THE MINT OF AXBRIDGE

By F. ELMORE JONES

The Domesday Borough of Axbridge on the River Axe in North Somerset is, like Milborne Port the coinage of which formed the subject of a recent study by Mr. Dolley,¹ one of the rarest of the many rare Somerset mints.

Unlike Milborne Port, however, it is an attribution which has not met with unqualified acceptance since Carlyon-Britton first proposed its substitution for Hildebrand's Axminster in Devon (at any rate so far as certain indecisive readings are concerned) in the same paper in this Journal as that in which he proposed the substitution of Milborne Port for Hildebrand's Milton in Kent.²

This latter reattribution, as Mr. Dolley aptly remarks, was by no means so original as it may have appeared to be at the time but it is certain that to Carlyon-Britton must be given the credit for the first appearance of Axbridge on our numismatic maps of today.

That Axbridge is a place of great antiquity is not open to doubt; not only is it mentioned as a Borough in the Domesday Survey³ but it is also to be identified with the AXANBRYGE of the early tenth century Burghal Hidage.⁴

In this document its assessment is recorded together with the assessments of 29 other 'burhs', mostly to be located in Wessex and of which no less than 20 (including Axbridge) are readily identifiable as known Anglo-Saxon mints. In alphabetical order these are: Axbridge, Bath, Bridport, Buckingham, Chichester, Cricklade, Exeter, 'Ham tun' (in this context undoubtedly Southampton), Hastings, Langport, Lewes, Lydford, Malmsbury, Oxford, Southwark, Wallingford, Wareham, Watchet, Wilton, and Winchester.⁵

For the distinction between Exeter and Axbridge in this document it is relevant to note that the former is EAXANCEASTRE a form which closely agrees with the coins. AXANBRYGE is therefore a certain candidate for mint status in the late Saxon period and it is perhaps a little surprising that it was not so recognized either by Hildebrand or by the authors of the British Museum Catalogue.

This is especially the case when one considers the very full and distinctive

¹ 'Three West Country Notes', B.N.J. xxix (1959), pp. 61-64.
³ See V.C.H. Somerset, i, p. 422 for details of these references. Perhaps the most significant are the statements therein that the survey records the number of burgesses as being 32 (which compares with 34 at Langport and 17 at Bruton) and that the third of the penny was paid to William the Sheriff of Somerset at the writ of the King for and on behalf of the burgesses of Ilchester, Langport, Milborne, Bruton, Axbridge and Frome. The inclusion of Frome is most significant but in quite another context (see B.N.J. xxviii (1958), pp. 504-8: R. H. M. Dolley, 'The Mysterious Mint of Fro').
⁵ In regard to the remaining ten 'burhs' I am indebted to Mr. Dolley for the following interesting information: 'The Halwell and Pilton of the document were shortly to become the "burhs" of Totnes and Barnstaple respectively and as such both are, of course, well-known Anglo-Saxon mints. In the same way it is probable that Burpham and Eashing may have been the forerunners of Steyning and Guildford respectively and it is also possible that Tisbury may have been the forerunner of Shaftesbury. The Twynham of the document, although not at present known as an Anglo-Saxon mint, is, of course, well attested as a Norman mint. This leaves only four "burhs" for which no satisfactory identification can at present be suggested, viz. "Eorpeburnan", "Lyng", "Schaftesige" (which is not to be identified with Shaftesbury) and "Portchester".'
mint-signatures on at least two of the coins, namely ACXEPO on a coin in Stockholm and AXSAP on one in the British Museum, the latter even having a Somerset hoard provenance.

Keary and Greuber assign the AXSAP reading to Exeter which, even considering that their catalogue was compiled as long ago as 1894, must surely be regarded as a particularly unimaginative and unlikely attribution. It is therefore not at all surprising that three other coins in the National Collection of the same period with the mint-signatures shortened to CAX,1 ACX and AXA three readings which are, of course, by no means so unequivocal, follow suit and are also given an Exeter attribution.

Hildebrand’s approach to the problem of these indeterminate readings, although made some forty-eight years previously, was considerably better.

Hildebrand did not attempt an identification of ACXEPO and he missed two Harthacnut readings which can only be associated with that particular mint (unidentifiable though it may have been to him), one such reading lurking under Canterbury and the other under Oxford, but he did not assign the two readings AXA and AXAN to Exeter.

These coins (three in number) are rightly catalogued separately but Hildebrand’s attribution of them to Axminster in Devon, a town which it is certain did not possess borough status in the tenth and eleventh centuries, has not stood up to the test of time and has long since been rejected.

It was left to Carlyon-Britton writing in this Journal in 1910 (Vol. VI) to be the first to put forward the undoubted claims of Axbridge as a late Saxon mint and to propose the transfer thereto of both the AXSAP and ACXEPO readings.

It is a strange fact, however, that Carlyon-Britton wrongly coupled another of Hildebrand’s unidentified mint-signatures with the ACXEPO reading, namely the ‘AGEPOR’ of the Edward the Confessor coin Hild. no. 3.

This is, in fact, a coin of Langport, a mint which was yet another of those under review in that same article in the context of the mint-signature LAG and it seems remarkable that Carlyon-Britton should have associated ‘AGEPOR’ with ACXEPO and not with LAG.3

The true reading of the Edward the Confessor coin is ON LAGEPOR which, when once the ligulation of the ‘N’ and ‘L’ is noticed, is virtually a perfect Langport mint-signature and the moneyer ÆGELWINE is also known in the same type with the unequivocal mint-signature LANCP (B.M.C. 609).

Although not relevant to Axbridge it may be remarked that ÆGELWINE also occurs on a unique coin of Canute B.M.C. type XVI (Lockett Sale, Lot 744) on which the mint-signature reads LAN. Conceivably (but improbably) this might stand for Launceston4 but obviously it can only otherwise denote Langport.

1 This curious feature of the letter ‘C’ at the start of the mint name, which is found on no less than three Axbridge readings, is not confined to this mint. It also occurs on Oxford coins of the same period, cf. Hildebrand, Harold I, no. 817 and Harthacnut, nos. 157 and 159.
2 Hild. nos. 15 (‘Canterbury’) and 164 (‘Oxford’).
4 In which case it would be the second known Anglo-Saxon coin of this mint in existence, the only other at present known being the unique Ethelred II B.M.C. type 2A +BRYN M -O LANSTF in the British Museum.
For some reason, which is not apparent, Brooke's acceptance of Axbridge as an Anglo-Saxon mint was by no means an unqualified one.  

It is strange, too, that Brooke omits *ÆGELWINE* as a possible Axbridge moneyer since he also accepts 'ACEPOR' as a possible Axbridge mint-signature but perhaps the inclusion of this latter was merely a clerical slip. 

Brooke's list of moneyers is confined to the four Harthacnut moneyers (three of whom are now assigned to his joint reign of 1035 and one to his sole reign of 1040-2) known from coins with full mint-signatures, viz. GOLDA and GOLDCYTEL (possibly the same name—B.M.C., nos. 1 and 2), LEOFRIC (Hild. no. 15—'Canterbury'), from which it would seem that Brooke too must have noticed this wrongly attributed coin since it is, I believe, unique, and LEOFWINE on the strength of Canute Hild. no. 1, the coin with the ACXEPO mint-signature which was then (1932) assigned to Canute but which can now be shown to belong to Harthacnut's sole reign.  

Carlyon-Britton's attribution to Axbridge did not go beyond the coins with the full readings of ACXEPO and AXSAP; he was undecided as to the attribution of Hildebrand's three 'Axminster' coins with the shortened mint-signatures of AXA and AXAN.  

He was right, of course, to rule out the possibility of Axminster for these two readings (the first of which occurs on one coin of Ethelred II and one of Canute, and the second on one coin of Canute) but since none of the three moneyers concerned, Ælfnoth, Æthe— and Ælfric, are known to have used any more extended mint-signature and all three might conceivably fit an Exeter attribution, Carlyon-Britton considered it better to assign them to either Exeter or Axbridge.  

Following this lead Brooke omits the names of these three moneyers from his list in *English Coins*. It is in fact only since the late Anglo-Saxon coins in the British Museum have been rearranged under mints and the classification brought into line with present-day attributions that the coins of the Axbridge mint in the National Collection have received their proper recognition.

---

1 *English Coins*, p. 69.
3 *English Coins*, p. 69.
4 *Num. Chron.* (1959), p. 185, is most relevant. 'A few early (i.e. 980) coins have a mint-signature EXAN or an extension thereof. A signature EXA(N) for Exeter is not recorded for the reign in Hildebrand, Nordman or B.M.C.' I feel that the matter is clinched quite conclusively in the case of the two Canute moneyers Ælfric and Æthe—especially when it is borne in mind that for that particular period, i.e. 1017 to 1030, the norm for Exeter readings has changed and has become EXECE which is even less likely to be varied to AXA(N). Possibly there may still remain some slight doubt in the case of the Ælfnoth AXA coin of Ethelred II which is some twenty years earlier and for which there is no corroborative evidence to help either the one (the Exeter) or the other (the Axbridge) attribution. However, I feel justified in claiming that all three coins with the AXA reading should be assumed to have emanated from the same mint and that such mint is not Exeter. It will be realized, of course, that there is nothing new in this and that I am simply following Hildebrand's lead (a lead not followed by Brooke) but, whereas Hildebrand assigned the coins to Axminster and Carlyon-Britton was inclined to sit on the fence, I am now assigning all three to Axbridge.
In the result no less than five coins are now placed to this mint including two of Canute with the seemingly indeterminate mint-signatures of AXA and ACX and an ‘uncertain’ coin of the same reign (B.M.C. no. 612).

For the +LODA ON ESPA of B.M.C. this latter coin is now read as +GODA ON [A]ESPA (for the sake of clarity the numerous pellets between the letters are omitted) and once it is recognized that the letter missing from the coin must be A and that the two last letters are transposed the resultant mint-signature conforms very closely to other undoubted Axbridge readings.

It is of interest to note that this coin, which is illustrated in Ruding\(^1\) and has lain in the British Museum for well over 100 years, has hitherto defied all attempts at the identification of either the mint or the moneyer.

The name of a second unpublished moneyer for the mint viz. HUNEWINE has also recently come to light in the same reign, mainly as a result of Mr. Dolley’s activities in Stockholm, and it is indeed a remarkable coincidence that this discovery should follow on so soon after the emergence of this same name as that of an unpublished moneyer of Lydford in this same type.

This latter results from Mr. Dolley’s correction of two mis-read coins in Hildebrand, one merely a large fragment, and is yet another instance of his brilliant work in this field.\(^2\)

It may be of interest to record that HUNEWINE, this very well-attested West Country name, is now known from the coins of no less than six Wessex mints, three (Exeter, Lydford, and Totnes) in Devon and three (Axbridge, Ilchester, and Watchet) in Somerset.

It is mainly as a result of the recent emergence of the names of these two unpublished moneyers (GODA and HUNEWINE) that I have been prompted to write this study of the mint but I have long felt that a review of the subject was overdue.

It would seem that very little, if indeed anything at all, has been written on it since Carlyon-Britton’s paper in B.N.J. 1910, although I suspect that Mr. Dolley was on the point of tackling it and that this paper of mine may well have forestalled yet another of his West Country Notes.

My main objectives in writing it are (1) to show that Brooke need not have had any qualms about the acceptance of Axbridge as an Anglo-Saxon mint and (2) to publish a revised catalogue of the coins with a plate in illustration of as many of them as possible.

The table which follows overleaf summarizes the history of the mint and its moneyers and also records the mint-signatures appearing on the coins of the different types. These mint-signatures are remarkably varied considering the sparsity of the coins and the comparatively short period which they span. They all stem from three alternative forms of the name AXANP, AXSAPO, and ACXEPO\(^3\) all of which undoubtedly represent one and the same place of mintage.

---

1. Annals of the Coinage, pl. 20, no. 23
3. The transition in the form of the name from the AXANBRYGE of the Burghal Hidage to the ACXEPO\((RT)\) of the mid-eleventh-century coins does not invalidate a claim that both spellings denote the same place. Changes in the forms of place names within the period of 100 years plus with which we are concerned here are by no means uncommon and many other instances spring to mind. The Burghal Hidage itself provides another instance, Hastings being HESTINGCEASTRE in the document and HESTINPOR on some mid-eleventh-century coins.
On the evidence of this table it will be seen that the mint cannot have been operative for more than about forty years, i.e. from c. 1000 to 1040, and also that its activity was very spasmodic. In this respect it is of interest to note that it follows much the same pattern as that of three of the other smaller Somerset mints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Reign and Type</th>
<th>Mint signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethelred II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.M.C. II A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subsequent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.M.C. VIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.M.C. XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.M.C. XVI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.M.C. I</td>
<td>(right facing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.M.C. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(reading R.E.N.T)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Canute</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ælnoth</td>
<td>Ælfric</td>
<td>Ælfric and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfric</td>
<td>Hunewine</td>
<td>AXA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æthe—</td>
<td>Æthe—</td>
<td>AXA and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goda</td>
<td>Æthe—</td>
<td>AXA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leofwine</td>
<td>Æthe—</td>
<td>AXA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leofric</td>
<td>Æthe—</td>
<td>AXA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golda</td>
<td>Æthe—</td>
<td>AXA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldcytel</td>
<td>Æthe—</td>
<td>AXA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Axbridge, in common with Bruton, Crewkerne, and Milborne Port, opens up on the smallest possible scale in Ethelred II's Longcross type (B.M.C. 4A) which ran from c. 997 to 1003; in common with those three mints it too is dormant until c. 1018 when it reopens in Canute's first type (B.M.C. viii).  


2 It will be noted that the Axbridge coins of this type are of two quite different styles, HUNEWINE'S coin being of one style and the two coins of ÆLFRIC of another. It is significant that these two styles are both predominantly associated with the mint of Ilchester and that neither occurs at Exeter, all the coins of which are of yet a third West Country style, the very distinctive 'Exeter' style itself. Ælfric's two coins are both characteristic examples of a stylistic group which is, in fact, confined to the county of Somerset. It is a style which has no very marked characteristics but which is, I think, fairly easily recognizable; the Cadbury/Bruton obv. die link (B.M.C. ii, pl. xvii, no. 6) which is illustrated and discussed by Mr. Dolley in B.N.J. 1956, p. 104, is another typical example. The HUNEWINE coin is of quite a different style and one which is, possibly, even more closely associated with Ilchester. It, too, is a typical example of this very distinctive and easily recognizable 'Ilchester' style. Although predominantly associated with Somerset this style does make one incursion into Devon, at Lydford, at which mint it occurs alongside 'Exeter' style coins. B.M.C. ii, pl. xviii, no. 10, a Lydford coin of the moneyer Sæwine, is a fine example. Another is the recently published and apparently unique Hildebrand coin of Lydford to which reference is made earlier in this paper. Of the coins in Hildebrand four (nos. 2862–5 of the moneyer SÆWINE) are of 'Ilchester' style and two (nos. 2860 and 2861 of the moneyers BRUNA and GODRIC respectively) are of 'Exeter' style. BRUNA and GODRIC are both Lydford moneyers in the immediately preceding type (the last type of Ethelred II) whereas HUNEWINE and SÆWINE are not, apart from these 'Ilchester' style coins of Canute's first type, otherwise known. Taking this into consideration it is significant that the coins of the latter two moneyers (HUNEWINE and SÆWINE conform to 'Ilchester' style whereas those of the former two (BRUNA and GODRIC) conform to 'Exeter' style? Is it possible that LYDANFORD is
In that year output was very considerably stepped up at any rate at both Axbridge and Crewkerne, but not apparently to quite the same extent at Bruton and apparently not at all at Milborne Port where Canute type VIII is unknown. Output again dwindles at all four mints with, in the case of Axbridge only, what would seem to have been a remarkable revival of activity under Harthacnut both in his joint and sole reigns. All four mints peter out altogether at different times between 1035 and 1042 and apparently not one of them was in operation under Edward the Confessor.

The catalogue at the end of this paper records details of all the nineteen coins of the Axbridge mint which are known to me; it is in the form of a "miniature corpus", as used by Mr. Dolley for his study of Milborne Port and all the coins are illustrated on the plate (Pl. VI, 1–19). Unfortunately one coin (no. 2 on the plate) cannot be reproduced photographically as its present ownership is unknown.

From this catalogue it will be seen that 5 coins are in the British Museum, 9 are in Stockholm, 3 are in Copenhagen, and only 2 are in private ownership in this country, of one of which (and the evidence for its existence does not extend beyond a description in Sainthill, albeit a convincing one)² the present whereabouts are unknown. Fortunately this coin is almost certainly a die duplicate of the Stockholm coin, the controversial Ethelred II, Hild. no. 5.

It will be apparent too that no less than 6 of these 19 coins belong to the reign of Harthacnut whose coins (even allowing for the fact that Canute B.M.C. type XVII is now recognized as being a coinage of Harthacnut's sole reign) are as rare as any in the late Saxon period. This is an exceptionally high proportion and is one which I am sure cannot be equalled at any other mint.

Further, this feature is not confined to the coins in the British Museum where the proportion is 2 in 5; the proportions of 3 in 9 and 1 in 3 in Sweden and Denmark respectively are also abnormally high.

It will be noted too that the number of Axbridge coins in this country compared with the corresponding number in Scandinavia, viz. 7 and 12 respectively, is surprisingly high and, for example, compares with 3 and 10 respectively in the case of Milborne Port.

The reason for this difference is of course to be sought in the incidence of the accident of discovery since no less than four of the five Axbridge coins in the British Museum came from the Wedmore find of 1853 (Thompson, Inventory, no. 374 but all four being there listed as 'Exeter'). Wedmore is a near neighbour of Axbridge (it is actually the adjoining parish) and is therefore a find spot which is only a few miles distant from the place of mintage of the coins.

another instance of two mints of the same name being in operation at the same time, one the undoubted mint of Lydford in Devon and the other Lydford-on-the-Fosse in Somerset? For the present this interesting, but highly speculative, possibility cannot be taken any further but I am hopeful that recent research in this field may bring fresh evidence to light. To sum up, it is not claimed that the style of the three Axbridge 'Quatrefoil' type coins is conclusive evidence for a Somerset mint attribution. There is always the possibility of the existence of a coin which is an anomaly at any mint within the general limits of the regions covered by the various stylistic groups but it is claimed, however, that considerations of style rule out Exeter as a likely attribution and that the attribution to a Somerset mint is a far more convincing one.

² Olla Podrida (1853), ii, pl. 26, no. 4.
The writer considers it not improbable that other coins of Axbridge may exist in this country, quite possibly assigned to Exeter, and he would welcome any such being brought to his notice.

It would be particularly gratifying if the other halves of the reading of the two unique cut halfpennies in Stockholm (Pl. VI, 10 and 15) were to come to light or if the present whereabouts of the ‘missing’ coin of the Sainthill woodcut could be located.

In conclusion I should add that it is obvious that a paper such as this could not have been written without the co-operation of the authorities of the Coin Rooms of Copenhagen, Stockholm, and London who supplied the direct photographs which illustrate it and to whom my very grateful thanks are extended. The extent of the help which I have received from Mr. Dolley in filling in much of the background for this paper must be equally obvious and to him in particular I am especially grateful.

THE AXBRIDGE MINT—A CATALOGUE OF THE COINS

(B.M. = British Museum: F.E.J. = writer’s collection: K = Royal Coin Cabinet, National Museum, Copenhagen: SHM = Royal Coin Cabinet, National Historical Museum, Stockholm.)

ETHELRED II (978–1016)

LONGCROSS ISSUE. (Hild. D = B.M.C. IVA = Brooke 5 = Hawkins 207.)

(Michaelmas 997–Michaelmas 1003?)

MONEYER: Ælnoth

1. Obv. +ÆELRÆDREX ÆNÆOX
   Rev. +ÆLEF/NÒD/MÒO/XAX
   (a) SHM, Hild. 5—hoard provenance not recorded. (Pl. VI, 1)
   (b) In 1853 in possession of Sir Montague L. Chapman (cf. R. Sainthill, Olla Podrida, ii, p. 149 and pl. 26, no. 4)—not now traced. (Pl. VI, 2)

CANUTE (1016–35)

QUATREFOIL ISSUE. (Hild. E = B.M.C. VIII = Brooke 2 = Hawkins 212)

(Michaelmas 1017–Michaelmas 1023?)

MONEYER: Ælfrec

2. Obv. +ÆNVTR EXÆNÆLORVM
   Rev. +ÆEL/[RI]/O[N]/XAX
   (a) SHM, Hild. 5—hoard provenance not recorded. (Pl. VI, 3)
   (b) SHM, Hild. 5 bis—hoard provenance not recorded. (Pl. VI, 4)
   (c) K—hoard provenance not recorded. (Pl. VI, 5)

3. Obv. +ÆNVTR EXÆNÆLOR
   Rev. +ÆL/FRI/[EON]/XAX
   (a) B.M., B.M.C. 56—from the 1853 Wedmore Hoard. (Pl. VI, 6)
   (b) SHM, ex Kviende (parish of Othem, Gotland) find (Inv. 21613). (Pl. VI, 7)
MONEYER: Hunewine
4. Obv. +/Error REX /ÆGLORV
   Rev. +ÆV/NEP/ÆNE/ÆXX
   (a) SHM, ex Botvalde (parish of Väte, Gotland) find (Inv. 23228). (Pl. VI, 8)
   (b) F.E.J. ex Grantley lot 1144—without hoard provenance. (Pl. VI, 9)

   POINTED HELMET ISSUE. (Hild. G = B.M.C. XIV = Brooke 3 = Hawkins 213)
   (Michaelmas 1023–Michaelmas 1029?)

MONEYER: Æthe—
5. Obv. +/Error R/ —
   Rev. +ÆDE — /ÆXX
   SHM, Hild. 6—hoard provenance not recorded. (Pl. VI, 10)

MONEYER: Goda
6. Obv. +ÆNV/Æ/ÆF
   Rev. +ÆÆPÆ ON /ÆÆ
   B.M., B.M.C. 612—hoard provenance not recorded but ex Miles 1820 and Tyssen 1802. Illustrated in Ruding, pl. 20, no. 23. (Pl. VI, 11)

   SHORTCROSS ISSUE. (Hild. H = B.M.C. XVI = Brooke 4 = Hawkins 208)
   (Michaelmas 1029–Michaelmas 1035)

MONEYER: Leofwine
7. Obv. +ÆNV/ÆRE
   Rev. +ÆÆPÆ ON ÆÆ
   B.M., B.M.C. 78—from the 1853 Wedmore hoard. (Pl. VI, 12)

8. Obv. +ÆNV/ÆRE
   Rev. +ÆÆPÆ ON ÆÆ Same die as preceding coin.
   K, ex Lübeck find. (Pl. VI, 13)

HARTHACNUT
(Reign 1035–7)

   JEWEL CROSS ISSUE—right facing bust (Hild. A = B.M.C. IA = Brooke 1
   = Hawkins 216)
   (Winter of 1035–1036?)

MONEYER: Golda
9. Obv. +ÆÆÐÆ/ÆNV
   Rev. +ÆÆPÆ ON ÆÆXÆ
   B.M., B.M.C. 1—from the 1853 Wedmore hoard. (Pl. VI, 14)

   Obv. +ÆÆÐÆ/ — TRE Same die as preceding coin.
   Rev. + — ÆÆÆXÆ·: Probably this moneyer.
   SHM, Hild. 164—hoard provenance not recorded. (Pl. VI, 15)

MONEYER: Goldeytel
11. Obv. +ÆÆÐÆÆ/ÆNV
   Rev. +ÆÆPÆ ON ÆÆXÆ
   B.M., B.M.C. 2—from the 1853 Wedmore hoard. (Pl. VI, 16)
MONEYER: Leofric
12. Obv. +HARDÆ/ENV'T RE
   Rev. +LEOFRIC ON EA·XN     
SHM, Hild. 15—hoard provenance not recorded. (Pl. VI, 17)

HARTHACNUT
(Sole Reign 1040–2)

ARM AND SCEPTRE ISSUE reading ENV'T (Hild. Canute (I) = B.M.C. Canute XVII
   = Brooke Canute 5 = Hawkins 209)
   (Summer 1040–Summer 1042?)

MONEYER: Leofwine
13. Obv. +ENV/TR EX ÂNG
   Rev. +LEOPINE ON AŒXÝPO
   (a) SHM, Hild. Cnut 1—hoard provenance not recorded. (Pl. VI, 18)
   (b) K, ex Thomsen 9034. (Pl. VI, 19)

ADDENDUM

Since this paper was written Mr. Dolley has discovered that Sir Montague Chapman’s collection passed to Sir Benjamin Chapman and that it was dispersed at Sotheby’s on 8 November 1894. The ‘AXA’ coin (No. 1(b) in this Catalogue) was doubtless among the 20 coins of the same type forming Lots 23 and 24 which included two assigned to Exeter, the coins simply being listed under Mints in the sale catalogue without any readings being given. The two lots fetched a total of 32s. and were purchased by Mr. Lincoln—doubtless for stock. The presumption must be that the ‘AXA’ coin was from an Irish find and that Hildebrand’s ‘Axminster’ attribution of 1881 was not appreciated by the cataloguers.