NEW LIGHT ON THE NINETEENTH-CENTURY FIND OF PENCE OF ÆTHELRÆD II FROM ST. MARTIN’S-LE-GRAND

By V. J. BUTLER and R. H. M. DOLLEY

In the 1953 number of this Journal there was published a summary listing of thirty-five pennies of the so-called Last Small Cross type of Æthelræd II (B.M.C, type i = Brooke 1 = Hildebrand A = Hawkins 205) preserved as an entity in the Guildhall Museum, London. The further suggestion was made that they represented the bulk, if not the whole, of a small hoard unearthed c. 1870 near St. Martin’s-le-Grand. Twenty-five pennies from this find were exhibited by a Mr. J. W. Baily of Gracechurch Street to the British Archaeological Association in November 1870 as an example of what some new technique of cleaning could do for coins in the friable and corroded condition that is typical of so many of the Anglo-Saxon coins found in London, and in the 1953 paper it was argued that the twenty-five coins exhibited in 1870 were the pick of the thirty-five coins in the Guildhall Museum. Recently, however, when it became necessary to take into account certain criteria the importance of which was not yet recognized by Anglo-Saxon numismatists seven years ago, we had occasion to check this provisional listing against the actual coins, and by a happy misunderstanding we were fortunate enough to stumble across a further parcel of twenty-two coins which must surely be from the same find.

The second parcel, likewise preserved as an entity, could be thought of as representing the pick of the hoard exhibited by Baily in 1870, and it is significant that these twenty-two coins though very brittle are all substantially intact. Strictly, of course, there should have been twenty-five, but the correspondence is near enough, and especially when it is borne in mind that the coins were in Baily’s cabinet for a number of years before their acquisition by the Guildhall Museum. Leaving aside the extreme fragility of these corroded and age-embrittled coins, one could ill afford to have dismissed the possibility that Baily may have parted with one or two of the coins in order to oblige his friends and customers. What we feel is very significant is that the twenty-two coins have a common patina. Superficially this is just a little different from that found in the case of the thirty-five coins already published, but on closer examination it will be found by no means inconsistent, and, in fact, the no more than seeming discrepancies would be entirely consonant with Baily’s specific statement that the coins exhibited to the British Archaeological Association had been subjected to special treatment.

Last Small Cross coins of Æthelræd II are not often found in the British Isles, and Mr. J. D. A. Thompson’s recent Inventory in fact records only one hoard where they seem to have occurred in any quantity, the find from St. Martin’s-le-Grand (Thompson 249). A substantial number admittedly are
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listed in the Inventory account of the ‘City’ hoard of 1872 (Thompson 255), but it is only necessary to refer to the printed accounts to show that these are derived—with a few exceptions—from a 1938 MS. listing of the Guildhall collection and that the author has assumed that all coins which came Baily’s way had a Walbrook provenance, an assumption which the 1870 J.B.A.A. shows to be quite unwarranted. In addition at least one Last Small Cross coin may be presumed to have been present in the virtually unpublished hoard from Constantine in Cornwall (Thompson —), and it is conceivable that one or two may have occurred in a far more significant Quatrefoil hoard of the eighteenth century, that from Kingsholm (Thompson —). Further it is possible that there may have been examples in the Stafford hoard of 1800 (Thompson 338), though in this case nobody seems to have considered the possibility that this hoard might in fact have been composed of successive types of Harthacnut and Edward, the ‘Cnut’ coins belonging to the former and the ‘Æthelræd’ coins being misread pieces of the latter. However this may be, it is abundantly clear that hoards composed entirely or even preponderantly of Last Small Cross coins of Æthelræd II are so exceptional, at least as regards the British Isles, that we must invoke the almost invariably sound if hackneyed principle that ‘thesauri non sunt multiplicand! praeter necessitatem’. Clearly, too, a hoard-provenance attaches to each of the two parcels of Last Small Cross pence, and the greater probability must be that it is the same hoard that is involved in each case.

Corroboration of this line of argument comes from a comparison of the content of the two parcels, though at first sight an analysis by mints may seem far from helpful:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parcel A</th>
<th>Parcel B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnstaple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One of the Leofred coins appears to have been counted in twice.

In both parcels, then, coins of London outnumber those of all other mints put together, which is of course consistent with the presumptive London provenance, but in Parcel A the proportion is perhaps only just over 50 per cent. and still under 60 per cent. even if we accept a London provenance for the uncertain fragment—while in Parcel B the proportion is virtually 90 per cent. We must remember, however, the circumstances in which the Baily coins were exhibited in 1870. On that occasion the emphasis was on whole coins,


2 Certain attributions have been modified in accordance with the detailed listing published below.
and in unfavourable conditions we might well expect coins which had not been exposed to wide circulation to have a better chance of surviving intact than others which had travelled long distances and been subjected to wear and tear before their burial in the ground.

If it is not asking too much of coincidence anyway to suppose that there should be two small hoards of exactly the same period and of the same range and from the same area—the only hoards of this date from the whole of the British Isles—it seems quite impossible that the two hoards should be dominated by coins of the selfsame moneyer. Yet, in both parcels we find pence of Leofred in proportions that bear no relation whatever to the probable extent of his coin-production as far as this can be gauged from the occurrence of his coins in the great Scandinavian coin-hoards. The figures are as follows:

Parcel A 8 coins (45 per cent. of those of London, 25 per cent. of the whole).
Parcel B 15 coins (75 per cent. of those of London, 70 per cent. of the whole).

However, if we are to judge from the coins recorded in the 1881 edition of B. E. Hildebrand's *Anglosachsiska Mynt*, for this period a very fair sample of the English coinage as a whole, Leofred's output was on so small a scale that it would have been remarkable if either parcel had contained more than a single coin with his name. Moreover, as far as can be estimated, there were in London during the last years of Æthelræd's reign more than two dozen moneyers who struck on a greater scale, and some of these seem to have employed as many as eight times as many dies as would appear ever to have been supplied to Leofred.

All the evidence, then, points to our two parcels being from one and the same hoard, and it is significant that in the case of the twenty-two coins there is a positive association with Baily who is known independently to have exhibited in 1870 a London hoard composed of coins only of Æthelræd II. Any lingering doubts must surely be resolved by the fact that all the fifteen Leofred coins in Parcel B are from the same pair of dies as all eight of his coins in Parcel A.

There is reason, therefore, to think that the 56 coins listed below represent the bulk of a hoard discovered near the church of St. Martin's-le-Grand c. 1870. If our suggestion be accepted that the 22 are survivors of the 25 exhibited in 1870, a few coins seem now to be missing (? disintegrated or given away), and it cannot but be significant that with them the hoard could be made to number exactly 60 coins, i.e. a Saxon round number, the half of a long hundred. Not only do sixty pence constitute five continental shillings—and there is documentary evidence for an English shilling of twelve pennies long before the Conquest—as well as twelve West Saxon shillings and fifteen Mercian shillings, but, and perhaps more significantly, sixty pence represent the double of the next multiple of account, the mancus. Nor can one quite forget on the supposition that one of the coins now missing (? disintegrated) was one of Leofred—as would have been likely on purely statistical grounds—that the most significant element in the hoard also represents a Saxon round number, Leofred's coins totalling twenty-four, the double of the dozen. However, patently it would be unwise to press the point any further, and the only conclusion that perhaps might legitimately be drawn from the available
evidence is that this hoard like so many others in the late Saxon period could be conceived of as a fixed amount put by for a nest-egg and not as a haphazard agglomeration of ready cash hastily concealed at the very moment of danger. Mr. R. Merrifield, however, has the feeling that the coincidence between the 22 coins of Parcel B and the 25 exhibited in 1870 is quite fortuitous, and that Baily recovered some 56 coins from a possibly larger find, 25 of which he picked out for a special exhibit in 1870, while on a later occasion 22 were selected quite independently for exhibition in the Museum. Obviously more than one construction can be placed on the very incomplete evidence now available, and our suggestion that the hoard may have numbered 60 coins is very tentative.

**Barnstaple**

1. *Obv.* +/EDEL R... ANGLO
   South-western Style
   
   Rev. +HVNGA ONBA......
   Die-axis: 270°
   Parcel A [GM 226]

2. *Obv.* +EDELREDREXAN
   Eastern Style
   
   Rev. +PVLFSIGEMOGRAN
   Die-axis: 180°
   Parcel A [GM 232]

3. *Obv.* EDELREDREX... L
   London Style
   
   Rev. +/ELFNOBONLE
   Die-axis: 0°
   Parcel A [GM 208]

4. *Obv.* +...... EDR.XAN,L
   South-western Style
   
   Rev. +... GODON.AXCESTRE
   Die-axis: 180°
   Parcel A [GM 213]

   In the 1953 account this very fragmentary coin was attributed to God(a) (cf. Hild. 530) but on a fresh scrutiny the dithematic name seems preferable.

**Cambridge**

2. *Obv.* +EDELREDREXAN
   Eastern Style
   
   Rev. +PVLFSIGEMOGRAN
   Die-axis: 180°
   Parcel A [GM 232]

**Chester**

3. *Obv.* EDELREDREX... L
   London Style
   
   Rev. +/ELFNOBONLE
   Die-axis: 0°
   Parcel A [GM 208]

**Exeter**

4. *Obv.* +...... EDR.XAN,L
   South-western Style
   
   Rev. +... GODON.AXCESTRE
   Die-axis: 180°
   Parcel A [GM 213]

   In the 1953 account this very fragmentary coin was attributed to God(a) (cf. Hild. 530) but on a fresh scrutiny the dithematic name seems preferable.

**Ipswich**

5. *Obv.* +EDELREDREXAN
   Eastern Style
   
   Rev. +LEOFZIGEMONGIPE
   Die-axis: 270°
   Parcel A [GM 218]

**Lincoln**

6. *Obv.* +.. ELR/EDR.......
   Northern A Style
   
   Rev. +B... NCOLN
   Die-axis: 270°
   Parcel A [GM 215]

**Lincoln**

6. *Obv.* +.. ELR/EDR.......
   Northern A Style
   
   Rev. +B... NCOLN
   Die-axis: 270°
   Parcel A [GM 215]

7. *Obv.* +/ED........ N
   Northern A Style
   
   Rev. +F... MOL...
   Die-axis: 180°
   Parcel A [GM 233]
8, 9. Obv. + /ÆDELÆ/ÆR
London Style
Ælfget
Cf. Hild. 2043
Rev. + /ÆFGÆTÆ /ÆONLVNDE
Die-axis: 180° and 0°
Parcel A (2) [GM 231 and 223]
The second coin is the merest fragment.

Æthelric
10. Obv. + /ÆDELÆ/ÆRÆXÆLÆ
London Style
Cf. Hild. 2154
Rev. + /ÆDELÆ/ÆCMÆ/ÆONLVNDE!
Die-axis: 270°
Parcel A [GM 235]

Byrhtwold
11. Obv. + /ÆDELÆ/ÆRÆXÆLÆ
London Style
Cf. Hild. 2281
Rev. + /ÆRÆXÆLÆ/ÆMÆLÆONLVN
Die-axis: 90°
Parcel B [GM 4]

Eadwerd
12. Obv. + /ÆDELÆ/ÆRÆXÆLÆ
Uncertain Style
Cf. Hild. 2385
Rev. + /ÆÆRÆXÆLÆ/ÆMÆLÆONLVN
Die-axis: 0°
Parcel A [GM 227]

Eadwold
13. Obv. + /ÆDELÆ/ÆRÆXÆLÆ
London Style
Cf. Hild. 2413
Rev. + /ÆÆÆRÆXÆLÆ/ÆMÆLÆONLVN
Die-axis: 180°
Parcel B [GM 8]

Godereæ
14. Obv. + /ÆDELÆ/ÆRÆXÆLÆ
London Style
Cf. Hild. 2540
Rev. + /ÆÆRÆXÆLÆ/ÆMÆLÆONLVN
Die-axis: 225°
Parcel A [GM 219]

Godman
15, 16. Obv. + /ÆDELÆ/ÆRÆXÆLÆ
London Style
Cf. Hild. 2552
Rev. + /ÆÆRÆXÆLÆ/ÆMÆLÆONLVN
Die-axis: 270° (2)
Parcel B (2) [GM 6 and 7]
The obverse die appears to be a3, ir. 17 according to Hildebrand’s classification, a combination not recorded for the moneyer.

Godwine
17. Obv. + /ÆDELÆ/ÆRÆXÆLÆR
London Style
Cf. Hild. 2610
Rev. + /ÆEDPÆNEÆMÆLVNDE
Die-axis: 0°
Parcel A [GM 221]

Leofred
18-40. Obv. + /ÆDELÆ/ÆRÆXÆLÆR
London Style
Cf. Hild. 2676
Rev. + /ÆÆÆRÆXÆLÆEONLVNDE
Die-axis: 0°, 19°, 90°, 3; 180°, 0; 270°, 1.
Parcel A, 8 [GM 207, 209, 210, 212, 228, 229, 234, 236]
Parcel B, 15 [GM 7, 9-22]

Leofwine
41. Obv. + /ÆDELÆ/ÆRÆXÆLÆ
Eastern Style
Cf. Hild. 2739
Rev. + /ÆÆÆRÆXÆLÆEONLVNDE
Die-axis: 0°
Parcel A [GM 217]

42. Obv. + /ÆDELÆ/ÆRÆ
London Style
Cf. Hild. 2732 &c.
Rev. + /ÆÆÆRÆXÆLÆEONLVNDE
Die-axis: 180°
Parcel A [GM 224]
The attributions to London are based on style, length of ethnic, form of copulative, &c., and may be taken as reasonably certain. In the 1953 account these coins were given to an uncertain Leofwold.
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**Oswald**

43. Obv. + /ÆDELÆÐREXAN
   Northern B Style
   Cf. Hild. 2896
   Rev. + OSPOLDONLYLV..
   Die-axis: 90°
   Parcel A [GM 239]

**Wulfryd**

44. Obv. ...ELRÆÐREXANGLO
   London Style
   Cf. Hild. 2980
   Rev. ...VLÆRYDM:ONLVDI.
   Die-axis: 0°
   Parcel A [GM 214]

**Lydford**

45. Obv. + /ÆDELÆÐREXANGLO
   South-western Style
   Cf. Hild. 3033
   Rev. + BRVNLONLYDAFØR
   Die-axis: 180°
   Parcel A [GM 206]

**Rochester**

Ælfheh

46–48. Obv. + /ÆDELÆÐREXANGLO:
   South-eastern Style
   Cf. Hild. 3265
   Rev. +ÆLFHEHÆM:ONROFEC
   Die-axis: 0° (3)
   Parcels A (2) and B
   [GM 3, 211 and 225]

**Stamford**

Swertbrand

49. Obv. + /ÆDELÆÐ...ANG
   Northern A Style
   Hild. 3540 var.
   Rev. +ÆPERTBRANDMOS
   Die-axis: 270°
   Parcel B [GM 23]

50. Obv. + /ÆDELÆR...O
   Northern A Style
   (Swert)gar
   Cf. Hild. 3554
   Rev. ......ÆRMOŠTĀ..
   Die-axis: 90°
   Parcel A [GM 237]

**Winchester**

Ælfstige

51, 52. Obv. +/ÆELÆRÆRXANGL
   Southern A Style
   Cf. Hild. 4040/1
   Rev. +ÆLFŠIEG, ONPINCST.
   Die-axis: 180° (2)
   Parcel A (2) [Gm 216 and 238]

53. Obv. + ...ELRÆÆÐREXANC...
   Southern A Style
   Cf. Hild. 4043
   Rev. +Æ....ONPINCSTR
   Die-axis: 0°
   Parcel A [GM 220]

In the 1953 account this coin was given to Alfwold but this attribution would seem precluded by the initial digraph.

**Alfwold**

54. Obv. ÆÆDELÆÐÆRXAN...
   Southern A Style
   Cf. Hild. 4091–3
   Rev. Æ...POLD...NEST:
   Die-axis: 180°
   Parcel A [GM 230]

**Uncertain Mint**
   (LINCOLN OR YORK?)

55. Obv. Illegible
   Northern A Style?
   Rev. .....IRN...
   Die-axis: 0°
   Parcel A [GM 222]

Perhaps a coin of a -bern moneyer (Cytelbern, Othbern, or Wulfbern at Lincoln?—no moneyer with this deuterotheme is known at York).
The fifty-five coins identifiable today prove thus to be from no more than twenty-eight pairs of dies. In other words, the hoard is far less representative of the output of the English mint-system than other hoards of the same period, notably that from Shaftesbury (Thompson —), where die-duplicates are the exception rather than the rule. It is indeed unfortunate that the two dozen coins of Leofred should be in such poor condition that no useful purpose could be served by attempting to record their weights. The evidence points to them being part of the same ‘batch’, and it would indeed have been interesting to discover to what tolerance an Anglo-Saxon moneyer was accustomed to work.

Nor does the comparatively limited range of the moneyers represented in the find make it particularly easy to establish with precision the probable date of deposit. An obvious terminus post quem is afforded by the introduction of the Last Small Cross type, an event which there seems good reason to date to Michaelmas 1009. The fact that Helmet coins are entirely absent suggests, too, that the hoard was put together after the expiry of whatever period of grace was allowed for the withdrawal of a demonetized type, and the presumption must be that it is unlikely that the hoard was concealed before the spring of 1010. Corroboration of this may be thought to be supplied by the presence of coins from mints as far away as Lincoln and Stamford in the north, and Barnstaple, Exeter, and Lydford in the west. The obvious terminus ante quem is the introduction of the Quatrefoil type of Cnut which is perhaps to be dated to the Michaelmas of 1017.

Of the twenty-five moneyers concerned, eight are known for the whole period c. 997–1029. The pattern as regards the remaining seventeen is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Long Cross</th>
<th>Helmet</th>
<th>Last Small Cross</th>
<th>Quatrefoil</th>
<th>Pointed Helmet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnstaple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hug(f)a</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leofsga</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo(j)ga</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfgaet</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æthelric</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrhtwold</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadwerd</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goderae</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswold</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfryd</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydford</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunna</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfi(h)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swertbrand</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swertgar</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfsige</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfwold</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The moneyers who principally concern us here are those who appear either to begin or to conclude striking with coins of Last Small Cross type. In the case of those who are not known for Cnut, i.e. Huni(g)a of Barnstaple, Bo(i)ga of Lincoln, Æthelric and Oswold of London, and Swertbrand and Swertgar of Stamford, there is a significant dichotomy between the two who are known in Long Cross and Helmet as well as Last Small Cross, and three of the four who seem to occur only in Last Small Cross. The former's Last Small Cross output is not significantly smaller than their output in previous types; indeed, in the case of the Stamford moneyer it is considerably larger. In other words, there is no reason to think that they ceased striking at the very outset of the Last Small Cross issue. In marked contrast, the output of three of the four moneyers who begin and end with Last Small Cross seems to have been on an extremely exiguous scale. Æthelric of London, for example, is recorded in Hildebrand for no more than three pairs of dies, while his fellow citizen Oswold is recorded only for one. Also known from a unique pair of dies is the Stamford moneyer Swertbrand—incidentally it is of the greatest interest for the student of the Scandinavian hoards that coins of these exceptionally rare moneyers should have turned up in an English context, and of no less significance that the dies concerned should appear to be the same. This paucity of coins of Æthelric and Oswold of London, and of Swertbrand of Stamford, must surely suggest that the moneyers concerned were not active at the inception of the type—the presumption being that the bulk of any given issue was struck within months at most of the change of type. Already, therefore, there is some indication that some at least of the St. Martin’s-le-Grand coins belong late rather than early in the currency of the Last Small Cross type.

In the case of the Stamford mint preliminary work has recently been done which suggests very strongly that coins of ‘Northern B’ style preceded those of ‘Northern A’. Significantly both the Stamford coins from St. Martin’s-le-Grand are of ‘Northern A’. In the same way, it is now believed that ‘Southern B’ coins of the Winchester mint precede those of ‘Southern A’, and all four of the Winchester coins in the find are of ‘Southern A’. This, however, is to digress from the purely prosopographical argument which can be reinforced by a consideration of the six moneyers who seem to have begun striking in Last Small Cross and to have continued under Cnut. Is(en)god of Exeter and Ælfgaet, Byrhtwold, Eadwerd, and Goderte of London seem all to have struck heavily in Last Small Cross, but there is little real significance in this as the normal practice must have been for a moneyer to have sought to date his appointment from the very beginning of a type when he could expect to partake of the fat profits accruing from an initial high level of output of coin. What is important is that Ælfheh should be known at Rochester from no more than one pair of dies, an indication surely that he was not striking at the type’s inception.

On balance, therefore, the numismatist prefers to date the St. Martin’s-le-Grand hoard at least a year after the introduction of the Last Small Cross type and the apparent nature of the hoard—a round sum—could be used as an argument that the occasion for its deposit may not necessarily have been the same as that for its non-recovery. After 1010 London was directly threatened by the Viking host on a number of occasions, and not least in 1013 when
Swein came to the borough [and] the citizens would not yield, but resisted with full battle, because King Ethelred was inside and Thorkel with him. For part at least of 1014 one no more than nominally ‘friendly’ Viking army lay at Greenwich, but in 1015 the capital does seem to have been spared immediate menace. In 1016, on the other hand, London was the main centre of resistance to the new invasion under Cnut, and after Æthelræd’s death the metropolis was twice besieged before opening its gates to Cnut and making a separate peace in accordance with the terms of the accommodation reached at Alney. It is not impossible, therefore, that the St. Martin’s-le-Grand hoard had been concealed in prudent anticipation of the events of 1013, and was not recovered because the owner had fallen in battle in 1016, but equally there is in strict logic no reason why it should not have been recovered because of some purely domestic tragedy a year or two earlier. We feel strongly, therefore, that the 1953 dating of the find c. 1015 with its implication of a margin of error of two or three years either way is still preferable to the Inventory’s ‘Nov. 1016’? In particular we would argue that the fact of the non-recovery of the find suggests that it had been concealed before Cnut entered London by somebody who did not live to enjoy the new king’s frith, and it would be interesting to know why Mr. Thompson should have preferred Cnut’s entry as an occasion of deposit to the slaughter of Ashingdon as an occasion of non-recovery.

Our proposal, therefore, is that in a new edition of the Inventory the account of the St. Martin’s-le-Grand hoard might perhaps be something as follows:

LONDON, St. Martin’s-le-Grand, autumn 1870.¹

60 (?) ¼ Anglo-Saxon pennies (56 listed). Deposit: c. 1015 (±2).


Disposition: Guildhall Museum, London (55 coins—Guildhall registration numbers 3–23 and 206–39). The coins were all in particularly poor condition.

This is not the place to attempt a systematic revision of the Inventory account of the Walbrook (‘City’) hoard of 1872, but we would point out there is one alteration at least that is consequent upon our new reconstruction of the find from St. Martin’s-le-Grand. This is the deletion of the twenty B.M.C.

¹ A scrutiny of the J.B.A.A. for the years around 1870 makes it clear that the discovery of the St. Martin’s-le-Grand hoard is most unlikely to have preceded the exhibition on 23 Nov. by more than a very few weeks.

² The Inventory describes the coins as of B.M.C. (A) type xi (the Agnus Dei Last Small Cross mule), presumably because of confusion between Æthelræd’s ‘last substantive type’ and the last of the types as listed by Grueber and Keary. The slip is the more curious because only one coin of B.M.C. (A) type xi is known to this day—the unique cut halfpenny of Stamford in Stockholm—and because in the 1953 publication the coins were described, quite correctly, not only as of Nordman’s ‘Second Small Cross Issue’ but also as of ‘Brooke, Type I’.
(A) type I pennies of Æthelræd II by 'illegible moneyers', and probably of
the 'uncertain moneyer' Rochester penny of the same type (p. 92). At the
same time we would point out that it was Baily and not Willett who was the
source of the two hundred or so pennies listed by Mr. Elmore Jones in 1938,
and the fact that we have been able to identify one group of coins as definitely
from St. Martin's-le-Grand surely indicates that there is little warrant for the
assumption that all the Baily collection coins are from the Walbrook ('City')
find (p. 99). Indeed, we would be reluctant to assign the 1872 provenance to
any specific coin that is not included in Willett's (*not* Willet's) 1876 account,
and certainly we would not care to do so without personal inspection of the
coins. In conclusion, we would like to express our thanks to Mr. Norman
Cook, F.S.A., and to Mr. Ralph Merrifield, F.S.A., who again placed at our
disposal all the resources of the Guildhall Museum.