THREE TENTH-CENTURY HOARDS: BATH (1755), KINTBURY (1761), THREADNEEDLE STREET (before 1924)

C. E. BLUNT AND H. E. PAGAN

In his valuable list of hoards, Professor Dolley names only four from the south of England and one from East Anglia deposited between 930 and Edgar's reform of the coinage in the 970s. Of the southern finds, the one from Threadneedle Street, London (Dolley, no. 83) is virtually unpublished; another, from Oxford (Dolley, no. 74), consists of four coins, all so corroded or damaged as to make close identification very difficult; of the other two, from Bath and Kintbury, the sketchiest information has so far been available. Of the one East Anglian find, made at Honedon in Suffolk in 1687 (Dolley, no. 85), Mrs. Strudwick (now Mrs. Martin) has been able to record only twenty-four coins out of a probable total of 200 to 300, but in so doing has produced a clear picture of the likely composition of the whole. The purpose of this paper is to place on record information that has lately come to light on the Bath and Kintbury hoards (Dolley, nos. 93 and 90), to publish in detail the little Threadneedle Street hoard, and to compare the Honedon hoard with them.

THE BATH HOARD OF 1755 (Dolley no. 93)

Dr. Metcalf, in his valuable study of the records of the Society of Antiquaries, called attention to a find of tenth-century coins at Bath which, though mentioned incidentally in a published work, had previously escaped the notice of modern numismatists. He supplemented the evidence of the Society's minute books with a long extract from a letter in the British Museum from W. Oliver, dated 22 January 1756.

These contemporary accounts show that during the demolition in 1755 of the Abbey House (or Priory House), a building of medieval origin associated with Bath Abbey which stood beside the Roman Bath there, workmen came across a number of graves at depths of seven to nine feet belonging to an Anglo-Saxon cemetery that overlay a Roman floor. (Professor Cunliffe has informed us that one further grave from the cemetery was discovered in his excavations in the area in the 1960s.) It was in one of these graves that the hoard was discovered. The Antiquaries' minute book states that the coins were found in a stone coffin, Oliver's letter that they were found 'under the occiput of a skeleton, who did not appear to have any coffin—They seem to have been laid up in a wooden box'.

When they come to the identification of the coins the two accounts differ in detail. The first entry in the minute books refers to '50 pieces of Saxon coin of Ethelred and Edmund' and a later entry adds that Mr. Vertue says that there was one of Alfred.

1 SCBI Hiberno-Norse, pp. 47-54. W. Oliver's letter is culled.
2 NC 1958, pp. 77-9 from which the information cited in this context from the minute book and from
3 Surtees Soc., lxxx (1885), p. 194,
Oliver’s letter refers to there being ‘between twenty and thirty coins, of Athelstan, Edmund, and Edred’.

Metcalf reviews the whole of the evidence and concludes that in all probability there were twenty to thirty coins of Athelstan, Edmund, and Eadred, and perhaps one of Alfred and that the date of the deposit must have been after 946. He then adds a note that there was in the Grantley collection a small group of four coins of Eadwig that Lord Grantley had bought in Bath and which were said to have come from an old hoard in the locality. ‘It is possible’, Metcalf says, ‘that they were from the Bath hoard and, if so, its date of deposit must be advanced another nine years, to after A.D. 955.’ We shall argue later that there is every likelihood that this last parcel is in fact from the Kintbury hoard.

That Metcalf’s first surmise was very close to the mark can now be shown as a result of the discovery of a contemporary manuscript list of the coins among Banks papers that are preserved at the Royal Mint. We are very much indebted to Mr. G. P. Dyer of the Royal Mint for bringing these papers to our notice and to the Deputy Master for giving permission for the material they contain to be used for the purpose of this paper.

The list is in the hand of the Revd. George North (1710-72), a well-known numismatist and the very person who, in January 1756, addressed the Society of Antiquaries on the subject of the Bath hoard. It is headed:

‘An Account of the Saxon Coins found at Bath in the foundations of the Priory (space) in the possession of Mr Wood Architect & transmitted to me by James Mundy Esq1 for my inspection’.

‘Mr Wood Architect’ would be John Wood the younger. To his father, also John and known as ‘Wood of Bath’, may be given the primary credit for the laying out of Georgian Bath with its terraces, crescents, circus, and squares. He died in 1754 and his son, who lived until 1782, was associated with many of his father’s works, brought some to completion after his death, and continued the development of the city, including building the famous Royal Crescent in 1767-9.¹

There then follows a list of the coins with full readings of both legends but for the most part without specific indication of the type. These can, however, be adduced with fair confidence. The listing is by reigns, but within the reigns in a seemingly haphazard order. At the end of the document, which is on two large sheets of paper, there is reference to two coins that must be irregular pieces.

The contents of the hoard may be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coin Type</th>
<th>BMC i (two-line type)</th>
<th>BMC i (two-line)</th>
<th>BMC i (two-line)</th>
<th>BMC i (two-line)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athelstan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMC v (circumscript/cross)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blundered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The coins, with the transcriptions that appear in the manuscript, may be described as follows:

¹ DNB.
ATHELSTAN

BMC i (two line)

1. Edelstan rex Alhstan, M

We previously knew of this variety only from the specimen in the Dublin (1883) hoard (BMA 505).

2. Edelstan rex [Vgen, Mon, N

Against this North has written 'forsan Norwich'. The type is not given, but it seems likely to be two-line. The G in the manuscript has a hook at the top making it nearly like a P with a foot. The same form is found in the transcription of the second G in the moneyer's name Ingelgar on no. 17 thus confirming that this was the letter intended. The Bath coin may be SCBI Copenhagen 710. The Norwich attribution must of course be ignored.

BMC v (circumscripti0n/cross)


This is an example of a plentiful issue but, if the omission of the G in the moneyer's name is correct, the reading does not appear to be recorded.

EDMUND

All appear to be of BMC i (two-line type) and, except for nos. 7 and 17, read on the obverse Eadmund rex. Except where indicated they are likely to have had a trefoil of pellets at the top and bottom of the reverse.

4. Aelfric Mon

Examples by this moneyer are in the British Museum (BMC 11, from the Rome hoard, 1846); Forum hoard, 292; American Numismatic Society, reading Elfric. None of these can be the Bath coin.

5. Aedered Mo

Our only records of this moneyer are a coin in the Brumell sale (1850) lot 44, which had a rosette at top and bottom of the reverse, which may be the same as SCBI Copenhagen 721 which, in turn, may be the Bath coin.

6. Baldric Mo.

A moneyer not hitherto recorded on the two-line type in this reign, but known for the 'helmet' type (BMC vii).

7. AIN, MO BVTD A (Baldwin Mo). On the obverse 'the letters reversed'.

A number of coins by this moneyer are known, but none corresponds with this description.

8. Baldpne Mo.

Nothing recorded corresponds exactly with this.
9. **BERNSIGE MÖ.**
   This could be *BMC* 28 ex Tyssen ex Hodsoll (1794).

10. **BIORNEARD M**
   A number of coins by this moneyer are known, but the only one reading BIORN- of which we previously had a record was from the Forum hoard (no. 306).

11. **BIVRENE 10.**
   We are unable to identify this moneyer's name or to record a comparable coin.

12. **BVRNRIC. MÖ**
   This form of the name, which probably equals Burnwic (see next coin), is recorded in *BMC* in italics, but we have not traced the coin on which the *BMC* entry is based. ¹

13. **BVRNFIC MO**
   Also in *BMC* in italics. A coin by this moneyer in the Murchison sale in 1866 (lot 272) is recorded as having a cross and two annulets on the centre line of the reverse.

14. **EDELSIGE.MO.**
   In *BMC* in italics. A specimen in the Blunt collection corresponds and has a cross at top and bottom of the reverse.

15. **GVNDFERD MO** (the D and M ligulated).
   This could well be *BMC* 72 (in BM before 1838).

16. **HEREMOD.MO**
   This could well be *BMC* 75 (in BM before 1838).

17. **EADMVNI REX.** 'the D omitted', **INGELGAR MÖ** 'The 4 first letters reversed'.
   The moneyer is well known, but we know of nothing corresponding to this description.

18. **ME-DO MONE.**
   Presumably Mældomen. We have records of four specimens, all with rosettes on the reverse, but none is likely to be the Bath coin. There is a coin of this moneyer, Carlyon-Britton 991 (ill.), which may be from the same reverse die as, due perhaps to a fracture of the die, it could easily be read MONE; it is not, however, the Bath coin because the L in the moneyer's name is clear.

19. **ONDRES MONETA.**
   Moneyer in *BMC* in italics and with a query. A specimen, with rosettes on the reverse (probably the authority for the *BMC* entry), was in the Forum hoard, no. 356; another similar coin is in the Manx Museum.

¹ The references in italics in *BMC* may at times be based on the Bath specimen. Grueber would no doubt have taken names from Hawkins who in turn derived from Ruding; and Ruding had access to North's manuscript material (Rudig, *Annals of the Coinage*, 3rd edn., 1841, i, pp. 122 n. and 132 n.; also Nichols's *Literary Anecdotes*, v, p. 454 n.).
20. FIGARD MO.

The moneyer’s name is known in this form from BMC 134 which is, however, from the Rome (1846) hoard. There is a drawing in the Murchison scrapbook in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, which is interesting in having an annulet in the centre of the obverse in place of the usual cross. This coin was not, however, in Murchison’s sale in 1866.

21. FIGEARD.M

A number of coins with the name in this form are recorded.

22. PVLFRIC.MO

A moneyer in BMC in italics, probably on the authority of Forum hoard no. 379.

23. ---RED.M-O

There are eleven moneyers in this reign with names ending -red so no identification is possible. No doubt a fragment.

EADRED

All appear to be BMC i (two-line type), reading on the obverse EADRED REX, and are likely to have trefoils of pellets at top and bottom of the reverse, except where otherwise noted.

24. ALSIGE.MO.

Alsige is in BMC in italics. Ælfsige (BMC 3 and 4) has rosettes top and bottom of the reverse and annulet, cross, annulet in the centre.

25. ADELMUND M-O

This corresponds with BMC 13 (ex Misc. sale 1842, lot 55).

26. BALDRIC.MON

This may be the coin illustrated BNJ xvi (1923-4), pl. i, 7 which in fact reads MO E, but not clearly. Rosettes on the rev.

27. BESE.MONT

This corresponds with SCBI Cambridge 589.

28. EAN.NMIO

Possibly Manna, but not identifiable.

29. ENGILRED.MO

BMC 38–9 are by this moneyer: another is in Leningrad. But none corresponds exactly.

30. INGELGAR MÖ EADRED REX I

Possibly BMC 58 (ex Shepherd 1847).

31. NAMNA.MO

Manna. Not unlike BMC 67 (ex Tyssen), but probably not the same coin.
32. OSEERB MO

33. OSEERB (the MO is omitted in the manuscript, but this may be without significance: unlike the other coins listed, it is placed on the same line as the preceding one and putting no more than the name may be just to call attention to the different spelling). Cited in this form BNJ xxi (1931–3), p. 38, no. 5. This, unlike the reference for the preceding coin, has rosettes. BMC 69 has the more normal trefoil of pellets, but has an s in the field, so should not be the Bath coin.

34. OSFAFD MO ‘the L reversed’. S in observe field.
Corresponds to BMC 71 (bt. Cureton, 1845) which has four pellets top and bottom of the reverse.

35. SEIFERED IO.
Corresponds to BMC 77 (in BM before 1838).

36. DEODMAER M. Obv. legend ends with what looks like LN in monogram.

37. DEODMAER M. Obv. legend ends with what looks like AV in monogram.

38. DEODMAER M. Obv. legend ends with r.


Theodmaer was one of Eadred’s more prolific moneyers and it is not possible to identify these particular specimens. No. 39, however, with L in the obverse field has not been noted elsewhere.

40. PRIN.MONÆ
Prin is in BMC in italics, but is this not more likely to be Wærin? Not traced.

BLUNDERED COINS

41–2. Here there is some uncertainty. The entry in North’s list reads:

‘With two others the Letters on which, expressing no King’s name, are inexplicable’.

Below this, on the left side, which normally gives the obverse legend, is a two-line inscription: I Æ

and on the right (in one line) ÆIVELFNIÆVIO

Below this ‘Upon one of the Saxon Coins found at Bath. 1755’.

The left-hand entry can only be the reverse of a two-line type, and the implication is that the other legend is the obverse of the same coin; in which case there is no description of the remaining coin. We have traced nothing comparable.

The absence of any coins of Eadwig in the Bath hoard points to a deposit—one will not say loss because it is clearly a deliberate grave burial—not later than the first year or so of his reign which began in November 955. Eadred’s own reign lasted nine and a half years, from 946, and in view of the relatively substantial and varied number of coins in his name a deposit date of 950–5 would seem reasonable.
KINTBURY, BERKS., 1761 (Dolley no. 90)

Kintbury is the name of a hundred and a village in Berkshire, the latter lying not far from the Wiltshire border beside the rivet Kennet from which the name derives. That there was already a church there in Anglo-Saxon times is suggested by a bequest in the will of a local magnate, Wulfgar, to the holy foundation at Kintbury. This will, though not dated, is ascribed to the period 931–9.¹

The hoard is an interesting one the exact extent of which remains uncertain. When Mr. James Petit Andrews² exhibited seven coins from it at a meeting of the Society of Antiquaries on 15 March 1764, the minute book records that with them were found ‘about forty or fifty other Saxon coins, and among them some of Athelstan’. The date of the discovery is there given as July 1762. Mrs. Strudwick, however, has called attention to an entry in the Annual Register of 1761 which refers to there having ‘lately been dug up some hundreds of ancient silver pieces of coin’ and she notes that five from the hoard were in the William Powell sale of March 1762.³ It may be accepted therefore that the date of discovery was 1761,⁴ and the fact that the report in the Society’s minute book was written three years after the discovery may make the figure in the contemporary Annual Register report more acceptable.

Both accounts state that the hoard was found under a skull in a churchyard. This of itself is of interest because it was in precisely such a position that the Bath hoard was found.

Besides the seven coins exhibited by Andrews, of which fortunately the readings are recorded, one coin with the Kintbury provenance is in the British Museum, one in the Ashmolean Museum, and one in the cabinet originally started by Archbishop Sharp (ob. 1714). Of the five coins in the 1762 sale there are unfortunately no particulars beyond that they were of Edmund and Eadred.

The following is a list of the few identifiable coins from the hoard. The seven for which no other reference is given are those exhibited by Andrews.

EADMUND. BMC i (two-line)

1. +EADMVND REX
   DIADE/+++/= the missing letters are put in in dots as possibly IMMO.⁵

EADRED

BMC i (two-line with three pellets at top and bottom of reverse)

2. +EA.DRED REX I:
   ./DEOM/+++/AERM/?

3. +EADRED REX I:
   ./DEOM/+++/AERM/ (BMC 92)

4. +EADRED REX I:
   ./LANO/+++/EBETO/:

¹ A. J. Robertson, Anglo-Saxon Charters, Cambridge, 1956, pp. 52–3, where the full text is given; see also P. H. Sawyer, Anglo-Saxon Charters, London, 1968, p. 429, no. 1533.

² Andrews was a local antiquary. His father lived at Shaw House, near Newbury, and he himself built a large house called Donnington Grove near his father’s seat (DNB).


⁴ Further confirmation is on the label of the coin in the Sharp cabinet, referred to below, which reads, in an eighteenth-century hand, ‘Found in a Grave under a Skull at Kintbury Churchyard Berkshire Jun (Jan ?) 1761’.

⁵ The account printed in Archaeologia viii (1787) Appendix pp. 430–1 makes it doubtful whether the coin of Edmund was from the find. The manuscript minute book, however, makes it clear that it was.
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5. EADRED REX

   BMC i (two-line with rosettes top and bottom on rev.)
   Rosette/ED/EL/+ + +/NAD/rosette (Sharp collection)

EADWIG

   BMC i (two-line with rosettes top and bottom on rev.)
   Rosette/INGVC/+ + +/ESMO/rosette

6. +EADFIG REX I

   'it in field below I of Edwig'
   BMC ii (three-line type)
   Mint of Bedford
   Rosette/BED/DA/FE/E/.

7. +EADVVIG RE+

   BMC iv (ornamental type)
   Mint of Newark?
   Rosette/ESFRE/+ III+DI+/DMOII/.

8. Obv. reading not given

   ./HERE/BE+/DA/FEIM/.

9. Obv. reading not given

   ./ESFRE/+ III+DI+/DMOII/.

10. EADFIG REX

   OSF/ALD (Ashmolean Museum)

It is likely that there were also one or more coins of Athelstan of which no particulars are available.

Nos. 2 and 3 may be the same coin, but the obverse legend of no. 2 as recorded in the minute book specifically shows a pellet after EA, which is not found on BMC 92.

Reference has been made under the Bath hoard to the four coins of Eadwig in Lord Grantley's collection which he bought in Bath and which were said to have come from an old hoard in the locality. There were nine coins of this king in his sale and four of these correspond exactly to descriptions of those exhibited by Andrews. Of nos. 6 and 9 we know indeed of no other specimens. Also in Lord Grantley's sale was a coin of Eadred that corresponds with no. 4 above.

It is hard to resist the conclusion that these five coins of Lord Grantley's were those exhibited by Andrews and that they came from the Kintbury hoard. No coin comparable to Andrews's Edmund was in the Grantley sale.

Coin no. 1 is likely to be of Diarelm, a known Eadmund moneyer. The presence of one (possibly two) coins of Theodmar (nos. 2 and 3) is to be compared with the four by this moneyer in the Bath hoard.

No. 4 has a puzzling reverse reading. A similar coin is illustrated in Fountaine's Numismata Anglo-Saxonica (1705, pl. vi, 12) which may be the one now in the Liverpool Museum (ex Nelson ex Carlyon-Britton 998) and there is another at Birmingham (SCBI 152). A moneyer signing Landferth struck the same type in this reign (BMC 63) and it is possible that this is the name intended, but the possibility must be a fairly slight one.

Ethelnath, the moneyer of no. 5, though formally unpublished, is known to us from two other specimens, one of which has the M in the obverse field. This and the rosettes point to a north-midlands origin.

No. 6, the Eadwig coin by a moneyer signing Ingue(es) followed by Mot is known to us from no other specimen. We do not know the present whereabouts of Lord Grantley's

---

1 No. 6, lot 1083b; no. 7, lot 1080; no. 8, lot 1081b; no. 9, lot 1082a.
2 Lot 1077a. This was later part of lot 620 in the W. H. Bennett sale, Glendinings 4.x.1972 (not illustrated).
3 Both Blunt.
coin but fortunately have a rubbing of it made in 1953 when it was in the hands of Messrs. A. H. Baldwin and Sons. This confirms the minute book’s reading and shows the letter in the field (an m of course and not an h) to be just where the minute book places it. The moneyer’s name in the same form is found on a coin of Eadred (*BMC* 62). The style indicates a north-midlands origin.

Nos. 7 and 8, though both rare, are recorded from several specimens. The Grantley sale catalogue describes lot 1080 (which is no. 7 here) as found in Bath. There are several instances in this catalogue where coins are stated to have been found in a certain locality and where, as here, it is more likely that they were acquired there—perhaps with the tradition of a local find attached.

In this case the original label in Lord Grantley’s hand for lot 1080 confirms that it was a local purchase. The label reads ‘Mallett of Bath’ (the vendors) and ‘found at Bath’. Malletts were, of course, the well-known Bath furniture dealers who have now moved to London.

![FIG. 1 (enlarged)](image)

No. 9. The Grantley coin is now in the Blunt collection and is illustrated here (Fig. 1). It presents problems, both as to mint and moneyer. The Grantley catalogue compares the moneyer’s name with the Efrard of *BMC* 23 but to us a more likely interpretation is Elfred which needs only assuming an l for the second letter in place of e. A moneyer of this name (reading, however, **Ælf**) issued coins of the style of nos. 5 and 6 above with m in the obverse field (*BMC* 15). The mint-name, in the middle line, is to be compared with the reading on a coin in the Chester hoard by the moneyer Cilm (no. 279). There the reading is **+Mi+Fe+** and, on the analogy of a coin in the Grosvenor Museum, Chester, by the same moneyer on which the mint reading is **+Ni+Fe+**, the mint is identified as Newark. We would suggest that the Kintbury coin is also from this mint.

No. 10 is, of course, a well-known rarity. Only four other specimens of the type are recorded of which two¹ are from the same dies as the Kintbury coin. The remaining two are by different moneyers—**Ælf**² and Oswine.³ The copy of Ruding’s *Annals* in the Society’s library with notes by Taylor Combe confirms the Kintbury provenance and

¹ *BMC* 36 and Chester (1950) hoard 367.  
² *SCBI* Midlands 158.  
³ *SCBI* Glasgow 674.
adds ‘It originally belonged to the Revd Mr Fowle Clergyman of that place’. Oswald
struck a similar type for Edgar of which two specimens survive.¹

The absence of the generally more plentiful coins of Edgar points to a deposit for the
Kintbury hoard not later than the very first years of his reign and, since Eadwig’s reign
was a short one, from 955 to 959, the bracket for the deposit can probably be narrowed
to 957–60.

LONDON, THREADNEEDLE STREET, before 1924 (Dolley no. 83)

Five coins and two smaller fragments (all or part only of a hoard?). Two of Athelstan; three of Edmund. This little parcel has not been published in detail and we take the
opportunity, through the courtesy of the Director of the London Museum where the
coins are, to record it here:


hoard.


The identification of the two smaller fragments is uncertain.

The deposit date of c. 945 suggested by Dolley seems acceptable.

HONEDON, SUFFOLK, 1687 (Dolley no. 85)

This East Anglian find is said to have consisted of between 200 and 300 coins, found in a
grave near a skull.³ Of these twenty-four are recorded in detail and may be summarized
as follows:⁴

Athelstan, 4. All of two-line type and of north-eastern style.

Edmund, 14. Most are identifiable from the descriptions as being of two-line type
and of north-eastern style; there is one of bust type which is likely to be East Anglian;
and one of York.

Eadred, 6. All but one are of bust type and are likely to be from the eastern part of
the country. The sixth is of two-line type; the moneyer is Siefereth whose location is
uncertain; a coin of his was in the Bath hoard (no. 35).

In the Honedon find, deposited c. 953, we get what was probably a typical cross-
section of the currency circulating in the eastern part of the country in the 950s. The
Oxford hoard can regrettably tell us nothing and the Threadneedle Street find is not
very helpful.

That makes the Bath and Kintbury hoards as now reconstructed of considerable
interest. In the former only one coin bears a mint-signature, but a number of others
can be associated with areas or mints with fair confidence. The mint-signed coin is of

¹ BM, ill. Brooke, pl. xv, 13; Carlyon-Britton 463.
⁴ We have added to the twenty-one listed by Mrs. Strudwick in the last quoted reference three listed by Dr. Metcalf (*NC* 1957, pp. 194–5).
Athelstan struck at York (no. 3). Of the other two coins of this king that by Alhstan (no. 1) is, from the style of the other recorded specimen, to be associated with a southern mint; no. 2, by an uncertain moneyer, seems likely to be from the north-eastern midlands.

Of the coins of Edmund, those by Aëthered (no. 5), Mældomen (no. 18), and Ondres (no. 19) may, from the use of rosettes, be ascribed to Mercia, probably to the north-western part, as may possibly nos. 12-13 by Byrnwig if the record of the central line of the reverse in the Murchison catalogue is correct. Mældomen was actually a Chester moneyer of Athelstan. The two coins by Ingelgar (no. 17 of Edmund, no. 30 of Eadred) and those of Theodmaer (nos. 36-9) may be attributed to the York mint.

Among the other coins of Edmund those of Ælfric and Ethelsige (nos. 4 and 14) are probably of Canterbury since moneyers of these names struck there for Athelstan, and, on the same grounds, the coin of Biorneard (no. 10) is likely to be of London. Of Eadred, the coin of Athelmund (no. 25) may well be of Oxford or Wallingford on the same grounds.

The hoard contains an interesting little group that appears to come from the midlands, primarily from Northampton. Oswald (no. 34 of Eadred) is a moneyer there in Edgar's circumscription/cross type;1 Baldric (no. 6 of Edmund and no. 26 of Eadred) in Eadwig's reign; and Prin (no. 40 of Eadred) also, if he is to be equated with Wærin of Eadwig's Hampton coins. Wells moreover identifies Osferth (nos. 32-3) as a Northampton moneyer.2 His arguments for this are not entirely convincing, but Osferth is likely at any rate to have been a moneyer somewhere in that part of the country.

It will be remembered that, in Athelstan's reign, the use of a rosette of pellets in the centre of the field on one or both sides became a distinguishing mark of the coins of Mercia, primarily in the north-west but extending down to Stafford and probably Warwick. In Edmund's reign the circumscription/rosette type virtually ceased; although the British Museum Catalogue treats it as a definitive type (BMC iv) we know of only two specimens, BMC 1, the coin there illustrated, and Forum hoard 398. Both these are stylistically irregular. Where the rosette now begins to appear is at the top and bottom of the two-line reverse and this primarily on coins by moneyers who, where identifiable under Athelstan, had struck at Mercian mints. A few struck both trefoil and rosette coins. A significant instance is Derby where coins of Sigar and Sigwold, who under Athelstan and Anlaf had eschewed the rosette, appear under Edmund with a rosette at top and bottom of the reverse (BMC 128 and BMA 543).

With the reign of Eadred a further change in the pattern is to be noted. The use of rosettes becomes more widespread and there is a noticeable increase in the number of moneyers who strike with both trefoils and rosettes.

We have noted this feature on coins of the following moneyers of Edmund:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Three Pellets</th>
<th>Rosettes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ælfwald</td>
<td>BMC 8-10</td>
<td>SCBI Oxford 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domenec(es)</td>
<td>BMC 41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demenece</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eroth/Erod</td>
<td>BMC 71</td>
<td>SCBI Edinburgh 214?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 BNJ xix (1927-8), pp. 90-1.
One other moneyer of Edmund, Hunlaf, issued coins with all crosses on the reverse \((BMC\ 77)\) and there was one by him in the Oman sale at Christies (31.x.1972, 33 ill.) which had rosettes. He was a Hereford moneyer for Athelstan.

The coins of Ælfwold with trefoils look southern in style and spell the moneyer’s name with a \(\text{wen}\). Those with rosettes are of West Mercian style and use a \(v\) instead of \(\text{wen}\). The name is a common one and it would be unwise to assume that both sets of coins were necessarily struck by one man.

Dominic/Domenec(es) was a moneyer in the NE I style for Athelstan and this style is found on the coins in the latter form that he made for Edmund. The Demene of Edmund who produced the rosette coins uses the form \(\text{MOT}\) and this, with the rosettes, associates him with Derby. It is possible that Dominic/Domenec(es) and Demene are two separate individuals.

The rosette coin that Geundfeth may have struck for Edmund is problematical. It is no more than a fragment on which only the first line of the reverse legend—\(\text{GEVN}\)—remains.

Eoroth is an unusual name—in fact Searle only cites it from tenth-century coins. On the three of Edmund that we have seen the name reads \(\text{EROD}\) on the trefoil coin and \(\text{EROD}\) or \(\text{EROD}\) on the rosette coins. This must surely be the same man.

With Eadred the list is longer and the identity of the moneyers more convincing. With the four moneyers found in the hoards reviewed in this paper the position is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three pellets</th>
<th>Rosettes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baldric</td>
<td>((a)) Carlyon-Britton 1002 (ill.). (s) in obv. field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osferth</td>
<td>((a)) (\text{BMC}\ 69. (s) in field. (b)) (\text{SCBI}\ Edinburgh 253/4. No (s) in field}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswald</td>
<td>((a)) (\text{BMC}\ 71. (s) in field. (b)) (\text{BMC}\ 70. (No) (s) in field}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warin</td>
<td>((a)) (\text{BNJ} \ xx (1931–3), p. 39, 14. (s) in field. (PARN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>((b)) (\text{BNJ} xxi (1931–3), p. 37, 1. (No) (s) in field}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{SCBI}\ Edinburgh 279. (No) (s) in field}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{BNJ xvii (1923–4), pl. i, 10. (No) (s) in field}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{SCBI}\ Oxford 375. (No) (s) in field. (PARN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{SCBI}\ Oxford 364. (No) (s) in field. (\text{WARIN and PARN})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This little group is clearly linked, especially by the spasmodic appearance of the \(s\) in the obverse field. This feature is found on few other coins in this reign. We have noticed it on only one other of the trefoil type, by the moneyer Osgrid \(\text{(SCBI SW 422)}\). This is the only occurrence of the name on coins at this time, something that always invites critical inspection, but the reading appears to be clear. In the rosette type the \(s\) is found in the field on one coin of Æthered (Carlyon-Britton 417, ill.) but, in place of it, there is an \(m\) on another coin of his \(\text{(SCBI Edinburgh 269)}\). This last is a peculiar coin in having a beaded inner circle, a rare feature in Eadred’s coinage. There is an \(s\) on a coin of Gislemer \(\text{(SCBI Glasgow 652)}\), but on others (e.g. \(\text{BMC 47}\)) it is absent. It is possible (though not quite certain) that there is an \(s\) in the obverse field of a coin by Sunu \(\text{(SCBI Copenhagen 755)}\) of the type equivalent to Edgar \(\text{BMC id}\) but on another specimen, at Glasgow \(\text{(SCBI 657)}\), there clearly is not.
The isolated coin of Osgod could well be the work of another midlands moneyer. The Gislemer coin with s, though superficially a good full piece (though in three fragments) weighs today no more than 14-2 gr. compared with 20-8 to 23-6 for the three without s. The Sunu coin is doubtful. Clearly the most interesting pair are the coins of Æthered, one with s, the other with M in the obverse field. The M is a feature associated with Derby, the centre which produced the dies for a large proportion of Eadred’s coins of the rosette type, and the presence of both s and M on coins by the same moneyer points to Derby having been at one point the centre to which midland moneyers turned for their dies. Another instance of the importance of Derby is discussed below in connection with Hunred.

In addition to the midlands group cited above we have noted the following further moneyers of Eadred who struck coins with both trefoils and rosettes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Three pellets</th>
<th>Rosettes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnard</td>
<td>\textit{BMC} 18</td>
<td>\textit{(a) SCBI} Edinburgh 271. M in obv. field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard</td>
<td>\textit{BMC} 17</td>
<td>\textit{no M}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grim</td>
<td>Carlyon-Britton 412 (ill.) \textit{(coarse work)}</td>
<td>\textit{SCBI} Glasgow 653 MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunred</td>
<td>\textit{BMC} 50–5 (55 reads MOT)</td>
<td>\textit{SCBI} Edinburgh 277. M in obv. field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingelgar</td>
<td>\textit{BMC} 58–61</td>
<td>Blunt ex Glendining 21.ii.1957, 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswine</td>
<td>\textit{BM ex Chester (1950) 209, ill. MOT}</td>
<td>\textit{SCBI} Yorks. 1008. MOT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two coins of Theodmær, from the same dies, are known with rosettes but their authenticity is in doubt and we do not consider that any arguments can be based on them.

Of these moneyers, Hunred, Ingelgar, and Theodmær are among the most prolific moneyers of Eadred and all belong to a group that may be associated with York. Ingelgar had struck for the Vikings who were finally driven out of Northumbria in 954; the other two first appear under Eadred and it is likely that they replaced Ingelgar. A die-link between Ingelgar and Hunred has been noted (\textit{SCBI} Edinburgh 249 and 238). The volume and complexity of the coinage in Eadred’s name by Hunred and Theodmær make it unlikely that it can all have been issued at York after Eadred’s recovery of Northumbria: this took place sometime in 954 and he died in November of the following year. It seems more probable that both had previously worked at Derby or Nottingham and moved to York in 954 (perhaps bringing with them the rosette die for Ingelgar?). The fact that a coin exists with Hunred’s rosette die and the Derby M in the obverse field suggests this even more strongly than does the use of rosettes in itself and it is strange that there should be known (apparently) no more than a single rosette coin of Hunred.

There are three other moneyers in the above list: Burnett/Bernard, Grim, and Oswine. The fact that some of Bernard’s rosette coins have the M associates them with Derby where a moneyer of this name produced mint-signed coins for Athelstan, coins with M in the field for Eadwig, and mint-signed coins for Edgar. Grim first appears in Eadred’s reign, but he is a moneyer at Bedford for Eadwig and at Bedford and Derby for Edgar. Oswine is an interesting moneyer. He first appeared under Edmund for whom he produced rosette coins. We have seen what he did for Eadred. For Eadwig his only product was the unique ‘ornamental’ type coin, \textit{BMC} iv (\textit{SCBI} Glasgow 674). For Edgar he produced the unique ‘floral’ type halfpenny found in the Chester (1950) hoard, no. 514, and an equally unique circumscription cross type (\textit{BMC} iii), unfortunately a fragment from which the whole of any mint name is missing.
Now what is the interpretation of all this evidence? Clearly Derby emerges as a major centre for dies for the Midlands and it would seem that its sphere of influence extended down to Northampton and possibly Bedford. It looks as if, while Northumbria was in Viking hands, Derby, with probably Lincoln and possibly Nottingham, took the place of York as the main monetary centres for the north-east and that, when Northumbria came again under English rule, Hunred and Theodmær moved to York. Both, after being most active moneyers for Eadred, hardly figure thereafter. We have a record of no more than a single coin of Hunred’s for Eadwig¹ and equally a single, rather curious, coin of Edgar.² Of Theodmær we have nothing.

Turning back to the composition of the Bath and Kintbury hoards, it will be noticed that, in the latter, of the four coins of Eadwig of which particulars are available, three are mint-signed coins of BMC type ii, a variety primarily associated with towns in the southern Danelaw, an area in which mint-names were for the most part not employed on the only previous occasion, under Athelstan, when they are found in any quantity on the coins. It has been clear since the discovery of the Chester (1950) hoard that these mints played a large part in Eadwig’s coinage and it is welcome to have confirmatory evidence from a southern hoard which was actually deposited during Eadwig’s reign.

The composition of the two hoards has several features in common. The moneyer Baldwin is found in both—two specimens from Bath and one from Kintbury, the latter with the mint-signature of Bedford. Of Theodmær there were four specimens from Bath and one (possibly two) from Kintbury. Oswald is found in both hoards: a single specimen of Eadred from Bath and of the rare ornamental type of Eadwig from Kintbury. This parallelism is the more marked when it is remembered that we have only ten identifiable coins from Kintbury.

There seems every reason to believe that these three major hoards, deposited in the south of England and East Anglia, do now provide us with a reasonable cross-section of the currency circulating respectively on the southern borders of Mercia and in East Anglia around the middle of the tenth century. We still lack hoards from the heart of Wessex and from south-eastern England, where the composition might prove to be substantially different.

That we have so little hoard evidence of this period in the south is, of course, a reflection of the fact that this was a time when England south of the Humber enjoyed unusual internal tranquillity, and the association of all three finds with graves shows that the depositors lived at a time when there could be reasonable confidence that the sanctity of consecrated ground would be respected.

It is a curious coincidence, but no more than a coincidence, that the only two hoards of any size of this period known to have been found in southern England should have been discovered over 200 years ago within six years of one another, and should have been deposited within much the same short interval.

¹ Shand sale, Glendinings 9.iii.1949, lot 332 (where it is described as of Edgar).
² Smarmore hoard, BNF xxvii (1952-4), pl. vi, 52.