SOME COINS OF SIGTUNA INSCRIBED WITH THE NAMES OF ÆTHELRED, CNUT, AND HARTHACNUT.

BY H. ALEXANDER PARSONS.

SIGTUNA, now not much more than a village, is situated about twenty-five miles north of Stockholm, the modern capital of Sweden. It first comes under notice as the place where the historic Odin is popularly supposed to have established his capital after his conquest of the country, and where he erected a temple for celebrating the rites of the new faith which he introduced. Freyer, who is reputed to have flourished at the beginning of the Christian era, removed his capital from Sigtuna to Upsala, but the former place continued to be of very considerable importance, at least down to the time of the issue of the coins which will presently be noticed, as an annual fair was held there, and it was a favourite residence of the court.

Before considering the coins of Sigtuna inscribed with the names of ÆTHELRED, CNUT and HARTHACNUT, I may perhaps mention, for the information of those readers who are not conversant with the coins of Scandinavia of the period, that the letter “G” is most frequently, if not always, softened into an “H,” or is omitted altogether from the coins. Thus on the money of Olaf Skötkonung and Anund Jacob, the first of Swedish princes to strike coins in their own names at Sigtuna, we get for that place-name such readings as SIHTVN and SITVN, or abbreviations. The coins of Magnus the Good of Norway and Denmark also disclose the same orthographical form, for his name appears upon them as MAHNVS and MANVS, never, apparently, MAGNVS.

Turning now to the coins of my title, I may perhaps mention that one of the primary objects of this paper is to discuss readings of certain pennies which have been recorded as “uncertain” in Anglo-Saxon lists.
Some Coins of Sigtuna inscribed Æthelred, Cnut, and Harthacnut.

In Hildebrand's comprehensive Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Coins in the Royal Cabinet at Stockholm, 1881, for instance, there appears a number of mints which were not located by him to any known place, and although in a most useful paper by Major Carlyon-Britton, on "Uncertain Anglo-Saxon Mints, and some new attributions," many of these unappropriated coins have, with every degree of probability, been geographically located, the list was not entirely exhausted. One of the mints which remains for discussion is that inscribed on the coins as SITV and SITVN. The coins inscribed SITV are given on p. 137 of the catalogue above referred to and they therein purport to be of the reign of Æthelred II. The inscription on the obverse lends colour to this position, as does the general design of the coins, which is similar to those of his "long-cross" or "Irish" type. From the specimen here illustrated, taken from my own cabinet, it will be seen that the legends are:

![Image of coin]

**FIG. I.—PENNY OF SIGTUNA INSCRIBED WITH THE NAME OF ÆTHELRED.**

*Obverse.*—ÆEDERED EX AIGOL

*Reverse.*—NHTINC-SITV  Weight 31½ grains.

Of the two coins in the Royal Cabinet at Stockholm with this reverse reading, one is exactly similar to the specimen described above, and the other differs only in the obverse legend, which reads ÆDELRED REX AIEO. Hildebrand, in a footnote in the 1846 edition of his catalogue, says that they are inserted in order to fix attention upon the town name. He adds, "For Swedish numismatists this name has a special interest through resemblance with that of Sigtuna, where Olaf Skötkonung and Anund Jacob, with English moneyers, struck Sweden's first money." These remarks seem to indicate that the learned author was alive to the possibility of the coins belonging to the Swedish mint of Sigtuna, and an endeavour will now be made to bring forward reasons for definitely
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1 *British Numismatic Journal, 1910.*
Comparisons with Anglo-Saxon Issues.

appropriating them to that town, so that the place-name may be eliminated from any future lists of Anglo-Saxon mints.

In addition to the confused inscriptions on the coins, which were also noticed by Hildebrand, the workmanship of the designs and letters is far inferior to that of the true Saxon pennies of similar type, and this will best be demonstrated by comparison with a typical English coin of Æthelred II., as illustrated by Fig. 2, which I have selected from my cabinet for this purpose. It reads:

![Fig. 2. Anglo-Saxon Penny of Æthelred II., Struck at Oxford.](image)

**Obverse.** + ÆDELRED REX ANGOX

**Reverse.** + PVLFPINE MΩO OXNA  Weight 24½ grains.

Fig. 1, the SITV piece, is obviously a copy, by an inferior workman, of a coin similar to Fig. 2, and this points to a foreign source of issue.

Further distinctive features to be remarked about these SITV coins are, that they are of a type which was very extensively imitated by princes contemporary with, or immediately succeeding, Æthelred II., and that their weight is most excessive, even allowing for the fact that the weights of the coins of Æthelred II. fluctuate to a considerable degree.

Taking the above facts as a whole, it seems that we should be not unreasonable if we first looked abroad before assuming that Britain was responsible for the emission of the coins. Of the foreign mints of the time, Sigtuna stands out, pre-eminently, as that which, from its orthographical form, is most likely to have been the place-name indicated. Further, since Æthelred II. could have had no jurisdiction in Sigtuna, it would follow that the SITV pieces inscribed with his name must also be transferred to a Swedish prince, almost certainly Olaf Skötkonung. This monarch is well known to have struck coins at Sigtuna of the same
Some Coins of Sigtuna inscribed Æthelred, Cnut, and Harthacnut.

type as those under notice, as well as imitations of another issue of Æthelred II., namely, the ERVX type.

FIG. 3.—PENNY OF OLAF SKÖTKONUNG, STRUCK AT SIGTUNA.

The specimen of Olaf's coins in the British Museum, indeed, gives the Anglian title, see Fig. 3, for it reads on the obverse:—

+ÔRÃFÃ REX ANEOG, so that the legend is but one step removed from the abject copies represented by Fig. 1. The average weight also of the undoubted money of Olaf is much the same as that of the uncertain coins under notice. This is a very important point, because the weights of the money of Olaf are so much higher than those of the coins of any other princes of his time and after, not excepting his son and successor, Anund Jacob. If, therefore, the SITV coins are of Swedish origin they must fall, by the weight test alone, to Olaf's reign.

FIG. 4.—PENNY OF LUND IN DENMARK INSCRIBED WITH THE NAME OF ÆTHELRED.

Hauberg suggests that these coins should be appropriated to Denmark, but the size, the crude designing, the confused inscriptions and, more especially, the weight militate against such an attribution when one compares the coins with those bearing the name of Æthelred, the Danish origin of which is indisputable. These latter are of good design, with well-formed letters in the legends, and are of small module and light weight. A comparison of Fig. 4, from the writer's collection, which illustrates one of these coins, weighing 15½ grains, with Fig. 1, the

1 Numismatic Chronicle, 1871, p. 45.
SITV piece, will amply demonstrate that the two classes had no common origin, and I think, therefore, that it is only reasonable to accept, in this instance, the message of the SITV coin itself, which message clearly indicates Sigtuna as the mint of origin.

Other instances of coins of one monarch inscribed with the name and titles of another are by no means rare in this period. An analogous issue is that of the coins of the kings of Dublin of the same type as the SITV pieces, with the name and title of Æthelred II. on the obverse. To illustrate this class for the purpose of comparison I have chosen Fig. 5 from my Irish series, which reads:

![Fig. 5.—Penny of Dublin inscribed with the name of Æthelred.](image)

**Obverse.**—+ÆDELRÈD REX AIGO
**Reverse.**—+FÆERÈMIN MO DYFLI Weight 21½ grains.

It can no more be said that Æthelred II. had jurisdiction in Ireland than in Sweden, and I think it will be conceded that these coins were issued in Dublin for King Sihtric of Dublin, as the SITV pieces were struck in Sigtuna for King Olaf of Sweden.

It is desirable next to consider an entirely different series of coins of Sigtuna, bearing on the obverse the inscription +CNVT REX SP, that is, Cnut, King of Sweden, for, of course, the letter P is our W; and on the reverse +DORMOD ON SIHT, or its abbreviation. No native king of Sweden of the name of Cnut is known to the history of this time, and the interesting question arises whether our Cnut the Great added a part of Sweden to his other very considerable dominions. Before entering into this question I may, perhaps, remark that these coins, unlike the other issues treated in this paper, have never been claimed as Anglo-Saxon, and, moreover, the regularity of their workmanship and the purity of their inscriptions place them in an entirely different category.
from the coins of Sigtuna bearing the name of Æthelred already discussed. Instead of being servile copies of a foreign coin by an ignorant workman, which is so characteristic of the "Æthelred" pieces, they have every appearance of being an issue by a skilled moneyer acting under proper instructions for the designs and inscriptions used. They are of two varieties, as follows:

**FIGS. 6 AND 7.—PENNIES OF SIGTUNA INSCRIBED WITH THE NAME OF CNUT.**

*Obverse.*—+ CNVT REX SP—divided by the bust. Mantled bust to left with fleured sceptre before.

*Reverse.*—+ DORMOD ON SIH Short cross voided, enclosed in an inner circle. On the centre of the cross and in each of the angles, an annulet enclosing a pellet. Fig. 6.

*Obverse.*—As before.

*Reverse.*—+ DORMOD ON SIHT Short cross voided, surrounded by an inner circle. In the centre, an annulet enclosing a pellet. Fig. 7.

In the *Numismatic Chronicle* of 1880 and 1881, Mr. Herbst, of Copenhagen, incidentally referred to the second coin, and as he considered that the name CNVT was carelessly engraved for ANVND, he gave it to Anund Jacob of Sweden. An examination, however, of the casts of the actual coin, which I am enabled to illustrate by the courtesy of the Keeper of the Royal Cabinet at Stockholm, does not show any trace of blundering either upon the obverse or upon the reverse. On the contrary, the dies for both this and the first variety, illustrated as Fig. 6, were very well executed. It is possible that Mr. Herbst never saw the coin he mentions, and he does not appear to have known of the first variety. His explanation of the legend may, I think, be dismissed.
Hauberg's Explanation.

Turning now to what Hauberg has to say, we find on p. 248 of his monograph on the coins of Denmark to A.D. 1146 the following remarks:

Of the time of Cnut we know some specimens of a rare money which offer interest wholly peculiar. One reads: + CNVT REX SP and + ĐORMOD ON SIHT. It designates, therefore, Cnut as King of the Swedes, and indicates that it was struck at Sigtuna by an English moneyer of the name of Thormoth. We find the name on several Swedish coins of this time, but not on any Danish or English piece.

Different opinions have been given on the signification of this money. History does not teach us that Cnut may have succeeded in subduing Sweden, or even a part of that country. On the contrary, his struggle against the royal allies, Anund Jacob of Sweden and Saint Olaf of Norway, did not end to his advantage. Nevertheless, as this piece is of a moneyer of Sigtuna and it expressly designates Cnut as King of the Swedes, some thought that they saw in it an important proof that this Danish king succeeded in forcing a part of Sweden under his domination.

If we ask ourselves what importance can be attached to this money, we must not dwell too much on the inscription of the reverse, according to which the pieces would have been struck in Sweden; in fact, we find many parallels to it among our Danish money of the times of Harthacnut and Magnus the Good. This often bears the name of an English town, especially Lincoln, simply because the moneyer made use of the reverse of coins brought from England. It is otherwise with the inscription of the obverse:—Rex Sverum. We possess, it is true, Danish money bearing the name of Æthelred, and of others, that [is,] of Edward [the Confessor], of which the origin is difficult to explain; but neither Æthelred nor Edward is intitled on them King of the Danes. The most natural explanation to give of the money of Cnut is that,
as he made warlike preparations to invade Sweden, he himself in the meantime caused to be struck some pieces bearing the title of King of Sweden; further, a Swedish moneyer may have been at this period in the service of the King who copied for the reverse a coin brought from Sigtuna.

In support of the Danish origin of these coins, Hauberg quotes, p. 47, another bearing the design of the Agnus Dei and a blundered inscription on the obverse, whilst on the reverse is the reading, \* WVLF MON SIHTVN; also a coin of Harthacnut reading \* OSBRN ON SITVN.

It must be confessed that Hauberg’s reasons for attributing the Thormoth coins to Denmark—in the catalogue they are placed under the mint of Lund—are no more convincing than Mr. Herbst’s reason for attributing them to Anund Jacob.

The existence of coins struck in Denmark with the names of Anglo-Saxon monarchs on the obverse, and of Anglo-Saxon towns on the reverse, is a strong point, but there seems little reason why the blundered Agnus-Dei piece quoted might not, as its reverse reading implies, have been struck at Sigtuna. The coin of Harthacnut referred to by Hauberg will be discussed later. Further, although the theory of the premature assumption of the Swedish title would be feasible, perhaps, in connection with one type of coins, the suggestion is much weakened when it is remembered that two varieties are in evidence. It is also, so far as I am aware, entirely without precedent in the early mediæval coinages. If Cnut did prematurely assume the Swedish royal title, it has to be explained why it is not found on any of the numerous and undoubted Danish coins with the name of Lund on the reverse. In other words, it is curious that a moneyer of Sweden working in Lund should have put the Swedish title on the coins struck for his Danish master, whereas no Danish moneyer did likewise, as it is inconceivable that the instructions to assume the conquest were given only to a moneyer from Sigtuna, and not to any who were natives of Lund. Again, the name on the coins is that of Thormoth, the well-known moneyer of Anund, Cnut’s Swedish opponent, and otherwise known only on undoubted Swedish coins.
Before accepting Hauberg's explanation, therefore, I think it would be well to examine the history of the quarrel with Olaf of Norway and Anund of Sweden, because I think that it will be possible to arrive at a reasonable conclusion that the coins are, what they purport to be, evidence of Cnut's overlordship of at least a part of Sweden.

In the winter of A.D. 1024 Cnut sent a Saxon embassy to Olaf of Norway, formally requesting him to pay homage for his kingdom and such tribute as had been levied on Norway by former Danish sovereigns. Olaf returned an insulting defiance and, in the following year, A.D. 1025, approached the King of Sweden, Anund Jacob, his brother-in-law, on the subject of an alliance against Cnut. Such an alliance was concluded on the basis of mutual support, and although Cnut made an attempt to dissolve it by sending gifts to Anund, and assuring him of security for himself and his kingdom if he would break away from Olaf, the attempt was unsuccessful. It was, however, not until the next year, A.D. 1026, that Cnut was in a position to fight the allies. He then headed a great fleet from England, which sailed eastward through Lime Firth, driving before him Olaf, who, with his ships, had been coasting along the shores of Zealand. In the meantime Anund was advancing westward along the Scanian coast. Cnut, after defeating part of the Swedish fleet at Stangeberg, 1 encountered the allies at the mouth of the Holy River, a small stream draining some inland lakes, in the eastern part of Scania, and here was fought the battle to which Hauberg alludes. Prior to the conflict a scheme of defence appears to have been entered into between Olaf and Anund, in pursuance of which the latter was left in command of the ships while the former landed, marched inland a little way, and dammed up the river with trees and turf, where it left the inland lakes, with a view to breaking the dam and letting the flood loose at the time when Cnut's ships would be in the river. Subsequent events may be described in the graphic words of Snorri Sturlason in the Saga of St. Olaf.

At dawn the next morning, a large part of Cnut's forces was found to have landed; some were conversing, others seeking
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1 Saxo Grammaticus, Gesta Danorum, 348.
amusement. Then, without the least warning, the waters came down in torrents, dashing the floating trees against the ships. The ships were injured and the waters overflowed the river banks, drowning the men who had gone on land and also many who were still on the ships. Those who were able to do so cut the ropes and allowed their ships to drift, each in its own direction. The Great Dragon that Cnut himself commanded was among these; it was not easily managed by the oars alone and drifted out towards the hostile fleet. When the allies recognised the ship, they immediately surrounded it; but it was not readily to be attacked, for the ship was high like a castle and had a number of men on board, who were carefully chosen, thoroughly armed, and very reliable. It was not long before Earl Ulf came up alongside with his ships and men and the battle was now joined in earnest. Cnut's forces then approached from all sides, and the Kings Olaf and Anund realised that they had won as much as fate had allowed them for this time; so they ordered a retreat, withdrew from Cnut's fleet and separated from the fight.

I have furnished a full description of the battle, because it shows that, but for Olaf's device, Cnut would probably have been an easy victor; and as it was, the engagement was drawn, since the allies withdrew, although leaving Cnut in too disorganised a condition to make an effective pursuit. It should be mentioned that the references in William of Malmesbury and Roger of Wendover to the effect that Godwin, afterwards the famous Earl of Wessex, took part in this campaign and defeated the Swedes unaided in a night attack, is a misconception. Henry of Huntingdon gives a similar account, with the exception that the exploit is alleged to have been against the Wends, and is given to the time of Cnut's first visit to Denmark in A.D. 1019. This account is no doubt the true version.

The battle of the Holy River was probably fought in September, A.D. 1026, although the Saxon Chronicle records it under A.D. 1025, and winter coming on without another engagement—it may be mentioned
that Olaf fled overland to his own kingdom—Cnut appears to have abandoned his project of subduing the allies for a time, and it seems not unlikely that he did so in the hope that, after an interval, the coalition would be dissolved. He was not a monarch who would heedlessly throw away his men if he could secure his end by diplomacy, as is evidenced by his wholesale bribery of the Norwegian chiefs before his conquest of that country. If this was Cnut's reason for not pursuing the war, it was, as will be seen later, amply justified.

For reasons political, or religious, he determined at this time upon the famous pilgrimage to Rome, which he carried out in the early months of A.D. 1027, although the Saxon Chronicle incorrectly, as will be seen, places it under A.D. 1031. From Rome, or upon his journey returning to Denmark, he sent the well-known letter to England, part of which is important to this discussion. It is therefore necessary to give the following short extracts:—

Cnut, King of all England, Denmark, Norway and part of the Swedes to etc.

I notify you that I have recently journeyed to Rome. I wish you further to know that, returning by the way I came, I am now going to Denmark through the advice of all the Danes, to make peace and firm treaty with those nations who were desirous, had it been possible for them, to deprive us both of life and of sovereignty. This, however, they were not able to perform since God, Who by His kindness preserves me in my kingdom and in my honour, and destroys the power of all my adversaries, has brought their strength to nought. Moreover, when I have established peace with the surrounding nations, and put all our sovereignty here in the East in tranquil order, so that there shall be no fear of war or enmity

1 Larson, Canute the Great, p. 167. Florence of Worcester furnishes internal evidence that its actual date was 1027, for he tells us that the letter was sent by the hand of Lyfing, who, he adds, was promoted to the see of Crediton in the same year, and we know that this was in A.D. 1027. He also states that Cnut met in Rome Conrad and "all the princes of the nations." The princes were no doubt assembled for the coronation of Conrad in A.D. 1027.
on any side, I intend coming to England as early in the summer as I shall be able to get my fleet prepared.

That Cnut expected a renewal of the war with the Norwegians and Swedes in the summer of this year, A.D. 1027, is evident from that section of the letter in which he declares that he is going to Denmark for the purpose of settling firm and lasting peace with those nations which, had it been in their power, would have deprived him of life and kingdom. This could have referred only to Olaf and Anund, against whom in the previous year so indecisive a campaign had been waged. But of the operations of the summer of A.D. 1027 history is unfortunately silent. That the “lasting peace” was not made is certain, because it was not until A.D. 1028, after his return to England late in the previous year, that Cnut’s conquest of Norway was accomplished. This historically silent summer of A.D. 1027 is very significant, and I would suggest that in it Cnut made a successful incursion against his Swedish enemy and forced his overlordship over Anund, or over at least a part of Sweden, as he did in the following winter over Malcolm, King of the Scots. Like the diplomatist he was, he probably dealt with his foes in detail; that is, Sweden first, in the summer of A.D. 1027, Scotland, as a probable ally of Norway, next, in the same year, and Norway last and most effectually in A.D. 1028. He would hardly have returned from Rome to England, via Denmark, without doing something, having regard to his expressed intention of clearing the political atmosphere in Scandinavia.

In support of the theory now propounded we have not only the very tangible evidence of the coins, but the fact that, in spite of mutual necessities and reciprocal agreements, Anund of Sweden no longer appears on the pages of history as the ally of Olaf, not even at the time of the latter’s direst need. Notwithstanding the Swedish king’s admiration of and kinship to the Norwegian monarch, he does not offer shelter when, in A.D. 1029, Olaf is treading the paths of exile, after the submission of Norway to Cnut. This is evident from the record of Olaf’s flight across Sweden and the Baltic Sea to Russia. Further, when, in A.D. 1030, the exiled king returned to Norway, only to be

¹ Snorri Sturlason, *Saga of St. Olaf.*
The probable Explanation.

defeated and slain at Sticklestead, the name of Anund is still absent from the records. These facts point strongly to the probability that the Swedish king was not in a position to render help to Olaf, and it seems a legitimate assumption to account for this by his subjection by Cnut, in A.D. 1027. Again, when Harthacnut, Cnut's successor on the Danish throne, in about A.D. 1038, adjusted his differences with Magnus, the son of St. Olaf, who had recovered his father's crown, the treaty was made on Swedish territory.¹

The omission of all reference in the Saxon chronicles to the Swedish conquest does not invalidate the theory now propounded. The conquest was so distant from England that it is not remarkable that the annalists in Britain failed to refer to it. Moreover, unlike the conquest of Norway, it could not have been very thorough, and it is probable that Anund's eclipse did not involve entire subjection. He was no doubt left as under-king; or a part only of his country was brought under the sway of Cnut, for there were large territories to the north of Sigtuna to which he might safely have retreated. In either case Cnut's supremacy would probably have been of a very loose character, like that over the Scots, and over the Danes of Dublin.

It might also be mentioned that there are many other accepted exploits of our sovereigns which are not referred to in the meagre record of the Anglo-Saxon chronicles.

We will now advert to the opening greeting of Cnut's letter, which describes him as overlord of Norway and part of Sweden. These two references have been questioned, and it is unfortunate that no contemporary manuscripts of the letter are in existence, the oldest known record being found in the writings of Florence of Worcester, who died A.D. 1118. This writer is, however, of the very highest value after the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. It has been suggested that the word Swedes in the letter is a scribal error for Slavs.² The Slavs were peoples settled along the Baltic coast and southern Danish border to the River Elbe; but it should be remarked that there was no organised Slavic state, whereas there was a Swedish kingdom, and it must not be overlooked

¹ Larson, Canute the Great, p. 336.
² Steenstrup, Normanertii iii, 326–8, and Larson, Canute the Great.
that although our copies of the letter are not contemporary, the coins which also give Cnut the Swedish title are, and for them no epigraphical explanation is necessary, for they prove that the word "Swedes" in the letter was not intended to be read as something else.

The reference in the letter to the kingship over Norway is certainly incorrect, as Cnut did not become overlord of that country until A.D. 1028. In explanation of this it has been considered by some that a later copyist, knowing Cnut to have been king of Norway, inserted the title, overlooking the fact that that country was not subdued until after the letter was written. It seems to me that the same thing might have happened in connection with the Swedish reference, and that, instead of a scribal error of Swedes for Slavs, who, after all, in the Chronicles seem mainly to be called Wends, the scribe knew of the Swedish conquest, either by tradition or otherwise, as well as of that of Norway, and inserted both references owing to the confusion in the dates. Or it may be that he desired to aggrandise the king, who, as is well known, was a very liberal supporter of the Church, and thus earned an appreciation which long outlasted his own life. If this explanation is correct, the reference to the kingship over Norway and Sweden would not have appeared in the original letter, but it has, nevertheless, considerable value to the present discussion, because the first record in which it is given, namely, the Chronicle of Florence of Worcester, is not only above suspicion, but is also not so very far removed in time from the date of the events.

In any case the scantiness of the records will not admit of a definite statement that Sweden, or a part of it, did not come under Cnut's control. As we have seen, Cnut returned to Denmark in A.D. 1027, with the avowed intention of prosecuting the war against both Norway and Sweden. Norway was subdued in the following year, and it is not an unnatural inference that Sweden was dealt with first, that is, in the summer of A.D. 1027. The records say nothing, either on this point or any other, and it seems only reasonable that we should, by the voice of the coins, fill up the hiatus caused through the silence of the documents.

It will be seen that the reverse of the first of the two varieties of coins under discussion is substantially the same as Cnut's Anglo-Saxon
Type represented in Hildebrand as Type G, and in the British Museum Catalogue as Type XIV, whilst the obverse is substantially the same as Hildebrand’s Type H, represented in the British Museum Catalogue as Type XVI. The second coin is practically the same as the last-named type, Hildebrand H, so that the issue of this Swedish money of Cnut the Great occurred just at the time that Type G was superseded by Type H, for there is little doubt that Type H immediately followed Type G, and there is reason to think that the end of the one type and the beginning of the other synchronized with the time suggested for the Swedish conquest.

We will now discuss the last variety of coins of Sigtuna on which appears the name of a king of England. It is placed in Hildebrand’s Anglo-Saxon Catalogue, under Harthacnut, No. 169. The legends on the coin run as follows:

**Obverse.** + HARALNV
**Reverse.** + OSBRN ON ZITVN

In common with the coins of Cnut inscribed SIHT, Hauberg attributes this piece to Lund in Scania, suggesting that the moneyer used a Sigtuna die, but as with the former coins, so with the latter piece, I do not think that we should hastily reject a Swedish attribution. The absence of the Swedish title on the obverse counts for very little as, in this reign, the territorial title was commonly omitted on Harthacnut’s coins both of England and Denmark. The question therefore arises whether Harthacnut had any jurisdiction, for a time, in Sweden. The evidence for this is very scanty apart from the coins, but I would suggest the possibility that when Harthacnut was invested with the kingship of Denmark at the congress of Nidaros, now Trondheim, after the subjection of Norway in A.D. 1028, the dignity carried with it the suggested newly-acquired overlordship of Sweden.
Cnut the Great over part of Sweden. The sagas describe Harthacnut's elevation as follows:—"Next he [Cnut] led his son Harthacnut to his own high seat, and gave him the kings-name with the government of the Danish realms." The last word of this quotation being in the plural, is significant, although not conclusive, because Denmark was then divided into East and West Denmark. But as some support from the records to the above proposition, that Harthacnut was invested with the kingship of Sweden as well as that of Denmark, we have the fact that the before-mentioned compact between Harthacnut and Magnus of Norway was made on Swedish soil. The type of the coin also is substantially that of the contemporary issue in Britain, and is similar to the last of the two Swedish types of Cnut. See Fig. 7. In common with the Swedish pieces of the latter, although worn, it is of good design and workmanship, with correct and regular, if abbreviated, inscriptions.

The following numismatic fact has also an important bearing on the coin of Harthacnut under discussion, as well as on those of Cnut previously treated. It is that after the initial Swedish coinage of Olaf Skötkonung and his son, Anund Jacob, there ensued a period in which no coins were, so far as is known, struck by native Swedish princes. Hans Hildebrand attributes this absence of native coins to the general state of the land, because "through favourable circumstances the Swedish nation had entered into the domain of history, but that it was not really ripe for this important advance, and no sooner did the special circumstances which favoured it disappear than it relapsed into a condition that must be referred to as prehistoric." So far as the beginning of this time is concerned, might not a contributory cause of this absence of coins of Swedish kings be, that the house of Biorn Ironside, of which the greatest member was Olaf Skötkonung, was overshadowed by the Danish house of Gorm, in the person and deeds of Cnut the Great?

Having regard to all the circumstances, therefore, there appears every probability that the coin under discussion indicates that
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1 Snorri Sturlason, *Saga of St. Olaf.*
Harthacnut possessed some sovereign influence in Sweden, for a time, which has otherwise failed record. As in the case of Cnut, so in that of Harthacnut, our materials for elucidating the history of the period are very scanty and their coins should, accordingly, form a not unimportant part in its composition. At least it is certain that the penny of Harthacnut which has been under discussion has no further right to a place in the list of Anglo-Saxon mints.