A typical well-struck Long Cross coin of Æthelraed II goes a long way towards refuting those who would see no art in the late Anglo-Saxon coinage. The cruder design of the 50 or so coins under discussion here, as one may see from the plates, stands out sharply in comparison. But one is also struck by the remarkable homogeneity of this group of coins; this is surely not the result of chance barbarisation.

The portrait first draws the attention to a coin of this group. Whereas on the more usual Long Cross coin it is rendered mainly in curves, the portrait on what will here be called the 'subsidiary' style is noticeably angular. The nose is a thick, straight line. The neck and shoulder are one continuous line from the ear to the edge of the coin, unlike the more naturalistic curve of the main style. With the hair or diadem, the radiating lines are all straight, and the terminal pellets very pronounced. The proportions of head to field are often distinctive in that the head is unusually large. The lettering too is distinctive; large and clumsy, it necessitates a drastic abbreviation of the ethnic, which seldom reads further than ANG on coins of this group.

Fig 1 Distribution of mints striking the 'Subsidiary Long Cross' variety.
True reverses are naturally more difficult to recognise. Sometimes it is possible to see
the same large lettering and short legend, but 'large' is a relative term in the absence of more
certain stylistic features.

The distribution of this 'subsidiary' group of Long Cross coins is interesting (Fig. 1). All
the instances so far recorded are from mints in the east and south-east of England. Most
northerly, the Lincoln mint provides several examples; they are represented at Norwich,
and in the little cluster of mints Huntingdon, Bedford and Cambridge. They are present at
Colchester, and most numerous at London. South of the Thames they reappear at
Canterbury, Dover, Romney and Lewes.

A problem in attribution is raised by the examples with mint-signatures of SVD and SVD.
Since coins in this style are plentiful at London, and continue to occur south of the river,
Southwark is a possible though not a certain location. On the other hand Sudbury lies midway
between the other source-mints of Colchester and Cambridge, and if a mint was operating
there in the period 997–1003, coins of this style would be expected. Prosopography helps
not at all; the SVD–SVDB moneyer is one Godric, perhaps the commonest of Anglo-Saxon
personal names at this period, widespread over the whole country with no regional associations.
Not surprisingly, the London mint has its Godric in the Long Cross type, and so do Cambridge,
Colchester and Huntingdon, the mints circumbent to Sudbury. Both London and Col-
chester have coins of Godric in the 'subsidiary' style. These coins could belong equally to
Southwark or Sudbury, or indeed some to each.

Having established that these 'subsidiary' coins constitute some sort of homogeneous
group in style and distribution, two questions suggest themselves. Firstly, are they in fact
part of the English series? And secondly, if they are, what part did they play in the Æthelraed
coinage?

The answer to the first question is not so obvious as it might seem. The fact is that
attention was first drawn to the peculiarities of the group during an attempt to weed out
foreign imitations from the Stockholm Systematic Collection. Long Cross is the type amongst
Æthelraed's coins most frequently imitated in Scandinavia and Ireland, and in Ireland
particularly the imitators developed a style of portrait certainly not barbarous, but
distinctive. There are, indeed, two coins which show the 'subsidiary' style on the obverse
and are unquestionably Irish. One is in the Systematic Collection in Stockholm and bears
Æthelraed's name and title. The other, in the Hermitage Museum, Leningrad, is from the
same reverse die, (reading EDRIC M'O DYF) but the obverse is in the name of Sihtric, king in
Dublin. It is, however, not necessary to class the 'subsidiary' group as a whole with the Irish
series on account of these two coins. In the first place, it is probably significant that the
only two known coins of the 'subsidiary style from the Dublin mint share the same reverse
die. Amongst the group with English mint-signatures there is very little die-linking, which
suggests that they are what they purport to be—the work of several mints, and not the
imitations of one. Further, all those signed as from English mints are free from the traces
of Irish imitation—the upright cross instead of x in rex, the intrusive i, the blundering
of personal or place-name. The close-knit distribution too, hardly favours a haphazard
copying of English mint-signatures. Finally, if the whole group were Irish, it would furnish
the only Irish imitation ever to be found in an English hoard of the late Anglo-Saxon period;
an example of this style appears in the Honey Lane Market hoard¹. The two Dublin obverses
must surely be regarded as clever imitations of the 'subsidiary' style.

¹ R. H. M. Dolley, in NC, 1958, p. 100.
As with many aspects of Anglo-Saxon numismatics, description is easier than explanation, since the coins exist almost in a documentary vacuum. Nevertheless, even if no acceptable explanation should be forthcoming, mere description has its uses; isolated examples of the style have been remarked on for their 'unusual work', and are better understood if they are shown to have a background of more numerous examples and a specific distribution.

It is tempting to find parallels with styles and varieties in other types. The one that springs most immediately to mind is Hild. var. C a in Crux. There is the same occurrence of a portrait of different styles from that in the main issue. In 'subsidiary' Long Cross too the flan tends to be small and though it is not consistently lighter than Long Cross as a whole, a frequency-table for the weights of 'subsidiary' Long Cross shows a greater proportion of the weights in the lighter reaches of the table than is the case for the type as a whole. A curious facet of this is that all 'subsidiary' Long Cross coins weighing more than 23 grains are from the London mint. This achievement of better weight by London is exactly the same as that noted by Mr. B. H. I. H. Stewart in the 'small Crux' variety.

Where the exact analogy breaks down is that Hild. var. C a is known not only from mints in the 'subsidiary' Long Cross area, but from Bath, Exeter, and probably from Barnstaple and York.

Another analogy lies in the regional styles in the Last Small Cross issue of Æthelred and Cnut's Quatrefoil. But it is not a close analogy since the area is much wider than that covered by any one style in the types mentioned. Also, the coins of the 'subsidiary' style are very much in a minority even at the mints where they are most plentiful. The most plausible die-cutting centre is London; it is unlikely that Lincoln should have supplied London with dies, or that Lincoln dies would have been sent south of the Thames. It is difficult to find any explanation for the regional distribution of 'subsidiary' Long Cross that does not include a division of territory for the supply of dies. Whatever the place filled by the issue of 'subsidiary' dies to the East, it is not impossible that some centre in the West, possibly Winchester, was fulfilling the same function for its own sphere of influence. We have so far spoken of the main issue as if it were completely homogeneous, but there is maybe a slightly variant style to be distinguished at southwestern mints, though it is less obtrusive than that under discussion here.

One explanation of the 'subsidiary' variety could be that after the initial recoinage in Long Cross was over, these dies were cut to supply replacements for broken dies. A shortage of silver at such a later date, caused by the drain of Danegeld from the country, might account for the smallness and lightness of the newer coins. Apart from this lowering of weight-standard there is no clue as to whether the variety appeared early or late in the type. Hoard evidence and prosopography, on present evidence, would fit either position. One could say with more confidence that this 'subsidiary' variety was taking the same place in the currency of Long Cross that 'small Crux', Hild. var. C a. took in the Crux issue, with this difference: that whereas the 'small Crux' variety was issued over the whole country, 'subsidiary' Long Cross reflects a regional die-distribution such as was later to show such effect in Last Small Cross.

There follows a list of examples of 'subsidiary' Long Cross coins from the Stockholm Systematic Collection. Other examples I have come across which furnish mints and moneyers not known in this collection have been added for the sake of completeness. Where obverse and

---

reverse legends are correctly recorded in Hildebrand, only the Hildebrand number is given. Finally, my thanks are due to the Statens Historiska Museum, Stockholm, and to the Department of Coins and Medals of the British Museum, for the photographs which make up the accompanying plates.

**BEDFORD**  
Ælfwi  
BM ex Honey Lane Market hoard  
Wt. 20-1 grains

**CAMBRIDGE**  
Edwine  
Hild. 1168  
Wt. 20 gr.  
Pl. II, 1

**CANTERBURY**  
Wulfsige  
Hild. 1211  
Wt. 19-2 gr.  
Pl. II, 4

**COVENTRY**  
Godric  
Hild. 295  
Wt. 19 gr.  
Pl. II, 6

**DOVER**  
Lyfeye  
Hild. 422  
Wt. 17-6 gr.  
Pl. II, 7

**HUNTINGDON**  
Ælfric  
Hild. 1361  
Wt. 19-5 gr.  
Pl. II, 8

**LEWES**  
Merewino  
Hild. 1461  
Wt. 20-5 gr.  
Pl. II, 10, 11

**LINCOLN**  
Ælfsige  
Hild. 1619  
Wt. 22-2 gr.  
Pl. II, 12

**LONDON**  
Ælfwine  
Hild. 2125  
Wt. 25-4 gr.  
Pl. II, 17

**MARGATE**  
Ælfwine  
Hild. 2126  
Wt. 25-4 gr.  
Pl. II, 18

**SCOTLAND**  
Ælfwine  
Hild. 2129  
Wt. 26-1 gr.  
Pl. II, 20

**SOUTHAMPTON**  
Ælfsige  
Hild. 1628  
Wt. 18-5 gr.  
Pl. II, 13

**OTHER LOCALLITIES**  
Wulfsige  
Hild. 1629  
Wt. 18 gr.  
Pl. II, 14

**SHREWSBURY**  
Ælfwine  
Hild. 2137  
Wt. 21-5 gr.  
Pl. II, 22 v

1 2 examples, the second weighing 21-5 gr.
2 Formerly attributed to Winchester; see R. H. M. Dolley in *SNO* 1959 p. 200.
3 Obverse in fact reads +ædleræd ræx an.
4 Obverse in fact reads +ædleræd.
5 Obverse reads +æðelcræf.
6 Obverse reads +æðelcræf.
7 2 examples, the second weighing 24.6 gr.
8 Reverse in fact reads +æðelræc n’o ñynd.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hild.</th>
<th>Wt.</th>
<th>Pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Osulf</td>
<td>2884</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>III, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toca</td>
<td>2946</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>III, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Úlfstan</td>
<td>2989</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>III, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfric</td>
<td>3005</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>III, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfwine</td>
<td>3006</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>III, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leofmar</td>
<td>3148</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>III, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leofwine</td>
<td>3316</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>III, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godric</td>
<td>3609</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>III, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(or ? Sudbury) Godric</td>
<td>3610</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>III, 52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(or ? SUDBURY)
A SUBSIDIARY ISSUE OF THEL/II's LONG CROSS TYPE. I

PLATE II
A SUBSIDIARY ISSUE OF ÆTHELRAED II'S LONG CROSS TYPE. II