THREE MORE LATE SAXON NOTES

By R. H. M. DOLLEY

A POSSIBLE SIXTH ANGLO-SAXON MINT IN LINCOLNSHIRE

Until quite recently it was generally accepted that Lincoln and Stamford were the only late Saxon mints in Lincolnshire, but in recent notes I have restored to Torksey some at least of the coins which Brooke suggested were probably Scandinavian,1 attributed with confidence to Caistor at least one coin of Edward the Martyr and another of Æthelræd II,2 and argued that a case can be made out for regarding a very exceptional coin previously attributed to London as more probably of Louth.3 In the course of this note it is proposed to draw attention to an unpublished penny of Æthelræd II in one of the Swedish hoards, and once again members of the British Numismatic Society are under a heavy obligation to Dr. N. L. Rasmusson who has given permission for the coin to be published here and supplied the direct photographs from which the accompanying block has been made.

The coin is of the First Hand type which those of us privileged to work on the Swedish hoards are inclined to date between Michaelmas 979 and Michaelmas 985.4 The obverse is perfectly normal, though, as we shall see, there are reasons of style for associating the dies with a centre established in the northern midlands, very possibly at Lincoln itself. The reverse also is quite normal, and the weight (18-21 grains) and die-axis (180°) alike give no cause for suspicion. We may further remark that the First Hand type is not one of those normally imitated in Scandinavia, and that the continental imitations which do exist,

1 N.C. 1956, pp. 293-5.
2 B.N.J. 1955, pp. 88–92 and cf. also ibid., p. 58.
3 Ibid., 1957, pp. 499–504. After another season in Stockholm I can only repeat that I have still to see a certain London coin of ‘Lincoln’ style.
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e.g. those from Bohemia and Stade, are blatant. Especially when the impeccable hoard-provenance is taken into consideration, there can be little doubt but that the new coin is English.¹

The reverse legend reads clearly +ÆThELÆR M°OHCRN, and this immediately raises the question of the identification of the mint. Horndon at once comes to mind, and my first inclination was to associate the new penny of ÆEthelræd II with the still unique penny of Edward the Confessor (B.M.C. 554) with mint-signature HORNIDVNE which occurred in the eighteenth-century find from St. Mary Hill, London (Thompson 250), and which is now one of the glories of the National Collection.² At the time, however, my friend and mentor Mr. F. Elmore Jones expressed scepticism, and certainly his doubts have proved in the event well-justified. Both of us remain convinced of the essential validity of the precept ‘monetae non sunt multiplicandae præter necessitatem’, but to neither of us does it seem any more improbable that there should have been two HORN... mints operating at different times—the interval is in fact some seventy years—that there should have been intermittent coining at Horndon throughout the late Saxon period. In this connexion it should be observed that technically at least Horndon should never have had the privilege of a mint. In 1066 it was not even a royal manor.³

During the last year I have begun to make a special study of the First Hand issue of ÆThelræd II, and already I have detected a regional pattern of die-production very similar to that which seems to have prevailed at the close of the reign.⁴ Both the obverse and the reverse dies of the new coin of HORN... correspond exactly to those which predominate in north-eastern England. In the case of the First Hand coins recorded by Bror Emil Hildebrand in the 1881 edition of Anglosachsiska Mynt I have noted dies of this style at the following mints, Chester (2 coins out of 4), Derby (1/9), Gloucester (1/3), Hereford (1/3), Leicester (1/2), Lincoln (13/14), Northampton (2/3), Nottingham (1/1), Shrewsbury (1/3), Stamford (4/11), and Worcester (3/3). It might be added that the same style also occurs on the unique Anglo-Saxon penny of Peterborough published by me in these pages some years back.⁵ Even more significantly it is the style of the unique First Hand coin of Torksey (B.M.C. 335) to which allusion has already been made.⁶ The criteria used for distinguishing the products of the different ‘schools’ will be set out in detail in my forthcoming study of the First Hand issue as a whole, but here it is only necessary to draw attention to the fact that the ‘Lincoln’ dies are differentiated from those in general use over most of southern England by the form of contraction employed in the ethnic, by the use of two concentric arcs or parallel strokes instead of a loop to indicate the brooch at the shoulder, and,

¹ The mainland hoard in question (SHM Inv. 7673) contains only a few English coins but among them an unpublished First Small Cross of York and First Hand coins of Barnstaple, Cambridge and Lydford. The German coins, which are much more numerous, likewise suggest a date of deposit before c. 990, before, that is, the imitation of English coins in Scandinavia really began.

² In the Inventory Thompson has given the date of the discovery of the St. Mary Hill hoard as 1775, but Bonser in his Bibliography (entry 9180) says it was 1774. In Archaeologia, iv (1786) the incumbent concerned, in a letter dated 27 Feb. 1776, states unequivocally that the coins were found on 24 June 1774, and one would like to know Thompson’s reasons for rejecting what seems at first sight irrefutable evidence for 1774.


⁶ Supra, p. 51, n. 1.
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on the reverse, by a very pronounced tendency for the wrist to break the lower of the two arcs which form the ‘clouds’. Not all these criteria emerge from the pages of a printed catalogue nor even are present on a given coin, but I would remark how all eleven of the First Hand coins of London recorded in B.M.C. read ANGLO\X whereas the two of Lincoln read ANGLO\X and ANGLO respectively.

A First Hand coin of Horndon, then, might reasonably have been expected to exhibit the characteristics of the ‘London’ school of die-cutting, and a glance at the block should be sufficient to bring conviction that this demonstrably is not the case. Even more suggestive is the fact that the dies used at East Anglian mints lying athwart the obvious routes between Lincoln and Essex belong without exception to a third stylistic grouping which is perhaps the most distinctive of them all. The criteria here include the use of ‘V’-shaped drapery on the obverse and a square cuff on the reverse, and in the case of coins listed by Hildebrand I have recorded it at Bedford (1/1), Cambridge (1/1), Huntingdon (3/3), Ipswich (5/6—the sixth an anomalous transitional die), Stamford (3/11), and Thetford (10/10). Significantly, too, Maldon’s unique die is of ‘London’ style.

The HORN... coin of Æthelræd II certainly is not East Anglian in style, and we have already seen that its distinctive features can be matched at no mint nearer to Horndon than Northampton, and are in fact characteristic only of the area between Stamford and the Humber. It is precisely in this area that we find Horncastle, Horncastre in the Lincolnshire Domesday, later at least an important market (readers of George Borrow will recall the celebrated horse-fair) and, more pertinent to our present investigation, a royal manor and the head of a soke and wapentake. If Caistor is accepted as a late Saxon mint, the case for Horncastle would be no weaker, and I would draw attention to the fact that we have quite a cluster of north-eastern mints which are known in the decade immediately following Eadgar’s great reform of 973 but from which coins have still to be recorded from the period c. 985–1010 when English coins generally have survived in such numbers as to be relatively common. To date these mints certainly include Newark, Torksey, Caistor, and Peterborough, the first two perhaps reopening but only very ephemerally c. 1015, and one beings to wonder whether a really large First Hand hoard from England might not throw up others. It is easy to forget how little in fact is known about the comparatively rare First Hand issue—as well as the mysterious mint or mints of BRYGIN/NIWAN we find Launceston uniquely known in this type—and the problems presented merit discussion in a full-length study. Here I would draw attention only to the fact that no Second Hand coins of Lincoln or of York are known to the numismatist, and make a tentative suggestion that the suppression of the minor mints of the Northern

1 In the case of the HORN... coin I would further draw attention to the abbreviated ties of the diadem and to the absence of any line beneath the pellet expressing the eye, features in themselves sufficient to cast the gravest doubts on a southern attribution.

2 TRE the manor was in the possession of Queen Edith and in 1086 in the possession of the king.


4 For BRYGIN/NIWAN cf. B.N.J. 1955, pp. 92–99: for Launceston, ibid. 1905, where there seems a deliberate attempt to conceal from the reader the fact that the coin had already been acquired for the National Collection.
Danelaw which seems to have occurred at the same time may likewise be due either to the notorious anti-Danish policies of Æthelræd II or to a reluctance on the part of the commercial classes of the north-east to become too involved in the manipulations of the weight standard that are so essential a part of Saxon monetary history after 985.

In conclusion I should like to make clear two points. In the first place I am quite convinced that Horncastle—even if acceptable for the Horn coin—would not provide the answer to the problems presented by the HORNIDUNE coin of Edward the Confessor mentioned earlier in this note. More important, my reasons for locating the mint of the Horn... coin of Æthelræd II in north-eastern England are still largely stylistic. The name Æthelgar, though, is not so very common among late Saxon moneyers. It is not found after c. 1010, and under Æthelræd, the Horn... coin apart, only at Shaftesbury and Winchester in four consecutive types. At neither of these mints is a ‘Lincoln’ style First Hand die ever found, and we can rule out at once the possibility of there being any connexion between the Æthelgar of the Horn... coin of c. 980 and the Æthelgar(s) striking in Wessex throughout the period c. 985–1005. Under Eadwig and Eadgar there is, however, a very rare moneyer of this name, and his rare coins struck for the latter king (cf. B.M.C. 63) exhibit a number of features which collectively leave little room for doubt but that he was operating in north-eastern England. We may instance here the style of the lettering, identical with that found on coins of Heriger, that prolific moneyer whom the Tetney hoard seems firmly to have associated with Lincolnshire if not with the Lincoln mint itself, the very spelling of the moneyer’s name (‘Adelger’), the pellets interspersed between the letters of the king’s name, and last but not least the elaborate stop (? a privy mark) which ends the obverse legend. It is a hypothesis that in the present state of our knowledge seems incapable of proof, but I should like to end this note with the suggestion that if there is any coin which is to be associated with the new coin of Horn... it is B.M.C. 63 of Eadgar.

AN ÆTHELRÆD II DILE-LINK BETWEEN LONDON AND HERTFORD

One of the more enigmatic of the late Saxon pence recorded by Bror Emil Hildebrand in the 1881 edition of Anglosachsiska Mynt is a coin of Æthelræd II’s so-called Helmet type (Hild. E = Brooke 4 = B.M.C. viii = Hawkins 203, &c.) which is described in the following terms:

VRTF

(?)

3862 a5, ir. 60

*LEOFSTAN M<OVRTF

E. *)

The footnote adds the information that there is a pellet in opposite quarters of the reverse field.

Surprisingly the identity of ‘Vrtf’ is not discussed by Carlyon-Britton in the course of his great paper in the 1909 Journal, and the time may now seem ripe for an elucidation of the mystery, and the more so because the passing

1 Supra, p. 52. 2 Cf. Hild., Æthelræd 3324/5, 4067–4075, &c. 3 Cf. N.C. 1952, p. 118.
of the years has thrown up no new coin with a complementary form of mint-signature. Enlarged direct photographs of the coin which have been supplied by the authorities of the Royal Swedish Coin Cabinet make it clear that the coin cannot be dismissed as an imitation, and accordingly it is necessary to consider the signature from two angles. Is it a blundering of a mint name that is already known, or is it perhaps the name of some Saxon place with which coins have still to be associated?

Prosopography unfortunately is of little assistance. A moneyer Leofstan is known for the reign at the following mints, Aylesbury, Canterbury, Colchester, Ipswich, Lewes, London, Northampton, Southwark, and York. In no case does the mint-signature even appear to lend itself to a blundering VRTF, least of all in the case of Canterbury and London where alone the moneyer is known for the actual type. If, therefore, VRTF should be a blundering of a mint name already known to the numismatist, it will be necessary also to argue that the moneyer is new for the mint.

It is noticeable that an initial aspirate could give the Saxon die-engraver of this period considerable trouble. Often he omitted it, anticipating thereby the modern spellings in the case of mints such as Hlydanford and Hrofeceastre (Lydford and Rochester) where the aspirate preceded a consonant. Omission before a vowel is, as it happens, particularly well-attested in the very Helmet type with which we are concerned—one need only cite Hild. 1232 (ÆSTIC for Hæsti(n)g), Hild. 1283 (AMTV for Hamtu), and Hild. 1391 (VNTD for Hunt(an)d). Consequently we are by no means justified in rejecting the hypothesis that VRTF may be for HVRTF.

The obvious expansion of HVRTF would be HVRTFORD, but the objection will at once occur that Hildebrand has recorded no coin of Hertford of Æthelræd II other than of the Crux type, while the mint-signature there is invariably HEO(RT)- or HER(T)-. That the broken and unbroken vowels, however, can exist side by side in the same issue does at least indicate that the sound gave a certain difficulty, and further evidence of this comes from Hild. 1400, a Long Cross coin with mint-signature 10RT, which the numismatist of today has no hesitation in giving to Hertford. Admittedly the moneyer Godric
is not known there in Crux, but an important hoard from the parish of Viby in the district of Narke in Central Sweden (SHM Inv. 14935) has thrown up a second Long Cross coin of the same moneyer with mint-signature HRT which must be for Hertford and which is also extremely relevant to the (H)VRTF signature under discussion.¹

Nor are Hertford coins of Æthelræd II in fact confined to the Crux and Long Cross issues. Two Gotland hoards (SHM Inv. 14565 and 18029) have produced Last Small Cross pennies of a moneyer Wulfric, the son or grandson presumably of the Wulfmar who was coining there in the earlier Small Cross issue for Eadgar and Edward the Martyr and a kinsman of the Wulfric who struck the Crux type for Æthelræd, while a third coin, also with mint-signature HEOR, has recently been acquired by the British Museum. Wulfric is, of course, the most prolific of the Cnut moneyers of Hertford in the Quatrefoil issue and it is interesting to list his different forms of mint-signature as recorded by Hildebrand, namely HEOR, HER, HET, HOR, HRE(TO), and—most significant of all—HYRT.

The Helmet type, then, is the only one of Æthelræd’s last four issues of which a Hertford coin has still to be published, and the suggestion of this note is that the VRTF coin alone would fill the gap.² As is well known ‘V’ and ‘Y’ are for practical purposes indistinguishable at this period—it is a moot point whether most Lydford coins read (H)LYD .. or (H)LVD .. (‘V’ being of course the standard writing for ‘U’), and forms such as (H)VRT- and (H)YRT- probably express the identical vowel sound. A feature of the Hertford mint that does not appear to have been remarked before is the tendency of the moneyers to strike at London in the same type, and accordingly it has seemed worth while to check the VRTF coin for a die-link with the capital. As it happens, Hildebrand records only two London pence of Leofstan in the Helmet type (Hild. 2724 and 2799), and the comparison was no onerous task although the

¹ A comparable coin is in the Fitzwilliam collection at Cambridge (Sylloge 694).
² In fairness it should be remarked that the late H. A. Parsons appears to have assumed the identification of VRTF with Hertford in the course of his controversial paper ‘Symbols and Double Names on Late Saxon Coins’ in the B.N.J. for 1917, but no attempt is there made to substantiate the assumption and Leofstan was not accepted as a Hertford moneyer by Brooke.
fact that neither is described as having the a5, ir. 60 variety of obverse legend meant that there could be little expectation of a positive result.

In fact the all-critical die-link has proved to exist, though it must be a matter of taste whether we describe the obverse legend as a5 or a5, ir. 60, and in support of this claim I illustrate Hild. 2724, likewise from enlarged direct photographs which have been made for the authorities of the Royal Swedish Coin Cabinet. The implication of the die-link is obvious. The mint of VRTF must lie in the neighbourhood of London, and, as is well known, Hertford is the nearest mint to the metropolis north of the Thames. As we have seen, VRTF is by no means an improbable mint-signature for a coin of Hertford at this period, and in combination these arguments must override the objection that Leofstan is not otherwise known for the mint.

### Table of Hertford Types and Moneyers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Cross</th>
<th>Æthelward</th>
<th>Ethelwine</th>
<th>Beornulf</th>
<th>Boiga</th>
<th>Byhtrtlaf</th>
<th>Edwilg</th>
<th>Godric</th>
<th>Leofstan</th>
<th>Lifinc</th>
<th>Wulfmer</th>
<th>Wulfnoth</th>
<th>Wulfric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(L signifies known at London in same type)

Die-links between mints are a phenomenon of the late Saxon coinage that until recently have received surprisingly little attention. Within the last five years, however, at least five pairs of mints have been coupled in this way, not to reckon numerous instances where there is a link between alternative names for the same place (i.e. Hamtun and Hamwic), and it is a commentary on the potentialities of the new approach that no fewer than five further pairings await publication in the near future. Just how little, too, is really known about

1 Hild. 1333, which on the strength of a mint-signature HER is there given to Hereford where the moneyer admittedly is known for the type if we accept, as we probably should, ÆLE- as a writing for ÆTHEL- (cf. N.C. 1957, pp. 214–16 where the difficulties inherent in the apparent svarabhakti are perhaps insufficiently stressed, while insufficient weight is certainly given to the possibility in certain cases of the disappearance of OE medial f in interconsonantal positions or of assimilatory loss of the same consonant before m and w.) On the other hand it is difficult not to discount the evidence of the two annulets in the field, a feature very characteristic of the London area in this type.

2 Intact coins in the British Museum (B.M.C. 113) and in several Swedish hoards show that this is the correct expansion of the Hildebrand fragment on which the moneyer’s name was read BY . . . . E (Hild. 1311).

3 Unpublished coins in British Museum and in several Swedish hoards.

4 Cf. Glendining 17.vii.1957, lot 219—I have seen the coin.

5 B.M.C. 10.

6 It is indeed difficult to believe that until the work on the Swedish hoards began the only die-link claimed between late Saxon mints was one between Oxford and Cricklade which in the event has proved non-existent (cf. B.N.J., 1957, p. 507, n. 1).
the Helmet issue of Æthelræd II can be gathered from the fact that this note has supplied not only the first die-link between mints for the type, but a new mint for the type, and a new moneyer for the mint.

At the time of writing my friend Miss G. van der Meer reports from Stockholm that she has discovered yet another instance of the Hertford mint employing a die used elsewhere, and in this case the moneyer at Hertford is one whose activities at other mints will have to be very carefully scrutinized. For this reason, if for no other, it may seem desirable to include in this note a table (p. 57) setting out the different types from the period 973–1023 for which each of the Hertford moneyers is known. The pattern is such that it may seem incredible that for Hildebrand the Hertford mint was known from coins of the Crux issue alone.

The absence of Hand coins of Æthelraed II is indeed extraordinary, and one even begins to wonder whether the minor mints around London may not have been closed c. 980 only to be reopened in 991 to help to cope with the first of the great Danegeld coinages.

**THE MYTHICAL MINT OF TOTLEIGH**

As no. 3566 on p. 304 of the 1881 edition of *Anglosachsiska Mynt*, Bror Emil Hildebrand has recorded a Pointed Helmet penny of Cnut on which the reverse legend is described as reading:

(++PVLFPERD ON TOTEL)

The suggestion is made that the mint might be Totleigh in Derbyshire, but Totleigh seems never to have been a place of sufficient importance to have aspired to the dignity of a mint. It was not even a royal manor in Domesday. The same objections can be raised in the case of other places of which the first element would appear to be a derivative from OE. tutian or, as with Totleigh, a well-attested personal name Tot(t)ja. What does not seem to have been remarked before is that the coin in question is principally notable because the sceptre on the obverse is completely wanting. It is indeed the only Pointed Helmet coin of this reign known to me where this omission occurs, but fortunately there can be no doubting that the dies were engraved in England as in all other respects the style is consistent with that found on roughly 40 per cent. of the coins of this issue. Unfortunately the die-cutting centre in question supplied dies to the whole country south of the Humber, and no clue is afforded by style to the vexed problem of the coin’s correct attribution.

The Stockholm coin has long been considered unique, but in fact there is in the Copenhagen collection a second specimen from the same dies which occurred in the 1849 Enner hoard from Jutland (Skovmand, p. 150, no. 10) and which was almost certainly discovered before the coin described by Hildebrand. In some respects this coin is much better preserved than the Stockholm specimen, and I am indebted to the skill as well as to the kindness of my colleague Inspektør Fritze Lindahl for the superb direct photographs (Fig. 1) which have supplied a convincing answer to the whole problem. It will be seen that the true reading of the legend is:

(++PVLFPERD ON TOTE^:^)
Moreover there are clear indications that the mint-signature has been recut on the die.

In the reign of Cnut a moneyer Wulfwerd is found at very few mints. Leaving aside TOTE, they are Exeter and Shrewsbury. In each case the moneyer is recorded in Hildebrand on the strength of a single coin. A feature of the Exeter mint that has not been remarked before is a marked tendency for the moneyers to occur in the same type at other mints in the same general area, and it does not need much research to find such links with Castle Gotha (?), Launceston, Lydford, Barnstaple, Totnes, Watchet, and Axbridge, to take only those mints where the phenomenon is uncontroversial. In the light of this it is difficult not to suspect that TOTE might indicate Totnes, and especially since there is no obvious TOT site in the vicinity of Shrewsbury. The principal objection must be that no spelling TOTE is recorded for the mint at this period, and TOT(T)A(N) is undoubtedly the norm on unimpeachable Totnes coins of Cnut where the mint-signature extends beyond TOT.

Wulfwerd, however, is recorded at Exeter in the Pointed Helmet issue
itself, whereas his by no means impeccable coin of Shrewsbury is of the succeeding Short Cross type. The substitution of unstressed ‘E’ for unstressed ‘A’ may disturb the linguistic purist, but it does not seem impossible, and in fact the numismatist can provide a very convincing explanation. As we have seen the TOTE is recut over a five-letter mint-signature, and the accompanying enlargement of the critical portion of the legend of the Stockholm specimen (Fig. 2) should be sufficient to convince the most hardened sceptic that the alteration is in the die. I think it is clear, too, that the underlying letters are EÆXÆL. Particularly clear are the middle bar of the first E to the right of the upright of the T, the curiously splayed straight sides and the flat top of the A beneath the O, and the E beneath the trefoil stop which was of course the basis of the reading L on which the Totleigh attribution really hinged.

In the light of this discovery the attribution of Hild. 3566 to Totnes can no longer be resisted, and a new moneyer for the mint is supplied as well as yet another instance of a moneyer being known at Exeter and another Devonshire mint in the same type.¹ Nor is it unsatisfactory that we should have a convincing explanation of the phonologically slightly puzzling substitution of ‘E’ for ‘A’. The engraver would doubtless have cut ‘A’ had he been working on a virgin die, but he was altering a misinscription and in the unstressed position ‘E’ was ‘near enough’. It only remains to say that the die in its unaltered state is not known to exist.

It would be ungracious not to end with a word of thanks to Øverinspektør Georg Galster and to Forste antikvarie Nils Ludvig Rasmusson who have authorized the supply of the remarkable direct photographs which illustrate this note.

¹ A die-duplicate of Hild. 3566 and of the Enner Coin is in fact correctly read and attributed to Totnes in the 1920 catalogue of the Bruun Collection (no. 962), but the absence of the sceptre is not remarked.