THE "JEWEL-CROSS" COINAGE OF ÆLFGIFU EMMA, HARTHACNUT, AND HAROLD I

By R. H. M. Dolley

In a paper contributed to the Journal for 1915, the late H. Alexander Parsons reviewed all the coins known to him that purported to be issued from English mints in the name of the youthful Harthacnut, Cnut’s lawful son by Ælfgifu Emma, daughter of Richard the Fearless, Duke of Normandy, and widow of Æthelræd II (“No-Counsel”).

The first part of this perhaps rather prolix paper drastically reduced the number of Hildebrand and British Museum Catalogue types, and set the survivors within the following chronological framework:

FIRST (JOINT) REIGN (November 1035–autumn 1037)
“Jewel-cross” coins with left-facing bust. (Hild., A)

INTERREGNUM (March–June 1040)
A mule of the preceding type with a reverse of Harold’s second substantive or “fleur-de-lis” type. (Hild., H)

An imitation of Harold’s second type. (Hild., Ha)

SECOND (SOLE) REIGN (June 1040–June 1042)
(a) “Jewel-cross” coins with right-facing bust. (Hild., Aa)
(b) “Arm-and-sceptre” coins. (Hild., B)

Few will wish to quarrel with this reduction of the number of types, but one may still legitimately question an arrangement that divides the “jewel-cross” issue into two distinct categories divided from one another by an interval of three years. No more easy of acceptance is an arrangement that cramms two substantive types into the space of two years. Under Æthelræd and Cnut the type would seem to have been changed every six years, under Edward the Confessor and the Norman kings every two or three years. Yet, if Parsons be right, Harthacnut revived one type in the summer of 1040 and changed the type no more than a year later.

Parsons was struck by the fact that the eight certain mints of the left-facing “jewel-cross” issue, “Axport” (Axbridge), Bath, Bristol, Dover, Exeter, London, Wallingford, and Winchester, lie all on or to the south of the line of the Thames. He went on to argue that the so-called Witan of Oxford in 1035 must have arrived at some division of the country. Now, it is certainly true that Ælfgifu Emma was pressing her son’s claims from Cnut’s palace at Winchester, while the other Ælfgifu was no less jealously advancing her son’s interests from her residence at Northampton. Cnut’s household troops were divided among themselves, the bodyguard cleaving to Harthacnut and the remainder adhering to Harold. Godwine of Wessex favoured the legitimate succession and the absentee, Leofric of Mercia the natural son on the spot. The significant thing is not that there was a cleavage of opinion but that there was no cleaving of skulls. England above
all prized peace, and what the Witan of Oxford did achieve was a compromise. Harold was to be regent of all England pending Harthacnut’s return from Denmark, and the men of Wessex acquiesced in that decision—grudgingly, perhaps, but acquiesce they did. The evidence of the Chronicle is strongly in favour of the view that the unity of England was put before faction, and it is noteworthy that Sir Frank Stenton, a historian unusually receptive to valid numismatic evidence, makes no mention of Parsons’s theory. This being the case, it surely behoves us very carefully to re-examine the numismatic evidence on which was postulated a division of the country that is not merely hypothetical but which conflicts with solid documentary evidence to the contrary. We may remark in passing that twenty years before the Witan of Oxford, England had in fact been divided on the line of the Thames, and that this division is not reflected at all in the coins of the period.

Parsons himself realized that the numismatic evidence was not quite as clear-cut as he could have wished—that is, if one puts implicit trust in Hildebrand. Three coins therein listed appear prima facie to be from mints north of the Thames, and it is instructive of Parsons’s methods to see how he disposed of these apparent objections. Two of the coins are fragmentary, and omit the mint name. One is clearly from a moneyer Leofthegn, and Parsons remarked that it could as well be of Malmesbury as of Bedford. Now, Hildebrand records only three other “jewel-cross” coins of Leofthegn, all of Harold, and it is a little disturbing to find that a Sanford Saltus Medallist of this Society had not checked for a die-link, especially in view of the number of casts and photographs which he received from the Stockholm Coin Cabinet. In fact there is a reverse die-link which establishes that the Harthacnut fragment is from Bedford, a mint north of the Thames (Pl. II, 1, 2). The second fragment is of a coin of the moneyer Wulsige. Admittedly this is a common name, but in this decade it was peculiarly associated with the Hereford mint. Parsons blithely argued that a Wessex mint was to be assumed pending evidence to the contrary, an assumption that seems hardly warranted when we consider that the name is misspelt PVLSICEE, a blundering found on a Harold “jewel-cross” coin of Hereford. Again, the two coins are die-duplicates, and the number of Harthacnut mints north of the Thames would seem to be increased to two (Pl. II, 3, 4). The third apparent exception to Parsons’s thesis was a coin of the Stamford moneyer Ægergrim (Pl. II, 5). Admittedly the coin is double-struck, but that is scarcely a reason for considering it, as Parsons did, a contemporary imitation or a forgery. Ægergrim is a moneyer peculiarly associated with the Stamford mint, and these three coins may seem seriously to shake our confidence in the tidy geographical pattern postulated by Parsons.

Ironically enough, the three coins do not in fact destroy his case, as he would have found out had he approached them with a more open

1 Anglo-Saxon England, p. 414.
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mind. For once Hildebrand was nodding. The three coins are not of Harthacnut but of Harold. Not only are the obverse readings quite decisive, but the Wulsige coin is from the same obverse die as well as the same reverse die as a Hildebrand coin of Harold. Consequently, for the time being at least, we have to accept the fact that no left-facing "jewel-cross" coins of Harthacnut are known from a mint north of the Thames.

What would seem not to have been noticed is that there is a remarkable similarity of pattern as between the geographical disposition of the mints of the left-facing "jewel-cross" coins on the one hand and of the right-facing coins on the other. Those of the left-facing coins are distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. of Thames</th>
<th>On the Thames</th>
<th>N. of Thames</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axbridge</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sixteen variant reverse legends are divided as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N. of Thames</th>
<th>On the Thames</th>
<th>S. of Thames</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The twenty-eight mints of the right-facing bust are distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. of Thames</th>
<th>On the Thames</th>
<th>N. of Thames</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axbridge</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td>Gloucester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>Ilchester</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridport</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
<td>Stamford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Malmesbury</td>
<td>Warwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>Shaftesbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>Steyning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>Watchet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mint of "Witham" is quite uncertain. Sixty-three recorded variants of reverse legend are divided as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N. of Thames</th>
<th>On the Thames</th>
<th>S. of Thames</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incidentally there is some reason for supposing that Gloucester, a mint of Alfred, should be reckoned as siding with Harthacnut—in which case only eight recorded variants of reverse legend fall "north" of the Thames—but the writer has thought it best here to follow a

¹ Unpublished coin in the collection of Mr. H. H. King.
purely geographical classification so as to avoid any suggestion that
he has given an historical warp to the evidence.

Too much emphasis cannot be laid on the fact that not one right-
-facing "jewel-cross" coin of Harthacnut is known from such major
mints as Chester, Derby, or Thetford. Other notable absentees in-
clude Bedford, Ipswich, Northampton, and Norwich. No less signifi-
cant is the fact that London, Lincoln, and York are represented by
only six out of sixty-four readings, though these three mints between
them accounted for 40 per cent. of the coinage of Æthelræd II, almost
50 per cent. of that of Cnut, 40 per cent. of that of Harold, and, with
the York mint apparently closed after 1040, for 30 per cent. of that of
Harthacnut. The percentages that follow are compiled on the basis
of Cnut's "arm-and-sceptre" type, his last type, as we shall see, and
struck between 1033 and 1035, of Harold's "fleur-de-lis" type, struck
between 1037 and 1040, and of Harthacnut's "arm-and-sceptre" type,
struck between 1040 and 1042.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{S. of Thames} & \text{On the Thames} & \text{N. of Thames} \\
\hline
Cnut, Hildebrand I & 30\% & 20\% & 50\% \\
Harold, Hildebrand B & 20\% & 30\% & 50\% \\
Harthacnut, Hildebrand B & 20\% & 25\% & 55\% \\
\end{array}
\]

If anything is clear from these figures, it is that about half of the later
Saxon coinage was struck at mints north of the Thames, and half
on or to the south of the river, a proportion that would seem to hold
good for the first half of the eleventh century at least. The picture
presented by the "jewel-cross" coins of Harthacnut is completely
different.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{S. of Thames} & \text{On the Thames} & \text{N. of Thames} \\
\hline
\text{Left-facing bust} & 75\% & 25\% & -- \\
\text{Right-facing bust} & 71\% & 9\% & 20\% \\
\end{array}
\]

Not only may it be thought that the figures in the first column are too
close to be altogether coincidental, but they are in essential conflict
with the pattern of Harold's "jewel-cross" coinage, which does not
depart significantly from that of the late Saxon coinage as a whole.
It seems odd, to say the least, that a coinage which Parsons attributed
to 1035–7 should exhibit precisely the same departure from the norm
as one he ascribed to 1040, and which differs only in the direction in
which the royal portrait faces. It may occur to an impartial student
that there is a strong possibility that B. E. Hildebrand was right, and
that all the Harthacnut "jewel-cross" coins belong to a single issue.

The present writer would go even farther and suggest that to this
issue of 1035–7 belong not only the "jewel-cross" coins with the names
of Harthacnut and Harold, but those with the name of Cnut as well.
A phenomenon that alike escaped the notice of Parsons is that the
mints of the Cnut "jewel-cross" coins follow precisely the same pattern
as that set by those of Harthacnut.
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S. of Thames | On the Thames | N. of Thames
---|---|---
Bristol | London | Norwich
Dover | Southwark |
Exeter | Wallingford |
Salisbury |
Shaftesbury |

Mention should perhaps be made of a curious mule of a Cnut "short-cross" obverse with a "jewel-cross" reverse, but little store can be set by it.¹ For one thing, it is a mule of non-consecutive types, i.e. a freak striking. For another, it might equally well be a Cnut/Harthacnut or Cnut/Harold mule. Indeed, the reverse mule, Harthacnut "jewel-cross" obverse and Cnut "short-cross" reverse, is known for Stamford, and a date 1035 is perhaps preferable in view of Cnut’s apparent success in the matter of eliminating muling, a success on which Parsons himself commented.²

The number of reverse readings is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>N. of Thames</th>
<th>On Thames</th>
<th>S. of Thames</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
<td>6 (43%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, one cannot fail to be struck by the absentee mints, centres of the importance of Chester, Derby, Stamford, Thetford, and York, some of them mints that have been studied in the closest detail by scholars of the calibre of Carson, Willoughby Gardner, and Wells. Nor is this the only reason that leads the present writer to believe that the type is posthumous.

All who have had the privilege of working on the Scandinavian coin-hoards will have been struck by the comparative rarity of Cnut’s supposedly penultimate "arm-and-sceptre" type (Hildebrand I). The Haagerup find from Denmark was quite exceptionally rich, and yet it provided no more than twenty-nine in a total of more than 200 Cnut coins.³ A more typical find is the Swedish hoard from Stora Sojdeby, which provided only seven "arm-and-sceptre" coins of Cnut in a total of approaching 300.⁴ Hildebrand’s totals for the substantive types between 1016 and 1052 are quite suggestive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cnut</th>
<th>Harold</th>
<th>Harthacnut</th>
<th>Edward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of course, allowance must be made for special circumstances affecting the flow of silver from England to Scandinavia, but the lumping together of "jewel-cross" into a single issue goes far towards removing apparent anomalies. If we further suppose that "arm-and-sceptre" of

¹ Hildebrand, Cnut 440.
⁴ Bror Schnittger, Silverskatten från Stora Sojdeby, Stockholm, 1915 (= Fornvannen, 1915, fascicules 2 and 4).
Cnut was an issue cut short by death, the picture presented by the Swedish hoards is a gradual tailing away which accords perfectly with what we know of the history of the period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Coins</th>
<th>(say 250 coins each year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1016–22</td>
<td>&quot;Quatrefoil&quot;</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1022–8</td>
<td>&quot;Pointed helmet&quot;</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>(say 200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1028–34</td>
<td>&quot;Short-cross&quot;</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>(say 150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1034–5</td>
<td>&quot;Arm-and-sceptre&quot;</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>(say 100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1036–8</td>
<td>&quot;Jewel-cross&quot;</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>(say 200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1038–40</td>
<td>&quot;Fleur-de-lis&quot;</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>(say 175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040–2</td>
<td>&quot;Arm-and-sceptre&quot;</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>(say 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1042–4</td>
<td>&quot;Quadrilateral&quot;</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>(say 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1044–7</td>
<td>&quot;Radiate&quot;</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>(say 80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1047–9</td>
<td>&quot;Pacx&quot;</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>(say 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1049–52</td>
<td>&quot;Short-cross&quot;</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>(say 50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other words, we get a gradual decline under Cnut, a slight resurgence in the years immediately following his death, and thereafter a pretty constant figure that reflects commercial intercourse on a scale that it is easy to underestimate.¹

The present writer, however, would be the last to suggest that this line of argument is conclusive, and numismatists in particular may prefer the following, which at least is capable of visual perception. It is based on consideration of the alleged "Pacx" type of Cnut. Parsons cited four pairs of dies, but in fact there are at least six, and it is likely that further research would bring to light others still.²

The mints and moneyers are as follows:

- **Lincoln**
  - Brihtric (British Museum, ex City find)
  - Sumerleda (Stockholm, Hildebrand 1734)
  - Ulf (British Museum, no provenance)

- **Romney**
  - Wulfmær (Copenhagen, Bruun 800)

- **Thetford**
  - Eadric (Stockholm, Hildebrand 3480)
  - (British Museum, ex Evans)

Especially should attention be drawn to the fact that one of these coins came out of the City find, which contained only a handful of coins of Cnut as against some 6,000 of Edward the Confessor, a proportion that makes the inclusion of so rare a type of Cnut quite extraordinary. Moreover, it is prima facie probable that both the other British Museum specimens come from English finds—Swedish purchases are almost invariably so ticketed. In other words, the soil of England is as rich in this type as that of Sweden, a phenomenon that is as true of the early types of the Confessor as it is false concerning the issues of Cnut. All the moneyers are known for the Confessor, but Ulf of Lincoln and Wulfmær of Romney are not known for Cnut. Since Ulf was striking as late as 1090 and Wulfmær as late as 1092, it is a little hard to believe that they were striking as early as 1035, still

¹ A question that merits fuller discussion elsewhere is the relative frequency in Scandinavian finds of coins of Harold and Harthacnut.

² I omit from my calculations a curious forgery found in Oxfordshire and now in the British Museum. It has been attributed to Cnut, but in my view the legend is deliberately meaningless.
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less c. 1030. Parsons himself showed that the "Pacx" coin of Harthacnut was a Harthacnut/Edward mule, and it is not hard to demonstrate that many of the "Pacx" coins of Edward are in fact struck from obverse dies of his first substantive issue. If the Confessor was being driven to use old dies on this scale, even to the extent of employing a Harthacnut die of the type in use at Harthacnut's death, it is not impossible that he fell back on Cnut obverse dies as well. In fact one or two of the obverses suggest that a crude attempt was made to bring the obverse die up to date, but fortunately there is evidence that is quite decisive.

If we compare Hildebrand, Cnut 1734, with Hildebrand, Edward the Confessor 375, we find that they are from the same reverse die—though curiously enough a weakness in the striking led Hildebrand to give slightly different versions of the reverse legend (Pl. III, a and b). Comparison of the Evans coin of Thetford in the British Museum (alas, registered as a normal Edward the Confessor and so described by Carson!) with a third Stockholm coin, Edward the Confessor 715, again establishes a reverse die-link (Pl. III, c and d). It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that coins of the alleged "Pacx" type of Cnut are in fact Cnut/Edward mules struck in the reign of the Confessor from old Cnut dies that had been left over from the earlier reign. If Cnut dies were left over, it is reasonable to suppose that they were dies of the issue interrupted by his death.

Yet another argument of some cogency may be adduced in support of the theory that "arm-and-sceptre" was the type interrupted by Cnut's death. This is that it was apparently so faithfully copied by Harthacnut after his restoration in 1040, a clear indication to all that he was Cnut's lawful heir and that the events of the last five years were an interlude of which he did not propose to take official cognizance.

Not one of these arguments is perhaps decisive in itself—though it is not easy to see how they can well be evaded, especially when taken in conjunction one with the other—but the numismatist, having on purely numismatic evidence postulated the possibility, to put it no more strongly, that the "jewel-cross" coins of Cnut are posthumous, may perhaps be pardoned if he suggests that the historical background is by no means unfavourable to such a supposition. It is pretty clear that Harthacnut's mother was devoted to her son by Cnut, and that her marriage to Cnut meant much to her. Her official biography did not as much as mention her first marriage to Æthelred, and she left her sons by him to fend for themselves.¹ Nor is it without significance that after the Witan of Oxford, Harold's first act should have been to deprive her of control of Cnut's treasury, though, despite the defection, as she would have termed it, of Godwine, she still resolutely maintained her residence at Winchester. Not until 1037 was Harold able to dislodge her, and the ruthless manner of her exile suggests not only that Harold had suffered much provocation but that

PAX Type Coins of Cnut and Edward

(See p. 272)
England at large knew her for what she was, a proud and meddling woman who put the interests of one of her sons before all else. She returned to England as the very proper consequence of Harthacnut's restoration, but his unlooked-for death brought about her own downfall. The saintly Edward, her own son, had not been king for a year before he was persuaded of the necessity of taking prompt action to protect himself, and, again, we are told that she was in possession of vast riches. It would seem that she had been intriguing with Cnut's kinsmen in Denmark to deprive her own son of his throne, so great had been her love of England's conqueror and so great her contempt for her first husband who had lost it. The numismatist will not fail to be struck by the fact that treasure is mentioned on both the occasions of her disgrace, and there is the intriguing tradition recorded in the Sagas that even in Cnut's lifetime she had abstracted his seal and employed it to Harthacnut's advantage. So determined a woman and so unscrupulous could well have initiated a new coinage immediately after her husband's death, setting his name on some coins and on others that of Harthacnut. Alternatively it is worth considering the possibility that Harthacnut was also known as Cnut.

A detail worth remarking is that on "jewel-cross" coins of Cnut, of Harthacnut with left-facing bust, and a few of Harold, the laticlave of the mantle is generally indicated by a single row of pellets running downwards from right to left (Fig. A). On "jewel-cross" coins of Harthacnut with right-facing bust and on most of those of Harold there is a double laticlave, the one intersecting and overlapping the other (Fig. 8). This would seem to suggest that the different coinages are very closely connected indeed, the single-laticlave coins being slightly the earlier. There is, moreover, at least one instance of a right-facing Harthacnut obverse employing the same reverse die as a Harold, a remarkable fact when we remember how rare it is for two obverses to be found in conjunction with one reverse at this period, and the comparative rarity of "jewel-cross" coins generally (Pl. II, 6 and 7). Incidentally, these coins provide one further argument against the Parsons arrangement, which would separate the two obverses by two or three years at least.  

1 Cf. the discussion by W. C. Stevenson, E.H.R. xxvii (1912), p. 6, n. 17.
2 Since the above was written, a second example has come to light. One of the unpublished Swedish hoards (SHM 11945) contains a "Harthacnut" coin by the moneyer Etsige of Dover which is from the same reverse die as BEH, Harold 42. I am grateful to Dr. Rasmussen for permission to illustrate the two coins (Pl. II, 8 and 9).
Consequently the writer would reconstruct the sequence of types for the years 1034–42 as follows:

(?) 1034—November 1035. "Arm-and-sceptre" coins with the name of Cnut.
November 1035–Spring 1036. "Jewel-cross" coins with the name of Cnut and (left-facing busts) with the name of Harthacnut.
Spring 1036–Autumn 1037. "Jewel-cross" coins with the name of Harold and (right-facing busts) with the name of Harthacnut.
Autumn 1037–March 1040. "Fleur-de-lis" coins of Harold.
March–June 1040. "Fleur-de-lis" coins with the name of Harthacnut.

The historical background of this arrangement would be roughly as follows. Cnut’s issue of "arm-and-sceptre" coins—imitations, incidentally, of Roman consular solidi unlikely to have been found in England but doubtless preserved in Rome—was cut short by his death. His widow initiated a new type with the name of Harthacnut, but it was not acceptable north of the Thames, and other obverse dies with the name of Cnut were also prepared, partly perhaps to emphasize continuity and partly to disarm objections to those with the name of the uncrowned and absentee Harthacnut. These, too, proved generally unacceptable north of the Thames. After the Witan of Oxford, Harold obtained the right of coinage and it was agreed that the issue should be continued in the names of both the claimants, some coins bearing the name of Harold and others that of Harthacnut. As a further differentiation, Harold obtained the left-facing bust and Harthacnut had to be content with the right-facing one. This subtlety in fact betrayed where real power lay, for from 991 onwards the portrait on a Saxon coin had always faced to the left—except when a careless engraver forgot to cut his dies in reverse. North of the Thames the Harold obverse was generally welcomed, though a few moneyers struck from Harthacnut dies either from personal preference or, more probably, to maintain a facade of impartiality. On and south of the Thames the Harthacnut obverse was at first employed fairly widely, but, as Emma’s son tarried longer and longer in Denmark, support for Harold became more and more general until there was scarcely a mint that was not striking for the Mercian nominee. Late in 1037 the pretence was dropped, and Harold began a new issue in which Harthacnut did not share even nominally.

In conclusion the writer would like to stress that the arguments that have led him to this arrangement are almost entirely numismatic. He believes, however, that it does not violate history, which is more than can be said for an earlier chronology which, as it happens, was numismatically unsound. The two disciplines are not quite disconnected, and it is doubtful whether sound numismatic reasoning and sound historical argument will ever be found to be essentially at variance.¹

¹ The substance of this paper was communicated to the International Numismatic Congress at Paris in July 1953. I am indebted to my colleague Mr. R. A. G. Carson for reading the paper at short notice in my absence.
POSTSCRIPT

Since this paper was set up in type Mr. Peter Seaby has suggested to me the possibility—for the moment neither of us is prepared to rate it higher—that the “arm-and-sceptre” coins of Cnut likewise are a posthumous issue and contemporary with those that bear the name of Harthacnut. He has also drawn my attention to the weight of evidence in favour of “Pacx” being the Confessor’s first substantive type—though again neither of us is prepared at present to make a final decision. Both these suggestions merit the closest of studies, and we hope in due course jointly to publish a full review of all the evidence. In the meantime it seems desirable to remark on the fact that the arguments put forward in the preceding pages are if anything strengthened by acceptance of Mr. Peter Seaby’s hypotheses. In particular, the Cnut/Edward mules would fall into place even more naturally as mules between consecutive types, and we would have an apt parallel for the collateral issue of coins of Harthacnut with his name and that of Cnut—was possibly Cnut a recognized by-name of Harthacnut? The six-yearly type cycle of Æthelræd would continue under Cnut, and we would also have an explanation of the “short-cross/jewel cross mules”, while there would no longer be an awkward hiatus in the coinage of York between Harold’s death and the accession of Edward the Confessor. I am particularly grateful to Mr. Seaby for permission to refer to his researches, the more so because his conclusions are still provisional pending my own reappraisal of the seemingly inconclusive evidence of the Scandinavian hoards.

COINS ILLUSTRATED

Plate II, 1 BEH, Harold, 11
2 " , Harthacnut, 215
3 " , Harold, 310
4 " , Harthacnut, 68
5 " , Harthacnut, 173
6 " , Harold, 823
7 " , Harthacnut, 166
8 Unpublished coin in SHM, Stockholm
9 BEH, Harold, 42.

Plate III, a BEH, Cnut, 1734
b " , Edward Confessor, 375
c Carson, Edward Confessor, 38 (N.C. 1949, p. 222.)
d BEH, Edward Confessor, 715