A further die-link in the Scandinavian imitative series
Dolley, Michael
Fornvänn 116-119
Ingår i: samla.raa.se
Bernard of Clairvaux to send monks. Probably 1143 was the year of the foundation. In due time monks from Alvastra came to Gudsberga. May we conclude that these monks brought the books with them? Though not certain, it would seem probable.

The books represent a tradition not kept up by the Swedish dioceses of later times. Beside the well-known old masters Notker Balbulus, Gottskalk (Limburg) and Adam de Sancto Victore, and Wipo, we find an influence from Cluny-Limoges.

Publication of the two books is highly desirable. An edition has been planned and prepared. It will be issued as soon as public interest provides the necessary funds.

Toni Schmid

A further die-link in the Scandinavian imitative series

That Cnut coins of Æthelræd’s Long Cross and Last Small Cross types belong to the English series is a misconception that appears to die very hard indeed, and this despite Mr. C. S. S. Lyon’s meticulous work on the more “English-looking” of the pieces, work that has been as truly pioneer as painstaking and illuminating. It is to this English amateur that must go the greatest part of the credit for having demonstrated quite conclusively a non-English origin for virtually all the coins in question, while the degree and pattern of die-linking which he has established as characteristic of the series as a whole is one that may be thought quite revealingly intricate. The student is left feeling, indeed, that research along these lines, if continued and intensified, should result in an early association of many individual coins with particular Scandinavian centres of coin-production, and it will be surprising if Lund especially does not emerge as one of the more critical as well as prolific of these mints. The purpose of this present note is merely to emphasise just how tightly knit together are groups of coins with the most disparate types and “mint-signatures”. Deliberately the

L.c. 53 ff. — According to the Exordium magnum (Tissier Bibliotheca Patrum Cistercienses, 1660, 158) Saint Bernard had sent monks to the new foundation in Sweden, and provided them among other things with books needed for divine service, also with bread blessed by himself. This seems to have been a custom.

Breviarium: size: 16.6 x 12, and 20.2 x 15.6 cm respectively. Colours used: red, green, blue.

Sequentiarium: size: 17.6 x 14.4, and 22 x 18.2 cm respectively. Colours used: red, blue, yellow.

C. S. S. Lyon, G. van der Meer & R. H. M. Dolley, “Some Scandinavian Coins in the names of Æthelræd, Cnut and Harthacnut attributed by Hildebrand to English Mints”, British Numismatic Journal XXX, ii (1961), pp. 235-251—as regards the systematic research put into this paper the pun “the lion’s share” would be at once pardonable and appropriate.
example chosen is one that is topical, the coin in question [Fig. 1] being one thrown up, as it were, as a “by-product” of the preliminary study of the “English” element in the recent (October 1966) hoard from Karls in the Gotland parish of Tingstäde. This major discovery comprised some 1300 Viking-age coins, Arabic, Byzantine, German, Irish and Scandinavian as well as English, and may be supposed to have been concealed a little before rather than after the year 1040. With commendable promptitude, Mrs Brita Malmer has already published a provisional account of the more obviously Swedish and Norwegian portions of the find, and the generosity of the authorities of the Royal Coin Cabinet means that in the process of preliminary publication are the 777 Anglo-Saxon coins, a listing of which will shortly appear in the British Numismatic Journal, and the 15 Hiberno-Norse pence which are scheduled for early publication in the Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland. From this it appears that all that is necessary is good-will, good sense and a modicum of diligence, and treasure trove need not lie unpublished and unseen for year after year until the hopelessness of the backlog induces a virtual moratorium on publication in any form.

On Plate XII of the 1961 British Numismatic Journal already cited, it is shown how BEH Cnut 3050, a coin which purports to be a Long Cross coin of Oxford but in Cnut’s name instead of Æthelred’s, is from the same obverse die as BEH Cnut 2896, another Long Cross coin but this time purporting to be from the unidentified but in fact mythical English mint of “Meonre”. The latter reverse occurs on a coin in Copenhagen (Bruun 742) which is a “mule”, the obverse being a Cnut’s Quatrefoil type, and the same obverse is found in the case of BEH Cnut 3518 which is from a Quatrefoil reverse purporting to be of Thetford. Now, the Long Cross type in England is believed to have been struck only in the sexennium c. 997–c. 1003, whereas on any telling the Quatrefoil type was not introduced before 1016. The accepted chronology suggests that in fact it was not introduced until the autumn of 1017, and the present writer is inclining to the view that the autumn of 1018 is even more likely. Thus, a

4 Lyon et alii, op. cit., p. 237; van der Meer, op cit., p. 186.
5 It is intriguing that critics, in some cases obviously not familiar with all the material, of the sexennial type-cycle under Æthelred and Cnut appear to have devoted all their energies to the period c. 975, where the position is far from clear, and seem not to have realized how ill a Michaelmas type-change in 1035 introducing Jewel Cross accords with Cnut’s death in the November of that year. It is entirely of his own accord, then, that the present writer would resolve difficulties that he himself has long appreciated by bringing down the inception of Quatrefoil, Pointed Helmet and Short Cross to 1018, 1024 and 1030 respectively, and by attributing to Harthacnut the Jewel Cross coins with the name of Cnut on the analogy of the Arm-and-sceptre coins inscribed “Cnut” which are certainly all of the son. The superficially very attractive alternative of a septennial type-cycle under Æthelred and Cnut seems no longer viable now that it has been shown that the former’s Helmet issue almost certainly began in the autumn of 1003 (Dolley,
coin such as Bruun 742 “mules” two types separated by as much as fifteen years,
and there are further difficulties inasmuch as “Meonre” cannot be identified
 even if there were a plausible intermediary other than London for a link between
 Oxford and Thetford. Diagramatically the relationship between the four coins
can be expressed as follows, a capital letter denoting an obverse and a lower
case a reverse, with the letters indicating the die-combinations:—

\[ A = A \quad B = B \]
\[ a \quad b = b \quad c \]

A being the obverse die which struck BEH Cnut 2896 and 3050, B the obverse
of BEH Cnut 3518 and Bruun 742, b the reverse die common to BEH Cnut
2896 and Bruun 742, and a and c the reverse dies of BEH Cnut 3050 and 3518
respectively. The new coin from Tingstäde turns out to be from the same
obverse die as BEH Cnut 3518, but the same reverse die as BEH 3050. In other
words it can be said to “mule” a “Thetford” obverse and an “Oxford” reverse, a
combination unlikely at the best of times even if there had not been a marked
discrepancy of style, the obverse being one barely acceptable for a coin of the
East Anglian mint and totally inappropriate in the case of an Oxford coin of
Quatrefoil type.²

What is interesting is to attempt to fit the new coin into the existing pattern.
No longer is it possible to express the relationship by a simple diagram of the
type that appears above. The new pattern is in point of fact very much more
sophisticated and can best be expressed thus:—

\[ A = A \]
\[ a \quad b \]
\[ a \quad c \quad b \]
\[ B = B = B \]

The type “muling”, however, is more graphically expressed as follows, the cap­
tal Q indicating a Quatrefoil obverse, and the lower case lc a Long Cross
reverse and so on:—

“The Sack of Wilton in 1003 and the Chronology of the ‘Long Cross’ and ‘Helmet’
Types of Æthelred II”, Nordisk Numismatisk Unions Medlemsblad 1954, pp. 152-156)
while Last Small Cross was no less probably introduced in the autumn of 1009 (Lyon,
“The Significance of the Sack of Oxford in 1009/1010 for the Chronology of the Coinage
² In the Ashmolean fascicule of the Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles (J. D. A.
Thompson, London, 1967) there are illustrated (nos. 653-667) Quatrefoil coins of Oxford
from no fewer than 13 obverse dies. Of these last, 5 were almost certainly cut at Win­
chester, 7 at a centre in the upper Thames valley, and 1 is anomalous (no. 667—reverse,
incidentally, mounted upside down on the plate and moneyer Wulfwi only doubtfully
to be expanded Wulfwine). Not one of these obverse dies, not even the anomalous one,
bears the least resemblance to that of BEH Cnut 3518.
and it is difficult to see how the two types could be more intimately interlocked.

On this basis it seems indisputable that some at least of the Scandinavian imitations of the Long Cross coins of Æthelred II and Quatrefoil coins of Cnut were struck contemporaneously and in one and the same mint. Since, too, imitations cannot precede their prototypes, the "Æthelred" imitations are surely posthumous, and it is the view of the present writer that they should be dated, at least provisionally, to the last years of the first quarter of the eleventh century. As we have seen, they cannot well be earlier than c. 1017, and a date very much later would seem to be precluded by the circumstance that the Long Cross imitations in Cnut's name appear, so far at least, to "mule" only into imitations of the Last Small Cross type of Æthelred II and the Quatrefoil type of Cnut. Conspicuous by their absence are any die-links into Cnut's later types—significantly BEH Cnut 1843 is a hapax which does not tie into any of the die-link chains already observed, and seems unlikely ever to do so in view of its weight and fabric. All in all, then, a date c. 1025 seems a very reasonable terminus ante quem for this particular class of imitation, and a median date c. 1020 for the issue as a whole is one unlikely seriously to mislead. Can we hazard any guess at the mint where the bulk of the Long Cross imitations in the name of Cnut were struck? For the writer the key coins are the Quatrefoil pieces BEH Cnut 2019, 2020 and 3780, the apparent reverse die-link between the last and Hauberg, Pl. I, Cnut 3 being all critical. If confirmed, as seems likely, there can be little doubt that many of the Long Cross coins of Cnut with both the English and the Danish title go with them, and it is not difficult for the historian to suggest reasons why such an issue should be peculiarly appropriate in the case of a mint at Lund operating in the years immediately following the death of Swegn Forkbeard.

Michael Dolley

P. Hauberg, Myntforhold og Udmynntninger i Danmark indtil 1146, Copenhagen, 1900.