THE COINAGE OF SOUTHERN ENGLAND, 796–840
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INTRODUCTORY

We think it desirable to explain how this paper came to be written under our joint names. For some years we have independently been aware of the shortcomings of the accepted chronology and classification of the coinage of the southern kingdoms in the age of the decline of the power of Mercia following the death of Offa. One of us, too, has been unhappy at the doubt which has been cast on the authenticity of certain coins in the Mercian series. Research in both these fields led us to write papers, read before the Society in successive years,¹ that not only overlapped to an appreciable extent but which happily showed a very broad measure of agreement on the interpretation of the surviving material. We therefore felt that a single definitive publication, resulting from the integration of our separate researches, would be more valuable than two distinct papers, and this we now offer.

Brooke classified the ninth-century coinage according to the kingdom from which a named ruler derived his primary authority. While this may be a satisfactory basis for the coinages of the kings of Kent and of East Anglia, whose mints were, of necessity, located within their own immediate territories, it is quite unsuitable for the issues of the kings of Mercia, who were at times in a position to employ these same mints to strike the bulk of their own coinage. This is also true to a lesser extent, at a later stage, of the coins of the kings of Wessex. Most of the difficulties presented by Brooke’s analysis solve themselves when the coins are classified according to issuing mint rather than titular authority. In the absence of any mint-signature on the majority of the coins, this first necessitates grouping them by moneyers and then seeking typological and stylistic affinities between the coins of different moneyers, using such coins as bear mint-signatures or are otherwise implicitly related to particular mints in order to associate groups of moneyers with their respective mints.

We believe that the arrangement of the illustrations demonstrates the effectiveness of this approach without the necessity for us to explain all the steps by which we evolved our own classification. We start with a brief historical survey and, after dealing with the coinage from 796 to c. 805 as a whole, consider the coins of each mint in turn, and endeavour in each case to justify our attributions and our chronology. In appendixes we discuss the hoard evidence and the authenticity of the disputed Mercian coins to which reference has already been made. We have added a corpus of the material available, listed under kings and archbishops, in the hope that this will be found useful as a ready means of reference.

We shall be reviewing in the following pages the penny coinage from the death of Offa in 796 to that of Wiglaf in 840. The only series of which we do not include a detailed

account are the coinages of the East Anglian king Æthelstan I and of the Wessex kings Ecgberht and Æthelwulf. The links of the former with the East Anglian issues in the names of Mercian kings are discussed but thereafter the coinage of East Anglia develops independently and we have thought it best to leave it for separate treatment. The coinages of Ecgberht and Æthelwulf of Wessex have recently been discussed elsewhere, but our study impinges on them, particularly that of Ecgberht, and leads to new attributions of some of the coins.

We review in detail the coinage in the names of the Mercian kings Coenwulf, Ceolwulf I, Beornwulf, Ludica, and Wiglaf; of the Kentish kings Eadberht Praen, Cuthred, and Baldred; of Archbishop Æthelheard, so far as his coinage took place in Coenwulf's reign, and of Archbishop Wulfred (Archbishop Ceolnoth's coinage is touched on, but a great part of it lies outside our period and, it is felt, should be left for separate detailed treatment); and of Eadwald, a shadowy figure whom we give reasons for identifying as an historically unrecorded king of East Anglia.

The scope of this study is deliberately confined to problems of chronology, attribution, and authenticity. We have limited ourselves at this stage to inquiring where, when, and under whose authority the various issues were struck, and do not pretend to have investigated the general monetary and economic background. Consequently we do not discuss variations in weight standards, areas of circulation, volume of output, and minting techniques except in so far as these considerations are germane to the points of arrangement at issue.

HISTORICAL OUTLINE

Before considering the coinage of the period, it is necessary to outline the historical framework into which it is to be fitted. Almost all the coins are struck in the names of the lords temporal or spiritual of south-east England, that is to say, the kings of Mercia, Kent, East Anglia and Wessex, and the archbishops of Canterbury. Table A at the end of the paper shows the various personalities involved and their relative chronology.

Arrangement of the coins depends to a major extent upon the known availability of the mints in Kent, Mercia, and East Anglia to individual rulers. It is therefore desirable to sketch what is known of the political history of the period from documentary sources.

At the end of this paper we have summarized such numismatic evidence as we consider may be significant to the historian in that it corroborates, extends, or challenges any aspects of this picture.

On the death of Offa in July 796 his son Ecgfrith, who had been crowned king of the Mercians in 787 during his father's lifetime, succeeded him as overlord of the southern English; he survived only 141 days. He in turn was succeeded by a distant cousin, Coenwulf. In Kent a revolt against the Mercian rule after the death of Offa was successfully carried out under Eadberht Praen, an apostate clerk, who secured the throne and held it for two years until Coenwulf succeeded in deposing him in 798. Although Æthelheard

---


3 This summary is based upon Sir Frank Stenton Anglo-Saxon England, pp. 222–34 (referred to hereafter as 'Stenton').

4 For the relationship see the genealogical tables in Professor D. Whitelock's The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1961, p. 212.

5 Stenton, p. 225.
remained Archbishop of Canterbury, his support of Mercian authority forced him temporarily to abandon his see when the uprising in 796 took place, and for a period at least he was on the Continent. Between 796 and 798 Coenwulf carried on negotiations with Pope Leo III for the transference of the see to London, but the pope refused to sanction so great a departure from long established custom and Coenwulf’s recapture of Kent obviated the need to press the matter further. Æthelheard, at whose request Eadberht Præn had been anathematized, was thus enabled to return to his see; the Kentish throne was in the same year given by Coenwulf to his brother Cuthred. After Cuthred’s death in 807 Kent again became a Mercian province.

The subordination of Wessex to Mercia, secured by the marriage of its king Beorhtric to Offa’s daughter, ended in 802. In that year Beorhtric died, and was succeeded by Ecgberht, an old rival, who had been driven abroad by Offa. For twenty years he had little or no influence outside Wessex, but he never apparently became a dependant of Coenwulf. Mercian influence in Northumbria had also come to an end with the death of another son-in-law of Offa, Æthelred, who was murdered in 796. Coenwulf’s authority when established thus embraced Mercia (as extended by Offa at the expense of Wessex), Kent, Sussex, Essex, and East Anglia. Of the last of these, virtually nothing is known from documentary sources until the accession of Eadmund in 855.

At Canterbury Æthelheard died in May 805, to be succeeded by his archdeacon Wulfred, who was consecrated in August. Until 817 he was on close terms with Coenwulf, but from that year until 821, when a settlement was imposed, king and archbishop were engaged in a dispute of such seriousness that the latter seems, during that period, to have ceased to exercise his office. This quarrel apart, our knowledge of the political history of southern England in the ninth century is almost a blank until Coenwulf’s death.

Coenwulf died in Wales in 821, and the Mercian throne passed to his brother Ceolwulf who continued the Welsh campaign until he was deposed in 823; with him the old royal line of Mercia seems to have come to an end. In the thirty years that followed, four kings, whose birth and origins are unknown, ruled in Mercia: Beornwulf, 823–5; Ludica, 825–7; Wiglaf, 827–9 and 830–40; and Berhtwulf, 840–52. Perhaps in an attempt to secure continuity with the old royal line, Wiglaf’s son, Wigmund, was married to Ælfled, daughter of Ceolwulf, but Wigmund never succeeded to the Mercian throne.

Sir Frank Stenton states that Beornwulf’s authority was recognized in Essex, Middlesex, and Kent, and that he was the dominant figure in southern England as late as the summer of 825. But before the year was out he had been defeated by Ecgberht of Wessex at the battle of Ellendun, which brought to an end the ascendency of the Mercian kings and was one of the decisive events of Anglo-Saxon history. Later in the same year Beornwulf was killed by the East Angles who had been in revolt against their Mercian overlord.

After Ellendun, Ecgberht sent an army to Kent which successfully ousted a King Baldred, of whom virtually nothing else is known, and the men of Kent, Essex, Surrey, and Sussex submitted to him. After 825 there were no more kings of Kent, and Canterbury was thenceforward a see whose archbishop derived his temporalities from the West Saxon king. Wulfred continued to hold it until his death in 832. Following a brief tenure

---

1 Stenton, p. 225.  
2 Ibid., pp. 224–5.  
3 Ibid., p. 223.  
4 Ibid., p. 223.  
5 Ibid., p. 227.  
6 Ibid., p. 229.  
7 Ibid., p. 208.
by a prelate named Feologild, the see was vacant until the consecration a year later of Ceolnoth, who survived until 870.

Beornwulf was succeeded on the Mercian throne by Ludica, one of his ealdormen, 1 in a kingdom now reduced to Mercia, Lindsey, Middle Anglia, and the provinces of the Hwicce and Magonsaetan. 2 In 827 Ludica was in turn succeeded by Wiglaf. Two years later Ecgberht defeated him and conquered Mercia. In 830, however, Wiglaf, in the words of the Chronicle, 'obtained the Mercian kingdom again', a phrase which Sir Frank Stenton understands to imply that it was not granted to him by Ecgberht but was probably recovered by a Mercian revolt. 3

Wiglaf's exact status throughout his second reign cannot be established, but charters make it clear that he became an independent ruler at least by 836 and that he had authority in Middlesex in 831. In 839 Æthelwulf succeeded Ecgberht as King of Wessex, but the Mercian kingship, though deprived of all external authority, continued in the persons of Berhtwulf, who acceded on the death of Wiglaf in 840, and of Burgred who followed him in 852 and reigned until he was expelled by the Danes in 874. Up to this time London remained a Mercian town. 4

MATERIAL

The material available for our study varies in quantity owing, no doubt, to the incidence of hoards. Of Coenwulf it is reasonable to believe we have a fairly representative selection and of Ceolwulf I, with his two-year reign, and of Baldred, the length of whose reign must remain in doubt, we have more than our fair share. Of the three last Mercian kings whom we discuss, Beornwulf, Ludica, and Wiglaf, surviving specimens are very few and this may in part reflect the unhappy state of the Mercian kingdom at this time, when military considerations may have overridden economic ones.

Of Eadwald and Eadberht Praen we again have few surviving coins, but the fact that the one had certainly three moneyers and the other five may point to a larger coinage than survival would suggest.

Cuthred's coinage, though still comparatively rare today, seems to have been on a fairly substantial scale. Of Archbishop Æthelheard's coinage with the Mercian king Coenwulf no more than fifteen specimens are recorded. It is thus almost as rare as his coinage with Offa of which twelve specimens are known. The absence of a moneyer's name both here and on the early issues of Wulfred may indicate that one moneyer only was being employed. From later in Wulfred's time, however, a substantially larger number of coins is known and the names of four moneyers are found. This fact, coupled with the removal of the royal name, points to an extension of the archbishop's coining rights.

1 Professor Whitecok has very kindly pointed out to us that Florence of Worcester (Thorpe, vol. i, p. 260) writes 'to whom [i.e. Beornwulfus] Ludican his kinsman succeeded but after a space of two years, while he wished to avenge his predecessor, he was killed by the same East Angles'. She remarks, however, that the use by Florence of Worcester of the accusative form Ludican in this sentence, where the nominative form Ludican would have been correct, shows that the Latin entry cannot be early, for no early writer would have made this mistake. William of Malmesbury (ed. Stubbs, p. 95) says 'Ludicanus was oppressed by the same Angles after a rule of two years, intending the vengeance of his predecessor'. The same criticism applies to this text and Professor Whitecok considers that the two cannot, in this instance, be regarded as independent authorities. The statements made, therefore, that Ludica was a kinsman of Beornwulf's and that he was killed by the East Angles, must be taken with reserve.

2 Stenton, pp. 229-31.
3 Ibid., p. 231.
Broadly, therefore, for the earlier part of our period we may be reasonably satisfied with the material at our disposal, but for the later we must be conscious of the inadequacy of what we have. In this later period we are, however, fortunate to have, thanks to the Middle Temple hoard with its ninety-two coins of Ecgberht, a good supply of material in the name of the king of Wessex, much of it struck at Canterbury.

The following table, compiled from the corpus in Appendix 3, summarizes the material which we consider in detail in this paper:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titular authority</th>
<th>No. of coins recorded</th>
<th>Titular authority</th>
<th>No. of coins recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kings of Mercia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Archbishops of Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>Wulfred</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceolwulf I</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beornwulf</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludwin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings of Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td>King of E. Anglia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadberht Praen</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Eadwald</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuthred</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldred</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE NON-PORTRAIT COINAGE, 796–c. 805, AT THE CANTERBURY AND LONDON MINTS (PLATES I AND II AND TABLE C)

Eadberht Praen, 796–798, King of Kent (Pl. I)

Eadberht Praen’s coins have, as might be expected, survived on a very small scale. They follow closely the latest coins of Offa and in fact a die-link between the two has been recorded. All have as obverse type the king’s name and title in three lines. On the reverse, those of Babba, Ethelmod, and Iaenberht (Pl. I, E.P. 1, 2, and 3) have a similar three-line design in which the moneyer’s name fills one or two lines; the coin of Ethelnoth (Pl. I, E.P. 4) uses a reverse die of Offa’s with the moneyer’s name in two lines and a ‘bone-shaped’ object between; the coin of Tidheah (Pl. I, E.P. 5) has the moneyer’s name in two oval lunettes.

Of the five moneyers who worked for Eadberht Praen, Iaenberht and Tidheah are confined to him; Babba, Ethelmod, and Ethelnoth struck for Offa and the first two for Coenwulf as well. The Ethelmod found striking for Ceolwulf I is likely to be another man of the same name. It is noteworthy that none of Eadberht Praen’s moneyers is found striking for Cuthred, his immediate successor on the Kentish throne. All of Eadberht Praen’s coinage was presumably struck at Canterbury.

The coinage of Coenwulf, King of Mercia: first group, without bust (Pls. I and II)

From what has been said in the historical introduction, it will be seen that, for the first two years of his reign, Coenwulf was denied the Canterbury mint and, the numismatic evidence suggests, that of East Anglia as well. Unless, therefore, no coinage was issued in this period, it must have come from some other mint.

In the later part of Offa's reign there had begun to emerge definitive types which were struck by more than one moneyer, in contrast with his earlier issues where the selection of type, within certain broad limits, seems to have been left to individual whim. Offa's new practice was continued and carried further by Coenwulf with the result that the coinage can now be placed into groups which, at the southern mints at any rate, appear often to have run in sequence.

Group I. Coenwulf's first substantive issue has as obverse type a rounded M (for Merciorum) continuing the circular legend. The reverse presents a tribrach, with hooked ends, with the moneyer's name in the angles. The arms of the tribrach are formed of two lines with sometimes a third dotted line between (e.g. Pl. I, Cn. 10 and 9). Comparable reverse types were used by Cuthred (Pl. I, Cd. 4) and Archbishop Æthelheard (Pl. II, Æ I). Both forms of tribrach are found on coins of the moneyer Duda (Pl. I, Cn. 6 and 7) which may confidently be attributed to Canterbury. Coins of this tribrach type were struck for Coenwulf by no less than sixteen moneyers.

Prior, however, to the introduction of this substantive type, which we have called B, there were three other varieties (A) represented by no more than six coins in all today, which may be regarded as transitional. These provide some clue as to the continuity of the coinage and suggest that a third minting-place for Offa may now be presumed.

The first transitional variety, A (i), known from three specimens by the moneyers Ludoman (Pl. II, Cn. 1) and Wilhun (Pl. II, Cn. 2), carries on (broadly) a reverse type used by these two moneyers on late coins of Offa. The obverse has a type comparable to, but not identical with, late coins of Offa.1 It shows the king's name and title in three lines, starting as on Offa's coins with the middle line, and reading in the order centre, bottom, top. The experimental nature of these coins is suggested by the difficulty the engraver has had in fitting the longer name of the new king into the middle line: on two of the coins the final F of Coenwulf is put on the bottom line after REX; on the third it has been got on to the right line by the expedient of omitting the second letter, o. On the next variety the king's name is also spelt in the latter way.

The second transitional variety, A (ii), known from two specimens both by the moneyer Diola (Pl. II, Cn. 3), has a similar obverse to the last, but the reverse has the tribrach found on the substantive type, though of a slightly different form. In this case the ends of the arm are of the 'bone' shape found horizontally on late coins of Offa,2 on one of Eadberht Praen (Pl. I, E.P. 4), and one of Coenwulf (Pl. I, Cn. 4). All three moneyers of varieties A (i) and (ii) struck the substantive tribrach issue for Coenwulf but are not found on later types or on coins of Cuthred.3

The fact that the reverse of A (i) continues a type used by Offa, and is struck by moneyers who worked for him, strongly suggests that the two issues followed one another fairly closely. If this is so, they must have come from some mint other than Canterbury. We have no specific evidence where that mint was, but the virtual absence of isolated finds from central Mercia4 suggests that it would be wrong to look for a mint there at this time. London was already an important port under Mercian control and is the most likely choice for a Mercian king deprived of Canterbury. If this is so, then the

---

3 Dealla, found later at Canterbury, is a variant form of Diola, but is probably a separate individual.
4 BNJ xxvii, pp. 459 ff.
comparable coins of Offa by these two moneyers are likely to be from the London mint as well. The implications of this for the coinage of Offa are outside the scope of this paper.

The second transitional variety, A (ii), clearly provides a link between the first transitional and the substantive tribrach type and shows that the tribrach was introduced at ‘London’.

In contrast to these two transitional varieties the third, A (iii) (Pl. I, Cn. 4), links the coinage of Eadberht Praen to the substantive tribrach issue of Coenwulf (B). It is represented by a single specimen which has as obverse type the M of the substantive type. The reverse has a horizontal ‘bone’ similar to that on coins of Offa and on one of Eadberht Praen (Pl. I, E.P. 4). The moneyer, Seberht, is found striking for the Kentish king Cuthred. It is apparent therefore that we have here to do with a Kentish moneyer. The coin can probably be regarded as in the nature of a ‘mule’, for, although Seberht is not known to have worked for either Offa or Eadberht Praen, the reverse type is associated with both kings and is not found elsewhere on coins of Coenwulf. This variety may therefore be regarded as the earliest of Coenwulf’s Kentish issues and, since we have no indication of a mint at Rochester operating as yet, can be attributed to Canterbury and to a date immediately after its recovery in 798.

That the name of the king on the coins was, except in cases of disputed succession, often not changed for some months after his accession is generally recognized as mint practice in medieval, as much as in later, times. That this was the case at the end of the eighth century is suggested by the absence of any coins in the name of Offa’s successor, Ecgfrith, who reigned four and a half months until December 796. Coinage in Coenwulf’s name is therefore not likely to have begun to appear from the London mint until towards the end of the first half of 797 and the two transitional varieties from that mint may accordingly be dated mid-797 to 798. On the other hand he may, in the circumstances of his recovery of the Kentish kingdom, have thought fit to start a coinage at Canterbury in his own name as soon as possible after he regained possession of it. The substantive tribrach type probably began therefore in 798.

If it is accepted that Coenwulf struck at a mint outside Kent, probably London, in the first two years of his reign—and the evidence adduced below certainly suggests that this mint was operating later in the reign—there is no reason to believe that it closed again when Canterbury was recovered. The question then arises how to distinguish the coins of the substantive tribrach type of these two mints. The table of moneyers (Table C)\(^1\) shows that a number of moneyers may be associated with Canterbury from the fact that they struck coins in the name of a king of Kent. Of the remainder Diola, Ludoman, and Wilhun have already been associated with the ‘London’ mint. We have treated as undetermined the coins of Ciolhard, Eama, Ibba, and Pendwine.

Pendwine we put in this group merely because we have not seen the only coin in his name of which we have a record and because the name is not found elsewhere. It might well prove, if the actual coin were available for inspection, that he could be associated with London.

The other three moneyers, Ciolhard, Ibba, and Eama (Pl. I, Cn. 14–16), have a special feature in common, namely that each struck, in Offa’s last issue, coins that, as regards their reverses, are comparable in type and differ from the type peculiarly associated with Offa’s last coinage. One specimen of the latter by each moneyer has survived and on each

\(^1\) p. 73 below.
the moneyer’s name is disposed in the quarters of a cross. The normal type has the moneyer’s name in one or two lines horizontally. It seems therefore that these three moneyers, whose coins of Coenwulf we had put in a separate grouping before we had appreciated that they formed a comparable separate grouping under Offa, hang together in isolation and the possibility that they worked at yet another mint cannot entirely be ruled out. It will be noticed that the only one of these three to continue after the tribrach type is Ciolhard.

That Eama and Eanmund are variant forms of the same name has been suggested, but the difference in style between their coins for Coenwulf (Pl. I, Cn. 15 and Pl. II, Cn. 19) suggests that in this instance they may represent separate moneyers, just as apparently do Eaba, Eoba, and Oba.

Both Ibba and Ciolhard struck coins for Offa’s earlier, as well as his later, issues and the earlier coins show the characteristics one has come to associate with Canterbury. Find-spots of Ibba coins are, for the earlier issues of Offa, Italy (?) 2, Trewiddle hoard (?) 1, Castor, Northants. 1; for the later, Kilkenny, Ireland; 4 for the two coins of Coenwulf, Shropshire (allegedly) and Breedon-on-the-Hill, Leics. Find-spots of Ciolhard coins for the earlier issues of Offa are Austria and Weston, Hunts. No find-spots are recorded for the later coins discussed here.

The style of the coins of these two moneyers on the earlier issues of Offa is different to that on the later. This might suggest that two men of the same name were working as moneyers in quick succession; on the other hand Ibba is a far from common name. Attempts to divide the coins of Ciolhard (who continued striking into Ceolwulf’s reign) into two groups on the basis of the various spellings of the proto- and deutero-theme (Ceol-, Ciol-, -hard, -heard) produced no conclusive results, but in this case the fact that the name is found over twenty-five years must make it possible that two men were involved. This, however, must at present remain quite uncertain as must the possible alternative suggestion in the case of Ibba that he moved from Canterbury to another mint. The evidence of find-spots, slight though it is, rather suggests that his later coins were not issued from Canterbury. The evidence of the later coins of Ciolhard, which are discussed below, points to a similar conclusion and in this case to the London mint.

The only other moneyers that need be discussed here are Eoba, Eanmund, and Wighard (Pl. I, Cn. 9; Pl. II, Cn. 19 and 21). The last two we attribute to London. This we have done in part on stylistic grounds and in part because of two coins of Coenwulf in their names that have the king’s bust. These are discussed below. Eoba may be accepted as a Canterbury moneyer; his name is found on coins issued by the Kentish kings Ecgberht and Heaberht.

First Coinage of Cuthred, King of Kent, without the bust (Pl. I)

Cuthred’s first coinage, which appears to have been inaugurated a year or two after his accession in 798 is, like that of Coenwulf, without bust. Basically there are two obverse and two reverse types, each with a number of minor variants which can be seen from the illustrations.

Obverse 1. Tribrach, with smaller tribrach in a circle in the centre (Pl. I, Cd. 11).
Obverse 2. Cross, with sometimes a pellet or a wedge in each angle (Pl. I, Cd. 8).

Reverse 1. Cross moline, in the centre a circle containing a cross or pellet (Pl. I, Cd. 10).

Reverse 2. Tribrach of varying forms, sometimes with a circle in the centre containing a pellet or a smaller tribrach (e.g. Pl. I, Cd. 6).

Both obverses are found combined with both reverses. All the coins of this issue are rare, in fact we can record no more than twenty-one specimens in all, by the moneyers Duda, Eaba, Seberht, Sigeberht, and Werheard and, since few are exact duplicates, it is probable that we have not as yet a representative selection of the entire issue. All these moneyers worked also for Coenwulf and it is apparent that Cuthred shared the Canterbury mint with his brother.

It will be noticed that on all these early coins the king is described as CVBRED REX in contrast to the portrait pieces where he is invariably described as REX CANT.

**Coinage of Archbishop Æthelheard with the name of Coenwulf (Pl. II)**

There must be some doubt as to which is the obverse and which the reverse on these early ecclesiastical issues on which the name of the moneyer does not appear, but we have followed Brooke in regarding the side with the name of the archbishop as the obverse and the side with the king’s name as the reverse.

The obverse type continues the legend that starts round the coin. In all but one case the letters in the centre are EP following the AR that ends the circumscription (Archiepiscopus) (Pl. II, AE. 1–2). The exception is a coin on which the whole of the circumscription is taken up with the archbishop’s name: as a result the letters in the centre become AR (Pl. II, AE. 3).

The reverse type generally shows a rounded M with an abbreviation mark over it, as on the coins of Coenwulf’s substantive tribrach issue (Pl. II, AE. 2), but a few show a tribrach, between the arms of which are the king’s name, title, and ethnic (Pl. II, AE. 1).

It is not apparent which reverse was used first. Coins with the tribrach have a Roman E in the obverse type which is the form found on Offa’s few coins with this type; on the reverse of these coins, moreover, it would seem that the engraver had difficulty in fitting so long a legend as COENVVLF REX M into the space available to him. In each case one of the Vs is relegated to a position near the centre and in one the X of REX is similarly placed. These two factors taken together might point to this being the earlier type.

The first point, however, is vitiated by the fact that it is extremely doubtful if there was any continuity between Æthelheard’s coinage in the name of Offa and his coinage in the name of Coenwulf. Æthelheard is known to have regarded London as a possible alternate seat for the Metropolitan and “towards the end of the eighth century there was a moment when the removal of the Archbishop’s seat from Canterbury (to London) was under serious consideration.” But it is doubtful if we are justified in taking this as evidence that, on Coenwulf’s losing Canterbury, Æthelheard moved his mint to London. It is on record that, during Eadberht’s usurpation, the archbishop fled to the Continent and it seems more likely that during this period his coining activities were suspended until Coenwulf recovered Canterbury.

---

1 Blunt, *Offa*, pl. vii, 137–8.  
As was the case with Iaenberht, none of the coins of Æthelheard have any indication of a moneyer's name. This suggests that, at this time, a single moneyer was working for the archbishop.

Æthelheard's death took place in 805, two years before the death of Cuthred. His successor's coins show affinities with the portrait coins of the Kentish king and, as none of the coins of Æthelheard does so, the change from the non-portrait to the portrait coins may have taken place about the time of his death in 805.

THE ROYAL MINT AT CANTERBURY AFTER c. 805

(PLATES II-IV AND TABLE D AFTER P. 72)

The starting-point for any attempt at identifying the products of the royal mint at Canterbury during this period must inevitably be the mint-signed coins of Ceolwulf, Baldred, and the profile Anonymous issue, and to a lesser extent, because it is further away in time, the Dorob C monogram type of Ecgberht. Only one moneyer (Sigestef) is known to have struck coins for Ceolwulf bearing the Canterbury mint-signature, and this exception seems to have been for a special reason which we discuss later; but five others (Diormod, Oba, Swelherd, Tidbearht, and Werheard) joined him in proclaiming the mint of origin of the profile Anonymous issue or of a clearly related group of portrait coins of Baldred. No moneyer, apart from these, is known to have taken part in this Anonymous issue (the facing Anonymous issue being evidently related to the archiepiscopal series), and coins of Baldred by other moneyers are quite distinct stylistically and, in our opinion, are not to be regarded as products of the Canterbury mint.

The same six moneyers also struck for Coenwulf and for Eggerht. Among the issues of Coenwulf that can be attributed to the later part of his reign, only one other moneyer (Dealla) struck coins that can be associated stylistically with those of the six moneyers, and he is not known after Coenwulf's death. In the early portrait Canterbury issue of Eggerht (Blunt Group 1)1 no other moneyer's name is found, and in the non-portrait issue (Group 2) a single new moneyer (Wulgar) is known. The pattern suggests that the complement of moneyers striking in the king's name at Canterbury at this time was, in fact, six, and by projecting stylistically forwards into the reign of Æthelwulf and backwards to the reign of Cuthred we are able to attribute to this mint a series of issues which may well have been struck by a group of moneyers that was, in general, of this size.

During this period the obverse types used by the Canterbury moneyers were, with few exceptions, common to them all. Standard reverse types were also used, although less consistently. The coinage of this mint can therefore be treated as a whole and considered chronologically.

Coenwulf and Cuthred: Introduction

During the reign of Coenwulf the coinage falls naturally into three main groups, the first of which (Group II) is distinguished by the small size of the flans (0.7-0.75 in.) and the general neatness of the portraiture. Coins of Cuthred of this group have, however, survived in appreciably greater numbers than those of Coenwulf, and its issue cannot long have outlasted the former's death in 807. Probably not later than c. 810 the flan

1 Blunt, Ecgberht, pp. 467 ff.
size was increased (0.75–0.85 in.) and new reverse types introduced, although the typical portrait of Group II continued in use for a time (Group III). The bulk of the large-flan issues, however, carried a new and less complex portrait (Group IV) and with its introduction the obverse inscription, which was previously interrupted as a general rule by the king’s bust, became continuous except on the coins of one moneyer (Oba). The portrait of Group IV continued in use into the reign of Ceolwulf, and indeed throughout the Anonymous issue also. At least two reverse types are found coupled with obverses of both Groups III and IV, and although this may merely mean that more than one reverse type was in issue simultaneously, the possibility must be admitted that the Group IV portrait was originally adopted concurrently with that of Group III. We have given the reverse types of Coenwulf alphabetical suffixes, but no indication of sequence is necessarily intended.

Coenwulf (II A) and Cuthred (II): Cross and Wedges type, c. 805–c. 810 (Pl. II)

On the coins of this type, which are struck on small flans and depict on the reverse a cross pommée with a wedge in each angle, the portrait is finely drawn and the obverse inscription is almost invariably divided by the king’s bust. On one variety of the moneyer Sigeberht (Cd. 20) the inscription begins at the king’s right shoulder, but the style of portraiture is unusual. On another variety of the same moneyer (Cd. 21) the inner circle is omitted on the obverse; otherwise it is always present. The moneyer’s name, where it ends in D or T, is always found in the genitive form, e.g. Verheardi moneta, ‘the money (or die) of Werheard’. The type is unlikely to have been introduced much before 805, since there is no corresponding portrait issue in the name of Archbishop Æthelheard and since we can, with reasonable confidence, attribute Archbishop Wulfred’s earliest coinage to the period of the Cross and Wedges issue.

Four moneyers (Beornfreth, Eaba, Sigeberht, and Werheard) are known to have struck this type for both Cuthred and Coenwulf, with in addition two (Duda and Heremod) for Cuthred alone and one (Seberht) for Coenwulf alone. It is probable that the type continued after Cuthred’s death in 807, because some coins in the name of Coenwulf (e.g. Cn. 24) are of rather less fine style than the majority of the coins of the issue. There is no historical reason why the two kings should not have shared the mint during Cuthred’s lifetime, but the survival of more than twice as many coins of Cuthred as of Coenwulf may be significant, and no die-links between coins of the two kings have yet been discovered.

Coenwulf (II B and C): Cross and Quatrefoil type and Sigeberht’s Triple Aura (Annulet-Triangle-Trefoil) type, c. 805–c. 810 (Pl. II)

There are two other types of Coenwulf, also struck on small flans, which seem to be contemporary with the Cross and Wedges issue. One of these was used by the moneyer Duda, who is not known for Coenwulf in the Cross and Wedges issue, nor in the later.
large-flan issues. The cross and wedges design is replaced by a cross and quatrefoil, with a pellet in each angle of the cross (Cn. 31), but the style of the obverse cannot be distinguished from that of the Cross and Wedges issue. Tidbearht—a new moneyer, who may have been Duda’s successor—struck coins with this reverse type, on one of which the spelling of his name without the A is unique (Cn. 33). Tidbearht’s coins, neither at this stage nor later, exhibit the genitive, but the small flan is sufficient to give the coin an early date. If the style of portrait be thought to be more in keeping with that on late coins of the reign, it is only necessary to consider its similarity to that on a Cross and Wedges coin by Seberht (Cn. 27) and on one of Cuthred by the moneyer Sigeberht (Cd. 20) and to note its finer engraving.

The second type is known only from a unique coin by Sigeberht himself, on which the reverse design is a combination of a trefoil, a triangle, and an annulet, superimposed on one another (Cn. 34). The inscription begins by the king’s right shoulder, but the temptation to associate it for this reason with later coins must be resisted, bearing in mind the small flan, the absence of any coins of later issues by Sigeberht, and the existence of the same feature on the coin of Cuthred just mentioned (Cd. 20) from which the design of the bust is clearly derived.

Coenwulf (IIIA and IVA): Pincer Cross type, c. 810-c. 820 (Pl. III)

The name we have given to this type, which is invariably found associated with the larger size of flan, represents an oversimplification of the design, which incorporates a cross and wedges within what can best be described as a pincer cross. It is the earliest type of a new moneyer, Diormod, and the latest of Beornfreth, the other known moneyers being Tidbearht and Werheard. Beornfreth appears to have ceased to be a moneyer before the introduction of the Group IV portrait, but what may be a transitional coin of his (Cn. 36) has the Group III portrait with the inscription unbroken. The moneyer’s name is no longer found in the genitive except on coins of Werheard of the earlier style (Cn. 39). The change of style coincides with a change in the last letter of moneta from a normal barred A to an inverted v, which is common also to Groups IVA to IVF below, although this alteration is not made in any A occurring in the moneyer’s name. Sometimes, too, the angular m replaces the rounded form.

Close dating of the Pincer Cross coins is difficult, particularly as coins of Group IV (Cn. 44-46) are predominant. On the basis of the number of surviving coins the issue must have been quite extensive, and probably began soon after the small-flan coins of Group II ceased to be struck. The change in style (assuming that there was no overlap) would seem to have occurred relatively early, and the type probably ceased to be issued before the introduction of the Crescent Cross type (Group IVD).

Coenwulf (IIB and IVB): Cross Moline types (excluding those of Oba), c. 815? (Pl. III)

A cross moline, without inner circle, is found associated with the earlier large-flan portrait on only two coins, by the moneyers Tidbearht and Werheard (Cn. 40-41). With inner circle it occurs on a small group of coins bearing the later portrait, all of which are by the moneyer Diormod and two of which are die-linked to Pincer Cross coins of the same moneyer (Cn. 47(a) to 44(d), and—illustrated—47(c) to 44(e)). It is possible that the coins of Group IIB are to be dated earlier than those of Group IIIA, and Group IVB later than Group IVA, but equally the Cross Moline and Pincer Cross
types might have been issued concurrently. No firm dating of the Cross Moline coins is therefore possible at this stage of our knowledge.

**Coenwulf (IIIc and IVc): Cross Crosslet types, c. 810-c. 820 (Pl. III)**

The use of the cross-crosslet design at Canterbury under Coenwulf was limited to the moneyer Dealla, who is the only moneyer of that king at this mint not known to have issued coins in the name of any other ruler. From the rarity of his coins with the earlier portrait (Cn. 42-43), it may perhaps be implied that he was not active until some time after the beginning of the large-flan coinage. For some reason he alone of the king’s Canterbury moneyers used dies which depicted the royal head without diadem—a characteristic feature of some of the Rochester issues of the time—and coins with this feature by Dealla (Cn. 53-55) are among the least rare issues of the reign. On some of his reverse dies the inscription is divided in three by crosses (e.g. Cn. 54). His Cross-Crosslet types must have extended over several years, in parallel with issues of different types by other moneyers.

**Coenwulf (IVd): Crescent Cross type, c. 820 (Pl. III)**

This type, having for its central reverse design four crescents back to back in cruciform, is known for the three moneyers of the Group IVA Pincer Cross coins, Diromod, Tidbeart, and Werheard, and also for Dealla (Cn. 56-59). It does not occur with the early portrait, and if confirmation of a late dating is needed, the type was copied at Rochester on Coenwulf’s latest coins of that mint and on coins of his successor.

**Coenwulf (IVE and IVF): ‘A’ type of Sigestef and Cross Fourchee type of Swefherd, c. 820 (Pl. III)**

These are the only known types struck for Coenwulf by their respective moneyers, who may be assumed to have been appointed in the last years of the reign. Sigestef’s type (Cn. 60) results from the detaching of the final letter of *moneta* from the circular inscription; he also used this type for Ceolwulf, and it was imitated at Rochester in that reign also. Swefherd’s is quite singular (Cn. 62).

**Coenwulf (IVG and IVH): Cross Moline and Cross and Wedges types of Oba, c. 815-c. 820 (Pl. III)**

Although Oba’s obverse dies conform in their portraiture to the general principles of Group IV, they were apparently prepared by a different engraver from that employed by the other moneyers. This engraver preferred to let the bust break the inscription, and to use a barred A in moneta instead of the inverted v typical of Group IV.

The most logical sequence of Oba’s types places first the Cross Moline coins with unbroken inscription and diamond-shaped o in Oba (Cn. 63-64), and second the coins of basically similar type but which have the inscription divided into three by crosses (Cn. 65). Finally there are the Cross and Wedges types on which the reverse inscription remains divided, but with the diamond-shaped o replaced by the round form (Cn. 67-69): modified in this way the divided inscription is also found on coins of the Anonymous issue (An. 3). An apparently transitional coin between Groups IVG and IVH has, in effect, a combination of the designs of both types, and carries the later form of divided inscription (Cn. 66).
Despite his use of the Cross and Wedges design, Oba cannot be regarded as other than a late moneyer of Coenwulf.

**Ceolwulf: Portrait issues, c. 821-2 (Pl. III)**

That only two Canterbury moneyers are known to have struck coins for Ceolwulf cannot be without significance. The volume of surviving coinage of Ceolwulf at Rochester and at the East Anglian and Mercian mints, and the number of coins of these two moneyers themselves, are sufficient to suggest that Oba and Sigestef were probably the only Canterbury moneyers who acknowledged the authority of Ceolwulf, and that we must look to the Anonymous issues for the bulk of the Canterbury coinage struck during this reign.

Oba’s portrait coins (Cl. 1) are from obverse dies cut by the same hand as those used by him for Coenwulf. The reverse type, a three-line inscription divided by hook-ended lines, is new and must be compared with the similar type used by the moneyer Eanwulf at Rochester and by some East Anglian moneyers, but Sigestef’s coins (Cl. 2) continue the reverse type he used for Coenwulf. There can have been little lapse of time between, for example, the engraving of the dies for Cn. 60 and Cl. 2, and in fact we have little doubt that Ceolwulf’s few portrait coins by Oba and Sigestef were struck early in his short reign.

**The Profile Anonymous issues and the Bonnet type of Baldred and Ecgberht, c. 822-c. 826 (Pl. IV)**

![Image of coins]

The Profile Anonymous type, bearing the name of the moneyer on the obverse in place of a king’s name and carrying the mint-signature *Dorobernia Civitas* in several lines on the reverse, was struck by at least five of the six moneyers active at Canterbury at the end of Coenwulf’s reign and during the years immediately following his death.

There are two different reverse varieties, one having the inscription in three lines, usually as *DOROBERNIA/CIVITAS* with a triangle of pellets above and below, and the other taking the form ++DOROBERNIA/CIVITAS with minor variations. Each obverse variety is found combined with both reverse varieties, although the evidence of the archiepiscopal series suggests that the second reverse variety was on the whole later than the first (see p. 21).
It can be divided into two main varieties, the first and clearly earlier variety having a bare, though diademed, head similar in style to that found on late coins of Coenwulf and on portrait coins of Ceolwulf (An. 1–7) and the second and later variety having an apparently covered head with diadem ties (An. 8–10). These will be referred to subsequently for convenience as Anonymous-Bare Head and Anonymous-Bonnet respectively, although no suggestion that the engraver really meant to depict any kind of headgear is intended.

Anonymous-Bare Head coins are known by Diormod, Oba, Sigestef, Swefherd, and Werheard, the portrait on Oba’s coins being of the distinctive form already noted for his coins of Coenwulf and Ceolwulf. Anonymous-Bonnet coins have survived from only two moneyers, Diormod and Swefherd. Tidbearht is not known for either variety.

Baldred’s Bonnet type portrait issue, with the moneyer’s name restored to the reverse and a necessarily shortened mint-signature (DR VR CITS and contraction marks, for Dorovernia Civitas) is, in our opinion, later in date than the Anonymous-Bonnet issue. Not only are the portraits on Baldred’s coins stylistically inferior to those on the Anonymous coins, but there is also a unique ‘mule’ of an Anonymous-Bonnet obverse with a Baldred reverse (An. 11), the obverse being evidently a later striking from the same die as An. 9–10, which are normal coins of the Anonymous issue with the full Dorovernia Civitas reverse. The archiepiscopal series provides supporting evidence for the order of these types, in the form of a sequence of moneyers which cannot be satisfactorily interpreted otherwise.¹

Five moneyers are known for this issue of Baldred, viz. Diormod, Oba, Sigestef, Swefherd, and Tidbearht. Of these, Oba’s coins are exceptional in still showing the head bare, though the portrait is less finely drawn than on his Anonymous coins. The king’s name is spelt Baldred on Oba’s and Tidbearht’s coins and on one variety of Diormod’s (Ba. 2) but is otherwise Beldred. No significance can be attached to the fact that Werheard, the missing moneyer, is also unknown for the Anonymous-Bonnet issue, because so few coins of either type have survived.

Ecgberht’s early portrait coins (Blunt Group 1) bear a very similar ‘bonneted’ head, although if anything the engraving is cruder than on Baldred’s coins. However, the reverse design, unlike Baldred’s, is not standardized. Each moneyer uses his own motif and with the exception of Diormod and Werheard, moneta is omitted. It is remarkable that the seven known specimens of this issue, which are of widely different provenances, are representative of no fewer than five moneyers (with Oba missing), and that they prove to be from only four obverse dies.² Statistically it is improbable that more than two or three obverse dies remain to be identified, and the issue must have been very brief indeed.

We thus have a group of portrait coins which span, at the most, a period of four years. Those of Baldred seem unlikely to have begun to be issued before 823. The Profile Anonymous issues, which are earlier, may have taken place largely, if not entirely, during the reign of Ceolwulf, but it is difficult to date them exactly in view of the conflicting evidence of the non-portrait coins of the period, which are discussed in the next section.

¹ Infra, p. 21. ² Of the coins listed on p. 468 of BNJ xxviii, there are obverse die-links between nos. 2 and 7, nos. 3 and 4, and nos. 5 and 6. No. 4 is Coats 529, no. 5 Hunter 530, and no. 7 is in the British Museum ex L. A. Lawrence (ill. above, fig. 1).
The non-portrait issues of Ceolwulf, Baldred, and Ecgberht, c. 822–c. 828 (Pl. IV)

For the first time since the Tribrach and related types of Coenwulf and Cuthred in the earliest years of the century, the Canterbury mint issued during Ceolwulf's reign a group of coins without the royal portrait. This group is further distinguished in that, whereas the king's name is always spelt CEOLVULF on portrait coins of the mint (as it is also on East Anglian coins), on the non-portrait coins it is invariably spelt CIOLVVLF (as also on all the coins we attribute to Rochester and London). Moreover, and again for the first time since the Tribrach issue, the word moneta is omitted from the reverse.

The omission characterizes the non-portrait issues in the names of Ceolwulf, Baldred, and Ecgberht. For this reason we group these issues together, and after describing them in detail, we discuss in the next section their relationship with each other and with the portrait issues of the same period.

The designs of Ceolwulf's non-portrait coins were apparently inspired by the issues of the London mint; as we point out elsewhere in this paper, the cross-crosslet, which is a feature of both the obverse and reverse of Cl. 4, the obverse of Cl. 3 and the reverse of Cl. 5, is commonly found on the reverse of coins of Coenwulf and Ceolwulf by the group of moneyers whom we associate with that mint. It is not found earlier at Canterbury except on coins of the moneyer Dealla and on one coin of Archbishop Wulfred. The obverse design of Cl. 5 seems likely to have originated at London, since not only is it used there by three moneyers but also Sigefest is at pains to record the Canterbury origin of his coins—the first time that an English penny bears the name of king, mint, and moneyer. The reverse design of the non-portrait coins of Oba (a cross with a pellet in each angle, and disconnected moline ends interrupting the inscription) bears a close resemblance to that on his non-portrait coins for Baldred, so close that it would be difficult to put forward any convincing chronology that did not place these issues adjacent to one another (cf. Cl. 3 and Ba. 8–11).

The obverse of Baldred's non-portrait issue is typically a plain cross within an inner circle, the inscription round the coin reading + BELDRED REX CANT. This design reflects that on contemporary Frankish coins, and the type is known for all six moneyers active at the time. In Werheard's case no coin is known with the ethnic, an omission applicable to some only of the coins of other moneyers (e.g. Ba. 12a, Sigefest). A variety by the moneyer Swefherd has a cross-crosslet in place of the plain cross (Ba. 14).

Diormod, Sigefest, Swefherd, and Werheard use a plain cross on the reverse also, though in Diormod's case (Ba. 7) the inscription is interrupted by a cruciform pattern of the initial cross and three forks attached to the inner circle. The close stylistic and epigraphical similarity between the reverses of these coins of Sigefest, Swefherd, and Werheard and some of those they struck for Ecgberht (whether portrait or non-portrait) is significant (cf. Ba. 12 and Ec. 1:6, Ba. 13 and Ec. 1:7, Ba. 16 and Ec. 2:13–14). Tidbearht's reverse design for Baldred is a cross with one forked limb (Ba. 15). This is not found on any of his coins for Ecgberht, but epigraphically there is a close resemblance.

Ecgberht's coins of Blunt, Group 2 need not be considered further here, except that...

---

2 We are uncertain whether this has any significance, e.g. in the context of trade with the Carolingians; though we consider this subject to be outside the scope of our paper.
3 Ec. 1:6 denotes Ecgberht, Group 1, no. 6 as listed in Blunt, *Ecgberht*, p. 468.
The relative chronology of the portrait and non-portrait issues after the death of Coenwulf, c. 821-c. 828

The stylistic patterns which emerge from the last two sections are clear but are difficult to interpret. They may be summarized as follows:

(a) **Portraiture.** The portraits on Ceolwulf’s coins are such that they must have followed closely Coenwulf’s latest coins. The Anonymous-Bare Head coins have a similar portrait and must be next in the portrait series. There is then a change to a covered head, soon followed by a deterioration in style, supporting the placing of the Baldred Bonnet type after the Anonymous-Bonnet coins; this is confirmed by the Sweferd ‘mule’ of the two issues and by the independent evidence of the archiepiscopal series. Ecgberht’s early portraits are similar to but, if anything, less neat than Baldred’s.

(b) **Omission of 'moneta'.** The omission of moneta is common to the non-portrait issues of Ceolwulf and Baldred and the non-portrait and early portrait issues of Ecgberht, although one moneyer (Diormod) does include it (as MNET) on his coins for Ecgberht. It is never excluded from coins of the other issues.

(c) **Standardization of reverse type.** The reverse type is standard for all moneyers in the Anonymous issues and Baldred’s Bonnet issue. Otherwise it varies from moneyer to moneyer.

(d) **Other reverse type affinities.** Oba’s non-portrait coins for Ceolwulf and Baldred are closely related; so are some of Sigestef’s for Ceolwulf to his early portrait coins for Ecgberht. The non-portrait coins for Baldred by Sweferd and Werheard are closely related to their early coins for Ecgberht.

(e) **Differences in spelling.** On Ceolwulf’s portrait coins, his name is spelt with an e, but on his non-portrait coins it is spelt with an i. On Baldred’s non-portrait coins his name is invariably spelt ‘Beldred’, but on his portrait coins it is sometimes spelt ‘Baldred’.
Dorovernia is spelt thus, by implication, on Baldred’s ‘Bonnet’ coins with the contracted form DRVR CITS. On Sigestef’s Rex Mercioru coins of Ceolwulf, and also on coins of the Anonymous issues, however, the v is replaced by b, and Ecgberht’s Donob C monogram (Blunt Group 3) depends upon the same substitution.

The difficulty is not in the chronology of the portrait issues and the non-portrait issues separately, but in their relationship to each other. This can be seen from the discordant effect created by the non-portrait issues in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Ecgberht</th>
<th>Baldred</th>
<th>Ceolwulf</th>
<th>Anonymous-Bonnet</th>
<th>Anonymous-Portrait</th>
<th>Baldred Non-portrait</th>
<th>Ceolwulf Non-portrait</th>
<th>Anonymous-Bone</th>
<th>Other moneyers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portrait</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard reverse type</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moneta</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorovernia</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigestef</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other moneyers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* denotes that the feature occurs regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ denotes that the feature does not occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>† denotes that the feature occurs irregularly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If our interpretation of the numismatic and historical material is correct, the coinage of Ceolwulf and Baldred and the Anonymous issues are all to be dated to the four years 821-5. We do not know how great the demand for coin was during this period, and therefore we cannot tell whether individual dies were, as a rule, worn out within a few weeks or used spasmodically over a period of several months or more. There are, in fact, substantial difficulties in the way of forming the portrait and non-portrait issues into a single consecutive series. On the basis of style and typological affinities, it would appear by no means unlikely that portrait and non-portrait dies were being cut and used simultaneously, at least under Baldred and at the beginning of Ecgberht’s rule in Kent.

There is no reason why a mint should not at this stage have struck parallel series of different type, though in this case such would seem likely to have derived from policy rather than accident. Since the output of the Canterbury royal mint had become relatively standardized in the ninth century, some reason should probably be sought beyond the alternate availability of two die-cutters with different tastes in types and spelling. The affinity of the non-portrait issues with contemporary Carolingian types could be a relevant factor.

However this may be, a case could be made out for Ceolwulf’s non-portrait coins having been rather later in date than his portrait coins. Not only is there a change in the spelling of the king’s name and a resemblance to the non-portrait coins of Baldred and Ecgberht, but also the moneyers Oba and Sigestef, who alone struck for Ceolwulf, are at present unknown for the rare ‘Anonymous-Bonnet’ issue. To place Ceolwulf’s non-portrait coins later than any of the anonymous coinage would, however, throw the problem of the raison d’être of the latter and the attitude of the moneyers Oba and Sigestef into higher relief, and we doubt whether a purely numismatic solution is possible at this stage of our knowledge.
Ecgberht and Æthelwulf, c. 828-c. 840.

Although not strictly within the scope of this paper, we think it desirable to record briefly the immediate effect on the classification of the remaining coins of Ecgberht and the early issues of Æthelwulf which our research appears to produce. It would not, however, be appropriate to develop the subject here in any detail.

The transitional Canterbury issues of Blunt Groups 1 and 2 of Ecgberht gave way probably quite quickly to the standardized monogram type of Group 3, which seems then to have lasted until the end of the reign; reasons are given in the Rochester section of this paper for the attribution of Group 4 to that mint. Æthelwulf's first Canterbury issue was, we think, the non-portrait Saxoniourum type with moneyer's name, of which only two specimens occurred in the Middle Temple hoard. Of the remaining 26 coins of the reign in that hoard at least 22, and perhaps all 26, are in our opinion to be associated with the Rochester mint, and it may be that, at least in respect of its Æthelwulf component, this hoard was gathered in an area where Rochester coins were more plentiful than those of Canterbury. Subsequent issues of the Canterbury mint are to be seen in the types which have in a recent paper1 been shown to be stylistically related to the Saxoniourum type.

ARCHBISHOP WULFRED’S MINT AT CANTERBURY (805–32)

(PLATE VIII AND TABLE E, P. 73)

I. Coins omitting a moneyer's name (c. 805–?)

None of the coins of Wulfred's predecessors, Æanberht and Æthelheard, bore either a portrait or a moneyer's name. They all, however, included the name and title of the Mercian king. The omission of the moneyer's name may thus have been due to lack of space, or—perhaps more probably—to the archbishop having had only one moneyer, since, when the royal authority was omitted by Wulfred, his earliest coins included not a moneyer's name, but the mint-signature (itself in a sense superfluous). An early date for these coins (Wu. 1 and 2) can be sustained on grounds other than the omission of the moneyer's name. For example, the small flan size is similar to that of Cuthred and Coenwulf's Cross and Wedges issue and of the associated issues of Coenwulf that link with it. The portrait and bust2 are drawn with more attention to detail than on other coins of Wulfred, as can be instanced by the inclusion of the crosses on the pallium on no. 2a.

The readings are in full, viz. VVLFREDI ARCHIEPISCOPI on the obverse, DOROVERNIAE CIVITATIS on the reverse. The use of the genitive on the obverse is noteworthy. It does not occur on his subsequent issues nor indeed on any other English coin. Unparalleled at this stage in the English series also is the genitive form of the mint-name and designation on the reverse.3

Of the reverse designs, the cross-crosset motif (Wu. 1) is reminiscent of early coins

2 The tonsured head would seem to have been inspired by the earliest portrait on a papal coin, that of Adrian I (d. 795).
II and III. The First Monogram type (before 823)

The introduction of the moneyer’s name relegated the mint-signature to the central design, usually in monogrammatic form. The first and commonest of such types of Archbishop Wulfred is easily distinguished from a later, Second Monogram, type (group VII) by its complexity. The coins are struck on larger flans than the previous issue, and the archbishop’s bust usually breaks the obverse inscription, which is thus shortened to VVLFRED ARCHIEPI (group III). The lack of any contraction mark over the D suggests that the genitive form was not intended (Wu. 4–8).

A transitional group (II), however, significant for the chronology of the series, continues the full legend of group I, though the lettering on both sides is larger, and on some specimens the inscriptions begin at irregular points in relation to the types. The bust, though still wholly contained within the circumscription, is less intricate and has a large pellet each side of the cheek (Wu. 3). Coins of group I and some of group II have a straight fringe of hair across the forehead, whereas in group III the hair is peaked between the eyebrows. The letter M of Moneta is of rounded form, and the final A is barred or unbarred. The left o in the monogram is diamond-shaped. Saeberht is the only moneyer of group II.

Group III, the normal First Monogram type, is more plentiful and saw the appearance of a second moneyer, Swefherd. Indications of sequence can be gained from comparison with the regal series, where the final A on the reverse took on a distinctive, unbarred form during the currency of the Pincer Cross type, and rounded M gave way to the Roman form; both these developments can be noted in Wulfred’s group III. An early indicator also is the diamond-shaped left o in the reverse monogram. Coins with all three early features, rounded M, barred A, and diamond o, sometimes singly, sometimes in combination, are known for both moneyers. Another feature—this perhaps a late one—which occurs on some coins of both moneyers is the inclusion of triple pellets in the field on either side of the archbishop’s face (Wu. 6 and 8); the obverse dies of one moneyer, Luning, in group IV exhibit a similar ornamentation. Swefherd presumably began to coin quite soon after the start of group III, but on the evidence of surviving coins, and if our criteria of relative chronology are valid, his main activity seems to have been concentrated rather later in the group.

The precise dating of the First Monogram type must remain an open question. We have no doubt that it preceded the Anonymous issue, and we therefore date it before

---

1 e.g. Hunter 392 (Blunt, Offa, 135).
2 There are difficulties in its exact interpretation. Doeswenna could be read from the main pattern, except that it apparently lacks an E and on some specimens the diagonals are not joined to the upright to form V and A. The loose C and V perhaps stand separately for Civitas.
3 Copied, perhaps, from the pendants on Byzantine imperial portraits (J. P. C. Kent in Anglo-Saxon Coins, p. 14).
Were it not for the historical evidence, it would have been natural to suggest a dating of c. 815 to c. 822 by analogy with the regal coinage, but in the face of Wulfred's known quarrel with Coenwulf from 817 to 821 this dating is difficult to accept. It could be that the type was issued both before and after the quarrel, and that the bulk of Swefherd's coins, and those of Saeberht's which resemble them, are to be dated to the later period.

IV. Anonymous (Tonsured Head) issue (c. 822–3)

Although it is tempting to associate it with the quarrel of 817–21, there can be no doubt, in view of the close similarity between the reverses, that the Anonymous (Tonsured Head) issue (group IV) (Wu. 9–14) is the archiepiscopal counterpart of the regal Anonymous issues, and it can therefore be dated with confidence to the period when the Canterbury moneyers were disinclined to acknowledge Ceolwulf any longer but had not accepted the authority of Baldred.

As in the regal series, there is a deterioration in style during the course of the archiepiscopal issue. At first the moneyers Saeberht and Swefherd used dies which seem to have been prepared by the engraver of the later First Monogram dies. The obverses, which show the archbishop's tonsured bust enclosed within an inner circle, have not only the double necklines which are characteristic of the type, but also two curved horizontal lines of drapery, and the reverses include the mint-signature in three lines, with triple pellets above and below (Wu. 9, 10). Towards the end of this phase (i), Saeberht appears to have been replaced by a new moneyer, Luning (Wu. 11).

In phase (ii) the horizontal drapery is omitted and the portrait becomes a mere caricature. On the reverse the mint-signature is extended so that the final s is on a line by itself, flanked by two pellets, as is the cross which precedes the inscription. The moneyers are Swefherd and Luning (Wu. 12, 13), until at the very end of the issue Luning gives way to another new moneyer, Vilnod, of whom only one specimen of this issue is known (Wu. 14).

V. Transitional and VI. The Baldred type (c. 823–c. 825)

Group IV was replaced by a new type which we have designated the Baldred type (group VI) because the reverse design is identical to that of Baldred's Bonnet issue—viz. the contracted mint-signature DRVR CITS in two lines within an inner circle. The obverse follows the style of portraiture of the second phase of group IV, but this becomes progressively more degraded: the bust remains within the inner circle, frequently with pellets in the field, and the archbishop's name and title are restored in the form VVLFRED ARCHIEPIS. The moneyers are Swefherd and Vilnod (Wu. 17 and 18).

At about the time of the change from group IV to VI, and perhaps transitionaly between them, occur two varieties of hybrid coin (group V), both with reverses appropriate to and probably belonging to group IV, phase (ii). One (group V, i) is apparently a direct mule—group VI/group IV (ii) (Wu. 15). The other variety (group V, ii) consists of two curious coins (Wu. 16a and b) bearing simply the name VVLFRED around a bust which extends to the edge of the coin, coupled with an 'Anonymous' reverse of the second phase; these appear to be hybrids, for there is no moneyer's name and the obverse dies seem to have been altered. There is also a true coin of group VI from an obverse die that shows signs of alteration and may, in fact, previously have borne a moneyer's name (Wu. 17a).
VII. The Second Monogram type (c. 830).

Only one coin of Wulfred is known of a type which can definitely be attributed to the period after Egbert of Wessex assumed power in Kent (Wu. 19). It bears on the obverse a crude bust of the archbishop which extends to the edge of the coin, with the inscription PLFRED ARCEPS, and on the reverse the Dorob C monogram of group 3 of Egbert. The moneyer is Svefherd, spelt in this instance as SPEFHEARD. From its similarity to a coin of Archbishop Ceolnoth of similar reverse type by the moneyer Wunhere (BMC pl. xiii, 7) it can be dated to the last years of Wulfred's archiepiscopate; it has little, if any, affinity with group VI. The rarity of this 'Second Monogram' type suggests either that the 'Baldred' type continued for some years after 825, or that the archbishop's coinage rights were not immediately confirmed by Egbert. Numismatically the latter explanation is to be preferred, for such indications as there are from the surviving coins suggest that the precedent created by the Anonymous issues in the alignment of the reverse designs of royal and ecclesiastical coins was followed for a time at least.

THE MINT OF ROCHESTER

(PLATES IV AND V AND TABLE F, P. 74)

The existence of a mint at Rochester in the early 820's is evidenced by two surviving coins of Ceolwulf bearing the ancient name of the city, Dorobrevia (Pl. V, Cl. 17–18). A small group of coins of Egbert inscribed with an abbreviation of Sanctus Andreas Apostolus has also been recognized as a product of this mint, and the absence of a moneyer's name on these as well as on the Dorobrevia coins has been interpreted as indicating a one-moneyer mint.1

These coins cannot be separated stylistically from a substantial group of coins of Coenwulf, Ceolwulf, Baldred, Egbert, and Æthelwulf by moneyers named Ealhstan, Dun(un), Eanwulf, Ethelmod, Cobba, and Beagmund. This group, which from the inclusion of coins of Baldred must be regarded as Kentish, is nevertheless set apart from the issues of the Canterbury mint in type, in spelling of the kings' names,2 in the absence of an anonymous issue, and—initially—in the use of engraved lettering. Furthermore, the relative commonness of coins of Ceolwulf in this group as compared with those of Baldred is in marked contrast to the corresponding rarity of Canterbury coins of Ceolwulf.

The Grateley Laws of Æthelstan show that, in the mid-tenth century, the king had two moneyers at Rochester and the bishop one. We know of no reason why, a century earlier, there should not similarly have been two issuing authorities, and it is our belief that the coins without moneyer's name are to be regarded as episcopal and the others as royal issues of the Rochester mint. The case for the 'St. Andrew' coins being an ecclesiastical issue is strong, for Rochester Cathedral is dedicated to that saint and there is a reference in a charter dating from the mid-ninth century to a community of

1 Blunt, Egbert, p. 473.
2 Ceolwulf's name is invariably spelt CEOLWULF, always ECGBEORHT.
St. Andrew; it would indeed be surprising if there could have been an episcopal mint in the second city of Kent in the absence of a mint there for the king. The normal establishment of moneyers for the king at Rochester during the period under review was, as we endeavour to demonstrate below, apparently two. This complement, coupled with a single moneyer for the bishop, shows a noteworthy correspondence to the Grateley figures. The coinage of this mint does not fall into such clear typological divisions as that at Canterbury, but nevertheless it is possible to consider it in sequence without the necessity for reviewing the issues of each moneyer separately.

Coenwulf (I): Early issues, c. 810–c. 820 (Pl. IV/V)

No coins of Cuthred can convincingly be assigned to Rochester. Those of the moneyer Sigeberht, as has been pointed out above, can be distinguished in some respects from the coins of the other Canterbury moneyers, but not to such an extent that they must be regarded as incompatible with a Canterbury attribution. The earliest coin of the moneyers which we associate with Rochester is by Ealhstan, and apparently copies the Cross and Wedges type of Canterbury, although modifying it into a cross with pellets (Cn. 70). The flan is small, the dies apparently engraved, and the bust divides the inscription.

Later coins of this group by Ealhstan have larger flans and the portraiture is much cruder. One coin repeats the reverse design of the previous one (Cn. 71) and others bear a cross moline (Cn. 72) and a cross-crosset (Cn. 75); all these are from engraved dies. A variety which is probably transitional between Groups I and II has a cross pattée and wedges on the reverse and the obverse inscription begins by the king’s right shoulder instead of being divided by the bust (Cn. 76); punches appear to have been employed in the lettering.

Probably also to be included in this group are two pieces by Dun bearing cross-crossetlets on the reverse. One of these (Cn. 73) is from dies which are of better workmanship than is normally found at Rochester at this time. The portrait was probably cut by the engraver of the normal Group IV Canterbury portrait and punches were undoubtedly used, yet the bust divides the legend, a feature unknown in Group IV Canterbury coins except those of the moneyer Oba, who used a different engraver. The other variety is, however, clearly struck from dies not made at Canterbury (Cn. 74); the inscription, which begins by the right shoulder, is engraved. It seems probable that both coins are by the same moneyer, and are both to be attributed to Rochester even though Canterbury may have supplied the dies for one of them.

Coenwulf (II): Late issues, c. 820 (Pl. V)

The late issues are distinguished by the similarity of the portraits, and of one of the two types, to those of Ceolwulf. The obverse inscription invariably begins by the king’s right shoulder, and the portraiture is similar to but cruder than that of Group IV at Canterbury. Both Dun (as Dunn) and Ealhstan use variants of the Canterbury Crescent Cross type (Cn. 77–81) and on one coin Ealhstan adopts a cross potent with an open lozenge in the centre (Cn. 82). Punched lettering has now become standard.

2 This point was not considered in the discussion of the minting-place of Ecgberht, Group 4 in Blunt, *Ecgbert*, pp. 471–2.
3 Supra, p. 11.
Ceolwulf (I): With bust, c. 821–3 (Pl. V)

Ceolwulf’s coins fall into two groups which are not necessarily chronological; one where the king is shown with bust as on coins of Coenwulf, and the other where there is a head only, within an unbroken inner circle. The portraiture in both cases is rudimentary.

The first group is known for Dun and Ealhstan, and for a new moneyer, Eanwulf. Dun uses an alpha and omega design (Cl. 6), while Ealhstan on one type brings the ta or the A of moneta into the centre (Cl. 7–8) as does Sigestef at Canterbury, and on another continues the cross and crescents design (Cl. 9). Eanwulf also adopts the A of moneta for one of his types, although in one case (Cl. 10) a superfluous A is retained in the inscription. Another coin (Cl. 12) carries his name and moneta in three lines in similar fashion to Oba’s portrait coins for Ceolwulf at Canterbury.

Ceolwulf (II): With head, c. 821–3 (Pl. V)

This group is known from two coins of Ealhstan with cross-crosslet (Cl. 13), one of Eanwulf with central A (Cl. 14) and another with a crescent cross design (Cl. 15), and a single coin by a new moneyer, Ethelmod, also with central A (Cl. 16). In addition there are the two coins bearing the mint-name but no moneyer’s (Cl. 17–18) which have already been associated with the bishop’s mint; one of these has the TAS of Cibitas in the centre, and the other an A. The similarity between the obverses of these seven coins leaves no room for doubt that they all belong to the same mint.

No coins are known of either Ealhstan or Eanwulf after Ceolwulf’s reign: Ethelmod seems to have replaced them both. It is difficult to say whether Eanwulf succeeded Ealhstan or whether the complement of moneyers was temporarily increased to three to meet the extra demand for coin which there seems, on the evidence of the surviving coins, to have been at this time, presumably because of the equivocacy of the Canterbury mint.¹

Baldred (I): With Rex H, c. 823–5 (Pl. V)

The significance of the title which distinguishes this group is not clear. If it refers to the Saxon name for the city, Hrofesceastre, it may infer that Baldred was not at the time in control of the whole of Kent; we defer a detailed discussion of this subject to a later section of the paper.²

The portrait (which includes bust) is neater than on Ceolwulf’s coins, and is unusual in the use of a rounded M to form an ear and the neckline. The letter R always appears virtually as F. Four coins of Dun(un) are known, and two of Ethelmod. Two of Dun(un)’s have a cross moline on the reverse (Ba. 17–18), one has a wheel design (Ba. 19), and the design on the fourth, a fragment, is uncertain (Ba. 20). Ethelmod’s coins both have the wheel design (Ba. 21).

Baldred (II): With Rex alone, c. 823–5 (Pl. V)

In this case the bust is more characteristic of the mint, and the lettering is normal. The three known specimens are all by Ethelmod, with the wheel design (Ba. 22–24). On the last of these the king’s name is spelt Bealdred.

No obviously episcopal coins of Baldred’s reign are known.

¹ Vide infra, p. 41.
² Infra, p. 41.
The coins of Ecgberht which we now assign to a royal mint at Rochester are those of Blunt Group 4. They comprise portrait types of Dun(un) and Ethelmod and non-portrait types of Ethelmod and two new moneyers, Cobba and Beagmund. The attribution of five coins with no moneyer’s name but with the name of St. Andrew to an episcopal mint has already been mentioned.

\[\text{Ecgberht} \text{ (St. Andrew)} \quad \text{RCL 459}\]
\[\text{Æthelwulf} \text{ (Beagmund)} \quad \text{BMA 419}\]
\[\text{Æthelwulf} \text{ (Occid. Sax)} \quad \text{BM}\]
\[\text{Æthelwulf} \text{ (Beagmund)} \quad \text{Coats 539}\]
\[\text{Æthelwulf} \text{ (Brid)} \quad \text{RCL 463}\]
\[\text{Berhtwulf} \text{ (Brid)} \quad \text{RCL 596}\]

The Middle Temple hoard contained no fewer than twenty-two portrait coins of Æthelwulf by Beagmund and Dun. One of these, by Beagmund, bears the same reverse design as, and is stylistically very similar to, a St. Andrew coin of Ecgberht (Fig. 3), thus providing further evidence for the location of the two mints in the same city.

Later, non-portrait, issues of Beagmund and Dun and certain other moneyers, which were not represented in the Middle Temple hoard, may also be attributed to Rochester. These have a distinctive style of lettering which, as has already been noted, is also found on the unsigned Saxoniorum Occidentalium issue, four specimens of which were in the hoard, and is an indication that this issue may have emanated from the bishop’s mint in Rochester. The subsequent history of the two Rochester mints is beyond the scope of this study but it seems at least possible that Berhtwulf had coinage rights there since, on grounds of style, Brid appears to be a Rochester moneyer (Fig. 3).

---

**EAST ANGLIA**

(PLATES V AND VI AND TABLE G, P. 74)

The recognition of coins in the name of Mercian kings, which linked with others in the name of an historically unknown king Æthelstan and, through Æthelweard, with the historically known king Eadmund of East Anglia (855-69), has for some time secured general acceptance of the idea that Coenwulf, Ceolwulf, and Beornwulf issued coins at Canterbury and the other at Rochester. Admittedly both occur in the Dun-b-Cant issue; however, Dun-b-Cant can equally well serve as an abbreviation for Rochester as for Canterbury. Cant presumably denotes Kent.

---

2 It seems clear, however, that the two officinae distinguished by Dolley and Skaare for much of Æthelwulf’s reign are, in fact, two different mints, one
from a mint in East Anglia. More recently coins of Offa have also been attributed to this mint. We find no difficulty in accepting Brooke’s attributions to East Anglia but we believe that his list should be extended. In particular we would reinstate Eadwald as an (historically unknown) king of East Anglia, reigning c. 796–8. This attribution was rejected by Brooke who included him in his list of kings of Kent as an historically unknown king who ruled ‘c. 798–801?’ on the grounds, amongst others, that ‘history seems to leave a gap between Eadberht and Cuthred which his coins are capable of filling’. Current thinking does not accept this ‘gap’: the Handbook of British Chronology (1961) accepts without reservation that Cuthred acceded in 798.

Numismatically the most significant evidence is Eadwald’s unique coin by the moneyer Wihtred (Pl. VI, Ea. 3). This moneyer links unquestionably with the East Anglian series on his coins for Coenwulf and Ceolwulf (which were accepted as such by Brooke) and it is quite inconsistent to separate his solitary coin in the name of Eadwald from his other issues.

We would also attribute to an East Anglian mint the coins struck by Lul for Coenwulf (Pl. V, Cn. 97-98). This follows in part from our attribution of the coins of Eadwald, Lul’s coins for Coenwulf having the same reverse type, and in part from their being stylistically so distinct from the coins that may be associated with Canterbury.

The moneyer Werbald Brooke regarded as of Canterbury. We believe he worked in East Anglia. The conclusive evidence would lie in finding his name on a coin of Æthelstan but this is not recorded; however, the style of his coins (Pl. VI, Cl. 29, Be. 1, L. 3) is the crude one associated with East Anglia and the reverse type with the moneyer’s name in three lines across the field is closely paralleled on coins of Æthelstan’s by the moneyers Eadgar and Monna. Such find-spots as there are support this attribution.

Brooke sought to divide the coins by the moneyer Eadnoth between Canterbury and East Anglia. Some of those struck by him for Beornwulf and the solitary surviving one for Ludica he attributed to Canterbury; others of Beornwulf and, of course, those in the name of Æthelstan he attributed to East Anglia. The division in the coins of Beornwulf he based on style. Those he attributed to East Anglia were, he says, ‘similar in style but of coarse work, with different style of portrait’. We do not believe that this distinction can be sustained. The coin illustrated by Brooke as of Canterbury (Pl. VI, Be. 3) is remarkably similar in style to coins by other moneyers that he attributed to East Anglia (e.g. Pl. VI, Be. 2). At a time when so few moneyers were working, the strongest evidence would be needed before one could accept the seemingly arbitrary division of coins in the name of one moneyer between two mints at the same point of time. We cannot see that this evidence exists.

We give below the moneyers who, we believe, may properly be associated with East Anglia. Clearly their coins form a homogeneous group and, we believe also, came from a single mint. It may be significant that, when mint-names first appear in any number on the coins in the time of Æthelstan (King of All England), a single mint served the whole of the former kingdom of East Anglia as compared with a widespread network in other parts of England. It is likely that this reflected an earlier practice.

1 See Blunt, Offa, p. 49.
2 For Brooke’s full argument see his English Coins, pp. 15–16. His argument that similar coins by the moneyer Lul are found in the name of Offa is, of course, vitiated if it is accepted that these too are East Anglian. (See Anglo-Saxon Coins, pp. 49–50.)
3 English Coins, p. 28.
4 Lockett sale, 2671.
5 English Coins, pl. viii. 8.
6 Ibid., p. 28.
We have listed the coins by moneyers because we believe that this best demonstrates the essential continuity of the series. Table G at the end of this paper also brings this out.

**Lul** (Pl. V). A moneyer already known for Offa. A coin of exactly similar type was struck by him for Eadwald (Ea. 2) and, with a similar reverse, for Coenwulf (Cn. 98). The coins of the last named, which must have been issued early in his reign, show a crude bust on the obverse, at a time when the corresponding Canterbury issues bore no bust, and it is interesting to note, even at this early date, the preference in East Anglia for coins with the royal bust, a feature very noticeable in the tenth century. Lul discontinued striking relatively early in Coenwulf's reign.

**Eadnoth** (Pl. V). This moneyer is not known for Offa, but two (possibly three) specimens of those he struck for Eadwald have survived (Ea. 1). They are similar in type to Lul's. A moneyer of this name is found striking for Beornwulf but, since there is a gap of some twenty-five years between the two issues, is likely to have been another man of the same name.

**Wihtred** (Pl. VI). A moneyer of Offa's, who produced a coin for Eadwald (Ea. 3) of the same type as his coins for Offa. He also worked for Coenwulf and for Ceolwulf. His latest issues for Coenwulf (Cn. 110) can be identified because a similar type is struck by Wodel for both kings (Cn. 113, Cl. 31). His intermediate issues, all of which are represented today by one, or at most two, surviving specimens, show a variety of reverse types, most of which are exclusive to this moneyer (Cn. 103-9). Cn. 109 approaches the type that links with Ceolwulf and so must also be late. Wihtred continued striking under Ceolwulf. Two coins are known, of generally similar style, with the moneyer's name in three lines between two crook-ended lines (Cl. 30).

**Fotred or Botred** (Pl. V). A moneyer spelling his name Botred had already worked for Offa in a group attributed to the East Anglian mint and dated c. 790-c. 792. Whether this is the same man as the Botred or Fotred found on coins of Coenwulf and Ceolwulf must remain doubtful. There would appear, if he were so, to have been an interruption in his activities. His output in any case would seem to have been small. Of Coenwulf three coins are known (Pl. V, Cn. 99-100). On the first he spells his name Botred; on the other two Fotred. This latter spelling is found on his only coin in the name of Ceolwulf (Pl. V, Cl. 25).

**Wodel** (Pl. VI). This moneyer started relatively late in Coenwulf's reign and was active in Ceolwulf's. All his coins for Coenwulf show some form of cross, voided in the centre (Cn. 111-13); the reverse of the last is almost identical with that of a unique Ceolwulf coin (Cl. 31). Wodel's more plentiful issue for Ceolwulf has the reverse with the moneyer's name in three lines (sometimes spelt Woddel) between two crook-ended lines (Cl. 32).

**Hereberht** (Pl. VI). This moneyer struck two distinctive types for Coenwulf (Cn. 101-2), both of crude workmanship. The former, with cross-crosslet on the reverse, has very similar, and indeed may even be the same, one of us is not convinced of their identity. However, the value of the connexion between coins of the two reigns remains.

---

1 See, for example, *English Coins*, pl. v. 20.
4 R. H. M. Dolley (BNJ xxviii. 247) has claimed this to be a die-link; whilst the dies are undoubtedly
a meretricious finish of a kind to make it suspect, but fortunately an unquestionable hoard provenance for one specimen removes any doubts as to authenticity. Two specimens of the second type are recorded both from the same reverse die: five of the first from four obverse and four reverse dies. Under Ceolwulf, Hereberht seems also to have been a relatively prolific moneyer; nine specimens are recorded, all of the same type (Cl. 28). Five obverse and six reverse dies have been noted.

This completes the list of East Anglian moneyers known to have worked for Coenwulf.

EACGA? (Pl. VI). The name of this moneyer must remain doubtful. On his only surviving coin of Ceolwulf (Cl. 26) it may be read EACGV; on the four known coins in the name of Beornwulf (Be. 2) it may be read GAFVC (twice), FYCGV, and EFYCV. In all cases the G is of the minuscule form. All are the same type with a cross-crosslet on the reverse.

EADGAR (Pl. VI). Four coins in the name of Ceolfwulf are recorded of this moneyer, from three pairs of dies (Cl. 27). Two coins, from different dies, are found in the name of Beornwulf (Be. 5). These six coins are all of the same general type with a crudely drawn bust on the obverse and, on the reverse, the moneyer’s name in two lines with a variety of ornaments in between. Eadgar’s name is found on a coin of Ludica and on a fragment which clearly belongs to this series but cannot be attributed with certainty (L. 1a and b).

The fragment (L. 1b) has hitherto been attributed to Cuthred. It came to the British Museum in 1950 from the L. A. Lawrence collection without provenance, but may confidently be equated with Carlyon-Britton 1617 (b) and Rashleigh 84. In both sale catalogues the moneyer’s name was read EABBA. Eaba (though his name is never found with BB on the coins) was a moneyer of Cuthred’s and, as the opening letters of the king’s name are clearly cv and the third may be a b, the attribution to Cuthred seems reasonable enough. Stylistically, however, the coin stands apart from the whole of the Kentish series but fits naturally into that of the East Angles. Close examination of the moneyer’s name reveals that, while the third letter could be a b, it is more likely to be a slightly damaged d. The fourth letter is at least as likely to be a g as a b and, having in mind Eadgar’s coin of the same type that bears Ludica’s name in full (L. 1a), we believe the correct reading to be -EADGAR(MONI)TA. On the obverse all that can be seen with certainty is +CV-. So little can be seen of the third letter that it is not possible to say with confidence what it is, but it could equally well, amongst others, be a D or a D.

In seeking to interpret the legend, regard must be had to the fact that Eadgar was a notoriously careless moneyer. On a coin of Beornwulf (Be. 5b) he uses a Δ as the initial letter of the king’s name and on another of the same type (no. 5a) the initial letter appears to be d. There are, moreover, cases in the East Anglian series where c is demonstrably used in place of l. This occurs, for example, on the obverse of two of Wihtred’s coins (Cn. 104-5) where the king’s name is spelt COENVVCF.

Finally, were the coin an issue of Cuthred’s, it would be unique among his ‘portrait’ coins in not reading rex Cant. On Eadgar’s coin which bears the name of Ludica in full the obverse legend ends, as on the fragment, rex.

While the attribution cannot be established with certainty, we feel on the evidence available that it is better placed among the coins of Ludica than among those of Cuthred to which it bears no resemblance. Eadgar’s name is also found on coins of Æthelstan
of East Anglia. 1 On the Ludica, the fragment, and one of the coins of Æthelstan the reverse type is a cross-crosslet and it will be apparent that the three coins are stylistically closely linked.

It is possible that Eacga and Eadgar are different forms of the same name. Professor Whitelock has very kindly told us that in The Place-names of Devon (EP-NS, p. 77) it is suggested that Yagland is 'Eagga's Land' with Eagga as a pet form of Eadgar. The spelling CG on the coin for GG need present no difficulty; one can compare froega and Bugan beside frogga and Buggan, & c. The two names begin at about the same time on the coins but Eadgar continues after Eacga had dropped out. They may represent the same moneyer since it is hardly to be expected that two with such similar names would be working in a mint which seems at its zenith to have employed no more than seven moneyers. Stylistically, however, the coins differ radically and the possibility of their being separate moneyers cannot be ignored.

WERBALD (Pl. VI). This moneyer struck for Ceolwulf, Beornwulf, and Ludica. His coins are all of one type with the moneyer's name in three lines on the reverse. Of Ceolwulf three specimens are known (Cl. 29) and of Beornwulf, four (Be. 1). Of Ludica there is a solitary specimen (L. 3). The find-spots are significant. One of the Ceolwulf's was in Roach Smith's collection and is therefore probably a London find; another is from Burgh Castle near Great Yarmouth. One of the Beornwulf's was from Hadstock, Essex, another from near Cambridge. The find-spots of the remainder are not recorded. While Werbald is not found striking for the East Anglian kings, a link is provided with the coins of Æthelstan by the moneyers Eadgar and Mon(na) referred to above and below where the name is similarly spread across the field.

EADNOTH (Pl. VI). This moneyer's name reappears under Beornwulf (Be. 3) (it has already been suggested that he cannot be the same man as the moneyer of this name who struck for Eadwald). He also struck for Ludica (L. 2) and for Æthelstan of East Anglia. 2 All his coins for the Mercian kings are of the same type with a cross-crosslet on the reverse. Find-spots again are outside Kent. Three of the five recorded specimens of Beornwulf have hoard provenances, one each from the Middle Temple hoard in London, the Dorking hoard, and the Delgany hoard. The Ludica is from the Suffolk hoard (which is discussed on p. 43). The only specimen of Æthelstan with the king's bust has no recorded find-spot.

MONNA (Pl. VI). This moneyer first appears under Beornwulf and is also found on coins of Æthelstan of East Anglia. No coin of his for Ludica has, however, been found as yet. Of Beornwulf four specimens are known, each from different dies. Of these one is from the Delgany hoard (Be. 4) and two from the Suffolk hoard. The fourth is said (probably wrongly) to be from the Trewhiddle hoard. 3 Monn is a fairly prolific moneyer for Æthelstan, but of his coins with the king's bust it would seem that only one specimen each, of two types, has survived. 4

If the interpretation of the material set out above is correct, we have evidence of an increasingly active mint in East Anglia in the first quarter of the ninth century. The five

---

1 e.g. BMC 4 and BM Aqns. 230.
2 e.g. English Coins, pl. viii. 7.
3 See Archaeologia, xcvi (1961), pp. 110-11.
4 BMC 5 and Lockett sale 409.
moneys operating during Coenwulf's twenty-six-year reign are to be compared with 6 or 7 in Ceolwulf's reign and 4 or 5 in Beornwulf's reign, each of two years. Perhaps the most significant point that emerges is that, with one possible exception that is discussed on page 35, all of the few surviving coins of Beornwulf and Ludica emanated from the East Anglian mint. Of Canterbury there is no trace at all in these two reigns and apart from 'the possible exception' (PI. VII, c) there is no trace of a London mint until Wiglaf reopened it on his accession in 827.

**THE MERCIAN MINT, AT LONDON (?)**

(PLATE VII AND TABLE H, P. 74)

A small group of coins in the names of the Mercian kings Coenwulf, Ceolwulf, and Wiglaf was issued by moneys who did not, apparently, at any time strike in the names of kings of Kent or of East Anglia, and whose mint may therefore reasonably be assumed to have been situated in Mercia proper. London would be the natural place for such a mint, although it is not named on the penny coinage before its brief occupation by the West Saxon king Ecgberht in 829-30. The naming of it in this case may have been due to the fact that it was the first occasion of its use by a king of Wessex; it would indeed be remarkable had Ecgberht's short period of authority there been marked by the opening of a mint for the conqueror where none had previously existed under the Mercian royal house. It is therefore not unreasonable to attribute to the London mint the series of coins, set out in Table H at the end of this paper, which cannot be related to either the Kentish or Anglian groups, and which are specially linked together and with Mercia by the non-portrait type of Ceolwulf. The spellings Ciolwulf and Ecgberht, which are invariable, also help to distinguish the series from those of other mints, Canterbury in particular. With the exception of a few coins which apparently imitate the cross-and-wedges and cross moline reverses of Canterbury, the reverse type is characteristically a cross-crosslet, generally without an inner circle. In this section such coins are referred to as the London series for convenience without it being intended to imply that the attribution is beyond doubt.

It will be seen from Table C that the two moneys, Eanmund and Ceolheard, who struck what may be considered the earliest of the Coenwulf portrait coins in the London series, are also known for the earlier tribrach issue. Earlier in this paper the suggestion is made that tribrach coins by these two, and by some other moneys, may have been struck at London.

After the tribrach type, the dating of coins in the London series depends largely on stylistic comparison of individual examples. Engraving styles vary more than in the Kentish and East Anglian groups. On the other hand, there is a sufficient number of points of contact between the dies of different moneys to suggest that they were all working, some concurrently, at a single mint; and there are also indications of the sequence in which the coins of each moneyer were struck. On the basis of these correspondences the table has been constructed, although the pattern is by no means certain in detail. From the few surviving coins, the careers of individual moneys appear to be continuous; but because the number of coins known today is so small, it must be quite possible that a new hoard of the period containing further specimens would considerably alter the pattern. On the other hand, it is remarkable how representative the
currenty extant sample of the issue seems to be in some respects; for example, all of the
same trio of moneyers are known for late Coenwulf types, Ceolwulf portrait, and Ceol-
wulf non-portrait, though five of the nine varieties involved (including two of the three
moneyers in the Ceolwulf non-portrait type) are represented by a single specimen only.
Consequently, the complete non-existence of coins of Beornwulf and Ludica by any of
these three moneyers must carry with it quite a strong implication that the mint was
not striking during their reigns; the particular claims of one coin to disprove this are
discussed later.

The careers of the various moneyers may be traced before the series is treated as a
whole: that is to say, the coins in the table will be treated first horizontally, then vertically.

Eanmund, a moneyer of the early (tribrach) group, is only represented by a single
portrait coin of doubtful authenticity (Cn. 83). It weighs only 11 gr. and although
pitted and corroded as if it had lost weight, it is small and can hardly have weighed
originally more than 15–16 gr. at most. Its obverse has a bust derived from a late
Roman portrait, dividing the inscription +COENVVL/FREX~M (rounded), without an
inner circle. The reverse has the usual type for the series, a cross-crosslet, with the
inscription +EANMVNDIM _ O in tall, elegant letters. The genitive may well derive from
copying of the usage of Heremod, Werheard, and Sigeberht at Canterbury in the Cuth-
red/Coenwulf group. In spite of the low weight, the style of the piece is exactly right for
the period, and if it is not an authentic coin it certainly represents ancient dies. The fine
style of lettering (including the form of n used by Ceolheard on his two early coins),
the use of the genitive, and the fact that Eanmund is known for earlier, but not for later,
issues, suggests that the coin should be dated early in the series, just after the tribrach
type, perhaps contemporary with the genitive-using Canterbury issues (c. 805–10).

Ceolheard is again a name found on the tribrach type of Coenwulf and, if the same
man, he had a longish career as a moneyer until the reign of Ceolwulf. Two only of his
coins call him Ciolheard (instead of Ceolheard) and these two appear to be the earliest.
Cn. 84 has a neat bust and inscription, copying very closely the Canterbury cross-and-
wedges type of Cuthred and Coenwulf: the reverse, though with larger lettering and
smaller central type is also a direct copy of the Canterbury cross-and-wedges type. The
reverse inscription (CIOLI-IEARD MON) is the only one of this moneyer to have H for ‘h’.
The second early coin (Cn. 85), also perhaps contemporary with the Canterbury type it
copies, has a beautifully engraved reverse inscription (CIOLIHEARD MONITA) around an
elegant cross moline. These two coins both show a characteristic N, made of a full-
length upright followed by a v which does not extend downwards to the level of the
upright.

All of this moneyer’s other coins spell his name Ceolheard and are of cross-crosslet
reverse type, but in other respects they vary widely in appearance. Two with very
similar reverses reading CEOLHEARD M (rounded) have a relatively well-drawn Roman-
style diademed portrait, based on a later fourth-century model (e.g. Valens), the one
facing left (Cn. 86b), the other right (Cn. 86a). On each the obverse inscription begins
above the head and is broken by the bust before REX; there is no inner circle. Another
with similar reverse (Cn. 87) has an obverse copied, perhaps at two removes, from the
Cuthred/Coenwulf Canterbury style bust, the die possibly having been copied from the
obverse of the earlier Ceolheard coin (Cn. 84).
Another pair, with very close reverse dies, has the same reverse reading as above but with pellets freely scattered about the letters. The first of the obverses (Cn. 88a) copies, though very roughly, an Arcadian style of portrait with a small head on a tall bust; the other obverse (Cn. 88b) could be, in turn, a very rude copy of the first, adding an inner circle.

Late in Coenwulf's reign must come a coin (Cn. 89) whose obverse and reverse correspond very closely with Ceolheard's portrait coin of king Ceolwulf (Cn. 19). Face, hair, and inscriptions are all engraved very similarly on the two coins, and the obverse dies at least must have been cut by the same hand (n.b. hair). The inscription on the reverse (the moneyer's name only) begins in an angle, not at a point, of the cross-crosslet. Curious marks occur between the letters in each case: wedges on the Coenwulf coin which may be merely ornamental, and lines on the Ceolwulf coin which could possibly be traces of an earlier engraving of the die.

Ceolheard's known career ends with the non-portrait type of Ceolwulf (Cn. 20), the reverse of which has four crosses disposed about a pellet, instead of the normal cross-crosslet. It spells his name -hard, with no e, and includes the abbreviation MO-N.

There are good grounds for attributing to this moneyer a gold solidus, the obverse of which reads CIOLS/EARD before and behind a tolerably good representation of a late Roman diademed portrait-bust, perhaps in the style of Valens and from the same prototype as served for the less close representation on two of Ceolheard's pennies (Cn. 86 a and b).1

Wigher. A single portrait coin exists with the reverse inscription apparently WIGHER, interspersed with pellets (Cn. 90). The third letter of the moneyer's name is equivocal, and we have considered whether the coin might have been struck by the East Anglian moneyer Wihtred, whose name could be read from the inscription.2 On a number of grounds it could plausibly be a London coin, perhaps of the same moneyer who struck the tribrach type of Coenwulf in the name Wighard. The reverse design, a form of cross moline with pellets, is represented in the East Anglian series, but the cross moline also occurs, though once only, on an undoubted London coin (Ceolheard, Cn. 85). The pellets dotted about the type, and between the letters of the inscription, singly or in groups, can be paralleled on a number of London coins (e.g. Æl/hun, Cn. 91 and 92; Ceolheard, Cn. 88 a and b), but the inner circle on the reverse occurs only once otherwise on a London coin of Coenwulf (Ceolheard, Cn. 84). The most apparent London feature is the depiction of the neck and bust, with the shoulders drawn in a continuous line, like two tabs, out of the inner circle, suggesting the hand of the same engraver as cut the die for the only comparable obverse which we have seen—a London coin of the moneyer Ceolbald (Cn. 94). An East Anglian attribution, however, remains possible.3

Æl/hun or Æl/hun, on the basis of surviving coins, was a contemporary of Ceolheard in the later years of Coenwulf and under Ceolwulf, but alone of Coenwulf's London group moneyers survived to issue pieces in the name of Wiglaf. All his coins have the cross-crosslet reverse. His name is variously spelt Æl/hun, Æl/hun or Æl/hu/n. Taylor Combe read the name Huunoell in his report on the Dorking hoard, a reading

1 The attribution of the solidus to this moneyer was proposed by Mr. Pagan in a paper delivered to the British Numismatic Society in March 1963. For an illustration of this coin see Brooke's English Coins, pl. lxx. 3.
2 As by Miss Robertson, with a query, in the Hunter and Coats Sylloge, no. 348.
3 Cf. the reverse of Cn. 107 on Pl. VI.
accepted by Hawkins. Brooke, however, preferred Ælhuin, and for this reading he received some support from two coins in the Middle Temple hoard (Wi. 1b and c). The name is also apparently the same as on the non-portrait Ceolwulf (Cl. 22) where it is followed by Æ-, the latter probably an abbreviation mark. On the reverse of a portrait coin of the same king (Cl. 21) it appears as Ælhuin, and as Ælhuin or Eilhuin on coins of Coenwulf (Cn. 91 and 92). It is possible that the o developed from copying a chevron-barred æ as a lozenge, a feature noticeable in the East Anglian series; however, apparently the earliest spelling with o, on the Ceolwulf non-portrait coins, has a round o. At any rate, all these coins were presumably struck by one moneyer and are so treated here. A moneyer with the same deuterotheme, Wilhun, struck in the tribrach type of Coenwulf.

Ælhuin does not appear to have coined in the earliest post-tribrach period. Of his three Coenwulf coins, one (Cn. 93) has a reverse very similar to his Ceolwulf portrait coins (Cl. 21), the obverse apparently being ultimately derived from the Cuthred/Coenwulf Canterbury style. Two pieces which are not connected with Ceolwulf and may thus be earlier have different, sans-serif letters interspersed with wedges. One obverse (Cn. 91) has a left-facing Roman diademed profile, without inner circle, like the Copenhagen coin of Ceolheard; the other (Cn. 92) has a right-facing bust of neater style. The portrait on Ælhuin's Ceolwulf coin, also Roman inspired, is again of quite different style. Three coins, all from different but similar pairs of dies, are known of Wiglaf by Ælhuin. On two of the reverses (Wi. 1a and c) the inscription is divided into four by crosses opposite the ends of the cross-crosslet. The obverse die of one (Wi. 1a) is in an advanced state of deterioration, large flaws and pitting having occurred in the inscription. The obverse dies of the other two (Wi. 1b and c) are engraved with wholly grotesque faces, not unlike some found in the East Anglian series.

Ceolbald was a moneyer under Coenwulf and Ceolwulf. Of the latter, his portrait (Cl. 23) and non-portrait (Cl. 24) coins are very closely similar in style, probably the same die-cutter's work. The reverse type of his Coenwulf coins, which spell his name Ceolbald, is not the cross-crosslet, but a plain cross with wedges (Cn. 94) or pellets (Cn. 95) in the angles, possibly derived, via Ceolheard's early coin (Cn. 84) from the cross-and-wedges Canterbury reverse of the Cuthred period. The obverses do not appear to be early: one (Cn. 94) looks like a derivative of Ælhuin's right-facing style bust (Cn. 92) or, indirectly (perhaps via Ceolheard's early coin Cn. 84) of a Cuthred-style bust, while the other (Cn. 95) has a distinctive bust, diademed, laureled, and draped in way highly reminiscent of that on the Louis the Pious gold solidus.

Eretcod (? Ethelmod) appears as a moneyer's name (ERETCODMONET) on a single reverse die of a nondescript style and rough workmanship (Cn. 96). It is coupled with two similar obverses of Coenwulf which do not seem to be related closely to the coins of that king struck in Kent or East Anglia. They are included here as of the London mint, in that they must be presumed to be Mercian in origin and in that the cross-crosslet reverse type associates them more with London than elsewhere. The portrait and epigraphy on one of them are somewhat comparable to the obverse of Ceolheard (Cn. 86a).

Burgherd is known only as a moneyer for Wiglaf by a single coin from dies closely resembling those used by Ælhuin for the same king (Wi. 2).

1 Silver Coins of England, 3rd ed. 1887, p. 49. as in the king's name.
2 On these the name is spell Ceolbald, with an i
Redmund is the moneyer of three coins all from different dies in the name of Ecgberht Rex[1] which, in the spelling of the king’s name (Ecgberht, &c., elsewhere), the use of the Mercian title, the obverse type (a cross potent), and the style of engraving, are very closely linked with a coin whose reverse reads +LVN/DONIA/CIVIT-. Of similar style also are two coins by the same moneyer in the name of WIGLAF REXT, both from the same pair of dies, one struck before (Wi. 3a) and one after (Wi. 3b) the addition of pellets in the field of the reverse. The pedigree and authenticity of the latter coin are discussed in Appendix 2.

The overall chronological pattern is less easy to establish, though for the 820’s the changes of ruler’s name facilitate the task. Ceolwulf inherited the portrait/cross-crosslet type from Coenwulf, and added to it the Rex Merciorum non-portrait type, which was coined by all three moneyers known to have been active at the time. Ælhusn’s and Ceolbald’s dies for this were probably cut by the same man. This is the clearest example of a standardization of type in the London series; the addition of the mint-name, Dorobernia, to Sigístef’s version of this type at Canterbury may mean that he was conscious that he was copying a London type.

With one possible exception there are no recorded coins of Beornwulf, and certainly there are none of Ludica, that can be attributed to the London mint, which seems thus to have been dormant until the advent of Wiglaf in 827. By that time Ælhusn alone of Ceolwulf’s moneyers still remains, but Burgherd appears (with a coin stylistically very close to Ælhusn’s), perhaps as a successor to either Ceolheard or Ceolbald, who struck their last known coins for Ceolwulf, or else to Ælhusn in a mint reduced to (or revived with) a complement of one moneyer only. Continuity of the moneyer Ælhusn and of the traditional London cross-crosslet reverse associates these coins with Wiglaf’s first reign.

Ecgberht’s capture of London in 829/30 provided the first opportunity for a West Saxon king to use that mint and to style himself as Rex M(erciorum) on his coins. His Lundonia coin (Pl. VII, A) is very close in style to three separate pieces struck for him by the moneyer Redmund (Pl. VII, B), whose coins for Wiglaf can most naturally be attributed to that king’s second reign, after he had recovered Mercia and the London mint in 830. Only two specimens are known from the single pair of Wiglaf dies by Redmund. Why pellets were added to the reverse die between the striking of these two examples which have come down to us cannot be explained: they may have been purely ornamental, or designed to obliterate flaws in the field of an old die. However that may be, these coins are all that can be attributed to Wiglaf’s second reign. Their close affinity to Ecgberht’s coins by Redmund tends to put them close to 830; the London mint perhaps soon afterwards lapsed into a further period of inactivity. On the other hand, a coin (BMC 139) by the moneyer Tatel of Berhtwulf (839–52) is struck from dies which may have been engraved by the same hand as Ecgberht’s and Wiglaf’s coins by Redmund, to which it is also linked by the cross potent type.

For the reign of Coenwulf, on the other hand, the chronological indications are few and ambiguous and the coins of the several moneyers, though sometimes corresponding closely, equally often diverge. Ceolheard and Ælhusn are the moneyers most closely associated by types and in style.

So far as the earlier stages are concerned, links with the tribrach issue through the

1 Blunt, Ecgberht, p. 473.
moneys Eanmund and Ceolheard, and perhaps Wigher, have been noticed above, as have Ceolheard's cross-and-wedges and cross moline reverses derived from Canterbury coins of the period of Cuthred and immediately afterwards. At the end of the reign there are also useful links with Ceolwulf, especially Ceolheard's two coins (Cn. 89 and Cl. 19), both of which display an unusual and distinctive arc of pellets forming an inner fringe to the hair.

Ælhun and Ceolheard both use two types of bust, one based on those of Cuthred-style at Canterbury, and the other directly on Roman diademed portraits, the latter group being characterized by a curiously pointed nose. The Cuthred-style sequence could be: first, the early Ceolheard (Cn. 84); then a later Ceolheard (Cn. 87) whose obverse is close to that of an Ælhun (Cn. 93), of which the reverse links in style with Ceolwulf (Cl. 21). The Roman pointed-nose busts are, to left by Ælhun (Cn. 91) and Ceolheard (Cn. 86b), to right by Ceolheard (Cn. 86a). The parallel course, and close connexion, of the two groups is shown by reverse stylistic links between them. Thus three very similar reverses of Ceolheard are combined with the Roman pointed-nose bust, facing left (Cn. 86b) and right (Cn. 86a), and with a Cuthred-derived portrait (Cn. 87), whilst a Cuthred-derived bust of very similar appearance (Cn. 93) is linked to Ceolwulf through Ælhus's reverse (Cl. 21).

There are even ties between the supposedly earliest coins and those that must be late in the reign of Coenwulf. Ceolheard's moline coin, for example (Cn. 85), is at first glance much like the same moneyer's late cross-crosslet coin (Cn. 89) which in turn links to Ceolwulf (Cl. 19); the resemblance may be accidental, but it cannot be overlooked.

Further, the Eanmund cross-crosslet coin (Cn. 83), which, because of this moneyer's known activity in the tribrach issue but not in the later Coenwulf series, should be early, has an obverse which is only comparable to that of a coin of Ceolbald (Cn. 95), plausibly thought to derive from the solidus of Louis the Pious, who acceded in 815.

In view of these difficulties, it is necessary to leave the exact chronology of the London series from c. 805 to the end of Coenwulf's reign an open question. For although individual obverses or reverses seem to be connected firmly with early or later phases, they often link by close similarities of style with coins at the opposite ends of the scale. There is, of course, no need to suppose that the London mint struck continuously throughout the reign of Coenwulf. The coins are sufficiently rare to suggest not; and in the 820's and 830's there were almost certainly periods when the mint was inactive, if not actually closed. Further, though there are undoubtedly some correspondences between the coins of different moneyers, especially Ælhus and Ceolheard, there are equally divergences which suggest that different die-cutters were employed from time to time as the need arose, which is less likely to have been the case if three moneyers were striking continuous, parallel series.

There remains the question of whether a single fragment (Pl. VII, c) should be considered as representing the use of the London mint by Beornwulf. Arguments have previously been put forward for ascribing the piece to Berhtwulf. Its obverse type is a small cross with a line in each angle, within a small inner circle surrounded by

1 P. Grierson, 'La Date des monnaies d'or de Louis le Pieux', Le Moyen Age, 1963, pp. 67-74; 'D'apres l'allure generale de ce buste, on peut penser qu'il est copie sur un solidus d'or de Louis le Pieux plutot que sur un de ses deniers d'argent' (p. 74). For the chronology of Coenwulf's coinage, it only matters that the prototype dates from 815 or later. The chance that Coenwulf's engraver was copying independently from a similar Roman prototype seems remote.

2 BNJ xxix, p. 10.
+B—VVLFRYX; the reverse reads +BEO—VLF around a cross-crosslet, with no inner circle. With this exception, no coins of Beornwulf and only two of Berhtwulf are known without portrait. One of the latter, by the moneyer Tatel, has been attributed to the London mint on the grounds of similarity of type and die-engraving with the *Lundonia* and *Redmudh* coins. There are undoubted epigraphical affinities between the fragment and Tatel’s coin, on which the obverse type is also comparable—a cross potent with a line in each angle. On these grounds a Berhtwulf attribution has been thought the more likely.

However, the reverse type belongs characteristically to the London series prior to 830, particularly resembling that on coins of Wiglaf here attributed to his first reign (827–9), and on this score it must be a possibility that the fragment represents a London issue of Beornwulf (823–5). The moneyer’s name Beo—ulf gives no positive help, being without parallel alike in the 820’s and 840’s.

On the other hand, there is no other evidence that Beornwulf or Ludica issued coins except in East Anglia, and it could be that Wiglaf only revived the London mint in 827 after the loss of East Anglia. There is thus at least as good a case for imagining that no coinage took place at London between 823 and 827, as that it was operating but that no certain examples of its output survive today. Perhaps, too, a Beornwulf coin of London might be fairly expected to bear the moneyer’s name Ėlhan, Cēolbald, or Cēolheard.

None of these arguments is conclusive, but this one difficulty, the reverse type, stands in the way of an attribution to Berhtwulf. It is hard to insist on a dating after 839 for a coin on which the cross-crosslet type, not contained within an inner circle, corresponds so closely with that of the earlier London issues which end with Wiglaf (827–9) over a decade earlier (cf. Wi. 1a). In this connexion, however, it must be remarked that there are traces of alteration on the reverse die: v is over an f, there are small wedges (e.g. to the top left of the initial cross) raised on the coin which might be traces of earlier letters, and at other points there are curious marks which could suggest the plugging of cavities in the die.

It seems just a possibility that, on the reopening of the London mint by Berhtwulf, a new inscription might have been cut round the original design on an old but still serviceable reverse die belonging to the earlier period. Whether or not this explains the use of the old London type, the reasons against the coin belonging to Beornwulf seem on balance to outweigh the testimony of the cross-crosslet, and it would be safer, on the basis of evidence presently available, to reassert the provisional attribution to Berhtwulf.

**CONCLUSIONS**

In the course of this paper we have surveyed the coinage of southern England from the death of Offa until it became a West Saxon monetary province with the eclipse of Mercia. Since in a number of respects our conclusions differ from previous views of the subject, it may be useful to summarize them here and to bring out the points where they accord with or seem to differ from those suggested by the relatively meagre documentary sources.

For convenience we have set out in tabular form the rulers of the kingdoms of Mercia, Kent, East Anglia, and Wessex and the Archbishops of Canterbury (Table A), rendering in italics entries which depend upon numismatic evidence alone; and a chronological table (B) of the mints suggesting when and for which authorities they were striking.
Mints and Coinage

As in the reign of Offa, Canterbury was the principal mint in southern England and during the 820's, and probably earlier, appears to have had a normal complement of six moneyers working for the king. The coins of Archbishop Æthelheard and the earliest coins of Archbishop Wulfred are without a moneyer's name. Subsequent issues of Wulfred, on which the moneyers are identified, begin in the name of Sæberht alone; at this stage, therefore, it seems that only one moneyer was operating for the archbishop. A second name, however, soon appears and two seem then to have been the normal complement, at least until late in his archiepiscopacy. The style of the coins issued for king and archbishop is often very similar and in two instances, at different periods, the same moneyers' names—Sæberht and Swefherd—are found in both series, which indicates that at times the two offices may have been combined. However, the Grately Laws speak of two moneyers for the archbishop and one for the abbot (of St. Augustine's), and if this was a continuation of ancient custom it could be that the latter's coins were struck in the king's name and were issued by one of the archbishop's moneyers. Since coinage rights were essentially a royal prerogative, it may be assumed that the archbishop's right to coin stemmed from the king; Wulfred exercised such a right while kings of Mercia, Kent, and Wessex successively ruled in Kent. In both regal and archiepiscopal series there is a curious anonymous issue, which we date c. 821–3, that suggests a major disturbance apparently at the time of Baldred's emergence in Kent, during which the Canterbury moneyers were in doubt as to whose authority they should respect.

There is in the royal series at Canterbury a standardization of obverse types and a less complete though significant uniformity of reverses, which make it possible in the case of this mint alone to arrange the coins in a chronological sequence that is applicable in general terms to all moneyers. Such standardization, and the mint organization which it implies, together with the number of moneyers and the volume of output, suggest that Canterbury had an importance of its own at this stage in English monetary history.

Coins without a moneyer's name from an ecclesiastical mint at Rochester have been identified previously for Ceolwulf and Ecgberht. We have put forward reasons for believing that a royal mint was operating even earlier in that city; it does not appear to have been active during the reign of Cuthred, and perhaps was opened c. 810. Its output under Coenwulf was smaller than it subsequently became, particularly under Ceolwulf, whose use of the Canterbury mint was perhaps cut short by the circumstances which gave rise to the anonymous issue. Under Ecgberht, Rochester's activity may have been intermittent. Its complement appears generally to have been two moneyers, one of whom may also have been associated with the bishop's mint.

Since Canterbury was denied to Coenwulf in the first two years of his reign, another mint, probably London, must have been the source of his earlier issues. Five moneyers at least coined at this mint during the first years of Coenwulf, a greater number than subsequently, and probably the result of the Canterbury and East Anglian mints being denied to the Mercian king. From the introduction of portrait types (c. 805) London's output appears spasmodic and, until the reign of Ceolwulf when uniformity is most apparent, the individual moneyers pursued somewhat separate courses. However, though the style of the coins varies enormously, with rare exceptions the reverse type became standardized as a cross-crosslet. At least three moneyers were working concurrently in Ceolwulf's reign and late in Coenwulf's, and this may have been the regular
complement at this stage. On the basis of surviving specimens, however, London’s output was considerably less abundant (at least after c. 805) than that of any of the other mints.

In East Anglia, probably at a single mint, coinage was issued more or less continuously from the later part of Offa’s reign and, though the volume of output and the number of moneyers employed at this mint apparently varied according to political as well as economic necessity, its total output seems only to have been exceeded by that of Canterbury. In the 790’s there were no more than three or four striking, but in the short reign of Ceolwulf I, whose output at Canterbury was negligible, no less than seven moneyers struck in the East Anglian series, and there were still five under Beornwulf. Reverse types varied greatly from moneyer to moneyer. There is some divergence of style in die-cutting which need not necessarily indicate more than one mint.

In general, the careers of individual moneyers at the various mints appear to have been continuous and, except where surviving specimens are unduly rare, the varieties in the name of any one moneyer should form a more or less consecutive record of his output. However, there were manifestly insufficient dies used in the later part of the reign of Coenwulf to account for continuous minting by six moneyers at Canterbury, two at Rochester, three at London, and three or more in East Anglia. Clearly there were times when a mint, whose output depended upon demand for coin coupled with a supply of silver, may have been inactive for weeks and months, or even longer: equally it is not to be assumed that in every phase of coining at any mint all the moneyers in office took part. The same may also be true of engravers. Some well-defined groups of coins are struck from dies prepared by engravers whose style or idiosyncrasies are characteristic and readily identifiable. There are strong grounds for associating the work of an individual engraver with a single mint and a particular phase of time. Indeed, the mint attributions in this paper depend largely upon the analysis of such styles. But chronologically it need not be the case that, once an engraver appeared on the scene, he either worked continuously or exclusively. For example, various styles of portrait are found in the London series and shared by two or more moneyers, but the evidence of reverses implies that these portrait styles, which are undoubtedly the work of different engravers, were not consecutive but recur intermittently, as if the mint had two or three engravers, of very unequal ability and with preferences for different prototypes, upon whom it could call. And at Canterbury, c. 821 to 828, the portrait and non-portrait types of Ceolwulf, Baldred, and Ecgberht, which types were probably the work of different engravers, must—because of the changes of ruler—have been issued either concurrently or alternately, necessitating the simultaneous or alternate activity of at least two engravers. Such considerations need to be borne in mind in attempting to establish the sequence of issues at each mint.

There seems to have been little official communication between mints: at least not enough to result in any real uniformity in their output. To such extent as types are shared between mints, they appear to derive from imitation. Canterbury types, as might be expected, were the most copied models: for example, Cuthred-style busts occur at London and Rochester; the cross-and-wedges and moline reverses were both copied at London; Rochester fairly consistently derives reverse designs from Canterbury coins of Coenwulf; and Canterbury influence perhaps reached East Anglian engravers in the form of some of Cuthred’s non-portrait designs. London’s cross-crosslet was popular in East
Anglia, and the Rex Merciorum non-portrait type of Ceolwulf was closely copied by one moneyer at Canterbury.

Such mutual exchanges of type are only of limited value chronologically; outside Canterbury, engravers appear to have imitated suitable models haphazardly as they came to hand, which would have only indirectly reflected the sequence of types in the original series. And extraneous prototypes were just as readily adopted: late Roman portraits at London (suggesting the possibility of the discovery of a hoard buried c. 400), Frankish non-portrait designs at Canterbury in the earlier 820's, and even a solidus of Louis the Pious for a London obverse style.

In the absence of hoards from within the reign of Coenwulf which would show what of the products of the various mints were in currency together, absolute chronology of any kind is, except at Canterbury, hardly attainable. In the series struck at other mints affinities with Ceolwulf give an indication of lateness, and occasionally a copy can be given a terminus post quem dating dependent upon its prototype. A further difficulty is that minting was either intermittent or of uneven volume, so that there are obvious dangers in establishing a sequence, assuming that it is to be spread evenly over the period covered, and thus ascribing absolute dates for types or individual specimens according to their relative positions in the series. This is particularly hazardous in the case of the coinage of Coenwulf with portrait, at all mints, and of Wulfred before 821. After that date political upheavals and changes of ruler enable rather more accurate chronology to be applied to the coins of the next decade.

Nevertheless, if for the sake of argument the surviving Canterbury regal coins recorded in the corpus (Appendix 3) for the period c. 805–25, representing an average of just under twelve for each year, could be regarded as a fair cross-section of a coinage constant in output, the lengths of the various issues would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Number of recorded coins</th>
<th>Hypothetical length of issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf/Cuthred, Group II</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf, Group III</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1½ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf, Group IV</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>7½ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceolwulf</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1½ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldred</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2½ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>238 coins</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These hypothetical periods are not inconsistent with the conclusions we have reached on other grounds in our analysis of this coinage. However, the correlation may be no more than fortuitous.

**Historical implications**

Considerable reservations are to be had in using numismatic material as evidence for political history. However, although the value of this material is relatively slight for periods when authority was vested for many years in one ruler, such as Coenwulf of Mercia, it may be significant for times when power changed hands suddenly and irregularly and with it the control of mints.
Ecgfrith, Offa's son, acceded to the Mercian throne in 796 but survived less than five months. No coins in his name are known, and it is likely that none was struck. The Chronicle records that a usurper, Eadberht Praen, took possession of the kingdom of Kent in the same year that Offa and Ecgfrith died. The reference to Eadberht follows the record of Ecgfrith's accession and death, but the order of entries within the year is not chronological; and, since the latter died in mid-December, Eadberht probably acquired Kent and the Canterbury mint during Ecgfrith's lifetime. The very close ties between Eadberht's coins and the late issues of Offa support this. At London, where the Mercian succession was not so interrupted, the mint was presumably available to Ecgfrith, but the advent of a new ruler was frequently not recorded on coinage immediately.

Two moneyers are represented by coins of East Anglian style with the sequence of royal names Offa-Eadwal-Eadwulf. Though there is no other evidence for such a rising, the coins suggest the possibility of a revolt in East Anglia soon after Offa's death —like the Kentish, perhaps during the reign of Ecgfrith—under a King Eadwulf (? c. 796–8). His coins are of the greatest rarity and are followed by portrait issues in the name of Eadwulf, suggesting that the revolt was suppressed and Eadwulf removed within a short time, perhaps about the time that Kent was recovered by the Mercian king (798).

Thus only the London mint was available to Eadwulf at the start of his reign, and his non-portrait coinage must have originated there. Continuity of types and moneyers indicates that this mint had already been in operation under Offa. Canterbury was recovered in 798 and since the types of Eadberht lead directly on to those of Eadwulf, it would appear that the Mercian king almost immediately began to use the royal mint, which he was soon to share with his brother Cuthred whom he had placed on the Kentish throne. Archbishop Æthelheard, who had abandoned his mint along with his see during the Kentish rising, resumed the privilege of coinage which he had previously exercised under Offa. Since he was abroad for some of the time and there is no strong numismatic argument for his having coined during 796–8, it is safer to suppose that his issues were interrupted for two years than that his mint was temporarily accommodated at London with that of Eadwulf.

The ending of series of coins in the name of Archbishop Æthelheard, who died in 805, and of King Cuthred, who died in 807, gives a useful indication of chronology for the earlier issues of Eadwulf. Royal portrait issues in Eadwulf's and Cuthred's names from dies engraved in a style comparable to that of the earliest coins of Archbishop Wulfred (c. 805) probably originated about 805—there are no related coins of Æthelheard—but well before 807, for Cuthred's are plentiful. They continued after that date in the name of Eadwulf only and confirm that Kent reverted to being a Mercian province until the advent of Baldred.

There is no firm evidence to suggest when the Rochester mint was opened. On the ground that its earliest identifiable product copies the cross-and-wedges type from Canterbury, the date must lie after 805. Rochester coins of Eadwulf are relatively scarce and mostly resemble those of Ceolwulf; it is not therefore easy to justify a date before, say, c. 810.

Wulfred's first issue marks the end of the recognition of royal authority on the archiepiscopal coins and the introduction of the tonsured portrait which became general.
during his archiepiscopate and that of Ceolnoth (833–70). Both features are indicative of Wulfred's status and of good relations between king and prelate, though the reintroduction of a portrait on the royal coinage would have given a natural opportunity for the archbishop to copy the facing portrait which had been adopted by Pope Adrian I (d. 795). There is no obvious break in the coinage of Wulfred which can be associated with the period of his quarrel with Coenwulf, 817–21. At first sight it might seem natural to attribute the anonymous tonsured-head coins to this period, but these cannot plausibly be separated from the parallel anonymous regal series which can confidently be dated after Coenwulf's death.

On the death of Coenwulf in 821, London, Rochester, and the East Anglian mint continued to coin for his successor, Ceolwulf. Output must have been considerable, for the number of moneyers involved and of extant coins is high for a two-year reign. But at Canterbury only two of the six moneyers active at this time are known to have struck for Ceolwulf, and the number of surviving coins, while small, is sufficient to indicate the improbability of the lack of coins of other moneyers being due merely to the accident of survival.

Surviving coins of Canterbury and Rochester, later Coenwulf to 825

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Canterbury</th>
<th>Rochester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>91 (group IV only)</td>
<td>15 (all issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceolwulf</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile Anonymous</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldred</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The coinage of the Rochester mint—as might be expected from its smaller complement of moneyers—is generally on a lesser scale than that of Canterbury, and the exception in the case of coins in Ceolwulf's name is striking. On the evidence of surviving coins, as set out above, it would appear reasonable to consider that most if not all of the anonymous issue should be attributed to a period when Ceolwulf was using the Rochester mint, though even if the anonymous group is added to the Canterbury issues of Ceolwulf the proportion of Rochester coins would still be higher in relation to those of Canterbury than in the immediately preceding and subsequent periods. Perhaps, with Canterbury's allegiance equivocal, Ceolwulf increased the output of Rochester.

Doubt must remain as to whether Baldred obtained possession of either mint before Ceolwulf's deposition from the Mercian throne. The use of the title Rex H (which may allude to the name of Rochester, Hrofe(s)ceastre) could be thought to imply that Baldred was there acknowledged king at a time when he was not recognized throughout Kent. Since the number of Baldred's surviving coins of Rochester is low compared with Ceolwulf's, it is safer to assume that he did not coin at Rochester long if at all before Ceolwulf's expulsion from Mercia (823), though the acquisition of the Canterbury mint might have removed a temporary need for extra output from Rochester. At Canterbury the survival figures suggest that the period from the accession of Ceolwulf (821) to the expulsion of Baldred (825) could be divided about equally between coinage in the name of Ceolwulf or with no king's name, and coinage in the name of Baldred. It could be that Baldred was striking Rex H coins at Rochester before coins in his name superseded the anonymous issues at Canterbury, though in view of Ceolwulf's known authority in Kent up to 823, coinage in Baldred's name at Rochester...
could hardly be dated before that year. The exact chronology of the coins of this period must remain uncertain. However, the general picture on the numismatic evidence seems to be that Baldred acquired the Rochester and Canterbury mints, not necessarily simultaneously, about the time of Beornwulf’s accession to the Mercian throne and of the deposition of Ceolwulf; before this, in view of the anonymous issues, there appears to have been a phase of political uncertainty at Canterbury.

Baldred, known to have been ousted by Ecgberht in 825, is a shadowy historical figure for whom the coins are the most solid evidence. Professor Whitelock has drawn our attention to charters issued by Beornwulf in 824 and 825 (BCS 378 and 384) dealing with lands in Kent, which support the suggestion which has been made that Baldred may have been a Mercian dependant. However, both charters are concerned with the settlement of the lawsuit about the inheritance of King Coenwulf, and are not fresh grants of estates by Beornwulf. Certainly there is no evidence of any coinage in Kent in the name of a Mercian king after Ceolwulf, such as was found when Coenwulf’s brother Cuthred was on the Kentish throne. There has been a tradition adopted by numismatists that Baldred’s coinage was spread over a long period, and even continued from that of Cuthred. If our interpretation of the numismatic evidence of the Rochester and Canterbury mints is correct, it would seem that he had no royal status during Coenwulf’s reign; and that, though he may have had Mercian connexions, he may nevertheless have been a rival of Coenwulf’s, with a claim sufficient to cause uncertainty of allegiance at Canterbury but insufficient for him to be acknowledged king of Kent until about the time of Coenwulf’s deposition. His eventual acknowledgement at Canterbury also resulted in a resumption of issues in Wulfred’s name (which the new king must have sanctioned).

Reverting now to the coinage of Ceolwulf, of his mints outside Kent London seems to have closed before or at the end of the reign, though his successor on the Mercian throne, Beornwulf, continued to strike on a (relatively) considerable scale in East Anglia. No London coin is known for either Beornwulf or his successor Ludica, and it seems that their coinage was confined to East Anglia, where they both met their deaths. With Ludica’s defeat in 827, the East Anglian kingdom seems to have been lost to Mercia; coins identify the local ruler who followed him as one Æthelstan, of whom history has no other record.

Ecgberht of Wessex, having evicted Baldred from Kent, proceeded immediately to employ the Rochester and Canterbury mints to produce coinage in his name, probably his first although he had been king of Wessex for over twenty years. Wulfred does not immediately appear to have regained the right of coinage from the new king, for his coins, which were of some number under Baldred, seem to cease abruptly in 825; there is only one coin of his which can certainly be attributed to the period 825–33, and this, by stylistic affinity, is close to a variety struck by Ceolnoth after 833.

Wiglaf, who succeeded to the Mercian throne in 827, apparently no longer had the East Anglian mint available to him. His coins were struck at London, which seems at this stage to have been duly reopened as the only mint available to the king of Mercia. Two years later, Ecgberht defeated him and marked his conquest of Mercia by issuing

2 E.g. G. C. Brooke in a manuscript quotes Henry of Huntington as saying Baldred reigned eighteen years, and in English Coins, p. 17, gives his dates as 807–25.
coins on which he claimed the title *Rex Merciorum* and advertised his use of the London mint by name. His control was, however, short-lived. A non-portrait issue by Wiglaf, struck by a moneyer (Redmudh) who worked for Egberht in 829–30, may date from his second reign and so bear out the statement in the Chronicle that Wiglaf regained the Mercian kingdom. But this issue is known from a single pair of dies and his later years, during which time perhaps he struck no coinage, are both historically and numismatically obscure.
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**APPENDIX 1**

**HOARDS**

The two recorded sources of coins of this period of outstanding importance are the Delgany hoard (*Inventory*, 117; see also *BNJ* xxi, pp. 11–12) and the Middle Temple hoard (*Inventory*, 366). The Delgany hoard was deposited *c.* 828, the latest Mercian coins being two of Beornwulf, the latest Wessex coins three of Egberht, one of his early groups, two of the type with the Canterbury monogram. The absence of coins of Wiglaf in a hoard of this size (well over 100 coins) suggests that, rare though they are, it is unlikely to have been deposited much, if at all, after his accession and the equal absence of any specimen of the relatively plentiful coins of Æthelstan of East Anglia supports the view expressed earlier than he acceded on the death of Ludica in 827 rather than on the death of Beornwulf in 825.

The Middle Temple hoard was deposited *c.* 842, that is to say just outside the period under review. In contrast to Delgany this hoard contained no less than four coins of Wiglaf and thirty-nine of Æthelstan but, curiously, none of Ludica.

Of a hoard found in Suffolk (and hitherto virtually unpublished) there is tantalizingly little information, although what there is is significant. Hawkins in his *English Silver Coins*, 3rd ed., 1887, p. 35, says, in a footnote referring to a coin of Baldred that had been lot 260 in the Cuff sale of 1854, that it had been "found with others of the same period about 1852, in Suffolk". The Cuff sale catalogue does not give the provenance of the Baldred but under lot 294, a coin of Beornwulf, has a note: "This and the two following coins were found in Suffolk." The two following coins are a second Beornwulf and a Ludica.

That Hawkins is wrong in dating the find as late as about 1852 can be demonstrated by the fact that Cuff's Ludica is illustrated in the 1840 edition of Ruding's *Annals* (Pl. C, 9) and in the 1841 edition of Hawkins's *English Silver Coins* (no. 79). Both it and one of the Beornwulfs are mentioned as being in Cuff's collection in Lindsay's *Coinage of the Heptarchy*, published in 1842, p. 112.

Recently there has come to light a letter from J. B. Bergne to Jonathan Rashleigh dated August 1868 which gives some indication of the importance of the hoard and throws some valuable light on it.\(^1\)

\(^1\) The letter is among a number of Rashleigh papers in the possession of Mr. Lyon.
My dear Sir,

I have read with much interest your paper in the No. of the Num. Chronicle just published on the six finds of Anglo-Saxon pennies & three of stycas. You are, however, I think, mistaken in including the Ludica in the Dorking find. It formed part of a hoard discovered 30 years ago or more in Suffolk, which came into the hands of Young the dealer & was bought of him in the mass by Mr. Cuff. I fear no record either of the place of discovery, or of the coins found, has been preserved; but I have a letter of Cuff’s written in answer to an enquiry of mine about his Baldred, in which he says ‘My Baldred is very similar to Hawkins 57, differing only in the name of the moneyer & a little in the portrait. It was one of the Suffolk coins, and came to me in company with the Coenwulfs, Ludica &c. &c. &c. and (he might I believe have added) the Ciolvulfs, of which he had more than everybody else, museum & all, put together. There may have been a Ludica among the coins found at Dorking, but at all events it was not Cuff’s. Was it the other one, which Hawkins says is in Wigan’s Cabinet?’

Yours very sincerely,

J. B. BERGNE

Jon. Rashleigh Esq.

‘My Baldred’, the only one of this king in the Cuff sale, is the coin to which Hawkins refers in his footnote. It is clear therefore that all came from the same hoard.

Matthew Young, the well-known dealer, through whom it will be seen Cuff acquired the hoard, died on 12 July 1837 so that its discovery must have been prior to that date. In fact it was probably prior to 1829. Hawkins, in a paper read before the Society of Antiquaries on 26 November 1829 and published in Archaeologia, vol. xxiii, illustrates every one of the eight coins of Ceolwulf I that were in the Cuff sale in 1854. No less than five of these are of the group which we associate with East Anglia, all by moneyers not known to Ruding. The rarity of these coins supports Bergne’s suggestion that some at least came from the Suffolk hoard.

The significance of this hoard would be greatly enhanced if more detailed particulars were available. It is for instance at least possible that some of Cuff’s 12 coins of Æthelstan of East Anglia, particularly the portrait pieces of which Cuff had two of the six now known, came from it. But, even as it is, the evidence of a hoard provenance for a coin of Ludica is important, especially as the authenticity of the coin in question has been doubted.²

The Suffolk hoard may conveniently be summarized as follows:

Suffolk (exact find-spot unknown), before 1837, probably before 1829.

AR. Anglo-Saxon pennies, number unknown. Deposit c. 830³?

Mercia:

Coenwulf: (more than one; no details)

Ceolwulf I: (probably; no details)

Beornwulf: Monna, 2.

Ludica: Eadnoth, 1.

East Anglia: Æthelstan I: ?

Kent:

Baldred: Tidbercht, 1.

Disposition: To Young the dealer who sold it entire to J. D. Cuff. The Baldred now Fitzwilliam, Sylloge 434; the two Beornwulfs respectively Carlyon-Britton sale 282 and Grantley sale 861; the Ludica is BMC 116.

The extent to which we are dependent on these hoards for our material for this period is shown by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mercian Kings</th>
<th>Delgany</th>
<th>Middle Temple</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf early</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf with bust</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The coins of Beornwulf, Ludica, and Wiglaf are of such rarity that forgery, or the suspicion of forgery, is bound to arise, and in some cases authenticity has been questioned without sufficient reason.¹

APPENDIX 2

THE QUESTION OF AUTHENTICITY

Fortunately, as has been shown above, there are hoard provenances for an unusually large proportion of the coins of these kings: of Beornwulf 9 or 10 out of the 19 surviving specimens; of Ludica 1 out of 3 or 4; of Wiglaf 5 out of 6.

In addition, a number of specimens can be traced back sufficiently far to preclude the possibility of their being fabrications of modern forgers: both the Beornwulf and the Ludica in the Hunter collection are listed in Charles Combe's inventory, probably drawn up a short time before Hunter's death in 1783; the Beornwulf, no. 3b in the list that follows, was in a sale in 1828; another, no. 5b, was in the seventeenth-century Cotton collection; the Wiglaf, no 3b (of which more is said below), is illustrated in the Pembroke plates, published in 1746. It has been suggested that the Beornwulf said to have been found at Trewhiddle may in fact have been an interloper. If this is so, it would be the specimen illustrated by Speed in 1611.2

It is thus apparent that there is an unusual proportion of specimens that can be accepted without reservation as genuine and in consequence a solid corpus of material against which to set possible forgeries.

The Suffolk Ludica, no. 2, is one of the coins on which suspicion has fastened. Until recently it had beside it in the tray in the British Museum a yellow heading label with the word 'False' written on it, in a hand that has not been identified. However, heading labels seem to have been a fairly recent introduction to the British Museum, so that the note is likely to have been a relatively recent one. Bergne's letter, already quoted, serves to show that this specimen came to Cuff from Young before 1837 as part of a hoard. The only question is whether the hoard was 'salted' by the introduction of a forgery of a great rarity before being sold to Cuff. In this connexion the intervention of Young in the transaction may be regarded as significant. Although Young must have more than suspected (if indeed he did not actually know) that the parcel of ninth-century coins was a hoard, he seems to have enjoyed a good reputation as a dealer. Professional standards as regards hoards were then not as high as they are today but there is nothing to lead us to believe that Young would have been likely to have been party to so fraudulent a transaction as 'salting' a hoard for the purpose of personal profit. In our view, on the evidence of the Suffolk provenance, the authenticity of the British Museum Ludica can be accepted without reservation.

Hunter's Ludica can also be accepted without question. It was illustrated by Fountaine in 1705 and had already been engraved in the 1695 edition of Camden's Britannia and in the second edition of Speed's History of Great Britain.

A more controversial coin is the Ludica by the moneyer Eadgar (no. 1a in the list). This was first published in the 1841 edition of Hawkins's Silver Coins where it is said to weigh 19 gr. and to be in Mr. Wigan's cabinet. Hawkins notes that it omits the Mercian ethnic. Mrs. Martin has most kindly supplied the information that Wigan bought it from Cureton, the dealer, in 1837 for £5. Haigh first heard of it as a result of Hawkins's publication and, in a letter addressed to J. Y. Akerman, dated 22 September 1841, saying as much, he asks if Akerman can obtain a sealing-wax impression for him.3

Ruding's 1840 edition, which was edited by Akerman,4 does not mention it, but it is described though not illustrated in Lindsay's Coinage of the Heptarchy published in 18425 and by Haigh in his Coinage of the East Angles, published in 1845, where he concludes, comparing a coin of Ethelstan with the Wigan Ludica:

The type and the name of the moneyer on the reverse of this piece are exactly the same as those on a coin of Ludica, King of the Mercians, in Mr. Wigan's cabinet, and the workmanship of both is so strikingly similar, that no one who has seen them can doubt that the dies from which they were struck were engraved by the same hand.6

This part of Wigan's collection was bought en bloc in 1871 by the Paris firm of Rollin & Feuardent. The Wigan Ludica is next met in the accounts of Thomas Coats who bought it in 1877 through John Gray, a Glasgow dealer. But it was not in the collection when it came to the Hunterian Museum in 1924.7

1 See Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles, Hunterian and Coats Collections, i, no. 354 and p. xi. 2 Archaeologia, xcvi (1961), p. 110. 3 This letter is in the British Museum Coin Room and was most courteously brought to our attention by Mr. R. H. M. Dolley. 4 The authority for this statement is DNB under Ruding. 5 Op. cit., pp. 8-9. 6 Glasgow Sylloge, page facing pl. ix.
though now a little chipped) was exhibited at a meeting of the British Numismatic Society about 1949 as one of a parcel recently acquired by a member from a Midland jeweller and for the most part consisting of blatant forgeries. The parcel was later acquired by A. H. Baldwin & Sons Limited as part of their commendable policy of taking forgeries off the market wherever possible. For many years it lay for safety in their forgeries cabinet, but always with the feeling that it might in fact one day be shown to be genuine.

Since this is probably the most controversial coin in this series an enlarged direct photograph is given here (Fig. 4).

The coin of Æthelstan to which Haigh refers is also illustrated (Fig. 5).

Comparison with the other two undoubted coins of Ludice brings out the following points of difference. The eye on the Wigan coin is almond-shaped; on the other two round. The circles on both sides are beaded, that is to say made up of pellets linked together by a thin line like a closely knotted necklace; on the other two the beading is smaller and more closely spaced so that the draughtsman's guiding line is only occasionally visible. The bust on the Wigan coin, which is not surrounded by the customary inner circle, is made up of marks scattered in a more or less haphazard way; on the Hunter
coin similar marks are used but are neatly arranged within two hoops; on the Suffolk coin dots only
are used on the bust. The Wigan coin has no ethnic; the Hunter and Cuff coins both read Re(x) Me.

On the reverse the main differences to be noted are the use on the Wigan coin of a form of m not
found on the other two and of a reversed d for o in the final word. Structure of design on the Wigan
coin is more loosely knit than on the Suffolk coin, but a comparable looseness may be detected on the
Hunter coin.

The Wigan coin, when whole, must have weighed 19 to 20 gr. which is less than the Hunter (21.4)
and the Suffolk coin (22.7).

These points taken cumulatively suggest the need for the closest scrutiny before the coin can be
accepted as genuine. One must now turn to the points in its favour.

Haigh's comment quoted above about the similarity of the workmanship on Wigan's coin and on a
coin of Æthelstan's is significant and is borne out by fresh examination. Eadgar, on his coins struck for
Æthelstan, used moreover the form of m found on the Wigan coin. The coin is struck and the dies
would appear to be engraved as they should be. The lettering is what one would expect and the use of
a reversed d for o would seem more likely to occur on a genuine coin than on a forgery. The d in its
normal form is found occasionally as a capital in place of an o in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. The coin
is certainly not an over-strike, a technique used by at least one nineteenth-century forger to secure a
good edge for his products. Undue importance should not be attached to the form of the bust. Eadgar was an
indifferent stylist as his coins for Ceolwulf I show (e.g. Pl. VI, Cl. 27, a coin which may usefully be
compared with the Wigan Ludica). The absence of the ethnic is probably not significant; it is never
found on coins of Beornwulf. The absence of the inner circle on the obverse is a feature not found on
any other coin of Beornwulf, Ludica, or Wiglaf. It is, however, occasionally omitted on coins of
Ceolwulf that are here attributed to London (e.g. Pl. VII, Cl. 21). Perhaps the most disquieting point
remaining is the almond-shape of the eye. There is generally a remarkable consistency at this time in
depicting the eye as a circle enclosing a pellet. Eadgar, however, seems to have had independent ideas.

In the invaluable list of provenances of the Anglo-Saxon coins in the British Museum, Mr. Dolley
and Mrs. Martin put this among the coins with undated provenances, that is coins that were in the
British Museum prior to 1838 when detailed registers were first kept. It is, however, illustrated in
Runding, pl. 17, 5 (one of Taylor Combe's plates) and is there stated to be in Tyssen's collection. It may
therefore be assumed that it passed to the National Collection with the Anglo-Saxon portion of
Tyssen's cabinet which was acquired in toto in 1802.

An engraving of Æthelstan Eadgar would therefore have been available to a forger as his model
in the 1830's.

What is significant, however, is that both in the Runding plate and in the text this coin is attributed
included it in the same place in his plates, but was unhappy about it and, in the text, expressed a
preference for attributing it to Æthelstan (II) of East Anglia (880-90). Haigh, in a paper dated
19 October 1841, disputed Hawkins's attribution, pointing out the similarity of the Æthelstan coin to
coins of Beornwulf and Ludica. This led him to attribute it to Egberht's son Æthelstan who was
sub-king of Kent, Essex, Sussex, and Surrey 839-c. 851, though he accepted the origin as East Anglian.

In 1843 Dymock published another portrait coin of Æthelstan, this time by the moneyer Eadnoth. Dymock agreed generally with Haigh's arguments but found it difficult to accept the attribution to
Egberht's son. He for the first time ventured the opinion that 'they belong to some East Anglian king

1 BNJ xxvii, pp. 26-27, 41.
3 NC iv, pp. 195 ff.
4 NC v, pp. 124-7.
prior to Edmund'. Haigh accepted this view when he came to write his Numismatic History of the East Angles published in 1845.1

A forger in the 1830's would therefore have had access to an engraving of the coin but would, before he could use it for the purpose of forging a comparable coin of Ludica, have had to make an attribution at which no one at that time had as much as hinted. We find it hard to accept that, even had a forger been talented enough to make the new attribution, he would have been prepared to conceal the evidence that would have served to enhance the value of his forgery.

We consider that the cumulative evidence in favour of the coin, and in particular the fact that the comparable coin of Æthelstan was not attributed to the period until a date after the Wigan Ludica is known to have been in existence, is overwhelming and that the coin should be accepted as genuine. This view, we are glad to find, is shared by Messrs. Baldwin.

It seems possible that Edward Burns, when he took over as adviser to Coats on the death of John Gray in 1878, went over the collection and weeded out those pieces that he considered false. If the parcel in which this coin reappeared represented coins rejected from Coats's cabinet, the need for a thorough reassessment is apparent. It was about this time that suspicion was beginning to fall on the products of the skilful forger whom Mr. Thompson and one of the present writers have discussed elsewhere.2 This would no doubt have inclined Burns to caution.

If the Wigan Ludica is accepted as genuine and may be equated with the one illustrated here (Pl. VI, L. 1a), it could be an isolated find or, possibly, a stray from the Hampshire hoard (Inventory, 182) that was found in the year that Cureton sold the Ludica to Wigan. Our only information on this hoard appears to be the Lindsay reference quoted by Mr. Thompson which says that all the forty-six coins he lists 'came into the possession of Mr. Sainthill'. There were five coins of Berhtwulf in the hoard so that a coin of Ludica would not have been out of context. Alternatively it could be a stray from the Sevington hoard (Thompson 328) which was deposited 840-50 and found in 1834. There is also the possibility, hinted at by Bergne, that it is a stray from Dorking (found 1817) but if this were so one might have expected it to have come to notice earlier.

Of the six coins of Wiglaf that are here listed, five have hoard provenances. The sixth was in the Lockett sale (lot 389) and is now in Commander Mack's cabinet. Considerable mystery surrounds this piece. It was lot 19 in the sale of the Pembroke collection in 1848 and could normally, therefore, be presumed to be (as the sale catalogue says it is) the specimen illustrated in the Pembroke plates, published in 1746 (P: 4, T: 1). However, Ruding writes: 'One specimen only, with a cross on the obverse occurs in Sir Andrew Fountaine's Plates, the original of which is not now known to exist'; the editor to the third edition adds a footnote: 'The coin from which the engraving in Fountaine is taken is probably that in the Pembroke collection, notwithstanding Mr. Ruding states that the original is not now known to exist. One of the same type and the same moneyer was recently purchased at the sale of the small, but choice, collection of W. B. Rich, Esq., and now belongs to the splendid store of our National Museum.'

This would seem to suggest that Ruding had made a slip were it not for the fact that no less an authority than Taylor Combe, reporting in 1818 on the Wiglaf found in the Dorking hoard, wrote: 'this is the only coin which has ever been discovered of this King'.1 It is hard to believe that Combe was not aware of the illustration of the coin that, besides being in the Pembroke plates, had appeared in Fountaine and in the 1695 edition of Camden's Britannia (where it is stated that it was then in the possession of William Charleton).

Are we to assume that both Combe and Ruding rejected these earlier publications? Combe did not include the coin in his plates of Anglo-Saxon coins that subsequently appeared in Ruding's Annals. It may therefore be that this is the case; but if they did so, we believe it arose from the fact that, at the time they wrote, access to the Pembroke collection had become virtually impossible and that both may have omitted the piece on the grounds that they were unable to see the original. It is perhaps significant that Lord Pembroke's famous solidus of Wigmund is also missing from Combe's plates and is equally not mentioned by Ruding.3 The Wiglaf, having passed through the Rashleigh and Granley sales, formed lot 389 in the Lockett sale where it was bought by Commander Mack. It was so encrusted with dirt that it was hard to say with confidence whether it was a struck piece or not. Since then,

2 BNJ xxviii, pp. 18 ff.

...
however, the coin has been cleaned and submitted to the Royal Mint who expressed the opinion that
it was in fact a struck piece. Other specimens exist, one at least of which could have been the source
of the early engravings. One is in the collection formed by Archbishop Sharp (died 1714) but is clearly
a cast. Another is the coin referred to above as having been in the Rich sale which is now in the British
Museum. This coin is illustrated in BMC i, pi. ix. 15. A note in Brooke’s hand with the coin says,
however, that it is a cast of the Rashleigh specimen and this would seem to be the case. Neither coin
is therefore included in our list of Wiglaf’s coins.

Of the three specimens discussed, we are therefore left with Lord Pembroke’s (= Lockett’s). Is this
genuine or not? That an original did in fact exist has been satisfactorily and surprisingly proved by
the discovery of a coin of this type in the Middle Temple hoard (Pl. VII, Wi. 3a) struck from the same
dies, with, however, the curious feature that pellets had been added in the field of the reverse by the
time it was used to strike the Pembroke coin. Linking this evidence to the opinion of the Royal Mint
that the Lockett coin is in fact a struck piece, we have no hesitation in accepting it as genuine and
believe that both Combe and Ruding, if they did not overlook it, were in error in rejecting it, though
one can understand the reasons for their doubt.

APPENDIX 3
CORPUS

The following lists of coins record all the specimens that we have noted. In the case of the less rare
varieties it cannot claim completeness, partly because such pieces were, until lately, not thought worth
illustrating in sale catalogues nor were their pedigrees usually recorded. Minor details are consequently
lacking and it would be impossible to avoid duplication. In the case of the rarer pieces completeness
has been the aim and any additions or corrections would be welcomed by the authors.

The coins have been arranged on the plates to bring out the arguments put forward in the text. In
the corpus they are listed by reigns and, within reigns, by groups or mints. In the plates the following
abbreviations have been used: Cn. (Coenwulf); Cl. (Ceolwulf); Be. (Beornwulf); L. (Ludica); Wi
(Wiglaf); Ep. (Eadberht Praen); Cd. (Cuthred); An. (Anonymous regal issue); Ba. (Baldred); Ea.
(Eadwald); Æ. (Æthelheard); Wu. (Wulfred). The numbers on the plates are those in the corpus. Each
number illustrated, and the actual coin within that number selected for illustration is marked with an
asterisk. The plate on which each group appears is given in the caption to the group. Die-links have
been noted as observed, but an exhaustive search has not been made.

Coins illustrated in text-blocks are noted thus: †.

COENWULF (796–821)

CANTERBURY AND LONDON MINTS

GROUP I, without portrait 796–c. 805. (The order of the types is not necessarily chronological.)

A. Transitional types (Plate II)

A (i) (London)

Obv. King’s name and title in three lines.

Rev. Moneyer’s name in two lines between lunettes.

*1. Ludoman. (a) BMC 99 (in BM prior to 1812). 21 gr. *(b) BMA 102 ex Evans ‘Lately found’

A (ii) (London)

Obv. As last.

Rev. Moneyer's name between arms of a 'bone ended' tribrach.


A (iii) (Canterbury) (Plate I)

Obv. King's name and title around central M.

Rev. Moneyer's name in two lines, 'bone shaped' object between.


B. Substantive tribrach type

Obv. As last.

Rev. Tribrach moline, each arm of two or three lines, moneyer's name in angles. (The number of lines in the tribrach are indicated below as 'double' or 'triple'.)

(Canterbury) (Plate I)

*5. Babba (Triple). *(a) BMA 98 ex Evans 19·2 gr. *(b) Rashleigh 49 (triple?). 19·1 gr.

*6. Duda (Double). *(a) BMC 93, undated. 19·5 gr. *(b) BMC 94 ex Tyssen. 18·0 gr. *(c) BMA 99 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 21 gr. *(d) Lockett 363 ex Grantley 851 ex Murdoch 27. 22·6 gr. *(e) Rashleigh 47 (double?). 19·9 gr. *(f) O'Hagan 299 (double?).


*10. Ethelmod (Double). *(a) BMC 97 ex Bank of England collection 1877. 21·0 gr. *(b) BMA 100 ex Ready 32. 21·5 gr. *(c) BM ex Barnett ex Carlyon-Britton 1609. 19·3 gr. *(d) Oxford ex Browne Willis, 1760. 20·8 gr. *(e) Batchelor ex Southampton excavations. *(f) Mack 'found in Kent' (fragment).

*11. Ethelmod (Double, with small semicircle in each angle). *(a) BMC 98 ex Tyssen. 20·0 gr. *(b) BMA 101 ex Evans 'probably found in Kent'. 20·2 gr. *(c) Lockett 364, found in Fleet Street, London, 1914. 20 gr.


Doubtful Canterbury or London (Plate I)


*16. Ibba (Triple). *(a) BM ex Lockett 2658; said to have been found in Shropshire. 15·1 gr. *(b) Tamworth Castle (loan) found at Bredon-on-the-Hill c. 1952.

17. Pendwine (Double). Grantley 852 ex Delgany hoard. 20 gr.

1 Authority for hoard provenance Ruding, Annals, i, p. 119.

2 The Lockett sale catalogue gives this coin in error the pedigree of the following piece.
London (Plate II)

*18. Diola (Triple). *(a) Shrewsbury Mus. 18 gr. (b) Delgany hoard 32. (c) W. C. Wells. 18½ gr. (plugged).


*20. Ludoman (Double). *(a) Blunt ex Lockett 3591 ex Drabble 813 ex Coles = ? Maish 6 ex Napier ex Evans (1894) 7 ex Montagu (1888) 10 ex Brice ex Borghesi. 18½ gr. (b) Delgany hoard 36 (Ludaman).


Contemporary forgeries?

(a) Vatican, Rome. III. BNJ xxvii, pl. xxvi, 6. 15-9 gr.


**Canterbury Mint**

**Group II.** Portrait issues struck on small flans, c. 805–c. 810. (Plate II)

A. **Cross and Wedges type**

**Obv.** + COENVVF/REX M (rounded): diademed bust r., resembling that on coins of Cuthred, breaking inner circle and dividing the inscription. Flan diameter 0-70–0-75 in.

**Rev.** Moneyer’s name, with MONETA (M rounded): cross pommée with a wedge in each angle, within inner circle.


*24. Beornfreth. (Rev. BEORNFRED.) BMA 52 ex Evans 16 ex Delgany hoard. 22 gr.

*25. Eaba. *(a) BM ex Bruun ex ‘Property of a Gentleman’ (1903) 329. 17-4 gr. (b) Westminster School ex Delgany hoard. 21-0 gr. (c) Mack ex Grantley 840 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. Chipped, 17 gr. (d) Stewart. Fragment. (e) Cast in BM of a coin at one time in Seaby’s hands. 22-5 gr.

26. Seberht. (Rev. SEBERHTI.) *(a) BMC 78 ex Barker 343. 20-0 gr. (b) Hunter 339. Fragment, 14-8 gr.

*27. Seberht. (Rev. +SEBERHTI MONETA.) Fitzwilliam 401 ex Young ex Carlyon-Britton 878. 19 gr.

Distinctive portrait, perhaps by the engraver of the dies of the later period of the reign.


*29. Sigeberht. (Rev. +SIEBERHTI MONETA, rounded M.) *(a) Lockett 3585 ex Reynolds 10 ex Astronomer ex Richardson 12 ex Marsham 72 ex Wigan. 21½ gr. (b) Allen 180 (ill.). —.

*30. Werheard. (Rev. +WERHEARDI MONETA.) *(a) BMC 85 (ill.) ex Tyssen. 21-0 gr. (b) BMC 84 ex Middle Temple hoard. Broken and corroded, 15 gr. *(c) BM ex Barnett 310 ex Rashleigh 45 ex Murchison 82. 20½ gr. (d) Fitzwilliam 403 ex Carlyon-Britton 276 ex Montagu 246 ex Brice ex Berne ex Pembroke. 20-6 gr. (e) Lockett 3587. 20½ gr. (f) Reading University ex Grantley 839 ex Lawrence. 20-6 gr.

B. **Cross and Quatrefoil type.**

**Obv.** As IIA.

**Rev.** Moneyer’s name, with MONETA (M rounded); cross pommée over a quatrefoil with a pellet in each angle, within inner circle.

*31. Duda. (a) BM 56 ex Evans ex Montagu (1897) 7. Chipped, 18-3 gr. *(b) BM 67 ex Middle Temple hoard. 20-5 gr. From the same obv. die as (a). (c) Ryan 630. —. From the same dies as (a). (d) Mack ex Lockett 368 (ill.). 20 gr. From the same obv. die as (a). (e) Montagu 239 ex Shepherd 20; probably found near Worthing, Kent (vide Shepherd catalogue, which is ambiguous). —.
32. Tidbearht. (Rev. *-TIMHE - BM, MONETA.) BMC 84; no date or provenance. Fragment.

33. Tidbearht. (Rev. *TIMBERHT.) BMA 83a ex Evans; found at Mildenhall. 20-4 gr. Distinctive portrait, cf. 27.

C. Sigeberht's Triple Aura (Annulet-Triangle-Trefoil) type

Obv. + COENWLF REX M (rounded): bust r. breaking inner circle; the portrait resembles that on coins of the later period of the reign (cf. also 27 and 33 above) but the bust has the prominent shoulders found on some coins of Sigeberht for Cuthred. Flan diameter as above.

Rev. *SIGEBERT MONETA (M rounded): within inner circle a design comprising an annulet with central pellet, superimposed on a triangle (slightly distorted) which in turn is over a trefoil.

34. Sigeberht. BMA 78; purchased in 1886. 18-5 gr.

GROUP III. Portrait coins struck on large flans: first bust (c. 810-c. 815) (Plate III)

A. Pincer Cross type

Obv. As IIA but flan diameter 0-75-0-85 in.

Rev. Moneyer's name, with MONETA (M rounded): no inner circle; double pincer-shaped cross superimposed on a cross-pommée with wedges.

35. Beornfreth. (Rev. BIORNRED.) (a) BM ex Barnett 305. 20-5 gr. (b) Lockett 366 ex Carlyon-Britton 881. 21-4 gr.


37. Diormod. (Rev. NE.) *a) BMA 60 ex Middle Temple hoard. 22-0 gr. (b) Royal Mint Museum.

38. Tidbearht. *(a) (Rev. HT, NE.) BMC 81; no provenance. 21-7 gr. (b) (Rev. HT, NE.) BMA 81 ex Middle Temple hoard. Chipped, 14-8 gr. (c) Ryan 629. —. (d) Drabble 328 (III.) ex Col. Coles. 20-2 gr. From the same rev. die as (c). *(e) (Rev. HT, NE.) Assheton ex Devonshire 22.

39. Werheard. (Rev. PERHEARDL) (a) BMC 86 ex Tyssen. 21-2 gr. *(b) BMA 85 ex Middle Temple hoard. 20-5 gr. *(c) BMA 86 ex Middle Temple hoard. 19-8 gr. *(d) Astronomer 95 ex Montagu 242 ex Bride ex Bergne. —. *(e) Ready 33 (III.). —.

B. Cross Moline type

Obv. As IIIA.

Rev. Moneyer's name, with MONETA (M rounded): no inner circle; large cross moline with wedge or pellet in each angle.

40. Tidbearht. (Rev. HT, wedges.) Blunt; found at Yaxham, Norfolk, in 1961. 23-15 gr. Vide Norfolk Arch. xxxiii, pp. 43-44.

41. Werheard. (Rev. PERHEARDL, pellets.) BMC 88; purchased 1853. 20-5 gr.

C. Dealla's Cross-Crosslet type

Obv. As IIIA.

Rev. *DEALLA MONETA (M angular); cross-crosslet with a pellet in each principal angle, within inner circle.

42. Dealla. Stockholm. 20-2 gr.

43. Dealla. (Rev. MONETA; a pellet and wedge in each angle of principal cross.) Fitzwilliam 398 ex Carlyon-Britton 278 ex Astronomer 93 ex Montagu 233 ex Bride ex Bergne 59. 20-6 gr.
GROUP IV. Portrait coins struck on large flans: second bust (c. 815-821) (Plate III)

A. Pincer Cross type

**Obv.** +COENWLF REX R (rounded): bust r. diademed, breaking inner circle: new portrait, with less complex treatment of the hair and angular shoulders. Flan diameter 0.75-0.85 in.

**Rev.** Moneyer’s name, with MONETA (m angular, A as inverted v in moneta only): design as Group IIIA, but cross usually pattee.

*44. Diormod. (Rev. m’s rounded.) (a) BMC 68: no provenance. 21.5 gr. (b) (Rev. ŠŚ) BMA 61 ex Middle Temple hoard. 19.0 gr. (c) (Rev. ŠŚ) Hunter 337. 21.0 gr. From the same rev. die as (b). (d) Lockett 3581 ex Bliss 77 ex Montagu 241 ex Brice. 20 gr. From the same obv. die as 47(a). *(e) Bagnall ex Drabble 810 ex Ready 34. 20 gr. From the same obv. die as 47(c). (f) Grantley 849. 20 gr. (g) Roth 56 ex Crowther 4 ex Doulton 4. 21 gr. (h) Wells ex Ganz 1002a. —. May be Group IIIA.

*45. Tidbearht. (a) (Rev. ŠŚ ŠŚ, m rounded.) BMC 82: no provenance. 20.3 gr. (b) Westminster School ex Scott ex Delgany hoard. Chipped, 18 gr. (c) Mack ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. Chipped, 16 gr. (d) Mack ex Shand 290 ex Mann 135 ex O’Hagan 296 ex Montagu 231. Slightly chipped, —. *(e) (Rev. ŠŚ) BMA 87 ex Middle Temple hoard. 21 gr. (f) (Rev. ŠŚ) BMA 88 ex Delgany hoard. Chipped, 15.8 gr. (g) (Rev. ŠŚ) Baldwin 1951; no pedigree. From the same obv. die as (e). — 21.4 gr.

B. Cross Moline type

**Obv.** As IVA.

**Rev.** — DIORMOD MONETA (m rounded, A as inverted v): cross moline within inner circle.

*47. Diormod. (a) BMC 69 ex Dymock (1830) I. 19.5 gr. From the same obv. die as 44(d). (b) Hunter 340. 21 gr. *(c) Lockett 371 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 20.4 gr. From the same obv. die as 44(e). (d) Stewart. —. From the same rev. die as (e). (e) Seaby’s Bulletin, March 1951, no. 3475. —.

C. Dealla’s Cross-Crosslet types

**Obv.** As IVA, but frequently without diadem.

**Rev.** As IIIc, but last letter of moneta as inverted v.

(i) With diadem.


51. Dealla. (Rev. has a pellet and a wedge in each principal angle.) Hunter 336. Pierced and chipped. 17.7 gr.


(ii) Without diadem.

*53. Dealla. *(a) BMA 59 ex Middle Temple hoard. 21.6 gr. (b) Westminster School ex Scott ex Delgany hoard. 21.0 gr. (c) Winchester City Museum. —. (d) Grantley 842 ex Murdoch 23 ex Montagu 229 ex Brice ex Lake-Price 16 ex Murchison 78 ex Dymock 66 ex Cuff 283. 22 gr. From the same obv. die as (c) and rev. die ex (b). (e) Lockett 3580 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 20 gr. From the same obv. die as (a).
54. Dealla. (Rev. has crosses dividing inscription at L/T and O/N.) (a) BMC 65 ex Hoare 147. 21-8 gr. *(b) BMA 56 ex Middle Temple hoard. 21-4 gr. From the same obv. die as 55(c). (c) BMA 58 ex Middle Temple hoard. 19-2 gr.

55. Dealla. (Rev. as 54 but M rounded.) (a) BMA 57 ex Middle Temple hoard. 19-6 gr. (b) Copenhagen ex Astronomer 94 ex Montagu 233 ex Marsham. 20 gr. (c) Lockett 376 ex Reynolds 8. 20 gr. From the same obv. die as 54(b). (d) Ryan 621 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. —.

D. Crescent Cross type. c. 820
Obv. As IVA.
Rev. Moneyer’s name, with Moneta (A as inverted v): four crescents arranged in cruciform within inner circle, around a central pellet.

56. Dealla. (Rev. has a pellet within each crescent.) *(a) BM ex Lockett 374 ex Dorset hoard. 21-7 gr. (b) BM ex Lawrence. Perhaps the specimen recorded in the Delgany hoard. Chipped and frail.

57. Diormod. (Rev. M rounded.) *(a) BMA 62 ex Middle Temple hoard. 21-3 gr. (b) BMA 63 ex Middle Temple hoard. 21-1 gr. (c) BMA 64 ex Middle Temple hoard. 21-4 gr. (d) BMA 65 ex Middle Temple hoard. 20-2 gr. (e) Ashmolean ex Bodley, before 1752. 20-1 gr.

58. Tidbearht. (a) (Rev. HT, NE.) BMA 82 ex Middle Temple hoard. 21-4 gr. *(b) BMA 83 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. Chipped, 19-8 gr. From the same rev. die as (a). (c) Hunter 344. 21-0 gr. (d) (Rev. HT, NE?) Blunt ex Lawrence, probably ex Montagu 244 ex Marsham 70. Badly chipped, —. From the same obv. die as (c).

59. Werheard. (Rev. has central cross instead of pellet.) BMA 90 ex Middle Temple hoard. Now chipped, 19 gr. The complete coin illustrated NC 1894, pl. iii, 4.

E. Sigestef’s ‘A’ type, c. 820
Obv. As IVA.
Rev. + SIGESTEF MONETA (M rounded), the A forming the central design within the inner circle (cf. Ceolwulf, Group I, no. 2).


61. Sigestef. (Obv. omits c.) BMC 79 ex Gentleman Sale (1850) 355; found near Porchester Castle 1844. Chipped, 16-8 gr.

F. Swefherd’s Cross Fourchee type. c. 820
Obv. As IVA.
Rev. + SWEFHERD MONETA (M angular, A as inverted v): forked cross with pellet in each principal angle, within inner circle.

*62. Swefherd. *(a) BMC 80 ex Cuff 287. 22-3 gr. *(b) BMA 80 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. Chipped, 18-5 gr. (c) Hunter 342. Chipped, 17-5 gr. (d) Mack ex Lockett 373 ex Dorset hoard. 20-3 gr. From the same dies as (b). (e) Sir J. Hanham ex Grantley 838 ex Murdoch 25 ex Montagu 243 ex Shepherd 19. 20-7 gr. From the same obv. die as (b). (f) Ryan 626. Chipped, —. From the same dies as (e).

G. Oba’s Cross Moline types
Obv. As IVA, but the portrait is by a different engraver and the bust divides the inscription.
Rev. + OBA/MON ETA (first o diamond-shaped, M rounded, A normal): cross moline within inner circle. One group, perhaps the later, has the inscription divided, as indicated, by crosses.
Reverse inscription undivided.

*63. Oba. *(a) Lockett 3584 ex Dorset hoard. 20·1 gr. *(b) Brown 24 ex Carlyon-Britton 879 (ill.) ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 21·3 gr.

64. Oba. *(Obv. inscription continuous.) T. S. Agnew ex Grantley 841 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 19 gr.

Reverse inscription divided.

*65. Oba. *(a) BMC 75 ex Tyssen. 21·0 gr. *(b) BMA 76 ex Middle Temple hoard. 19·3 gr. *(c) Fitzwilliam 399 ex Carlyon-Britton 279 ex Hay (7) 21·5 gr. *(d) Fitzwilliam 400 ex Prof. Hughes 1876; found at Haslingfield, Cambs. Pierced and chipped. 17·5 gr. *(e) Lockett 2653 ex Reynolds 9. 22·1 gr. *(f) BM ex Middle Temple hoard. 18·5 gr. *(g) Seaby's Bulletin, Aug. 1950, no. 7140 ex Tyssen (ill. Ruding, pl. 6, 8). Chipped, 20·5 gr. *(h) Winchester Cathedral Library. *(i) Glendining's Sale 29.3.49 lot 176, now in BM Forgeries, having been condemned as a cast. If this judgement is correct it must have been cast from (h), which we have not seen, or from a coin not known to us. The obv. is from the same die as (f).

(iii) As (ii), but cross over cross moline: first O round.

*66. Oba. *(a) BMA 76 ex Cuff 288. 22·2 gr.

H. Oba's Cross-and-Wedges types, c. 820

Obv. As IVG.

Rev. +OBA+MON+ETA (o round, m rounded, a normal): cross with wedge or 'leaf' in each angle, usually within an inner circle from which spring the three crosses in the inscription.

(i) With cross pommée and wedges: inner circle.

*67. Oba. *(a) BMA 77 ex Middle Temple hoard. Chipped, 17·0 gr. *(b) BM ex Lockett 3583 ex Drabble 326 ex Evans, probably ex Delgany hoard. 19 gr. *(c) Wigan ex Cuff (ill. Dymock MS.). —. *(d) and (e) Delgany hoard. *(f) BM ex Middle Temple hoard. 17·5 gr. *(g) BM ex Lockett 369 ex O'Hagan 297 ex Montagu 234 ex Whitbourn. Chipped, 17·5 gr. Small flan.

(ii) With cross pattée and 'leaves': no inner circle.

*68. Oba. BM ex Lawrence, probably ex Montagu 247 ex O'Hagan 298 ex Wakeford. 17·7 gr.

(iii) With cross pattée and 'leaves': no inner circle.

*69. Oba. BMC 77 ex Tyssen; apparently the coin illustrated in Fountain, pl. iv, 5. 21·8 gr.

Rochester Mint

Group I. Early issues, c. 810—c. 820 (Plates IV, V)

A. With cross and pellets.

*70. Ealhstan. *(Obv. +CONNVV/LF M (rounded): diadem, bust r., breaking inscription and inner circle; E (of king's name) backwards in front of face. Rev. +EALHSAN MONETA (M rounded): cross with pellet in each angle, within inner circle.) BM ex Lockett 369 ex O'Hagan 297 ex Montagu 234 ex Whitbourn. Chipped, 17·5 gr. Small flan.

*71. Ealhstan. *(Obv. +COENVV/LF M (rounded): cruder bust than last, without diadem. Rev. +EALHSTAN MONETA (M rounded): type as last.) BM ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 18·7 gr. Large flan.

B. With cross moline

Obv. Similar to 71 but COENVV/LF.

Rev. +EALHSTAN MONETA (M rounded): cross moline with a pellet in each angle, within inner circle.

*72. Ealhstan. *(a) Hunter 341. Chipped, 22·0 gr. *(b) (Rev. omits final A.) Lincoln Museum. —.
C. With cross-crosslet.
   
   **Obv.** + COENVVLF REX M (rounded), variously divided: bust r. breaking inner circle, with or without diadem.
   
   **Rev.** Moneyer's name, with MONETA (M rounded): cross-crosslet within inner circle.
   
   ***73. Dun. (Obv. r: diadem.)** Hunter 338. 22.0 gr. From dies which appear to have been made in Canterbury.
   
   ***74. Dun. (Obv. inscription continuous: no diadem. Rev. has pellet in each principal angle.)** BMC 70 ex Tyssen. 22.0 gr. Local dies.
   
   ***75. Ealhstan. (Obv. l: no diadem.)** BMC 72 ex Tyssen. 18.7 gr.
   
D. With cross-and-wedges.
   
   **Obv.** + COENVVLF REX M (rounded): diademed bust r. breaking inner circle, but inscription undivided.
   
   **Rev.** + EALHSTAN MONETA (M rounded): smaller lettering than previously: cross-and-wedges, within inner circle.
   
   ***76. Ealhstan.** BM ex Lockett 372 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. Chipped, 19 gr.

**Group II. Late issues, c. 820 (Plate V)**

A. With cross and crescents.
   
   **Obv.** + COENVVLF REX M (rounded): diademed bust r. breaking inner circle, imitating Canterbury Group IV.
   
   **Rev.** Moneyer's name, with MONETA (M rounded): small cross with crescent opposite each angle, wedges between, all within inner circle. Dun spelt DVNN; Ealhstan EALI-TAN (cf. Ceolwulf 1) and has NE in moneta.
   
   ***77. Dun. (Rev. DVNN: pellet in each crescent.)** BMA 68 ex Middle Temple hoard. 20.3 gr.
   
   **78. Dun. (Rev. DVNN: no wedges or pellets.)** Blunt ex Lawrence, probably ex Delgany hoard (43). Fragment.
   
   ***79. Ealhstan. *(a) BMC 71 ex Loscombe ex Sevington hoard. 22.0 gr. *(b) Assheton ex Devonshire 22. —.
   
   **80. Ealhstan. (Rev. without wedges.)** Berlin ex Murdoch 28 ex Bayne 1120 ex Murchison 86. 20.1 gr.
   
   ***81. Ealhstan. (Rev. has crescents joined to ends of cross.)** BMA 69 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 19 gr.

B. With cross potent.
   
   **Obv.** As A.
   
   **Rev.** As A, but design is a cross potent, displaced, with a lozenge centre and 'diamonds' in the angles and within the lozenge.
   
   ***82. Ealhstan.** BMA 71 ex Montagu 240 ex Lord Jersey. 21 gr.

**London Mint (Plate VII)**

Obverses with bust to right, and reverses with cross-crosslet and no inner circle, unless otherwise stated. Variations of type are fully discussed in the text, and since all significant varieties are illustrated, they are not described in detail below.

Moneyers: Eanmund, Ceolheard, Wigher(?), Aelhun, Ciolbald, and Eretcod(?).

**Eanmund**

*83. Obv. Late Roman style bust, no inner circle. 11.0 gr. Blunt, ex D. Mangakis (? authentic, see p. 31).
Ceolheard

*84. Copy of Canterbury cross-and-wedges; inner circle on rev. 21.8 gr. Westminster School 12 ex Scott ex Delgany.

*85. Moline reverse. 18.5 gr. BMA 55 ex Evans and Delgany.

**86. Pointed nose; no inner circle. *(a) Rf. facing. 21.8 gr. Westminster School 13 ex Delgany.

*(b) Left facing. 22.1 gr. Copenhagen Museum (Thomsen 1445).


**88. Arcadian bust; pellets on reverse. *(a) No obv. inner circle. 22.3 gr. BM ex Lockett 367 ex Grantley 848 ex Delgany. *(b) Crude bust, inner circle. 21.2 gr. BMA 54 ex Montagu 230 ex Brice ex Berne ex Murchison ex Dymock, = Fountain, pl. iv, 3.

*89. Bust as on Ceolwulf 19. 20.1 gr. BMA 53 (pl. x, 11) ex Evans ex Delgany.

Wigher (Possibly Wihtrude of East Anglia; cf., rev. of Cn. 107)

*90. Obv. cf. Wigher no. 94; pellets on rev. 21.6 gr. Glasgow (Hunter) 348 (ill. Ruding, pl. 6, 10).

Aelhun

*91. Left facing bust, pointed nose. 21 gr. BM, ex Lockett 370 ex Lawrence (during lifetime).

*92. Bust r., inner circle. 21.5 gr. BMA 72 ex Evans ex Delgany.


Ceolbald


Eretcod (?)


EAST ANGLIA FROM C. 798? (Plates V and VI)

Early group. All moneyer Lul.

Obv. Crude bust to right.

Rev. Moneyer’s name on ‘leaves’ in arms of a cross with splayed ends.

*97. *(a) BMC 73 ex Tyssen. 21.6 gr. *(b) BMC 74. No prov. 18.5 gr. *(c) Found at St. Augustine’s, Canterbury, Jan. 1921. Believed to have been stolen from the Canterbury Museum. Same dies as BMC 74. *(d) Hunter 334. 22.1 gr. *(e) Coats 335 ex York Moore 34. 17.7 gr. *(f) Montagu 245 ex Marsham 74 (no illustration available).

Rev. Moneyer’s name in the quarters of a cross the ends joined.

*98. *(a) BMA 74 ex Middle Temple hoard. 18.7 gr. *(b) Ashmolean ex Lockett 365 ex Carleyon-Britton 277. 19.6 gr. *(c) Lockett 2652 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 19 gr. *(d) Grantley 845 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 19.5 gr. *(e) BMA 75 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 20.6 gr. *(f) Blunt ex Ryan 624 ex Bruun 25 ex Carleyon-Britton 880. 20.6 gr. *(g) Hunter 332. 19.1 gr. *(h) Hunter 333. 18.6 gr. *(i) Dresser ex Grantley 846 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 22 gr. *(j) Grantley 847 ex Sotheby 4.7.1901. 19.3 gr.

Later groups

Obv. All with king’s bust to r., legend generally COENVVLF REX M.

Rev. Of various designs. These are not described since they appear in the illustrations.
Botred (?) Fotred

*99. BMC 63 ex Tyssen. 21-8 gr.

*100. (a) BMA 97 ex Montagu 235 ex Shepherd 21. (b) Ryan 628 ex Nunn 47 ex Montagu (1886) 8 ex Brice ex Montagu (1886) 9 ex Addington ex Bergne 62 = ? Devonshire 19. Same obv. die as last; similar rev.

Hereberht

*101. (a) BM ex Barrett. (b) Lockett 3582 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 18+ gr. (c) Hunter 345. 17-9 gr. (d) Ashmolean ex Lockett 377 ex Carlyon-Britton 1606 ex Rashleigh 42 ex Cuff 284. 22+ gr. (e) Blunt ex Lawrence (not in sale). Badly chipped. Same dies as last.

*102. *(a) BMA ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 19-9 gr. (b) W. C. Wells (?) 'Found in Suffolk'.

Witred

*103. Harris ex Lockett 2654 ex Grantley 854 ex Evans. 19 gr.

*104. BMC 89 ex Dean of St. Patrick's 109. 21-2 gr.

*105. Blunt ex Lockett 3588 ex Bliss ex Croydon Palace hoard. 22-4 gr.

*106. (a) BM ex Lockett 2655 ex Montagu 237 ex Marsham 70 ex Wigan. 19 gr. *(b) Hunter 347. 20+ gr.

*107. BMA 91 ex Montagu 238 ex Marsham 81. 18-8 gr.

*108. BM ex Barnett 311 ex Carlyon-Britton 1607 ex Rashleigh 46. 18 gr.

*109. BMA 92 ex Middle Temple hoard. 21-8 gr.

*110. *(a) BMC 90. No prov. 22-5 gr. *(b) Hunter 346. 22-6 gr. *(c) Blunt ex Lockett 378 ex Grantley 850. 18+ gr.

Wodel

*111. *(a) BMA 95 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 22-2 gr. *(b) Lockett 2656 ex Rashleigh ex Cuff. But appears to be Rashleigh ex Cuff. Also appears to be Roth (ii) 65 ex Crowther 5 ex Montagu 249 ex Brice ex Bergne 64 ex Christmas 27. 19+ gr. *(c) Ryan 631 ex Drabble 330 ex Carlyon-Britton (not in sale).


*112. BMA 96 ex Montagu 251 ex Brice ex Bergne 67. 20-9 gr.

*113. (a) BMC 91 ex Devonshire 20. 18-2 gr. *(b) BMA 93 ex Middle Temple hoard. Same rev. die as Ceolwulf I no. 31. 19-8 gr. *(c) BMA 94 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 18-7 gr. *(d) Lockett 3589 ex Thorburn 24 ex Montagu 248. 20 gr. *(e) Mack ex Lockett 379 ex Rashleigh 44 ex Cuff 290. 20+ gr.

CEOLWULF I (821-823)

CANTERBURY MINT

GROUP I. Portrait types (Plate III)

* Obv. CEOLWULF REX * (in rounded); bust r. breaking inner circle. There are two different portraits: that used by Olga breaks the inscription after the king's name, but that used by Sigesdott does not (cf. Ceonwulf).

* Rev. Various designs: M rounded.

1 The Bergne provenance attached to this coin in the Montagu sale catalogue seems more likely to attach to the Ryan specimen. Both are said to be ex Bergne, but he had only one.

2 The Montagu 1886 catalogue says ex York Moore, but no such coin is identifiable in his sale. The Devonshire provenance given without reservation in the 1886 catalogue seems uncertain. See NC (New Series), vi, pp. 308-9.

3 One of this type, the actual specimen not identifiable, found at Southampton, JBA 20, 1884, p. 71.

4 Rubbing among L. A. Lawrence papers.

5 The Cuff provenance given in the Lockett catalogue does not appear in the Grantley catalogue. The coin is not identifiable in the Cuff sale.

THE COINAGE OF SOUTHERN ENGLAND, 796-840

*1. Oba. (Rev. + OBA-MONETA divided by two horizontal lines, hooked at each end.) *(a) BMA 112 ex Lawrence (1903) 9. 21 gr. (b) BMA 113 ex Evans ex Marsham 79. 21-5 gr. From the same rev. die as (a). (c) Hunter 350. 21-1 gr. From the same obv. die as (b). (d) Lockett 2662 ex Thorburn 26 ex Montagu 263 ex Shepherd 24 found near Ixworth, Suffolk. 23½ gr. From the same obv. die as (b) and (c).

†2. Sigestef. (Rev. + SIGESTEF MONETA, the A forming the central design within the inner circle—cf. Coenwulf, Group IV.) *(a) BMA 114 ex Evans 38 ex Delgany hoard. 20-7 gr. (b) Glasgow (Coats) 352 ex Wigan. 20-8 gr. *(c) Ryan 633 ex Carlyon-Britton 884 ex Astronomer 99 ex Montagu 257 ex Shepherd 23 ex Murchison ex Dymock. 22-4 gr. A coin of this type found at Dudhendhoe End, near Saffron Walden, is recorded in NC vi (1843) Proceedings, p. 5, as having been exhibited by Mr. Joseph Clarke.

GROUP II. Cross-Crosslet type (Plate IV)

Obv. +CIOLWLF REX M (rounded): cross-crosslet within inner circle.
Rev. Moneyer's name, without moneta: different designs.


†4. Sigestef. (Rev. Cross-crosslet.) *(a) BMA 120 ex Middle Temple hoard. 20-1 gr. *(b) BMA 121 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 19-9 gr.

GROUP III. 'London' type (Plate IV)

Obv. +CIOLWLF REX MERCI/ór/V, the last three letters placed in the field within the inner circle, divided by a tall cross standing on a letter omega (cf. coins of the London mint).
Rev. + SIGESTEF DORBERNA: cross-crosslet within inner circle.

*5. Sigestef. BMC 113 ex Devonshire (1844) 27. 21-7 gr.

ROCHESTER MINT

GROUP I. With bust (Plate V)

Obv. +CIOLWLF REX M (rounded): crude bust r. breaking inner circle.
Rev. Moneyer's name with moneta: various designs within inner circle: m invariably rounded.

*6. Dunn. (Rev. Alpha above omega, with groups of pellets in the field.) *(a) BMC 102 ex Pembroke 21. 21-5 gr. (b) Nunn (1896) 48 ex Lord Jersey. —. *(c) See Camden's Britannia (1695) pl. vi, 7 where a fragmentary or defaced coin is attributed to Æthelwulf.

*7. Ealhstan. (Rev. + FAHT-FAN MONETA, the last two letters in monogram as the central design.) *(a) Mack ex Lockett 380 ex Grantley 857 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 20-5 gr. From the same obv. die as 8(b). *(b) Delgany hoard (a second specimen). —.

*8. Ealhstan. (Rev. as 7 but moneta, the last letter in the centre.) *(a) BMC 106 ex Rich ex Dorking hoard. 19-7 gr. *(b) BMA 106 ex Middle Temple hoard (ill. NC 1894, pl. iii, 7). 21-5 gr. From the same obv. die as 7(a).


11. Eanwulf. (Rev. Disjointed A of moneta, with 'diamonds'.) *(a) Lockett 3593 ex Napier ex Rashleigh 78; allegedly from the Trewhiddle hoard but is not the characteristic Trewhiddle colour and may be the coin illustrated in Fountaine, pl. iv, 2. 22 gr. *(b) Blunt ex Ryan 634 ex Drabble 333 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 18 gr. The obv. omits the ethnic.
GROUP II. With head only (Plate V)

A. With moneyer's name.
   
   *12. Eanwulf. (Rev. EAN/HALEMO/KEV divided by two horizontal lines, each with one hooked end; 'diamonds' in the field; no inner circle.) BMC 107 ex Gravesend hoard. 21-2 gr.

*13. Ealhstan. (Rev. MONET: cross-crosslet.) * (a) BMA 105 ex Middle Temple hoard. 19-6 gr.  
   (b) Mack ex Lockett 2660 ex Bascom 11 ex Rashleigh 79 ex Cuff 293; possibly from the Suffolk hoard. Chipped, 18\frac{1}{2} gr.

*14. Eanwulf. (Rev. MONET/A, the last letter in the centre.) BMA 108 ex Middle Temple hoard. 20 gr.

*15. Eanwulf. (Rev. Four crescents cruciform round a central pellet.) BMA 109; purchased 1909. 18-3 gr.

*16. Ethelmod. (Rev. MONET/A, the last letter in the centre.) BMA 110 ex Middle Temple hoard. 22-1 gr.

B. With mint name but no moneyer's. Probably struck by the bishop's moneyer.

   *17. Anonymous moneyer. (Obv. MCI Rev. +DOROBREBIA CIBI/TAS-P, the last letters arranged to form the central design.) BMC 112 ex Cuff 291; possibly from the Suffolk hoard. 21-3 gr.


LONDON MINT (Plate VII)

I. Portrait coins: obv. neat bust right; rev. cross-crosslet.

II. Non-portrait type: obv. cross between Ô and v, completing circumscription—Merci:orun; rev. cross-crosslet or similar.

Moneyers (all struck both types): Ceolheard, Aelhun, and Ceolbald.

Ceolheard

*19. I. Inner circle on obv. only. 19-3 gr. Blunt ex Ryan 635 ex Grantley 855 ex Evans ex Delgany.

*20. II. Rev. type 4 crosses cruciform about central pellet. * (a) 21-5 gr. BMA 119 ex Evans ex Delgany. (b) Fountaine, pl. iv, 3.

Ælhusn

*21. I. No inner circles. *(a) 19\frac{4}{5} gr. Lockett 381 ex Evans (found at Toddington, Beds.—NC, n.s. v. 168). (b) Same pair of dies. 16-7 gr. (slight chip) BMA 103 ex Montagu 296 ex Marsham 80.

*22. II. 21-6 gr. BM ex Lockett 382 ex Grantley 860 ex Montagu 265 ex Brice.

Ceolbald (spelt Ciolbald)

*23. I. Inner circles. *(a) 21-5 gr. BMA 104 ex Evans ex Delgany. (b) Same obv. die; rev. different, but very similar die. 21-9 gr. Westminster School 15 ex Delgany.

*24. II. 18-0 gr. BM ex Barnett 312 ex Carlyon-Britton 1610.

EAST ANGLIA (Plates V and VI)

Fotred? (Botred?)

*25. BMA 117 ex Evans ex H. Burke Godwin, believed to have been found in N. Lines. 20-2 gr.

1 See NC (New Series), vi, p. 308.
Eacga
*26. BMC 103 ex Devonshire 32. 21-8 gr.

Eadgar
*27. *(a) BMC 111 ex Vidal 33. 17-0 gr. *(b) Mack ex Lockett 385 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. Same dies as last. 19\frac{1}{2} gr. *(c) BMA 116 ex Middle Temple hoard. 21-2 gr. *(d) Blunt ex Ryan 638 ex Grantley 859 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 20-5 gr.

Hereberht
*28. *(a) BMC 108 ex Dymock 62. 21 gr. *(b) Ryan 637 ex Watters 28 ex Rashleigh 54 ex Pembroke 18. 20 gr. *(c) Bagnall ex Drabble 314 ex Bliss 39 ex Montagu 261 ex Addington ex Bergne 70 ex Dymock 62. 21 gr. *(d) BMA 111 ex Middle Temple hoard. 19-4 gr. *(e) Lockett 384 ex Reynolds 11 ex Astronomer 100 ex Richardson 13 ex Doulton 5. 22 gr. *(f) Fitzwilliam 404. No prov. 20-8 gr. *(g) Hunter 351. 20-8 gr. *(h) Lockett 2661 ex Miller ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 20\frac{1}{2} gr. *(i) Grantley 858 ex Montagu 262 ex Marshall 81. 17-4 gr.

Wer bald

Wihtred
*30. *(a) D. Lockett ex Lockett 3594 ex Mann 137 ex Bascom 6 ex Boyne 1122 ex Murchison 95. 22\frac{1}{2} gr. *(b) BMC 110 ex Cuff 322. 19-6 gr.

Wodel
*31. BM ex Lockett 386 ex Rashleigh 50 ex Cuff 324. Same rev. die as Coenwulf no. 113(b); same obv. die as 32(f) below. 21\frac{1}{2} gr.
*32. *(a) BMA 115 ex Middle Temple hoard. 17-5 gr. *(b) BMA 116 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 19\frac{1}{2} gr. *(c) Ashmolean ex Lockett 3593 ex Rashleigh 52. 21\frac{1}{2} gr. *(d) BMA 115 ex Middle Temple hoard. 20-5 gr. *(e) Carlyon-Britton 281. 20-7 gr. *(f) Abp. Sharp. Same obv. die as 31 above. 20-7 gr. *(g) Westminster ex Delgany hoard. 20-7 gr. *(h) Fitzwilliam 405 ex Duncanson ex Smart. 20-5 gr.

**BEORNWULF (823–5) (Plate VI)**

**EAST ANGLIAN MINT (only)**

**Type I**

*Obv.* Bust r. BEORNWULF RE.
*Rev.* Moneyer’s name (Wer bald), in three lines.

**Type II**

*Obv.* Bust r. – BEORNWULF RE.
*Rev.* Cross-crosslet in inner linear circle, moneyer’s name around.
*2. Eacga. *(a) Ryan 639 ex Bruun 29 ex Carlyon-Britton 885. 22-3 gr. *(b) Hunter 353. 18-1 gr. *(c) BMA 125 ex Middle Temple hoard. Same obv. die as next. 20-1 gr. *(d) BMA 124 ex Middle Temple hoard. Same obv. die as last. 19-5 gr.
*3. Eadnoth. *(a) BMA 123, ex Middle Temple hoard. 20-9 gr. *(b) Lockett 2663 ex Rashleigh 55 ex Murchison 96 ex Dymock 64 ex Rich. 22 gr. *(c) Bagnall ex Drabble 335 ex Crompton-Roberts ex Montagu 266 ex Shepherd 26 ex Docking hoard. Same dies as next. 21 gr. *(d) Blunt ex Grantley 862 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. Same dies as last. Fragment. *(e) BMC 114. No date or provenance. 19-2 gr.

1 This is said in error in the Lockett sale catalogue to be ex Thorburn.
4. Monna. *(a) BMA 126 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. Same obv; die as next. 18-9 gr. *(b) Grantley 861 ex Montagu 268 ex Addington ex Cuff 294 or 295 ex Suffolk hoard. Same obv; die as last. 21 gr. *(c) Bagnall ex Carlyon-Britton 282 ex Astronomer 101 ex Montagu 267 ex Brice ex Wigan ex Cuff 294 or 295 ex Suffolk hoard. 21-4 gr. *(d) Mack ex Lockett 388 ex Napier ex Reynolds 12 ex Rashleigh 56. Said to be from the Trewhiddle hoard, but see Arch., xcvi, p. 110. 22 gr.

Type III

**Obr.** Bust r. +DGRVVL+RE (on no. 5(a)); +DGRVVL+REX (on no. 5(b)). **Rev.** Moneyn’s name in two lines, ornaments between.

5. Eadgar. *(a) BMA 122 ex Middle Temple hoard. 19-6 gr. *(b) BMC 104 ex Cotton. 20-4 gr. *(Attributed in BMC to Ceolwulf I.)*

LUDICA (825-7) (Plate VI)

EAST ANGLIAN MINT (only)

Type I

**Obr.** Bust r. +LVDICA REX on no. 1(a); cv. ... on no. 1(b); LVDICA+HE on no. 2; no inner circle on no. 1(a); inner circle on nos. 1(b), 2, and 3. **Rev.** Cross-crosslet in beaded inner circle; moneyn’s name around.


**2. Eadnoth.** BMC 116 ex Cuff 296 ex Suffolk hoard. 22-7 gr.

Type II

**Obr.** Bust r. in dotted circle. +LVDICA REX ME. **Rev.** Moneyn’s name (PERBALD) in three lines.

**3. Werbald.** Hunter 354. 21-4 gr.

WIGLAF (827-9, 830-40) (Plate VII)

LONDON MINT (only)

1st Reign. 827-9

**Obr.** Crude bust r. within inner circle. +WIGLAF+RIXM (rounded). **Rev.** Cross-crosslet; no inner circle. Moneyn’s name. Moneyners: Ællhun (Ælhus), Burgherd.

Ællhun

**3. Ecgberht, 829-30, the London mint struck coins reading on the obv. +ECGBERT+RIXM (rounded), with a cross potent as central type. Rev. name of mint (-I-LV), -I-DONIA/CIVIT-, pl. vii, A) or of moneyn, +RED (rounded) VDHMONET(I) around central (r)A (pl. vii, B).**

2nd Reign. 830-40

*Obr. +WIGLAF+RIX M. Cross with pellet in each angle. **Rev.** Moneyn’s name (Redmuth) in three lines, lunettes above and below.

* For a discussion of the pedigree and authenticity of this coin, vide supra, pp. 46-49.
*3. *(a) 21·6 gr. BMA 131 ex Middle Temple hoard, Brooke, vii. 16. *(b) Same dies as *(a) but pellets added on reverse within lunettes. 22 gr. Mack ex Lockett 389 ex Grantley 863 ex Rashleigh 58 ex Pembroke 19. (Forgeries of this coin in Sharp and B.M. collections; see p. 50.)

KINGS OF KENT

EADBERHT PRAEN (796–8) (Plate I)

CANTERBURY MINT (only)

*Obv. King's name and title in three lines: EADBERHT REX.

Type (i)

Rev. Moneyer's name in one or two lines as part of a three-line pattern that varies in detail.

1. Babba. *(a) BMC 2 ex Gerrard, found at Hellesdon, Norwich. 20·4 gr. *(b) Bagnall ex Ryan 585 ex Grantley 879 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 17·3 gr. *(c) Fitzwilliam 429 ex Beaupré Bell, 1741. 18·4 gr.

2. Ethelmod. *(a) BMA 157 ex Evans ex Rolfe. Probably found in Kent. 18·4 gr. *(b) Ashmolean ex Ballard, 1755. 18·5 gr. *(c) Blunt ex Lockett 325 ex Drabble 342 ex Bruin 36 ex Bascom 13 ex Astronomer 78 ex Montagu 285 ex Marshall 50, ? ex Delgany hoard. 18·5 gr. *(d) BMA 156 ex Middle Temple hoard. 20·9 gr. *(e) Mack ex Ryan 586 ex Grantley 880 ex Rashleigh 81. Said in Rashleigh catalogue to have been acquired in Copenhagen in 1869 and in others to have been found at Maidstone. 16 gr.

3. Lætherht. BMA 3 ex Tyssen. 22·3 gr.

Type (ii)

Rev. Moneyer's name in two lines, 'bone' between.


Type (iii)

Rev. Moneyer's name in two lunettes.

5. Tidheah. Hunter 384. 19·6 gr.

CUTHRED (798–807)

CANTERBURY MINT (only)

GROUP I. Without portrait (c. 800–c. 805). (The order of the types is not necessarily chronological.) (Plate I)

Type (A)

*Obv. Throughout: King's name and title CVDRED REX round a cross with usually a pellet or a wedge in each angle.

Rev. Moneyer's name between the arms of a tribrach moline of varying forms, with sometimes a wedge in each angle.

(i) Triple tribrach


2. Eaba. *(a) BM ex Bruin 38 ex Wilte 24. 19·6 gr. *(b) BMC 12 ex Cotton (fragment).

(ii) Double tribrach

3. Eaba. Delgany hoard 4* (fragment).

4. Werheard. *(a) BM ex Barnett. 21·3 gr. *(b) Lockett 3548 ex Richardson 16 ex Doulton 1. 18·5 gr. *(c) Grantley 885 ex Marshall 52.

* We are indebted to Mrs. Martin for this reference.
(iii) Single tribrach

(iv) Double tribrach with circular centre containing a pellet


(v) Double tribrach with circular centre containing a smaller tribrach
*8. Eaba. *(a) BM ex Lockett 328 ex Montagu 289 ex Addington ex Bergne 45. Probably found in Beds. (Hawkins, p. 33). 20 gr. *(b) BM ex Roach Smith (small fragment).

Type (A)/(B)

Obv. As last.

Rev. Cross moline with circular centre containing a small cross.


Type (B)

Obv. Plain tribrach with circular centre containing a smaller tribrach.

Rev. As last, but pellet in centre.

*10. Duda. BMC 11 ex Cuff 258. 21-1 gr.

Type (C)

Obv. Tribrach with circles at end and circular centre containing a smaller tribrach.

Rev. Tribrach of varying forms.

(i) Rev. Single tribrach moline with circular centre containing a smaller tribrach
*11. Sigeberht. (a) BMA 161 ex Middle Temple hoard. 20-8 gr. *(b) Fitzwilliam 436 ex Lockett 329 ex Carlyon-Britton 294. 21-4 gr.

(ii) Rev. Single tribrach moline, a wedge in each angle

(iii) Rev. Double tribrach moline, a wedge in each angle

GROUP II. Cross-and-Wedges type, c. 805-807 (Plate II)

Obv. +CIVSRED REX/CANT: diademed bust r., breaking inner circle.

Rev. Moneyer’s name, with MONETA (M rounded): cross pommée with a wedge in each angle, within inner circle.


*15. Duda. *(a) BMC 5 ex Devonshire. 19-3 gr. *(b) BMA 158 ex Evans: found near Cambridge. 19 gr. *(c) BM ex Barnett 327, 17-6 gr. *(d) Fitzwilliam 431, no provenance. Chipped, 19-4 gr. From the same obv. die as (a). *(e) Glasgow (Cants) 386 ex Wigan. 19-8 gr. From the same dies as (d). *(f) Ryan 587 ex Carlyon-Britton 893. 18-8 gr. *(g) Rashleigh 82 (ill.). —. *(h) Lockett 2629 ex O’Hagan 304 ex Allen. 20 gr. *(i) Thorburn 29 (ill.) ex Montagu 287 ex Brice. —. *(j) Carlyon-Britton 293 (ill.) ex Mann 139. 20 gr. *(k) Lawrence 290 probably ex Rashleigh 84. —. *(l) Reading Univ. ex Wells ex Hazlitt 1022 (ill.).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Eaba. (Obv. inscription undivided.)</td>
<td>796-840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Eaba.</td>
<td>796-840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Heremod. (Rev. HEREMOD.)</td>
<td>796-840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sigeberht. (Rev. SIGEBERHTI, M angular.)</td>
<td>796-840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sigeberht. (Obv. Portrait of distinctive style, with prominent shoulders reminiscent of coins of Offa: inscription undivided. Rev. as 19.)</td>
<td>796-840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sigeberht.</td>
<td>796-840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Werheard. (Rev. VERHEARDI, M angular.)</td>
<td>796-840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Werheard. (Rev. as 22, but M rounded and С.)</td>
<td>796-840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canterbury Anonymous Issue (c. 822-3)**

**Group I. With bare head (Plate IV)**

- **Obv.** + (Moneyer’s name) MONETA: bare head, diademed, r.
- **Rev.** (i) °/DOROB/ERNIA/CIVITAS°: in five lines.
- **Rev.** (ii) °/DORO/BERNIA/CIVITA°: in five lines.

1. Diormod. (Rev. (i).) BMA 181 ex Middle Temple hoard. 21-8 gr.
2. Diormod. (Rev. (ii).) BMA 180 ex Dymock ex Cuff. 21-5 gr.
3. Oba. (Obv. inscription divided by 3 crosses joined to inner circle. Rev. (ii) but c/i, and no pellets below.) (a) BMA 182 ex Middle Temple hoard. Ill. Brooke, pl. iii, 13. 21-6 gr.
   (b) (Rev. without pellets.) BMA 183 ex Middle Temple hoard. 20-2 gr. (c) (Rev. without pellets.) BMA 184 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 21-0 gr.
4. Sigestef. (Rev. (i).) +/Hunter 390. III. Ruding, pl. 13, 2. Probably the coin referred to in Pegge’s Assemblage, p. 32, as being then in Duane’s cabinet. 21-5 gr.
5. Swefherd. (Rev. (ii).) +/Dresser ex Grantley 896 ex Montagu 312 ex Marsham 120 —, and probably also (b) Delgany hoard no. 4 (possibly the same coin as (a)). (c) Grantley 897 ex Lawrence and (d) Walters 41, a fragment.
6. Werheard. (Rev. (i).) BMA 187 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 21-0 gr.
7. Werheard. (Rev. (iii).) Blunt ex Ryan 602 ex Carlyon-Britton 896 ex Rashleigh 95, found at Eynsham Abbey, Oxford, 1854. 21-8 gr.
GROUP II. With 'bonneted' head (Plate IV)

**Obv.** As I, but 'bonneted' head with diadem ties.

**Rev.** As I.


*9. Sweferth. (Rev. (i) but ci/v and no triangles of pellets.) *(a) BMA 185. No pedigree. 23-2 gr.  (b) Copenhagen 84 ex Montagu 311 ex Brice. 22-2 gr.  *(c) Mack ex Lockett 2635 ex Carlyon-Britton 1619 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 21-3 gr.  *All three coins are from the same pair of dies.*

*10. Sweferth. (Rev. (i) but ci/v.) BMA 186 ex Middle Temple hoard. 22-2 gr.  *From the same obv. die as (9).*

*Mule: Group II/Baldred Bonnet type

*11. Sweferth. Abp. Sharp collection. 20-9 gr.  *From the same obv. die as 9 and 10.*

---

**Baldred** (c. 823-5)

**A. Canterbury Mint**

GROUP I. Bonnet type (Plate IV)

**Obv.** +Baldred Rex Cant: head r., 'bonneted' with diadem ties, within inner circle.

**Rev.** Moneyer's name, with moneta: within inner circle drvr cits in two lines, with contraction marks. m sometimes rounded, sometimes angular.

*1. Diormod. (Obv. cant.) BMA 164 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 21-4 gr.

†*2. Diormod. (Obv. Baldred. Rev. Moneta.) *(a) BMC 15 ex Tyssen ex Langford. 20-7 gr. and probably also *(b) Ryan 589 (ili.) ex Grantley 888 ex Rashleigh 86. Fragment, 16-4 gr.  *(Spelling of king's name uncertain.)*


*4. Sigestef. Bagnall ex Grantley 887 ex Montagu 291 ex Shepherd 12 ex Murchison 59 ex Dymock 38 ex Barrett ex Rich ex Dimsdale 78. —.

*5. Sweferth. BM ex Lockett 330 ex Bascom 17 ex Murdoch 36 ex Montagu 290 ex Addington ex Yorke Moore 27. 22 gr.


GROUP II. Non-portrait types (Plate IV)

**Obv.** +Baldred Rex Cant: plain cross within inner circle.

**Rev.** Moneyer's name, without moneta: various designs, within inner circle.

*7. Diormod. (Rev. diormod: plain cross, with three disconnected forks dividing the inscription. BMA 165 ex Middle Temple hoard. 20-7 gr.


*9. Oba. (As 8, but a over e to read Baldred.) BMA 171 ex Middle Temple hoard. 19-6 gr.

10. Oba. (O. Cross and pellets. Rev. as 8.) *(a) BMC 17: no date or provenance. 22 gr.  (b) BMA 170 ex Middle Temple hoard. 17-4 gr.  (c) Hunter 389. 20-0 gr.

*11. Oba. (O. as 10. Rev. as 8 but without pellets.) BMA 173 ex Middle Temple hoard. 19-5 gr.

†*12. Sigestef. (Rev. Plain cross.) *(a) O. omits cant. BMA 174 ex Middle Temple hoard. 21-5 gr.  *(b) D. Lockett ex Lockett 3549 ex Grantley 890 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 20 gr.


*15. Tidbeaht. (Rev. Cross with one limb forked.) *(a) BMA 177 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 19-1 gr. *(b) BMA 178. 18-8 gr. and *(c) BMA 179. 19-2 gr. Both ex Middle Temple hoard. *(d) Westminster School ex Delgany hoard. 20-4 gr. *(e) Blunt ex Rashleigh 85 (ill.) ex Bergne 47; found near Aylesford, Kent. 19 gr. *(f) Mack ex Ryan 588 ex Crompton-Roberts ex Montagu 295 ex Evans ex Shepherd 13; found in Suffolk. The coin is illustrated in NC xxv. p. 103. The Montagu catalogue confused it with (e).

*16. Werheard. (Obv. omits the ethnic. Rev. Plain cross.) *(a) BMC 19 ex Dorking hoard. 21-2 gr. *(b) Murdoch 37; found in East Coker churchyard, near Yeovil, between 1860 and 1870. —.

B. ROCHESTER MINT

GROUP I. With 'Rex H' (Plate V)

Obv. + BALDRED REX H (R usually appears as F): bust r. breaking inner circle, with ear and back of neck formed as a rounded M on some specimens.

Rev. Moneyer's name, with MOŠETA (N rounded): various designs, within inner circle.

*17. Dunun. (Rev. Cross moline.) BMA 166 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 19-6 gr.


*19. Dunun. (Obv. omits initial cross. Rev. DANAN: wheel design with seven 'spokes', pellets between.) Ashmolean ex Passmore; found in Old Swindon 1903. 20-8 gr.

*20. Dunun. (Obv... ALDRED... Rev. +DVN... Type uncertain.) Stewart ex Grantley 899 (?) Fragment.

21. Ethelmod. (Rev. Wheel design, no pellets.) (a) (Six 'spokes') BMC 16, no date or provenance. Chipped. *(b) (Uncertain obv. reading, seven 'spokes'.) Ashmolean ex Knight, presented to Bodley 1795. III. Ruding, pl. 29, 12. Chipped, 16-8 gr.

GROUP II. With 'Rex' alone (Plate V)

Obv. + BALDRED REX (R normal): bust r. of more conventional form, breaking inner circle.

Rev. As I: wheel design.

22. Ethelmod. (Rev. Seven 'spokes', no pellets.) Mack ex Lockett 2631 ex Grantley 886 ex Evans. 19 gr.

*23. Ethelmod. (Rev. Eight 'spokes', pellets between.) BMA 167 ex Montagu 293 ex Miss Scott ex Delgany hoard. 18-5 gr.


KINGDOM OF EAST ANGLIA

EADWALD (c. 796–c. 798?) (Plates V and VI)

Type I

Obv. King's name and title in three lines.

Rev. Moneyer's name in quarter of a cross, the ends joined.


*2. Lul. BM. Found at Richborough 1924. 22 gr.

Type II

Obv. As last.

Rev. Moneyer's name in quarters of a cross with arms joined to form a celtic cross and with lozenge centre.

CANTERBURY ARCHBISHOPCOPAL MINT
ÆTHELHEARD (793–805) (Plate II)

Type I

Obv. The archbishop's name and title in a circumscription, finishing with two letters, EP, in the centre.
Rev. The name of the king, his title and ethnic in the arms of a tribrach moline. No moneyer's name.

*1. (a) BMC 24 ex Hollis 67. 21-9 gr.  (b) Hunter 393. 19-0 gr.  (c) Blunt ex Lockett 2633 ex Bascom 19 ex Murdoch 38 ex Montagu 301 ex Bergne 110 ex Murchison 88 ex Dymoel 40 ex Devonshire 155. 21 gr.  (d) Ryan 593 ex Sotheby 28.7.1930, 192. Found at New Stanstead Hall, Essex, 1870.  (e) Proc. Num. Soc. 21.12.1876. 'Lately found near St. Edmund's Chapel, Rochester Cathedral'. (Present whereabouts not known.)

Type II (A)

Obv. As last, but the e in the centre is miniscule and sometimes reversed.
Rev. King's name and title in circumscription; in centre rounded m.


Type II (B). Similar to (A) but letters in centre AR.

*3. Vatican. No provenance. 21 gr.

WULFRED, 805–32 (?suspended, 817–21) (Plate VIII)

GROUP I. Types without moneyer's name (c. 805–810?)

Obv. ÆVLREDI ARCHIEPISCOPI: tonsured facing portrait within inscription.
Rev. +DOROVERNIAE CIVITATIS: (i) cross-crosslet (ii) Alpha-Omega.


GROUP II. Transitional Monogram type (with full obv. inscription) (c. 810?)

Obv. ÆVLREDI ARCHIEPISCOPI: as group I but less intricate portrait, and large pellet each side of face.

Rev. +SAEBERHT MONETA (rounded m): Monogram with angular first o.

*3. Inscriptions begin at 12 o'clock:  (a) BM ex Barnett 332.  (b) Fitzwilliam 438. 20-6 gr.  *(c) D. Lockett ex R. C. Lockett 3552 ex Montagu 304 ex Marsham 111 ex Murchison ex Loscombe ex Sevington hoard. 21 gr.  Obv. Inscri. starts at 1 o'clock:  (d) A. E. Bagnall ex Drabble 346 ex Carlyon-Britton 1618 ex Rashleigh ex Cuff. 21 gr.  *(e) BMC 27, broken (final a barred?).  Obv. Inscri. starts 6:30 o'clock. Rev. at 9 o'clock; final a chevron-barred:  (f) Hon hoard, ill. NNFS, no. 4, Oslo 1931, pl. no. 6, with loop attachment.

GROUP III. Regular monogram type (pre-823)

Obv. ÆVLREDI ARCHIEPISCOPI: bust to edge of coin.

Rev. As group II; usually Roman m and final a unbarred. Moneyers Saebherht and Sweferht.

*4B. Sæberht. Rev. Inscr. starts at 6 o'clock; final A barred; diamond o. BM ex Barnett 331.

*4C. Sæberht. Rev. Final A barred; round o. Copenhagen 83 ex Montagu 303 (ill.) ex Brice ex Bergne 111. 22-2 gr.

*4D. Sæberht. (Usual variety, with Roman M, final A unbarred, and round o.) (a) Glasgow (Coats) 396. 22½ gr. (b) Hunter 395. 20-6 gr. *(c) Ryan 594 ex Reynolds 22 ex Astronomer 124 ex Richardson ex Doulton. 22½ gr. (d) Obv. Inscr., A below p, followed by colon: BMC 26 (pl. xii). (e) Ashmolean ex Lawrence 210. 13-2 gr. (fragment). (f) ? this variety. Bascom 20. 21 gr., broken and repaired.

4E. Obv. as no. 4A, Rev. as 4D. Mack ex Grantley 894 ex Lawrence. Pierced.


*6. Obv. Three pellets each side of face (all coins same obv. die). *(a) BMA 198 ex Middle Temple hoard. 20-7 gr. (b) Westminster School ex Scott ex Delgany. 21-2 gr. (c) BMA 197 ex Middle Temple hoard. 21-7 gr. (d) Fitzwilliam 439 ex Rashleigh 93. 14-0 gr. (corroded). Specimens (c) and (d) ? from same rev. die.

7A. Sæfherd. Rev. round M, barred A, round o. Fitzwilliam 440 ex Young gift 1936 ex Bliss 46 (ill.) ex Montagu (v) 3. 23-3 gr.


*7C. Sæfherd. Rev. Round o, Roman M, unbarred A. *(a) BMA 202 ex Middle Temple hoard. 20 gr. (b) ? this variety. Bruun 42 (not ill.) ex ‘Property of Gentleman’ 1903, 340. 19-7 gr. (c) ? this variety. Montagu 305 ex Shepherd 51.

*8. Sæfherd. Obv. Three pellets by each cheek. Pellets in line: *(a) BMA 201 ex Middle Temple hoard. 17-6 gr. (b) Same obv. die as (a). Westminster School ex Scott ex Delgany. 19-4 gr. (c) Drabble 818 ex Mann 140 ex Bliss 47 ex Montagu 306. 21 gr. (d) Same dies as (e). Lockett 3551 ex Rashleigh 92 ex Cuf f 391. 21½ gr. (e) Same dies as (c) and (d). Gantz 1007 (ill.). Pellets in triangle: (f) BMA 200 (pl. xi, 6) ex Evans fd. near Wallingford. 19-2 gr. (g) Mack ex Grantley 895.

GROUP IV. Anonymous Issue (c. 823)

Obv. Moneyer’s name surrounding tonsured, facing bust. Luning’s obv. dies have three dots each side of face.

Rev. Mint name in lines across field.

(i) "DOROBERNIA/CI VITAS/’

(ii) "DOROBERNIA/CIVITA/’

(i) Moneyers Sæberht, Sæfherd, and Luning


10. Sæfherd. (a) Hunter 399 (ill. Ruding, pi. 13, 4). 20-6 gr. (b) Glasgow (Coats) 400 ex Wigan. 18-3 gr.

*11. Luning. (a) BMA 210. 20-8 gr. *(b) Same dies as (a) Westminster School ex Scott ex Delgany hoard. 20-8 gr.

(ii) Moneyers Sæfherd, Luning, and Vilnod

13. Luning. (a) Fitzwilliam 441 ex Carlyon-Britton 299. 21·1 gr. (b) Same rev. die as (a). Fitzwm. 442 ex Lockett 337 ex Astronomer 131 ex Montagu 309 ex Brice ex Lake-Price ex Murchison ex Dymock, 20·4 gr. (c) Glasgow (Craits) 397 ex Wigan. 22 gr. (d) BMA 207 ex Middle Temple hoard (ill. NC 1923, pl. xi, 8, and Brooke, pl. iv, 3). 20·9 gr. (e) BMA 208 purchd. 1838. 20·4 gr. (f) Unbarred A in Civitas. BMA 209 purchd. 1890. 17·9 gr. (chipped). (g) BM ex Barnett 333 = ? Bruun 44 ex Napier 16 ex Evans ex Delgany hoard. 19·3 gr. (chipped). (h) Drabble S19. 21 gr. (i) Blunt ex Lawrence (repaired).

14. Vilnod. Unbarred A in Civitas: BMA 212 ex Middle Temple hoard. 21·1 gr.

**GROUP V.** *Dorobernia Civitas* in Wulfred's name (hybrids with reverses of group IV, ii)

(i) *Obv.* As Group VI + WULFREDARCHIEP.

(ii) *Rev.* As Group IV, ii. (A mule.)

15. *BMC* 25 (pl. xii, 6) ex Devonshire 156. 22·0 gr. (See also Ruding, pl. 13, 3 quoting Pegge's Assemblage.)

(ii) *Obv.* Name Wulfred only, apparently cut over earlier inscription on the dies.

*GROUP VI.** *Baldred type* (c. 823–825)

*Obv.* | WULFREDARCHI.

*Rev.* DAVR CIVTS, surrounded by moneyer's name and MONET.

Moneyers: Sweferth and Vilnod.

17. *Sweferth.* *(a) Obv.* inscription recut? *Rev.* line below CITTS. Blunt ex Lockett 2634 ex Dorset hoard (NC 1915, pl. xvii, 8), 22·0 gr. (b) Pellet each side of head. *BMC* 28 (pl. xii, 8), purchd. 1836. 20·8 gr. (c) Two pellets on left side of head. Lockett 335 ex Carlyon-Britton 298 ex Astronomer 125 ex Montagu 30 ex Brice ex Shepherd 50 ex Murchison ex Loscombe ? ex Sevington hoard (see Arch, xxvii, pl. xxiii, 2). 22·0 gr.

18. *Vilnod.* *(a) Line above DR. *BMA* 204 (pl. xi, 7), ex Middle Temple hoard. 21·5 gr. *(b) Line above DR and below CITTS. *BMA* 205 ex Middle Temple hoard. 20·8 gr. *(c) Pellet each side of face. *BMA* 206 ex Middle Temple hoard. 18·8 gr.

**GROUP VII.** *Second monogram (Ecbergirht) type*

*Obv.* | PLFRED/ARCEPS. Bust to edge of coin.

*Rev.* | SPEFHEARD MOH around DOROB c cruciform monogram.

19. *Sweferth.* *BMA* 203 ex Middle Temple hoard (NC 1894, pl. iv, 1). 19·0 gr.
### TABLE B

*Approximate Chronology of the Activity of Southern English Mints, 796–839*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Canterbury (royal)</th>
<th>Canterbury (archiepiscopal)</th>
<th>Rochester</th>
<th>East Anglia</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Winchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>796</td>
<td>Eadberht</td>
<td>Mint closed?</td>
<td>Eadwald</td>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td></td>
<td>M?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>798</td>
<td>Praen</td>
<td>E_Ethelheard</td>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 800 (?)</td>
<td>Coenwulf and Cuthred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805</td>
<td>Wulfred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807</td>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 810 (?)</td>
<td>Wulfred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>821</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Wulfred</td>
<td>Ceolwulf</td>
<td>Ceolwulf</td>
<td></td>
<td>M?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>823</td>
<td>Baldred</td>
<td>Wulfred</td>
<td>Baldred</td>
<td>Beornwulf</td>
<td>M?</td>
<td>M?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825</td>
<td>Ecgberht</td>
<td>Mint closed?</td>
<td>Ecgberht</td>
<td>Ludicia</td>
<td></td>
<td>M?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_Ethelstan</td>
<td>Wiglaf</td>
<td></td>
<td>M?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecgberht</td>
<td></td>
<td>M?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>Wulfred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wiglaf</td>
<td></td>
<td>M?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>833–9</td>
<td>Ceolnoth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mint closed?</td>
<td>Ecgberht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The date at which Cuthred's coinage started has not received the attention in the text which we had intended. He appears to have shared the Canterbury mint with Coenwulf, but the fact that none of the moneyers who struck for Cuthred had issued coins either for Offa's last type or for Eadberht Praen, whereas three of those working for Coenwulf had struck for Offa or Eadberht (or both), suggests that Cuthred did not obtain coining rights immediately on his accession in 798. This view receives some support from the fact that in our Group I surviving coins of Ceolwulf of the Canterbury mint are nearly twice as plentiful as those of Cuthred, whereas in Group II those of Cuthred are more than twice as plentiful as those of Coenwulf. We have therefore given c. 800 as a provisional date for the start of Cuthred's coinage, which appears to have represented, towards the end of his life, the greater part of the output of the Canterbury mint.
TABLE A

Historical Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mercia</th>
<th>Kent</th>
<th>Archbishops of Canterbury</th>
<th>East Anglia</th>
<th>Wessex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Offa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accn. and death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Egfrith.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accn. of Coenwulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>821</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>821</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Coenwulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accn. of Ceolwulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expn. of Ceolwulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accn. of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beornwulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beornwulf, Accn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Ludica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludicia, Accn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Wiglaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecgberht</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conquers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiglaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recovers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Wulfred.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feolgoild arbp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceolnoth arbp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Wiglaf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accn. of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berhtwulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berhtwulf, Accn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Burgred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items in italics depend on numismatic evidence only.
## Table D

Canterbury Moneyers at the Royal Mint from c. 805 to c. 828, showing the Number of Coins Recorded of each Type or Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Monogram Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 805-c. 810</td>
<td>Cuthred and Coenwulf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuthred</td>
<td>A. Cross-and-Wedges Quatrefoil Aura</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>B. Cross and Moline</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. Cross-Crosslet</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. 810-c. 815</th>
<th>Coenwulf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cuthred</td>
<td>A. Cross-and-Wedges Quatrefoil Aura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>B. Cross and Moline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>C. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>D. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>E. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>F. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>G. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>H. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>I. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>J. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>K. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>L. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>M. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>N. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>O. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>P. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>Q. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>R. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>S. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>T. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>U. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>V. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>W. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>X. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>Y. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>Z. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. 815-21</th>
<th>Cuthred and Coenwulf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cuthred</td>
<td>A. Cross-and-Wedges Quatrefoil Aura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>B. Cross and Moline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>C. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>D. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>E. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>F. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>G. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>H. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>I. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>J. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>K. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>L. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>M. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>N. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>O. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>P. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>Q. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>R. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>S. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>T. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>U. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>V. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>W. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>X. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>Y. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>Z. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. 821-3</th>
<th>Cuthred and Coenwulf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cuthred</td>
<td>A. Cross-and-Wedges Quatrefoil Aura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>B. Cross and Moline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>C. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>D. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>E. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>F. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>G. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>H. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>I. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>J. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>K. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>L. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>M. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>N. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>O. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>P. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>Q. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>R. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>S. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>T. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>U. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>V. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>W. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>X. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>Y. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>Z. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. 821-3</th>
<th>Cuthred and Coenwulf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cuthred</td>
<td>A. Cross-and-Wedges Quatrefoil Aura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>B. Cross and Moline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>C. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>D. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>E. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>F. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>G. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>H. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>I. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>J. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>K. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>L. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>M. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>N. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>O. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>P. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>Q. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>R. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>S. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>T. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>U. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>V. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>W. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>X. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>Y. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coenwulf</td>
<td>Z. Cross-Crosslet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. 822</th>
<th>Eaba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. 823</th>
<th>Seberht</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. 824</th>
<th>Werheard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. 825</th>
<th>Heremod</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. 826</th>
<th>Dealla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. 827</th>
<th>Oba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. 828</th>
<th>Sigestef</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. 829</th>
<th>Swefherd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. 830</th>
<th>Walgar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table above provides a detailed record of the numismatic history of Canterbury during the period from c. 805 to c. 828, highlighting the moneyers and their types, along with the number of coins recorded for each.
The figures shown on Tables C–H are the number of specimens listed in the Corpus.

### TABLE C

Table of Moneyers of the Early (Non-portrait) Coins of Mercian and Kentish kings at Southern Mints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyers</th>
<th>Canterbury</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Undetermined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earlier</td>
<td>Late</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babba</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eoba</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethelnoth</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethelmod</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isenberht</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidheah</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seberht</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duda</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaba</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigeberht</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werheard</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE E

Coins of Archbishop Wulfred's Mint at Canterbury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>I. Eadberht c. 805–7</th>
<th>II. Coenwulf Pre-823</th>
<th>III. Coenwulf Phase (i) c. 823</th>
<th>IV. Anonymous Issue c. 823</th>
<th>V. 823</th>
<th>VI. 823–5</th>
<th>VII. c. 830</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No moneyer's name</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saeberht</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweferht</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luning</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilnod</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE F

The Moneyers Active at Rochester from c. 810 to c. 840

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>I. Early</th>
<th>H. Late</th>
<th>I. With bust</th>
<th>H. With head</th>
<th>I. Rex H</th>
<th>H. Rex</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>Non-portrait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ealhstan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dun (un)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eanwulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erthelmod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beagnum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE G

East Anglian Moneyers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Offa</th>
<th>Eadwald</th>
<th>Coenwulf</th>
<th>Ceolwulf</th>
<th>Beornwulf</th>
<th>Ludica</th>
<th>Eadwig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witred</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadnoth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fotred (Botred)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereberht</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadgar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werwald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadnoth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE H

Coins Attributed to the London Mint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Coenwulf 796-821</th>
<th>Ceolwulf 821-3</th>
<th>Beornwulf 823-5</th>
<th>Ludica 825-7</th>
<th>Wiglaf 1st Reign 827-9</th>
<th>Wiglaf 2nd Reign 829-39</th>
<th>Wiglaf restored 830-40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sasnamund</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceolheard</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigher (?)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælflæl</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceolbald</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ercmodd (alias Ethelmod)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgheard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Londonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II . . . . . waifu</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>