOS might have something against that, so we raised an objection against the local development plan.” This upset local citizens who protested, “Why would the parish council interfere in that?” A group of local citizens expressed frustration with this “church meddling” in what they saw as a “living town,” which was made possible by the key role of the parish council in managing the World Heritage. These citizens felt that their town had become World Heritage without their input, while they had to bear the consequences of living in a site governed according to ICOMOS standards. In order to gain decision-making influence, they decided to take the—in the Danish context—unusual step of politicizing the local parish council elections by contesting all eight seats. In the end, six of the eight incumbent parish councilors stepped down, and a new council was elected without vote. However, no Viking-themed playground has been built yet.⁸

In 2017, a series of meetings were held over the management of the town, the heritage, and the church, as many local residents thought that the site was overrun by tourists. A parish council meeting in August sought to deal with the increased numbers of tourists and the interference with services and ceremonies in the church and graveyard. In line with the parish council’s official role in the management of the World Heritage Site, this meeting exuded a “can do” attitude by proposing a new management plan (*Forvaltningsplan*) plan for the area. A public meeting for town residents in October 2017, on the other hand, was characterized by a more gloomy atmosphere, where attendants kept on talking past each other, failing to resolve the strained relations between parties. While the frame of reference for officials in charge of the World Heritage Site, the visitor center, and local museums were the UNESCO and ICOMOS guidelines, local residents asked hard questions about what the UNESCO inscription had brought local residents and wanted to know whether the World Heritage is equally concerned about local residents as about tourists: “What is being done for the Jelling residents rather than for the tourists? We have only lost things, and you’re only talking about tourists. What about traffic issues?” The chairperson of the parish council admitted that “it’s as if we have a really nice piece of meat, but the plate is just a bit too small.” In April 2018, a town meeting was convened over a plan to build new houses on the fringe of the monument area (*randbebyggelse*), right where years previously houses were razed in order to beautify the heritage area. Under the title “Revolt against local council: citizens want to be heard too” (*Oprør mod lokalråd: Borgere vil også høres*), the local daily *Vejle Amts Folkeblad* reported that some angry residents spoke out against the plan, some referring to its putative unacceptability to UNESCO. The local councilors were re-elected without contestation, however. During a second

meeting in May 2018, the UNESCO site manager assured that the building plans would not violate UNESCO rules, but the chairperson of the parish council expressed protest against the plans. The resulting distrust led to the local council's chairman stepping down in August 2018.⁹

These meetings show that there was some local discontent over the lack of influence of Jelling citizens over the World Heritage and its impact on the town; over the strong role of the parish council in heritage management in comparison with that of local residents; over the importunity of the massive increase of tourists in the church and town and the lack of shared benefits; and over planning decisions made by outside agencies that have the interests of the heritage and its visitors at heart, but allegedly not those of local residents. The difference of the relative bargaining strength of local citizens in comparison with the local parish council in heritage matters was palpable. After a recent, post-UNESCO restoration of the church (in combination with archaeological and art-historical research), the church was also thoroughly renovated, with the laying of a new, modern tile floor and new stained glass windows. This reflects the respect of the Danish heritage authorities for churches as living sites of worship, but in UNESCO World Heritage Sites it is unusual to modernize crucial elements of the site. How this was justified to UNESCO is unclear, but this is testimony to the limits of World-Heritagization in the face of the fundamental hybridity of the church as, at once, heritage site and living site of worship. The institutional strength of the parish as an autonomous unit and hence of the local congregation stands in stark contrast with the cleansing of the heritage "buffer zone" of houses, no matter how old and valuable they are; even in the highly secularized Danish society, the local parish is strong, but the local community less so. That difference can be explained through the combination of top-down heritage preservation according to UNESCO guidelines, with practical heritage management by a site manager employed by a local church body that enjoys a high degree of autonomy.

This section provided a snapshot of some of the tensions evoked by the management of a Danish church as World Heritage. The increase in bureaucracy with external representation from church and government authorities in recent years shows how the recent World-Heritagization of Jelling has added more layers of professionalization and bureaucratization of heritage management and more lines of upward accountability, against the backdrop of local discontent with growing tourist numbers encroaching on the town and the church. Still, professional responsibility for management is anchored in the local parish council as the officially appointed steward of World Heritage, resulting in a hybrid religious-cum-heritage management setup entangled in a web of secular heritage bureaucracy. Some local town residents, on the other hand, feel underrepresented in the various manage-

ment bodies, with little influence over the heritage impact on their town outside the parish council. The following section on Roskilde Cathedral will dwell on the combined institutional proliferation and hybridization against the backdrop of World-Heritagization.

Religious Propagation and Heritage Communication at Roskilde Cathedral

Founded in its current form in the late twelfth century, Roskilde Cathedral was Denmark's second site to be inscribed in the World Heritage List, in 1995. The cathedral was inscribed to the World Heritage List because it is deemed an outstanding example of the earliest Christian church complexes in northern Europe built in brick and for the successive architectural styles that have been added to the church through the centuries. This can be seen in the various ancillary chapels and porches of the cathedral, which since the sixteenth century has been the national burial grounds for the Danish royal family. The continuing addition of burial chapels makes this grand cathedral a place of national importance as the royal burial monument. Together with Jelling, the Roskilde Cathedral thus monumentalizes a union between Christianity, the Danish nation, and its royal family (Kjær 2013; Schütze 2013; Warburg 2013). In this sense, the two sites represent a historically rooted combination of secular (cultural, national) and religious interests and values. Like the Jelling parish, Roskilde Cathedral is also a functioning parish church within the Danish state church and is governed by the parish council and the diocese.

As an outstanding architectural monument, Roskilde Cathedral has for a long time been a listed heritage site in Denmark and a tourist attraction just outside the greater Copenhagen area. Within the past decade, the World Heritage label has emerged as an increasingly important part of the Cathedral's iconicity as a national heritage site and as a tourist attraction. A curious but telling indication of this World Heritage boom in Roskilde is the fact that it was not until 2015, twenty years after its World Heritage inscription, that an official UNESCO plaque was put up next to the main entrance of the cathedral. This hesitant World-Heritagization of the cathedral is also brought out by a conflict and subsequent solution over the proper way of funding a visitor center at the cathedral. This section shows how the case of a proposed visitor center in Roskilde in response to World Heritage requirements amplified the ambiguity that exists where church and cultural heritage converge in the religion-as-heritage complex in Denmark.

In line with the state-mandated governance of church and heritage in Denmark, the management of Roskilde Cathedral as a World Heritage Site

resembles that of Jelling in that the local parish has a large degree of autonomy and local sovereignty, which in Roskilde is compounded by the fact that the cathedral is also the site for the Roskilde deanery (*provsti*) and diocese (*stift*). There are also important differences in how the Roskilde site is managed, the most significant one being that the parish council of the cathedral has set up neither an external steering committee nor a management group. In a periodic report to UNESCO, this sort of an external representational organ for management and supervision was “not considered relevant.”¹⁰ This means in practice that, like in Jelling, the main responsibility for management of the cathedral as a World Heritage Site rests with the parish council, as stated in church law. While maintenance and preservation of the church’s structure in terms of its World Heritage value and as a cathedral of national importance are the responsibility of the parish council and employees of the church, the National Museum and local Roskilde museums are periodically consulted.

Apart from the regular funding and supervision structure for all church buildings in Denmark, Roskilde Cathedral annually receives specialized funding by the Danish state because of its national-historical importance. Thus, the state provides earmarked funds for restoration projects in the cathedral each year, where the Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs has been responsible for covering expenses for ordinary maintenance and restoration of the royal burial chapels inside the cathedral, which are subsidized annually through the state budget along with funding for extraordinary projects.¹¹ This continued government funding and the special supervisory arrangement regarding heritage aspects show us that already before World Heritage inscription, the management of Roskilde Cathedral entailed a certain degree of cooperation with various church and government agencies on cultural heritage preservation.

During a quiet first decade following the inscriptions of the Jelling (1994) and Roskilde (1995) sites, not much importance was attached to World Heritage status. This changed in the mid- to late 2000s, when interest in World Heritage began to set in among tourists, locals, and state agencies alike. In line with the global “heritage fever” since the mid-2000s, interest and pride in World Heritage status surged in Denmark, in part encouraged by UNESCO via the Danish Agency for Culture and Palaces. In line with this emergent interest and with formal requirements on the part of UNESCO, Roskilde parish council presented in 2010 the first plans for an underground visitor center to the public. The church stated that when built, the center would accommodate the standards expected of a World Heritage Site from tourists and heritage agencies (which at the time was deemed inadequate by UNESCO), with an estimated price tag of DKK 68 million (EUR 9 million).



Figure 4.2. A special section cordoned off for religious worshippers in Roskilde Cathedral. © Oscar Salemink, 2018.

However, the project of the visitor center was complicated because of the intricate organization and legislation regarding Danish churches and their responsibility for cultural heritage preservation. The heart of the matter was a concern about what kind of public funding of churches within the Danish state church could legally be used or not used for this purpose. As part of the Danish state church, the cathedral is primarily a religious site intended for worship, which implied that it cannot use church funds for a visitor center, which services tourists rather than worshipers, and hence serving cultural rather than religious purposes. The debate surrounding the visitor center at Roskilde Cathedral reveals a core tension between heritage communication (*formidling*) and religious propagation (*forkyndelse*) when churches in Denmark become World Heritage Sites (Figure 4.2). As described in detail by Lisbeth Christoffersen, professor of law and religion at Roskilde University, the initial plan for the funding was to collect church taxes, admission fees to the cathedral, and private grants as funding for the establishment of a modern underground visitor facility situated near the cathedral (Christoffersen 2015). The parish council had requested about DKK 500,000 (EUR 67,000) of church funds (*ligningsmidler*) to partially support the project, but the Roskilde deanery committee forwarded the request to the diocesan authority of Roskilde diocese. The deanery and diocese proved skeptical about the proposed model of using church taxes for a heritage-related visitor center servicing tourists—that is, for heritage communication rather than religious propagation—and asked the bishop of Roskilde and a state-employed regional director of the diocese to assess the legal framing of subsidizing such a project via church taxes.

In 2013 the diocese determined that a sum of about DKK 300,000 (EUR 40,000) could be allocated from admission fees from the cathedral to the fund, as these were not part of the subsidies collected from church members (Christoffersen 2015: 83). This resolved the dispute about whether the visitor center required by UNESCO could be funded by the church, with the outcome that income from commercial activities like admission fees to the cathedral could be allocated to the project, but not church funds. An expert on church law, Christoffersen calls this a “clarification of competence” between the religious (*forkyndelse*) and heritage (*formidling*) responsibilities of the cathedral, in the form of a demarcation of the parish council’s authority over and autonomy to dispose its given (church) budget (Christoffersen 2015: 85). Talking about the project, the UNESCO site manager in charge of the cultural heritage expressed this responsibility and budgetary divergence as follows:

The church is primarily a religious institution and cultural heritage dissemination is not its main responsibility. Some churches experience it as a challenge to balance these two things (i.e., heritage and church functions). . . . A church like

Roskilde Cathedral, which has this big, heavy heritage, assumes responsibility for heritage promotion and education, but the primary task of a church is religious and running the church as a place of worship.

Here, the UNESCO site manager clearly prioritizes *forkyndelse* (religious propagation) over *formidling* (heritage dissemination), showing the double bind in which he found himself.

The situation was compounded by disagreement in the parish council over the question whether entrance fees should be imposed. In November 2013, the vice-chairwoman who was in favor of free entrance—and hence on the side of *forkyndelse* rather than *formidling*, predicated on the idea that the church should be open to all—was deposed.¹² But entrance fees were not enough to fund the project, and despite initial hopes, no church funds could be allocated to the project within the current funding scheme framework for parish councils within the Danish state church, even though ultimately the source is the same, namely taxes collected by the Danish state. Yet, a parish council under the Danish state church has to consult with its respective deanery committee over the disposal of its funding and can potentially be assessed by church authorities, thus revealing its limited financial autonomy. The case of the funding of a UNESCO-mandated visitor center attached to Roskilde Cathedral shows that even though church and heritage funds ultimately come from the state, funds from church taxes are earmarked for religious activities under the rubric of *forkyndelse* and hence cannot be used for nonreligious purposes like servicing tourists.

Institutional Proliferation and Hybridization

In 2013, after funding for the visitor center proved harder to acquire than initially thought, control of the project was transferred from the parish council to an external foundation, the Fund for Communication of Cultural Heritage in Roskilde (Fonden for formidlingen af kulturarven i Roskilde). In 2015 another external foundation was constituted, namely the Development Fund for a Communication Center of the Cultural Heritage of Roskilde Cathedral (Anlægsfonden Formidlingscenter Kulturarven Roskilde Domkirke), whose purpose was to support the first foundation by acquiring the funds needed for the visitor center project. The UNESCO site manager and director of communication for Roskilde Cathedral was initially employed by the parish council, but the formal employment relationship was transferred when he became the director of both foundations, while both boards of trustees count the same representatives from the Danish Agency for Culture and Palaces, the National Museum, Roskilde parish council, and Roskilde Municipality:

While nobody disagreed with the plan to establish a visitor center, one encountered a bit of resistance against *fundraising* for the construction of a visitor center. There was concern that private foundations would not be willing to support such a project if it was managed by a church organization. Therefore it was decided to establish an independent commercial foundation, with the task to disseminate the cultural heritage of Roskilde Cathedral and to raise funds for the establishment and manage a visitor center. I was employed by the parish council, but I am now transferred to the foundation. That means that the dissemination tasks were separated from the parish council, but there is still close collaboration with the parish council. And so the Agency for Culture, the National Museum, the parish council, and Roskilde Municipality appoint the five members of the board, for which I am director and secretary. And they have now more dissemination-professional access, but there is still a link with the parish council in the sense that a parish council member sits on the board of the foundation. And some agreements were made on how to practically handle an organization next to a church organization. And that functions really smoothly.

Thus a potential conflict over funding for the visitor center required by UNESCO was externalized by setting up additional bureaucratic layers with representation from the same agencies through the same people, resulting in a process of institutional proliferation and simultaneous hybridization against the backdrop of the World-Heritagization of Roskilde Cathedral. As we will elaborate below, this hybridization stands in contrast to the heritage purification of the environment of the heritage site, as in Jelling.

In 2016 and 2017, two other World Heritage-related institutions were added by Roskilde Cathedral's parish council, thereby further hybridizing responsibility for cultural heritage management. The first of these was the World Heritage Committee (Verdensarvsudvalg) set up in 2016 as an internal committee to the parish council tasked with handling all World Heritage affairs. The other, the World Heritage Council (Verdensarvsråd), was set up in 2017 with internal representation from the parish council itself and external representation from relevant local organizations in Roskilde, including Roskilde Municipality, local museums, local tourist organizations, local businesses, Roskilde University, and local schools and colleges. The purpose of this external council was to improve the dissemination of information about the World Heritage Site and to involve interested parties from the area in order to handle common and diverging interests emerging in Roskilde over its World Heritage Site.¹³ With the addition of the World Heritage Council made up of representatives from secular society (experts and state authorities), most matters of promoting Roskilde Cathedral as a UNESCO World Heritage Site have been formally removed from the parish council's sphere, marking a further "clarification of competence" between what the church authorities can and cannot do regarding the cultural heritage aspect of the

cathedral. As Ulla Kjær and Poul Grønder-Hansen make clear in their chapter to this volume, the church already carries a legal responsibility to maintain its cultural heritage. In practice, the separation between religious and heritage functions and the consequent clarification of competence (cf. Christoffersen 2015) seem primarily to be a question of how church funds are handled, but ultimately the funding comes from the state, regardless whether it is channeled via religious or cultural institutions. Yet, handling this state funding requires a clarification of competence between religious and heritage interests in the cathedral, which is achieved through institutional proliferation.

Our research began in January 2017—that is, after most of the organizational and institutional changes had taken place—with a meeting that took place in the office building next to the cathedral, which is in use by the priests, the parish council, and also by the UNESCO site manager. The site manager emphasized the close working relationship between the church and heritage officials at the cathedral:

It's quite important to say that I do not have any formal division between me and my colleagues. You can look in there, I am sitting in the same room as all the others. My paycheck just comes from another place and my superiors are someone else than the parish council. . . . In practice, I rarely do anything that is not in close collaboration with the church.

In other words, the UNESCO site manager extolled the smooth collaboration with the church and the parish council made possible by the separation of religious and heritage functions and his transfer from the first to the latter. Unfortunately we could not triangulate the interviews through ethnographic research at Roskilde Cathedral, hence our findings about the process of clarification of competence between religious and heritage management interests are limited.

The proliferation of the site manager's formal affiliations reflects the organizational changes needed for developing a visitor center in Roskilde, resulting in increased involvement of external government and nongovernment parties in the professionalization, bureaucratization, and institutionalization of heritage management. In effect, the autonomous existence of the parish council has become increasingly bureaucratized, as decisions about heritage management were hybridized through institutional proliferation involving the very same agencies and people. It is clear that this worked, for in the early spring of 2018, the foundation to establish the visitor center announced that, eight years after the project was first presented to the public, it would open in 2022. Plans include exhibition facilities, a café, and other amenities for the approximately 150,000 annual visitors to the cathedral, for an estimated price of DKK 115 million (EUR 15.8 million).

The development in Roskilde Cathedral from lacking interest in UNESCO World Heritage status to an increased interest coincided with a development from relative autonomy of the parish council to increased bureaucratization against the backdrop of its World-Heritagization. The resolution and aftermath to the deliberations over the visitor center reveal a bureaucratic tension over the overlapping competencies between the local autonomy of the parish council and the centralized authority of state and church. This tension was defused through the institutional proliferation of various boards and foundations with their shared purposes in relation to World Heritage, with the same agencies and the same people taking part in these various committees in Roskilde. This illustrates how the ongoing World-Heritagization of Roskilde Cathedral is predicated on institutional proliferation and their simultaneous hybridization, as these twin processes make it virtually impossible to practically distinguish between church and heritage interests and lines of accountability. Thus, by creating more hybrid entities responsible for the World Heritage Site and the visitor center, the so-called clarification of competence occurred within the very same circle of agencies and people, creating a specific hybrid context for the management of religious heritage as part of the Danish state church and as World Heritage.

Conclusion: World-Heritagization and Its Discontents

Both the Jelling and Roskilde sites were already considered national heritage before they were listed as World Heritage and therefore did not generate much attention in terms of regulation or publicity during the first decade after World Heritage inscription. This only began to change when these two sites began to experience the effects of the UNESCO label as an international brand in the tourist market and as a “quality control” device requiring adherence to specific regulations and “best practices.” In both cases, World-Heritagization added other bureaucratic layers in response to UNESCO professional management requirements, in particular regarding the establishment of visitor centers at both sites. Given the articulation of specifically Danish legislation regarding state church property with UNESCO requirements, the heritage site managers in Jelling and Roskilde are formally affiliated with the local parish councils, meaning that institutionally cultural heritage values are superseded by the religious values of the churches—in the internationally unusual situation of non-separation of church and state in Denmark. Thus, the religious heritage sites that are part of the Danish church retain considerable say over their heritage, as the local parish councils employ the UNESCO site managers.

In both Jelling and Roskilde, the professional and institutional demands of World-Heritagization entailed bureaucratization and institutional proliferation. World-Heritagization compounded existing heritage management structures that conformed to Danish legislation privileging local parishes as the rightful owners of the churches, including of cultural heritage property. The different—religious and heritage—management requirements of the churches generate tensions that demand careful treading, something resolved through intertwined processes of heritage purification, hybridization, and institutional proliferation. Global and national heritage governmentality (cf. Coombe and Weiss 2015) is geared toward the purification of heritage sites, but where these sites are simultaneously under some form of religious sovereignty, the resulting tension is in the two Danish cases discussed here, distributed through the establishment and proliferation of hybrid institutions. These consist of largely the same actors but have slightly different purposes and mandates, so as to defuse any tensions. This might seem like a classic church-versus-state equation, but the Danish irony is that financially, both the cultural heritage and church streams of funding come largely from state coffers, albeit channeled through different agencies.

In conclusion, World-Heritagization of religious sites in Denmark generates changes in the management through the twin processes of institutional proliferation and hybridization and, in the case of Jelling World-Heritagization, even generates changes on the ground, in the environment (cf. Brumann and Berliner 2016). Whereas the exact nature and direction of these processes depend on local specifics, the churches in both Jelling and Roskilde are part of the Danish state church, in which the local parish councils exercise local sovereignty. The local parish council employs the heritage site manager and hence exercises a considerable say over the management of the cultural heritage site—sometimes to the detriment of nonreligious local residents, as in Jelling. In other words, in the context of World-Heritagization, local Danish congregations deploy various tactics such as institutional proliferation and hybridization with more or less success in order to deal with tensions and with potential threats to their local autonomy.

Sofie Isager Ahl received her doctoral degree from the Department of Anthropology at the University of Copenhagen, based on research on regenerative agriculture in Scandinavia. She has previously done fieldwork at religious World Heritage Sites in Denmark as scientific assistant in the HERILIGION: The Heritagization of Religion and the Sacralization of Heritage in Contemporary Europe research project and worked with the Danish delegation to UNESCO. She is the author of *Naboplanter* (2018), coeditor of *Ny Jord—Tidsskrift for naturkritik 1* (2015), and translator of Eduardo Kohn's *Soul Blindness* (2016).

Rasmus Rask Poulsen is a PhD fellow in the section for European Ethnology at the SAXO-Institute at the University of Copenhagen and the Danish Folklore Archives at the Royal Danish Library. His PhD project examines the (world) heritagization of three affiliated religious communities of the Moravian Brethren (Herrnhuter) and their eighteenth-century settlements in Denmark, Germany, and the United States. In 2017, he attained an MA in social anthropology from the Department of Anthropology at the University of Copenhagen, specializing in the fields of cultural heritage and religion.

Oscar Salemink is professor of anthropology at the University of Copenhagen. Between 2001 and 2011 he worked at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, from 2005 as professor of social anthropology, and from 1996 through 2001 he was responsible for Ford Foundation grant portfolios in social sciences and arts and culture in Thailand and Vietnam. He received his doctoral degree from the University of Amsterdam, based on research on Vietnam's Central Highlands. He is currently working on global projects on heritage and contemporary arts. He has published two monographs, ten edited volumes, and eight themed issues of journals.

NOTES

The research for this article took place in the framework of the European project HERILIGION: The Heritagization of Religion and the Sacralization of Heritage in Contemporary Europe (2016–20), funded by Humanities in the European Research Area (HERA) grant # 5087–00505A.

The fieldwork in Jelling and Roskilde was conducted by Sofie Isager Ahl (2017–18), and all of the quotations of informants come from her fieldnotes. Both Ahl and Rasmus Rask Poulsen (2018–19) were research assistants in the HERILIGION project that constitutes the basis for this volume. All three coauthors contributed substantively and substantially to this chapter.

1. In Denmark, four out of seven cultural World Heritage Sites contain Protestant church buildings. These are, in order of adaption to the World Heritage List, Jelling Mounds, Runic Stones and Church (1994), Roskilde Cathedral (1995), Kronborg Castle (2000), and Christiansfeld, a Moravian Church Settlement (2015). The church in Kronborg Castle is a chapel rather than a parish church with a congregation, as is the case in the other sites. Because Christiansfeld's Moravian congregation is outside of the Lutheran state church, it is both theologically and in terms of heritage preservation governed differently from the Danish mainstream, and hence not representative for the Danish case.
2. See the chapter by Kjær and Grinder-Hansen in this volume.
3. Translated into modern English the inscription says, "King Harald bade this monument be made in memory of Gorm his father and Thyra his mother, that Harald who

- won for himself all Denmark and Norway and made the Danes Christians” (Hvass 2011).
4. “Vi er vilde med vikinger: Museum slår ny besøgsrekord,” *Vejle Amts Folkeblad*, 2 January 2019, <https://vafo.dk/artikel/vi-er-vilde-med-vikinger-museum-sl%C3%A5-ry-bes%C3%B8gsrekord> (accessed 24 August 2020).
 5. The A. P. Møller Foundation is the majority shareholder of the global Mærsk shipping empire. The full name of the foundation is A. P. Møller og Hustru Chastine Mc-Kinney Møllers Fond til almene Formaal.
 6. See the chapter by Ulla Kjær and Poul Grinder-Hansen in this volume.
 7. See the official statistics here: <https://www.km.dk/folkekirken/kirkestatistik/folk-ekirkens-medlemstal/> (accessed 1 September 2020). Many church members are token members who hardly ever visit church or engage in religious activities.
 8. Fieldnotes by Sofie Isager Ahl. See also “Stor udskiftning i menighedsråd,” TV Syd, 14 September 2016, <https://www.tvsyd.dk/artikel/stor-udskiftning-i-meninghedsraad>; Seks af otte forlader Jelling Menighedsråd, *Vejle Amts Folkeblad*, 14 September 2017, <https://vafo.dk/artikel/seks-af-otte-forlader-jelling-menighedsr%C3%A5d>; “Opgør om nationalarv er slut i Jelling” *Kristeligt Dagblad*, 1 October 2016, <https://www.kristeligt-dagblad.dk/kirke-tro/opgoer-om-nationalarv-er-slut-i-jelling> (all accessed 24 August 2020).
 9. “Oprør mod lokalråd: Borgere vil også høres,” *Vejle Amts Folkeblad*, 21 April 2018, <https://vafo.dk/artikel/opr%C3%B8r-mod-lokalr%C3%A5d-borgere-vil-ogs%C3%A5-h%C3%B8res>; “Der kommer et nyt møde om randbebyggelsen,” *Vejle Amts Folkeblad*, 7 May 2018, <https://vafo.dk/artikel/der-kommer-et-nyt-m%C3%B8de-om-randbebyggelsen>; “Brat farvel til lokalråd: Formand blev træt af mistilliden,” *Vejle Amts Folkeblad*, 19 August 2018, <https://vafo.dk/artikel/brat-farvel-til-lokalr%C3%A5d-formand-blev-tr%C3%A6t-af-mistilliden> (all accessed 24 August 2020).
 10. Periodic Reporting Cycle 2, section II, 2013: 5, see <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/695/documents/> (accessed 1 September 2020).
 11. Finansloven 2018a §22.11.02. From 2005 to 2011, the state budget furthermore awarded extraordinary funds to restorations of the royal burial chapels and the cathedral’s roof. From 2011 to 2017, the budget also covered expenses for the establishment of Queen Margrethe’s sepulchral monument in a chapel of the cathedral at an estimated price of DKK 31.4 million (EUR 4.2 million) (Finansloven 2018b §22.11.15; see also Christoffersen 2015: 81–82).
 12. “Intriger i domkirkens menighedsråd,” *SN.dk*, 22 November 2013, <https://sn.dk/Roskilde/Intriger-i-domkirkens-menighedsraad/artikel/371042> (accessed 24 August 2020).
 13. “Menighedsrådet kom på plads,” *Roskilde Avis*, 22 November 2016, p. 76, <http://www.e-pages.dk/roskildemidtuge/555/78>; Roskilde Kommune, 2017 Ansøgning om støtte til lokale erhvervs- og turismeprojekter: Verdensarvsdag i Roskilde lørdag den 10. marts 2018, http://roskilde.dk/sites/default/files/fics/DAG/3404/Bilag/Indkomne_ansoegninger_UVEG_oktober_2017.pdf (pp. 1, 13–15); “Nyt råd skal gøre unge bevidste om domkirkens verdensarv,” *Dagbladet Roskilde*, 13 May 2017, sec. 1, p. 2, <https://sn.dk/Roskilde/Nyt-raad-skal-vaerne-om-domkirkens-verdensarv/artikel/654884> (all accessed 1 September 2020).

REFERENCES

- Berliner, David. 2012. "Multiple Nostalgias: The Fabric of Heritage in Luang Prabang (Lao PDR)," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (N.S.) 18: 769–86.
- Brumann, Christoph, and David Berliner. 2016. "Introduction: UNESCO World Heritage—Grounded?," in Christoph Brumann and David Berliner (eds.), *World Heritage on the Ground: Ethnographic Perspectives*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 1–34.
- Christensen, Leif Baun. 2016. *Jelling—byen der forsvandt*. Jelling: Lokalhistorisk forening for Jelling, Kollerup-Vindelev og Hvejse.
- Christoffersen, Lisbeth. 2015. "Roskilde Domkirke. Styling af sognekirke og turistattraktion," *Religionsvidenskabeligt Tidsskrift* 62: 77–89.
- Coombe, Rosemary J., and Lindsay M. Weiss. 2015. "Neoliberalism, Heritage Regimes and Cultural Rights," in Lynn Meskell (ed.), *Global Heritage: A Reader*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 43–69.
- De Cesari, Chiara. 2012. "Thinking through Heritage Regimes," in Regina Bendix, Adytia Eggert, and Arnika Peselmann (eds.), *Heritage Regimes and the State*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen, pp. 399–413.
- Harrison, Rodney, and Michael Hitchcock. 2005. *The Politics of World Heritage Negotiating Tourism and Conservation*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Herzfeld, Michael. 2006. "Spatial Cleansing: Monumental Vacuity and the Idea of the West," *Journal of Material Culture* 11(1/2): 127–49.
- Herzfeld, Michael. 2009. *Evicted from Eternity: The Restructuring of Modern Rome*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Herzfeld, Michael. 2015. "Heritage and Corruption: The Two Faces of the Nation-State," *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21(6): 531–44.
- Hvass, Steen. 2011. *Jelling-Monumenterne—deres historie og bevaring*. Copenhagen: Kulturarvsstyrelsen.
- Jessen, Mads Dengsø, Mads Kähler Holst, Charlotta Lindblom, Niels Bonde, and Anne Pedersen. 2014. "A Palisade Fit for a King: Ideal Architecture in King Harald Bluetooth's Jelling," *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 47(1): 42–64.
- Kjær, Ulla. 2013. *Roskilde Domkirke*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Rubow, Cecilie. 2011. "Religion and Integration: Three Danish Models for the Relationship between Religion and Society," in Karen Fog Olwig and Karsten Paerregaard (eds.), *The Question of Integration: Immigration, Exclusion and the Danish Welfare State*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, pp. 94–110.
- Salemink, Oscar. 2016. "Described, Inscribed, Written Off: Heritagisation as (Dis)Connection," in Philip Taylor (ed.), *Connected and Disconnected in Vietnam*. Canberra: ANU Press, pp. 311–46.
- Schütze, Laura Maria. 2013. "Myten om Danmarks dåbsattest. Civilreligion i kongernes Jelling," in Margit Warburg, Signe Engelbreth Larsen, and Laura Maria Schütze (eds.), *Civilreligion i Danmark. Ritualer, myter og steder*. Højbjerg: Univers, pp. 55–76.
- Warburg, Margit. 2013. "Dansk civilreligion i det store og Små, in Margit Warburg," in Signe Engelbreth Larsen and Laura Maria Schütze (eds.), *Civilreligion i Danmark. Ritualer, Myter og Steder*. Højbjerg: Univers, pp. 7–54.
- Waterton, Emma, and Steve Watson (eds.). 2011. *Heritage and Community Engagement: Collaboration or Contestation*. London: Routledge.