THE MINT OF HUNTINGDON
ROBIN J. EAGLEN

Origins of Huntingdon

The banks of the River Ouse were more suited to early settlement than the neighbouring forests and the extensive fen to the north and east. By Roman times the site of Huntingdon had become the crossing point of the river for Ermine Street, linking London to York, and for lesser roads from the direction of Cambridge and Sandy in Bedfordshire. The first substantial settlement at the crossing, however, was a Roman garrison and town on the south side of the river at Godmanchester, tentatively identified with the name *Durovigutum*. Although Godmanchester later became overshadowed by the growth of Huntingdon on the north side of the river, it retained its separate urban identity until the local government reorganisation of 1974.

The ‘town of Huntingdon’ is mentioned in the Laud version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (s.a.656), describing the endowment of Peterborough Abbey. This is unsafe evidence of urban development by that date since the text is judged to be a twelfth century fabrication. In contrast, the Parker Chronicle provides a contemporary record of the Danish host abandoning their fortress at Huntingdon s.a.921 for a new one at Tempsford, between Bedford (which Edward the Elder had already taken from the Danes) and St Neots. Thereupon, Edward restored the fortifications at Huntingdon and admitted under his peace and protection ‘all the original inhabitants who had survived in the district’. This points to more than a transient Danish presence at Huntingdon, probably stemming from the armies’ settlement of Mercia and East Anglia in the late 870s.

Market and Mint

The Laud Chronicle also cites (s.a.963) a charter of Eadgar, containing the grant of a market at Peterborough and decreeing ‘that there be no other between Stamford and Huntingdon’. Again, this is a weak testimony of an implied market at Huntingdon at that date because the charter is generally considered spurious. There is likewise no specific reference to a market in the Domesday Book entry, but the mention of 256 burgesses and of minting activity in the town would make the absence of a market by the late Anglo-Saxon period very implausible.

The earliest coins attributable with confidence to Huntingdon were struck in the reign of Eadgar by the moneyer Pirim. Other coins both of Eadgar and his predecessor, Eadwig, have with varying conviction or misgivings been assigned to the mint. They are included in the catalogue of coins below but should not be definitively admitted to (nor excluded from) the fellowship of Huntingdon coins without further convincing evidence. Accordingly, the catalogue numbers for die combinations other than those of Pirim are shown in parentheses. No Huntingdon coins are so far known from the reign of Edward the Martyr, but from Æthelred II onwards there are surviving coins from every reign until the end of Stephen’s. Although the number known from William II and thereafter is small, this may reflect a decline in output as much as the vagaries of survival and discovery.

---

5. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, as in n. 2, pp. 75, 77.
8. The Phillimore edition of *Domesday Book*, translated and edited by John Morris (Chichester, 1975), renders ‘toll and team’ attaching to sixteen houses belonging to Countess Judith (Gl. 203a) as ‘market rights’. This is an unjustifiably broad interpretation of the phrase, given the context.
Synopsis of Coinage

Figure 1 shows the number of coins, by reign, included in the study. These coins are listed in the catalogue of coins by type, moneyer and die combination. Where possible, the weight of the coins is recorded, indicating those affected by wear or disfigurement. Figure 2 shows the ‘equivalent’ reverse dies where the number of known surviving coins justifies such calculations by type and/or reign, using the formula:

\[
\frac{\text{total number of (known) coins} \times \text{total number of reverse dies}}{\text{total number of (known) coins minus total number of coins uniquely representing a reverse die (‘singletons’)}}.
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Coins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Æthelred II</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cnut</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold I/Harthacnut</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward the Confessor</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William I</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William II</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry I</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 1 Number of coins in study.**

In Table 1 these calculations are compared with those made by Metcalf, relating the coins recorded in Mossop’s die study of the Lincoln mint to the Lincoln coins recorded in the systematic collection at Stockholm by Hildebrand and in the Copenhagen sylloge, and applying the resulting relationship to the other mints so recorded.²

Brooke, writing in *The Victoria History of the County of Huntingdon* in 1932, stated that ‘the comparative scarcity of coins of Huntingdon prevents a satisfactory estimate of the number of moneyers employed’.¹² Sufficient coins are now known to attempt this task. Figure 3 shows, from the number of moneyers at work in any one type, an estimate of the minimum complement of moneyers at different times. The number of moneyers at work together is calculated from those who were active in consecutive types and those with an unusual name, when there is a gap of only one or two types between their issues. A moneyer whose coins are known of only one type is discounted unless there is at least one moneyer for that type who was also active in the preceding and following type. When the type can be divided into, say, early and late output on the basis of weight or other criteria, it is possible to produce a more sophisticated calculation, and this may

---

² See Stewart Lyon in H.R. Mossop, *The Lincoln Mint* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1970), pp. 15-17, where he points out that the formula is likely to result in underestimates of die usage because it hypothesises equal output from known and unknown dies, whereas the number of unknown dies may exceed the estimate owing to their having been less extensively used. The formula was found to yield comparably useful results when assessed alongside various other methods by G.F. Carter in ‘Comparison of methods for calculating the total number of dies from die-link statistics’ in *Statistics and Numismatics*, edited by C. Carcassonne and T. Hackens (Part 5, 1981), pp. 204–13.


increase the estimated complement, especially when there are a number of moneyers only active in a single type. The effect of this will be seen in the Helmet type of Æthelred II and Quatrefoil type of Cnut, and has been reflected in the Figure.¹²

The contribution of Scandinavian finds to our knowledge of Huntingdon coins is demonstrated by Table 2, showing the number of coins for the reigns of Æthelred II, Cnut and Edward the Confessor (up to and including the Small Flan type), derived from Scandinavian hoards compared with ‘others’. The latter category includes not only coins known to have been found in England and elsewhere outside Scandinavia, but also coins of unknown provenance currently in such countries, some of which could, of course, have originated from Scandinavian hoards. The percentage of coins from Scandinavian hoards is thus likely to be understated. Despite this dominance, the ‘Cnut’ hoard (c.1993) of English origin, to be discussed below, alone accounts for almost thirty per cent of the coins of Cnut included in the catalogue of coins.

The coinage of Huntingdon will now be considered in detail by reign and type.

¹² See Tables 7 and 14.
TABLE 1: 'Equivalent' reverse dies at Huntingdon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign/Type</th>
<th>Number of coins</th>
<th>Number of dies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metcalf</td>
<td>Eaglen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æthelred II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crux</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Cross</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmet</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Small Cross</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cnut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quatrefoil</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointed Helmet</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Cross</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold I/ Harthacnut</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward the Confessor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PACX to Small Flan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2: Number of Huntingdon coins from Scandinavian and 'other' hoards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Scandinavian hoards (%)</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Æthelred II</td>
<td>181 (63)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cnut</td>
<td>116 (53)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold I/ Harthacnut</td>
<td>18 (62)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harthacnut</td>
<td>12 (32)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward the Confessora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>327 (62)</td>
<td>250b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Figures relate to first four types only.
b Seventy-three coins (29%) of this total are from the 'Cnut' hoard (c. 1993).

Æthelred II

In this study, the largest number of coins (289) and 'equivalent' reverse dies (124) are from the reign of Æthelred II, followed by Cnut (222 and 115 respectively). Table 3 shows the number of coins by type for the twelve moneyers minting under the Huntingdon signature during the reign. Only one of these, Osgrid, bore an Old Norse rather than an Old English name. This, alongside the lack of Scandinavian place names in the area, may reflect the Saxon inhabitants acquiescing in Scandinavian rule rather than extensive Viking settlement in this part of the Danelaw. One or two moneyers appear to have supplied most of the coinage at any one time, with other moneyers playing a minor role. This phenomenon continues under Cnut.

Fig. 3  Minimum complement of moneyers at Huntingdon.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>First Hand</th>
<th>Second Hand</th>
<th>Crux</th>
<th>Long Cross</th>
<th>Helmet</th>
<th>Last Small Cross</th>
<th>Quatrefoil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ælfric</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfgar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leofric</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgut</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadwine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æthelstan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cnut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sæwine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfget</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfnoth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æthelweard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manwine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 also shows the total ‘equivalent’ reverse dies for each type. The peak reached in the Long Cross type, also contributing half of the total of known coins from the reign, is doubtless responding to the call for tribute payments. The lower die usage at Huntingdon in the preceding Crux type contrasts with other mints in the Southern Danelaw and, presumably, reflects an unexplained lesser contribution to the geld at that time. A close analysis of the connection between tribute and geld payments and mint output is not productive given our uncertainty about the accuracy and completeness of the payments recorded in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the accurate dating of the coin types.

As the reign progressed, the minimum number of moneymen in office together at Huntingdon rises from two at the beginning to four in the Last Small Cross type. In spite of this, the level of activity measured by equivalent reverse dies slackens in the Helmet and Last Small Cross types. This decline does not appear to be imputable to statistical bias arising from the smaller number of surviving coins.

---

The ‘Hand’ types (*BMC* iia, d; *Hild*. B1,2) yield only sixteen coins of Huntingdon. Of these, fourteen are First Hand (*BMC* iia) coins of Ælfric – who also provides the only Second Hand (*BMC* iid) coin known – and one is of the moneyer Wulfri. No examples of Benedict Hand (*BMC* iii, *Hild*. B3) have so far come to light. With this modest sample it is unsafe to try to draw firm conclusions. Nevertheless, from the proportion of ‘‘singletons’’ (Ælfric’s fifteen known coins being struck from eleven different reverses) it is clear that we have a very incomplete picture of the dies used. Lyon’s argument that Second Hand was not a distinctive issue from First Hand also appears to be supported. The Second Hand coin weighs 1.26 g, compared with an average/median for Ælfric’s First Hand output, using obverses A to F, of 1.58 g. This suggests that it was struck late in the ‘Hand’ period. Only one of Ælfric’s First Hand coins weighs lighter than this (1.21 g) and is also conspicuous as the only specimen from Huntingdon with a round sleeve on the reverse (dies Gm). This feature is identified with a Southern (London ?) die-cutting workshop, whereas the remaining coins all have a square sleeve identified with an East Anglian (Norwich ?) workshop. At other times Huntingdon moneyers appear to have resorted to London for dies to strike light (late) coins, which may have arisen as provincial workshops ceased operating before the introduction of a new coin type. The sole coin of Wulfri is also relatively light at 1.39 g but, so far, no coins have been discovered of the following Crux type in his name.

The two First Hand coins struck from dies Ei and Ej merit comment. Any suspicions aroused by the blundered reverse of Ei (ELFRIK M-O HVNTANN) are assuaged by the use of the same obverse with an impeccable reverse die (Ej). The latter coin was one of a number of Huntingdon coins of various reigns stolen from the Norris Museum at St Ives in 1964, which the malefactor then set about selling. Seabys were offered some of them and were told that they had been found by the vendor’s grandfather at Hemingford Grey, a village close to Huntingdon. Seabys ticketed the coins accordingly. However, suspecting the explanation, Seabys made enquiries as a result of which the coins offered to them were restored to the museum. The tickets still remain with the coins to divert those who know the circumstances and ensnare those who do not into believing a spurious provenance. Before the theft, in 1958, Christopher Blunt had visited the museum and photographed its Huntingdon coins. From the plates it appears that fourteen coins were still missing after Seabys’ intervention. Twelve of these suddenly surfaced in the Glendining sale of 11 October 1993 and were duly withdrawn and returned to the museum, leaving only two coins unaccounted for.

Bill Lean has drawn the author’s attention to Oswig at the neighbouring mint of Bedford using the First Hand obverse A of Ælfric. As Oswig’s coin, from the Castle Street (2) hoard, Dublin, was struck from rusty dies, we may presume that he took the die over from Ælfric. A large fragment from Ælfric’s output of dies Aa was in the Castle Street (1) hoard. This may be a coincidence, rather than indicating that the two moneyers were operating in tandem, because this fragment is not pitted like Oswig’s example. So far, only one other example has been identified of the same obverse die being used at Huntingdon and at a neighbouring mint, involving Cambridge in the Helmet type of Æthelred II. The transfer (or sharing) of dies between moneyers at Huntingdon is almost equally rare, found to date only in the Helmet and Last Small Cross types of Æthelred II and late in the reign of Edward the Confessor. The incidence is greater of obverse dies being used at Huntingdon and mints further afield, especially in the Long Cross type of Æthelred II, and this apparent anomaly is discussed below.

---

Crux type

In the standard Crux type, \((BMC\ iiia;\ \text{Hild.}\ C)\) Ælfric employed two pairs of obverse dies with single reverses (ADA, BEC). The fourteen intact coins struck from these dies have a weight spread between 1.62 g and 1.48 g. The average and median weight of these coins is 1.57 g which is conceivably the standard to which they were struck. Since, however, six of the coins weigh between 1.62 g and 1.60 g, and a further six between 1.55 g and 1.52 g, it is just possible (although unlikely) that the coins were struck with remarkable precision to two separate weight standards. Petersson identified more than one weight standard in the type, but he was probably referring to the weight differences between the standard and light issue about to be considered.\(^{18}\)

A distinct group of Crux pence (Gm, Ho, Iq, Js) was struck by Ælfric on perceptibly smaller flans and was markedly lighter, in the range 1.28 g–1.01 g. All the recorded Crux coins of the moneyers Leofric and Osgut are similarly light, between 1.32 g and 1.16 g. The dies used are stylistically similar to those of the heavier coins, if less neatly executed. The king’s name is rendered as EDELRED on obverse J used by Ælfric and the mint town usually reads HVNTA or NIVNTA rather than HVNT, which is invariably found on Ælfric’s obverses in the standard issue. Only one of the coins has the sceptre intercepting the drapery (Ælfric, J) and none the back-swept hair associated with the variety Hildebrand designated as ‘Ca’ and known as Small Crux.\(^{19}\) That the coins were struck late in the Crux issue is supported by the appearance of Osgut, who also struck in the next two types but is unknown in the preceding Hand issues. From the surviving coins of the other moneyer, Leofric – four light Crux and one Last Small Cross – the pattern of his career is less clear.

No differentiation is found in the distribution of heavy or lighter weight coins of the Crux type between the Scandinavian hoards and ‘other’ coins.

Long Cross type – Die usage

More coins of the Long Cross type of Æthelred II (\(BMC\ iv\); Hild. D) are known from Huntingdon than for any other type, although the number of surviving dies and estimated ‘equivalent’ reverse dies are greater in the Quatrefoil type of Cnut. Both Ælfric and, to a lesser extent, Osgut were active moneyers, whereas the only other one known, Eadwine, is only represented by a single reverse used with three separate obverses. Ælfric uses one reverse with two obverses (KLv) and, in the subsidiary Long Cross variety,\(^{20}\) one of his reverses with three obverses (ABCa), and Osgut one of his with two obverses (ABa). In the standard issue Ælfric uses three reverses (Imn) with obverse E but one of them (I) also with obverses F and G. Remarkably, obverse F has been die-linked to a Scandinavian reverse, suggesting that at some stage it fell into Viking hands. The same fate appears to have befallen Ælfnoth’s dies Aa in the Last Small Cross issue of Æthelred II. Otherwise, both Ælfric and Osgut normally appear to have used an obverse with one or more reverses, up to four (Ælfric, Bcdef, Hioq) or five (Osgut, Dfgij). One of Ælfric’s group of three reverses (Cghi) is linked to another group of four (Hioq), whereas Osgut has two obverses used interchangeably with two reverses (ABab) and one reverse common to a set of three and six dies (Cef, Dfgij). The evidence thus points to great fluidity at this time in the arrangements for issue and use of dies at Huntingdon. This is reinforced by the instances where obverse Long Cross dies of Ælfric and Eadwine were also used by moneyers at other mints. Those so far identified are set out in Table 4 and referenced in the catalogue of coins. The author is grateful to Bill Lean and Stewart Lyon for the information contained in the Table.


\(^{20}\) See Veronica M. Smart, ‘A Subsidiary Issue of Æthelred’s Long Cross Type’, \textit{BNJ} 34 (1965), 37–45. In the present paper the issue is referred to as a variety, representing a late regional die-cutting style.
TABLE 4: Æthelred II, Long Cross type. Obverse die links between Huntingdon and other English mints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Huntingdon Moneyer</th>
<th>Obverse die</th>
<th>Other Mint(s)</th>
<th>Moneyer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ælfric</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>Eadward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Æthelweard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td>Æthelweard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>Eadwine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(subsidary issue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadwine</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Leofnoth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eadric (or Godric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Buckingham</td>
<td>Ælfric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>Godric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sharing of obverse dies between moneyers at different mints could have arisen either by transfer of the dies from one centre to another, or from the moneyers operating, exceptionally, from the same workshops. The pattern of use points strongly towards the latter. Two obverses were shared by Ælfric with Eadward of Rochester. Another obverse was shared between Ælfric and four separate London moneyers. The obverse thus employed (K) was combined with Ælfric's reverse v, itself used (as far as is known) exclusively with two obverses (KL). Most significantly of all, Eadwine used a single reverse die with three obverses shared respectively with two London moneyers (AB), and one each from Buckingham and Hertford (C). This suggests that these moneyers may all have been operating at that time from London and drawing upon a pool of obverses for use with their own reverse dies. Combining resources was perhaps the most expeditious way to convert locally collected bullion into coin to meet pressing geld commitments. None of the fourteen coins struck from these obverses weighs more than 1.37 g.

Long Cross type – Weight standards

Taking coins struck from individual die pairings and die-linked coins together as distinct groups, the weight ranges within which they were struck fell into relatively narrow bands, with the exception of one pairing of Ælfric Aa with an exceptionally heavy coin (1.80 g). Another pairing Ho has an apparently maverick spread between 1.58 g and 0.97 g but all the coins weighing less than 1.46 g are either corroded or fragmentary. Obverse die B of Ælfric is especially informative. The twenty-two known coins are used with four reverse dies (cdef). The average weights of intact coins struck from these reverses are closely similar: c (1.65 g: 11 coins), d (1.62 g: 5 coins), e (1.64 g: 3 coins) and f (1.57 g: 1 coin). More importantly a horizontal neck flaw develops during the use of the obverse and the spread and average weights correspond closely between the coins struck before and after this flaw has developed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of coins</th>
<th>Average weight (g)</th>
<th>Spread (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-flaw</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-flaw</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests that the twenty coins were all struck to the same standard of approximately 1.63 g or 1.64 g with outer limits of deviation arising in the sample of 0.08 g (5%) above and 0.11 g (7%) below the standard. In reverse d a horizontal flaw also develops, and this results in a similar snapshot, the sole unflawed coin weighing 1.65 g and the four flawed coins having a spread of 1.68 g–1.53 g and an average weight of 1.62 g.
Since the weight range of die-linked coins from Huntingdon in the Long Cross issue is relatively narrow it is possible, by plotting the spread of weights and calculating the average and median of each group, to arrive at the likely standard to which the coins were struck. This exercise is based on the rational assumption that the small resulting deviations were not the reflection of an intricate manipulation of weight standards. The raw data is set out in Table 5 and supports the operation at Huntingdon of three standards during the Long Cross issue at approximately 1.63 g, 1.51 g and 1.30 g, with a deviation from the median value of + or − 6%. Given the level of accuracy to which the mint workers were capable of operating, standards with as little as a 0.12 g difference were sufficiently differentiated. Petersson also concluded that more than one standard applied at Huntingdon in the Long Cross as well as the Crux type.\(^{21}\)

**TABLE 5: Æthelred II. Long Cross type. Weight analysis.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Dies</th>
<th>Number of coins</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Weight(g)</th>
<th>Spread</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ælfric</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.80-1.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bcdef</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.72-1.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cghi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.60-1.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dj</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elmn</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.51-1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.38-1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hiopq</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.58-1.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.35-1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ji</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.34-1.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KLv</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.37-1.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(subsidiary)</td>
<td>ABCa</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.43-1.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eij</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.16-1.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadwine</td>
<td>A(B)Ca</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.34-1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Os gut</td>
<td>ABab</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.80-1.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cef</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.70-1.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dgfhf</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.60-1.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.30-1.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(subsidiary)</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Long Cross type – Additional symbols**

In the Long Cross type special additional symbols make their appearance on certain Huntingdon coins. These are in the form of pellets added to a sector of the reverse cross. They are only found on coins of Os gut, both in the standard and subsidiary variants. One reverse of Os gut (k) shows the pellet within an annulet. As the symbols occur in the same position on each coin struck from the same die and protrude from the surface of the coin, the feature was clearly engraved on the die itself. The absence of any coins from such dies without pellets also suggests that the dies were issued with the feature and not modified after receipt at the mint. No satisfactory explanation has been given for such symbols. They could have been used to signal some special physical attribute of the coins themselves or a peculiarity in the arrangements under which the coins were struck or issued. The possibility of their being a decorative whim of bored engravers must be discounted.

\(^{21}\) Petersson, 'Coins and Weights', as in n. 18, p. 227.
The most tempting explanation is that the symbols signify coins struck at an abnormal weight, logically (but not inevitably) lighter than the standard. They could also indicate abnormal purity or that the bullion had not been assayed because, for example, of the urgency to strike currency to meet tribute payments. In such cases, the purpose of the symbols would be to absolve the moneyer from future censure for deviating from the standard.

Unfortunately, to the best of the author’s knowledge, no metallurgical analysis has been carried out on pelleted Huntingdon pennies. On the question of weight, combined use by Osgut of pelleted and unpelleted reverses with the same obverses in the standard issue enables weight differences (if any) to be readily identified. The combinations are obverses AB with reverse a (pelleted) and b (unpelleted); C with e (pelleted) and f (unpelleted) and D with ghij (unpelleted) and i (pelleted). The number of intact coins, and their average, median and spread of weights, are set out in Table 6. This shows that the weight variations for pelleted and unpelleted reverses used with obverses A and B were negligible, but with a pelleted reverse providing the heaviest coin (1.80 g). Again, although the number of coins is small, no discernible differences are apparent in the use of obverse C. With obverse D the results again are statistically comparable, although here the pelleted coins are marginally lighter than the unpelleted. The weight spread (1.60 g–1.26 g) in the use of obverse D suggests that it may have been deployed to strike coins at successive weight standards. The same may also be true of obverse C. The conclusion from the sample studied must be that at Huntingdon, at least, the pellet marks in the Long Cross type were not indicative of weight manipulations. Examples occur of pellets in each quarter of Osgut’s reverses, but there are no obvious differences to suggest that the choice of quarter had significance.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O.</th>
<th>R.</th>
<th>Number of coins</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Spread</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>a*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.80–1.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.69–1.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>e*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.70–1.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>ghij</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.60–1.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.56–1.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Pelleted reverses are asterisked.

The question should be asked whether Osgut’s pelleted dies were being used by the more active moneyer, Ælfric. The answer would appear to be not, on two counts. First, pelleted reverses are found die-linked to unpelleted reverses of Osgut. Secondly, none of his pelleted reverses is found die-linked with obverses used by Ælfric.

Using Mossop’s die study of the Lincoln mint for comparative purposes,22 eight of its sixteen Long Cross moneyers used reverses with added symbols. These are predominantly in the form of a pellet in the second quarter, but the moneyer Dreg also has the letter D in the third quarter of one die and a small cross in the second quarter of two others. A similar cross is encountered in the third quarter of reverses inscribed with the names of Æthelstan and Godlief at Huntingdon in the Quatrefoil type of Cnut, to be discussed below. As at Huntingdon, there is nothing to suggest that the symbols at Lincoln were weight related. The weight spread of thirty recorded coins, excluding those of Wulmar considered not to be of English work, ranges from 1.58 g to 1.07 g, giving a wider spread at the lighter end than at Huntingdon.

In conclusion, the symbols appear (subject to metallurgical tests) to have some unidentified administrative significance rather than to refer to the physical characteristics of the coins. Pellets

---

22 Mossop, *The Lincoln Mint*, as in n. 9, Plates VIII–XVI.
or other symbols also occur at Huntingdon in the Helmet type of Æthelred II, the Quatrefoil and Pointed Helmet types of Cnut and the Trefoil – Quadrilateral and Expanding Cross types of Edward the Confessor. These are dealt with under those types since it should not be assumed that the meaning of such symbols is constant at different periods.

**Long Cross type – Comparison of the standard issue and subsidiary variant**

The subsidiary variant at Huntingdon displays characteristic attributes beyond the angular bust and the light weight shared by presumed late coins struck with standard obverses. Most of the obverses of Ælfric and Æsgut in the standard issue read REX ANGLO, whereas in the subsidiary variant the inscription is shorter and, for Ælfric’s dies, sometimes irregular: REX AIG (obverse G) and RÆ AIGO (obverses ABE), the latter reading accompanied by crude, thug-like styles of bust. Another anomaly is the use of D instead of Æ in the king’s name. Irregularities are also occasionally found in the standard issue, however, one obverse of Ælfric reading RE+ ANGL, with a crude accompanying bust (E) and two of Æsgut reading RE+ ANGO and RE+ ANG (D and F respectively). Virtually all the reverses, whether of the standard issue or subsidiary variant, render the mint town as HVN(T), often with a quixotic N instead of the initial letter H. Æsgut, however, uses one subsidiary reverse reading VNTD (a), and this is matched by a die of the same reading in the standard issue (k). The only known reverse of Eadwine reads uniquely, but logically, HVNTE. With the possible exception of Æsgut’s die D, none of the standard dies with irregular characteristics is found at the highest weight, suggesting that deviations from the REX ANGLO/NVNT norm gradually crept in during the currency of the type, affecting alike the standard issue and subsidiary variant.

**Helmet type**

Although only forty-three coins are recorded at Huntingdon for the Helmet type of Æthelred II (*BMC* viii, Hild. E), the sixteen obverse and fifteen reverse dies appear to represent substantially, if not entirely, the die usage in that type. The 1:1 ratio of dies is in marked contrast with the preceding issue. The mint’s activity, measured by estimated reverse dies, declines to forty per cent of the level in the preceding type, despite an increase in the minimum number of moneymen concurrently at work. Æthelstan replaced Ælfric as the leading moneyer, and may have had simultaneous access to a number of the obverse and/or reverse dies set out in Figure 4.

![Figure 4](image)

**Fig. 4** Æthelred II, Helmet type. Æthelstan die-chain, and number of coins.
Helmet type – Weight standards and complement of moneyers

All except two coins in Æthelstan’s chain A–E are in the weight range 1.51 g–1.40 g (average 1.45 g) whereas those struck from Ei weigh 1.28 g and 1.27 g respectively. This points to a change in weight standard late in the chain. This hypothesis is supported by the other recorded coins. Æthelstan himself struck two coins from dies Fl at 1.49 g and 1.48 g respectively, which should perhaps be placed at the beginning of his output. Both Osgut (Aa) and Sæwine (Aab) also struck to a mean weight of 1.43 g/1.42 g. At the lower weight Osgut struck a coin from dies Cc weighing 1.29 g as did Eadwine (Aa). The other die combination known for Osgut (Bc) includes one coin recorded as the heaviest in the type, at 1.59 g. This may be a maverick striking, rather than an indication of a change in standard during the life of the die, as three other coins struck from the same reverse, but using two obverses (BcC) average 1.27 g.

Importantly, Æthelstan’s free-standing dies Gm show pellets in the first and third quarters of the reverse cross. The three known coins weigh 1.29 g–1.24 g (average 1.27 g) both supporting a standard at that level and mitigating against the hypothesis that the pellets signified output below the normal weight standard in the Helmet type.

The evidence thus points to an initial weight standard of about 1.45 g, falling to around 1.29 g–1.27 g. In addition there are two coins of Æthelstan (Ho) struck at 1.19 g and 1.17 g respectively, another (Iq) at 1.16 g and the sole coin of Cniht at 1.12 g. Die H is very unusual in the Huntingdon series in that it was also used by Osgut (as die C) to produce a coin at 1.29 g.23 Given that Osgut is not known after the Helmet type, the likelihood is that when he ceased operating (in abnormal circumstances?) his die was taken over by Æthelstan and that the late, light coins just referred to represent a second reduction in the weight standard. Insufficient coins have so far come to light, however, to pinpoint the actual standard. Metcalf identified a peak at just over 1.4 g in the type but with lower standards detectable ‘or suspected in the easterly shires as usual’.24

With a framework of three standards it is possible to obtain a clearer idea of the number of moneyers in office together, as Table 7 demonstrates. Without subdividing the type in this way the complement cannot be safely numbered beyond two, as in the preceding Long Cross type.

TABLE 7: Æthelred II, Helmet type. Complement of moneyers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Long Cross</th>
<th>Early (1.45 g)</th>
<th>Helmetal Mid (1.28 g)</th>
<th>Late (± 1.17 g)</th>
<th>Last Small Cross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Æthelstan</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cniht</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadwine</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgut</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sæwine</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helmet type – Links with Cambridge mint

In the Helmet type there are two clear links between Huntingdon and the neighbouring mint of Cambridge. First of all, one of Osgut’s obverses (B) was also used by the Cambridge moneyer

---

23 Other instances occur in the Last Small Cross issue of Æthelred II (Æthelstan obverse A, Sæwine B) and under Edward the Confessor (see Figure 6).

Leofsige.\textsuperscript{25} The state of the striking and weight (1.10 g) of Leofsige's example indicates that the die passed to Cambridge late in the issue, possibly again when Osgut ceased operating. Secondly, a moneyer named Cniht was active in the Helmet and Last Small Cross types (and beyond) at Cambridge. Given the rarity of his name, it is virtually inconceivable that they could be different persons. The light weight (1.12 g) of the sole Huntingdon coin makes it clear that his sojourn at Huntingdon was an interruption or extension to his activities at Cambridge. Maybe he took Osgut's die B back with him. Another possible link exists through the moneyer Eadwine, known at Huntingdon from three coins in the Long Cross issue and from one coin in the Helmet issue. A moneyer of the same name was active in Cambridge in the same issues and could conceivably be the same person, since the name is not that common. A like possibility could be argued, if less forcibly, for the moneyer Ælfric who was active at Cambridge in the Crux and Long Cross issues, with a namesake at Huntingdon from First Hand through to Long Cross.\textsuperscript{26} Ælfric was a prolific moneyer at both mints in the Crux issue, Ælfric the pre-eminent moneyer at Huntingdon in the Long Cross issue and Eadwine in the Long Cross issue at Cambridge. This could imply that these men were the 'professionals' amongst the local fraternity of moneyers at the time and thus in demand and capable of fulfilling a role at more than one mint in an area, as needed. Such correspondence of names between the two mints does not otherwise so clearly occur other than in the reign of Edward the Confessor, so the possibility of it being a coincidence – with the exception of Cniht – should not be discounted.

**Helmet type and Viking attacks**

The confluence at Huntingdon of a number of unusual events in the Helmet issue – obverses passed from moneyer to moneyer, or mint to mint, the loan of a moneyer, and very light coins – may be more than chance and symptomatic of disruption in the smooth running of the mint. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records in 1010 the sacking of large areas, including 'half of Huntingdonshire'.\textsuperscript{27} The destruction of Cambridge and Thetford and the presence of the Danish Army at nearby Tempford are specifically recorded. No mention is made of Huntingdon as such but it is hard to imagine that the town escaped the Viking swords and torches. To attribute the unusual occurrences as the outcome of the attack on Cambridge and Huntingdon (or Cambridge alone) must be speculative, but the author knows of no other circumstances in the Huntingdon coinage of Æthelred II which could so clearly point to such an upheaval. However, for this association to be valid, the dating of the Helmet type would have to be extended until at least 1010, at variance with other evidence for the introduction of the abortive Agnus Dei (\textit{BMC xi, Hild. G}) and Last Small Cross types in c. 1009.\textsuperscript{28}

**Helmet type – Design and execution**

As with the Long Cross issue, the obverse dies of the Helmet type show considerable disparity in the skills of design and execution. Some of Æthelstan's in particular are crudely conceived and allied to unusual or irregular legends. The king's name may begin with \textit{E}D instead of Æ\textit{D} (dies B, C, D, E) and the abbreviation of the country name be strangely expressed as A[L]O (die C), and EIGO (dies D, E). However, the extensive die-linking in Æthelstan's output associates these runts with other offspring of impeccable pedigree, to dispel doubts about acceptance of these coins as official products of the mint. Furthermore, the reverses appear beyond suspicion. The mint name


\textsuperscript{26} Jacob was unable to identify any obverse die links of Eadwine or Ælfric between the two mints amongst the coins of Cambridge known to him and of Huntingdon to the author in 1983.

\textsuperscript{27} \textit{The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle}, as in n. 2, pp. 140–1.

receives varied treatment, all of Æthelstan’s reading HV (or NV) with the exception of one, rendered as VNT. HVNTA is found on coins of Eadwine, Osgut and Æfwine. Osgut also uses VNTD and Cniht (the visiting moneyer) the most explicit reading, HVNTAD.

**Last Small Cross type**

In the Last Small Cross type (BMC i, Hild. A) the number of coins in the study (forty-two) is similar to the preceding type and, although the known moneymen increase from five to seven, the minimum complement of moneymen remains at four. The surviving singletons, compared with two or more coins struck from the same dies, signal that a greater number of reverse dies were in use: twenty-five ‘equivalent’ reverse dies, as against fifteen in the Helmet issue, but with the recorded reverses again not exceeding the total known obverses. This recovery in activity still falls far short of the level attained in the Long Cross issue. It is strange that a lesser demand for coinage in both the Helmet and Last Small Cross types should have been met by a greater complement of moneymen. The explanation may be that demand for their services was sporadic but intense when it arose.

**Last Small Cross type – Weight standards**

The under-representation of dies, deriving from a similar number of coins, makes it more hazardous to calculate the likely weight standards in use at Huntingdon in the Last Small Cross type. This is compounded by the greater spread of weights evident from those coins which do survive. The most widely represented die pairing (Ælfnoth, Aa) has two coins averaging 1.74 g and four coins averaging 1.28 g, clearly representing distinct standards. As will be seen from the catalogue of coins, these dies appear to have eventually fallen into Scandinavian hands. The die chain Æthelstan (Aa)/Æfwine (Aa, Ba) – where die A of Æthelstan is the same obverse as die B of Æfwine – supplies eight coins. Seven of these are within the weight range 1.80 g–1.60 g (average 1.70 g), but the eighth coin, at 1.51 g, hints at an intermediate standard between those inferred from Ælfnoth’s dies Aa. Æthelstan’s dies Bc, with two coins weighing 1.45 g (average) may also be the foundations of this standard, as may be the single coin of Æthelweard (Aa) at 1.54 g. At the lower standard there are seventeen coins ranging between 1.38 g and 1.24 g, with an average of 1.29 g. This leaves, as is observable with earlier types, a few coins at still lower weights. There are five of these ranging from 1.19 g to 0.96 g, but as they are all struck from uniquely represented die combinations no conclusion can be drawn on whether they reflect one or more further reductions in the standard.

On the material available, the following tentative conclusions may be drawn. At least three weight standards were in use in the Last Small Cross type, approximating to 1.70 g, 1.50 g and 1.30 g. These weights, if correctly deduced, are markedly higher than those applied in the Helmet type and represent a return to the levels seen in the Long Cross issue. The middle weight may have been of short duration since only four of the forty-two coins appear to have been struck to this standard, and none (so far) come to light from Ælfnoth’s die Aa, used at the two outer standards. The lightest known coin (Æfwine, Iq) at 0.96 g has a blundered reverse, reading SAEPNNE MON HVHET.

**Last Small Cross type – Sources of dies**

In 1958 Dolley, with his customary astuteness, used the coins in the Stockholm systematic collection, as catalogued by Hildebrand, to classify the busts of the Last Small Cross type.\(^{29}\) He identified nine different styles issuing from seven different die-cutting centres, whilst voicing the possibility that ‘a number of “Eastern” coins’ could have been issued from London rather than

---

presumably Norwich or Thetford, where the style was otherwise most encountered. His main findings have been generally followed in subsequent studies of the Last Small Cross type. At the most mundane level it is not always easy to apply the classification to individual coins. Dolley himself gave Hild. 1377 (Æthelstan Aa) to the 'Northern A' style, but Hild.1393 (Sewine Ba) to 'Southern B', although both coins were struck from the same obverse. More generally, the conclusion that, for example, the five moneyers he considered at Huntingdon drew their fourteen sets of dies from at least five different centres seems to call for scrutiny. Were the moneyers free to go where they wished for their dies? Presumably not, because otherwise they would all have used the nearest convenient die-cutting centre. If they were directed to particular centres, how was this determined? Was a moneyer's centre constant or did it change? And if it did, why and how was the change communicated? It all begins to appear unbelievably complicated.

Table 8 shows Dolley's allocation, by bust, of the Huntingdon coins in the systematic collection and the author's allocation of the larger number of dies in the present study. For comparison, Dolley's allocation of coins for the neighbouring mints to Huntingdon is also shown.

**TABLE 8: Æthelred II, Last Small Cross type. Sources of dies at Huntingdon and neighbouring mints.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Northern A</th>
<th>Northern B</th>
<th>Southern A</th>
<th>Southern B</th>
<th>South Western</th>
<th>Western</th>
<th>South Eastern</th>
<th>Eastern (?)</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdon (Dolley)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Eaglen)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eaglen)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to see how the arrangements may have affected individual moneyers, Table 9 shows each of the obverse dies used by the moneyers at Huntingdon, classified by bust style according to Dolley's study as refined and revised by Lyon, in 1999, set against the weight standards (as proposed above) at which each die was apparently brought into use.

**TABLE 9: Æthelred II, Last Small Cross type. Huntingdon moneyers' sources of dies (obverse).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Early (1.70g)</th>
<th>Mid (1.50g)</th>
<th>Late (1.30g-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ælfget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>London (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfnoth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>Lincoln (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ævelstan</td>
<td>Winchester (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æveltheard</td>
<td>Winchester (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leofric</td>
<td>Winchester (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manwine</td>
<td>Winchester (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewine</td>
<td>Winchester (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Winchester (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of dies shown in parentheses.
On this analysis the complexity of the arrangements begins to evaporate. At the outset all the dies so far coming to light were collected (or delivered) from Winchester, including the work of a die-cutter perhaps later associated with Exeter (Ælfnoth A), and in the middle period from Lincoln. Only in the late period, represented by thirteen of the twenty dies, is the picture more complicated, with London assuming equal importance with Lincoln as a provider, and apparently obverses cut at Exeter and a Norfolk centre being deployed. Of the moneys only Sæwine appears to have used more than one die-cutting centre, during the latter part of the issue. Dolley’s scenario is thus more credible than at first sight. It is certainly more convincing than the hypothesis that a group of die-cutters based, say, at London were engaged to cut dies predominantly, but not exclusively, for a given range of mints. It still leaves a puzzle as to why moneys operating from or close to a recognised die centre should have drawn their dies from more distant places rather than their own doorsteps unless, for example, the resident die-cutter had become ill or died.

During the type the copulative ON begins to be used instead of MO(N). The change seems to be mainly associated with dies engraved at Winchester and Exeter used to strike heavy coins, with the old style MO(N) continuing to be used elsewhere, except for light/late coins where Lincoln obverses are combined with ON reverses of East Anglian style. The reverse dies linked to the Southern style bust (Winchester A) have the fullest mint designations: HVNTAN, HVNTANDV and HVNTANDVN.

**Last Small Cross type – Die links**

At the beginning of the issue Æthelstan (A) and Sæwine (B) struck coins from the same obverse and the latter appears to have retained the die to strike a coin at the intermediate weight standard (1.51 g). Sæwine, the most active moneyer later in the issue, also used an obverse (H) found combined with a reverse of Ælfwig of London and Brantinc of Sudbury. Obverse H is of ‘Norfolk’ style and the circumstances of its being shared may explain what is otherwise an unknown style of bust at Huntingdon in this type. Similar circumstances may also explain the use of an ‘Exeter’ style bust by Sæwine (G), although to date no die links to moneys at other mints have been identified. A light coin (1.14 g) of the moneyer Ælfget of Huntingdon is known from a single coin die-linked to the London moneyer Godwine. These occurrences, allied to multiple sourcing of dies, may again point to disturbed times upsetting the normal pattern of activity at the mint.

**Cnut (1016–1035)**

Table 10 shows the number of coins by type known for the twenty moneys recorded as operating at Huntingdon during the reign of Cnut. Two of them, Faerthen and Thurcetel, bear Old Norse names.

**Quatrefoil type – Impact of ‘Cnut’ hoard (c.1993)**

The Quatrefoil type (BMC viii: Hild. E) provides the second largest sample of Huntingdon output by type with ninety-four coins from twelve moneys. The number of coins has been swelled to almost double those previously recorded by examples appearing on the market in the UK and abroad from 1993 onwards. They have brought to light Æthelstan as a new moneyer for the type.30 These newcomers are often in extremely fine condition and mostly bright from cleaning, although some appear to have been toned. They clearly share a common provenance. Acquaintances who have had the opportunity to inspect batches of the coins concur that the representation of mints points to a hoard assembled in the Cambridge area, possibly containing as many as 10,000 pieces. The majority are from the reign of Cnut, with a small proportion from the Last Small Cross type of Æthelred II. For want of better information, this paper refers to the coins as from the ‘Cnut’

30 The Häss hoard (1894), contained a cut half penny of Æthelstan, now in Berlin, reading [AN M/HVN], which has hitherto been attributed incorrectly to the moneyer Man. See catalogue of coins, no. 130 (3).
### TABLE 10: Huntingdon moneyers under Cnut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Æth. II Last</th>
<th>Quatrefoil</th>
<th>Pointed Helmet</th>
<th>Short Cross</th>
<th>Harold U/ Harthacnut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leofric</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æthelstan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sæwine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfnoth</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æthelward</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadnoth</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfthel</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godleof</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godric</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man [ ]</td>
<td>(?),</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanmarc</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trincetel</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfwine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ælfseg)²</td>
<td>(?),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godman</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leofwineᵇ</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynsige</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfgear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfstan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfwine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total        | 94           | 89           | 39            | 222         |

Number of moneyers: 12+ 8 4 20+
O. dies: 42 24 9 75
R. dies: 51 25 8 84
R. dies ('equivalent'): 77 29 9 115

---

A Leokettt 2761, not traced.
ᵇ Or 'Stearwine'.

---

The hoard (c.1993). Table 11 shows the impact of the hoard on the Huntingdon corpus in the Quatrefoil type.

The hoard, at a stroke, has redressed the preponderance of coins found in Scandinavia compared with 'others'. Moreover, this study certainly does not include all, or even most of, coins from the Huntingdon mint found in the hoard, but too little information is available on which to

### TABLE 11: Cnut, Quatrefoil type. Contribution of coins from the 'Cnut' hoard (c. 1993).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of coins and source</th>
<th>'Cnut' hoard excluding</th>
<th>'Cnut' hoard including</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. dies</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. dies</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. dies ('equivalent')</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
make even an inspired guess about how many may be missing.\(^{31}\) Thanks to the hoard, the number of known reverse dies increases from thirty-five to fifty-one, and the calculation of ‘equivalent’ reverse dies from seventy-two to seventy-seven. This figure contrasts with Metcalf’s estimation of forty.\(^{32}\) It is also a marked increase upon the author’s estimate for the Long Cross issue of forty-three ‘equivalent’ reverses, represented by 151 coins. It would be dangerous, nevertheless, to equate the difference with significantly higher levels of activity in the Quatrefoil type. During the Long Cross issue two moneyers, Ælfric and Os Gut, used most of the dies, with a minor contribution from Eadwine, whereas in the Quatrefoil type there are twelve recorded moneyers of which half are only known from single die sets of one obverse with one or two reverses. It may be that these moneyers simply did not work their dies as hard as Ælfric and Os Gut had done. Of the other six moneyers, Eadnoth with twelve known obverses was the most active, followed by Godleof.

*Quatrefoil type – Other features*

No obverse die-links have so far been found between Huntingdon and other mints in the Quatrefoil type, nor of Huntingdon moneyers sharing an obverse. The pattern of obverse to reverse usage is less regular than in the preceding type, seven individual obverses being known with two reverses, and two with three reverses. There are four instances of two obverses being used with one reverse, although two of these involve a simple chain.\(^{33}\) Overall forty-two obverses are known compared to fifty-one reverses, but the ‘equivalent’ die calculations imply that an estimated fourteen obverses remain to be discovered, compared with twenty-six reverses, giving a 3:4 overall ratio for the issue.

There are a number of coins from Huntingdon of unusual style, with blundered obverse legends. Blackburn and Lyon have identified these with an illiterate die engraver at Northampton rather than, as previously supposed, the work of Scandinavian imitators.\(^{34}\) They are all of the moneyer Eadnoth. The reverses of two of these coins (Ec, Dh) are also used with conventional obverses (Be, Kh), and an example of obverse B was in the ‘Cnut’ hoard, affording convincing evidence that Blackburn and Lyon are correct. Besides a third obverse of Northampton style reading ANGELI (Eadnoth C) there are two further Northampton style coins known from single specimens, one of which has the extraordinary obverse inscription +VENEBTONAEORN. The moneyer is rendered EDLERD HVN on this coin and +ÆLFORD MO HVN on the other. Veronica Smart considers that both are attempted renderings of the name Æthelweard,\(^{35}\) presumably from the same bungling craftsman’s hand.

In the Quatrefoil issue there are five further features to be considered: namely weight standards, sources of dies, use of MON(N) and ON copulatives, symbols added to the obverse or reverse design, and abnormalities in the form of gouges in certain reverse dies. The question should also be raised whether any relationship is discernible between these features. This unavoidably entails taking into account certain of them (such as added symbols and gouges) before they have been explored in the text.

*Quatrefoil type – Weight standards*

Quatrefoil pence were struck to markedly lower weight standards than pence of the preceding issue.\(^{36}\) The heaviest coin in the study weighs 1.50 g and the lightest, as crisp as if it had just left the mint, 0.59 g. The moneyers Æthelstan, Ælnoth and Æthelweard, all active in the preceding issue, struck the heaviest coins, but, unexpectedly, their colleague Sæwine is only known from a

---

31 A handlist of 1739 coins from the hoard, examined in 1994, contained twenty-two Huntingdon coins (ten Quatrefoil, nine Helmet, and three Short Cross types), but there is no way of knowing if this was representative of the hoard as a whole. If it was, it suggests over 100 coins of Huntingdon in all, compared with seventy-three in this study.

32 See Table 1 above.

33 Eadnoth Be, Ecj, Dgh, Khn.


35 Private correspondence. The coins are Æthelweard Dg and Ce.

single coin weighing 0.85 g (Aa). Moreover, he is unknown in the following Pointed Helmet type. This peculiarity will be considered further below. The moneyer MAN could be an abbreviation for Manna, or possibly for Manwine who is known from a light coin of the previous type.

Before assessing the relationship, if any, to weight standards of symbols added to the obverse or reverse design and gouging of reverses, the weight pattern will first be considered excluding coins displaying such features. Fifty-eight coins thus remain and reveal the pattern set out in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate standard</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Late</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.45g</td>
<td>1.26g</td>
<td>1.06g</td>
<td>0.88g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Coins</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. dies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. dies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. dies as % of total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The heaviest standard at Huntingdon does not appear to have been long maintained, and Eadnoth’s only die used to strike a heavy coin is more widely represented by coins in the 1.14 g–1.00 g weight range. Half his activity seems to have occurred at the 1.06 g standard, its separation from another group of coins at the low weight of 0.88 g being clearly apparent despite the small sample. Apart from two obverses used with one reverse, four obverses with two and one with three reverses, the normal coins are known from pairings of one obverse with one reverse. Blackburn and Lyon have estimated the standards applied at five major mints in the Quatrefoil type. Taking Lincoln as the comparator, the picture painted at Huntingdon by Table 13 is consistent, allowing for some variation between mints which must have been officially sanctioned rather than merely tolerated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight standards (g) (% of O. dies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.88 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.40 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.20 (30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coins featuring added symbols or gouges all fall within the middle and late weight standards, but whether they were struck at the same or different periods compared with normal coins of similar weights will be considered below.

The highest weight at which each normal reverse die was used again enables a more sophisticated assessment to be made of the number of moneyers likely to have been in office at the same time than by considering their activity by type. The latter calculation gives a complement of at least four moneyers at the beginning of the type and three at the end. As Table 14 shows, four

38 Blackburn and Lyon, 'Regional die-production', as in n. 34, p. 254.
moneyers were at work at each point of change in the weight standard, which has to be increased to five for whatever period Sewine used his dies Aa, already referred to. It also shows Man and Stanmaer operating at the 1.06 g standard. It may not be safely concluded, however, that they augmented the complement because two other moneyers (Æthelweard and Ærthnæ) may have ceased operating during the lifetime of that standard and Man and Stanmaer then could have replaced them, only to be succeeded in turn by Godric and Godleof.

### TABLE 14: Cnut, Quatrefoil type. Complement of Huntingdon moneyers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Æth. II</th>
<th>Quatrefoil standard (g)</th>
<th>Helmet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Small</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfnoth</td>
<td>Cross</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æthelweard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>+a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æthelstan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadnoth</td>
<td>4c</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ærthnæ</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanmaer</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godric</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godleof</td>
<td>+d</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurdcel</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfric</td>
<td>+b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complement of moneyers 4–5 4–5 4–5 4–5

- Reverse a used with different obverses (AB) supplied from Thetford and Bedford respectively.
- Abnormal die; position in issue uncertain.
- Dies Aa used at 1.45 and 1.06 g standards.
- Dies Aa used at 1.06 and 0.88 g standards.

If coins with added symbols were taken as having been struck to the current standard, the moneyer Man should be added to the complement at the 1.26 g standard and Ælfnoth at the 1.06 g standard. Leofric has been altogether excluded from the reckoning because, although his coins are known from the Last Small Cross type of Æthelred II and Helmet type of Cnut, none has so far emerged of the two intervening types. A coin (Hild. 361), reading LEOFRIC M DVH and struck from Oxford-style dies, is almost certainly assignable to Buckingham.

**Quatrefoil type – Sources of dies**

As at the end of Æthelred II's reign, mints on the borderland between die-cutting centres, such as Huntingdon and Cambridge, seem to have had complicated die supply arrangements. Based on the definition of die-cutting styles made by Blackburn and Lyon,\(^5\) Table 15 sets out the sources from which each moneyer received his regular obverse dies, plotted by weight standard, those with added symbols and/or gouging being indicated by parentheses.

The Table shows that Huntingdon moneyers took their dies from six different centres in the course of the issue: namely, Thetford, Lincoln, Northampton, Bedford, London and Stamford. Blackburn and Lyon suggest that the so-called ‘Northampton’ dies could equally have been produced at Huntingdon.\(^6\) This seems unlikely. Their analysis of the styles yielded from the Stockholm systematic collection and the Copenhagen syloge eleven coins from Northampton of eponymous style, but only five (three by the author's reckoning) from Huntingdon. The sample of ninety-four coins in this study only increases the Huntingdon total from five to nine. But, more

---

\(^5\) pp. 226–46.
\(^6\) p. 240.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Early 1.45 g</th>
<th>Mid 1.06 g</th>
<th>Late 0.88 g</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ælfnoth</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æthelweard</td>
<td>T^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æthelstan</td>
<td>T^</td>
<td>T^</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sæwine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadnoth</td>
<td>Li^</td>
<td>T N</td>
<td>Lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Færethian</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>B^</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Lo)^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godric</td>
<td></td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godleof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stannmer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Li Li/S</td>
<td>(Li)/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(S) (Lo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of die-cutting centres: 2 3 6 5

Key: B = Bedford        N = Northampton
     Li = Lincoln       S = Stamford
     Lo = London        T = Thetford

a = same reverse (a)    d = same obverse (D)
b = same dies (Aa)      e = same reverse (a1)
c = same obverse (A)    f = reverse a1 with gouge (a2)

importantly, the Northampton style employed over the two middle weight standards accounts for only five obverse dies compared with sixteen from other centres. Three of these were used by Eadnoth who also had recourse for his obverses to Thetford, Lincoln and London. It may legitimately be asked why he should have spurned an indigenous source for part of his requirements and why only Æthelweard amongst his six colleagues should have availed himself of it. The complexity of the overall arrangements is proportionate to the level of activity of each moneyer.

On the material available, Thetford and Lincoln were the initial source of dies for the Huntingdon moneyers, joined by Northampton and possibly Bedford when the standard was first lowered. At the second lowering Stamford and London came on stream, the latter predominating in the closing stages of the issue. The contribution of Bedford was insignificant and its independent existence as a die-cutting centre should not perhaps be treated as beyond doubt. Given that three centres (Bedford, Northampton and Stamford), were close to the mint and the main sources of obverses (Thetford, Lincoln and London) were more distant, convenience was clearly not the driving force in the supply of dies. The moneyers, therefore, were doubtless directed to obtain their dies from particular centres for reasons that are not immediately apparent. It at least implies a sophisticated system of control, also intimated by the use of added symbols and gouges shortly to be considered.

**Quatrefoil type – Use of MO and ON copulatives**

On the evidence of known coins, reverses with the MO copulative, deployed in a variety of formats, make their final bow at Huntingdon. Lincoln, Stamford, Thetford and (the solitary) Bedford style obverses are all associated with this copulative, except for an exceedingly light coin of Godleof (Ei, Thetford style, 0.59 g, with a pellet added to the fourth quarter of the reverse).
Reverses bearing the ON copulative are also found on coins of Eadnoth (Ir, Lincoln style obverse) and Thurecetel (Aab, Stamford style obverse), but in each case the reverse is of London style.

Northampton and London style obverses present a more complex picture. One pair of Northampton dies uses a reverse lacking any copulative to strike a coin at 1.01 g (Æthelweard Dg). Another uses a MO reverse of London style to strike coins at 1.06 g and 1.05 g (Eadnoth Ej) and a third uses an ON reverse of London style to strike at 0.96 g (Eadnoth Dh). The heaviest known coins struck from London obverses weigh 1.05 g. One of these is found with a MO copulative (Eadnoth Hp) but another is used with two reverses lacking any copulative to strike coins ranging between 1.05 g and 1.00 g (Eadnoth Gmn). This raises the possibility that at London, at least, the MO copulative was abandoned during the currency of the 1.06 g standard and that briefly the copulative was omitted altogether before the introduction of ON. The author knows of no Northampton style reverses with an ON copulative to suggest a similar progression, but equally no Northampton reverses have been found to weigh less than 1.01 g.

The remaining coins struck from London obverses are associated with the ON copulative and weights below 1.05 g with three explicable exceptions. First, a coin of Eadnoth (Lu, 0.96 g) has a MO copulative but the reverse is of Stamford style. It also has two pellets (or a colon) in the fourth quarter of the reverse. Secondly, the only known Quatrefoil penny of Sewine, weighing 0.85 g, also has a London obverse used with a MO copulative. This reverse is possibly of Lincoln (or Stamford) style and features a gouged out symbol resembling a dagger. Since Sewine was active in the preceding Last Small Cross issue, and unknown in the Pointed Helmet type, a scarcity of his coins in the Quatrefoil type would be expected to be reflected by the survival of heavier coins rather than the light one here represented. Thirdly, a London obverse of Godleof with a sceptre engraved behind the bust (D) is used with a reverse enjoying a chequered history. It first appears in combination with a Lincoln obverse and bears the MO copulative and a small cross in the fourth quarter. In this state it is used to strike a coin at 0.90 g (Godleof Ce1). Later this reverse is used with the same obverse but the reverse cross gouged out, to strike a coin at 0.91 g (Ce2). The gouged reverse is also used with the London obverse described above (D) to strike a coin again at 0.91 g. The importance of Godleof dies Ce1/Ce2 is amplified below.

Quatrefoil type – Added symbols

A distinction has to be drawn between unusual features simply resulting from the die-cutter’s interpretation of the official design and those differences put in on purpose to signal an intentional deviation from the norm, whatever that might be. Admittedly, cases may arise when it is not possible to be sure into which category a particular feature should be placed, but that is no excuse for not attempting the exercise. For the purposes of the following analysis, coins with additional pellets, colons, trefoils and similar punctuation in the legends are not treated as deviant in the sense of having a special significance. One thing is certain. The difficulty in interpreting identifiable symbols proves that they were intended to be meaningful to the mint administrators rather than the coin user. These cryptic features normally consist of extraneous pellets, annulets or crosses placed conspicuously in the field of the design. They may be divided into those appearing on the obverse or reverse of a coin, or both. To them should be added the distinct category of gouges, appearing as bars on the reverses of a number of Huntingdon coins in this type, with corresponding shallow depressions on the obverses.41

Under Æthelred II, the use of pellets on the coins of the moneyer Osgut did not appear to be weight-related. In contrast, in the Quatrefoil issue no Huntingdon coins at the heavy/early weight standards have so far appeared with added symbols. They all occur on coins struck to the 1.06 g standard or below. The key question is whether this relationship is significant or merely coincidental.

Taking the obverses, only one (Godleof A1) is known where the die has been modified after being brought into use, by adding four pellets behind the bust (A2). Four coins are known in the original state (A1a) struck between 1.02 g and 1.00 g, but a fifth weighs 0.89 g, as do both coins

41 The author is collaborating with Robert Grayburn in studying the use of gouges at other mints, particularly Stamford.
struck in the modified state with a different reverse (A2b). Another instance occurs where the moneyer Eadnoth used an obverse (D) with pellets either side of the bust at two weight levels: 1.11 g (Dg) and 0.96 g (Dh). The latter reverse is die-linked to two coins using a standard obverse (Kth) and weighing 0.96 g and 0.95 g respectively. Too much should not be read into the pellets in either case, the drop in weight probably representing the carrying-over of obverses from one weight standard into the next. One other obverse, of Stamford style, has a pellet in front and a cross behind the bust, and additional pellets on the reverse (Ælfneth Dg). Here the reference to something unusual is unambiguous. The two examples are struck at 1.08 g and 1.01 g, the only coins of the moneyer known at that weight standard, who otherwise took his dies from Thetford, striking coins in the range of 1.50 g to 1.32 g (average 1.45 g). However, to claim this as an example of highlighting coins struck at below the current standard would not be justified on the evidence.

A further group of obverses can probably be consigned to the normal fold. These are dies with a single pellet behind London ‘C’ style busts: Eadnoth (M), Thurcetel (C, used with a gouged reverse), and Wulftric (A).

Turning to reverse symbols, two coins of Eadnoth (Ab) have pellets in annulets in the first and second quarters and pellets in the third and fourth. They weigh 1.03 g and 1.02 g compared with standard dies (Aa) used to strike one coin at 1.43 g, one at 1.14 g and two others at 1.04 g and 1.00 g. The relationship here between the standard heavy and light coins and light coins with added symbols is analogous to that already observed with the obverses of Godleof (A1/2) and Eadnoth (DK). More significantly, a coin of Æthelstan (Bc) with an early Lincoln obverse is used with a reverse with a cross in the fourth quarter to strike a coin at the late/light weight of 1.00 g. This at first sight could have weight implications, but other evidence to be considered below casts doubt on such an interpretation. Table 16 shows that the moneyers Stanmaer and Thurcetel provide further curiosities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Die combination</th>
<th>Reverse abnormality</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stanmaer B c</td>
<td>4 annulets</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>4 pellets</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>4 annulets</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurcetel A a</td>
<td>gouge</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1 pellet and gouge</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the dearth of specimens from each die combination it is not possible to formulate a weight related interpretation of these markings.

From the foregoing it must be concluded that no persuasive case can be made for dies with conspicuous added symbols, such as pellets, annulets and crosses, indicating sanctioned weight manipulations within the Quatrefoil issue. The unique coins, Godleof (Ei) and Sæwine (Aa) defy satisfactory interpretation until further specimens emerge.

**Quatrefoil type - Gouges**

It remains to consider the more crudely executed gouges. Two points are clear. First of all, since coins from otherwise identical reverse dies exist with and without gouges (Godleof e1, e2; Man a1, a2) they were evidently added at the mint rather than the die-cutting centre. Figure 5 shows enlargements of Godleof’s reverses e1 and e2.

Secondly, they are mutilations of the reverse die. They are invariably found in the same position on reverse die duplicates and show up as shallow depressions at different positions on the obverse, according to the die axis adopted by the hammer-man. In addition, gouges are known at
Huntingdon placed in the second, third and fourth quarters of the reverse, but not, so far, the first. A reason, however, for the positioning of a gouge may exist beneath the gouge itself. The first clue is an un-gouged reverse of Æthelstan (c) with a tiny cross in the fourth quarter. No gouged version of this reverse is known, but Godleof (c) provides examples of such a cross in a similar position, both with and without gouges, the gouging only partly obliterating the cross. There is no material difference in the weight at which these specimens were struck. They fall within the range 0.91 g to 0.88 g. This militates against interpreting Æthelstan’s reverse as having weight implications. The abnormal coin of Æwine (a), already referred to several times, also has a gouge, partly obliterating what appears to be a dagger-shaped symbol. Two reverses of Thurcetel likewise appear to be erasing a symbol, leaving a small pellet outside each gouge (a and e). In fact, only one possible example at Huntingdon has so far arisen of a gouge not used to erase something underneath. This is a die of Man (a1, a2) when, unusually, a small erasure appears to have been made at the outer edge of the coin, marring an otherwise normal legend. There is nothing from the examples known of Huntingdon to suggest that gouging to erase symbols underneath is in itself weight-related. Frustratingly, this leaves the reason for both as a mystery yet to be unravelled. It is conceivable that the gouges were made to remove symbols engraved on the dies for a particular reason, probably not connected with weight manipulation, that was no longer valid.

**Pointed Helmet type**

The Pointed Helmet type (BMC xiv, Hild. G) yields eighty-nine coins, almost as many as for the Quatrefoil type, but from fewer moneyers and dies. This downward trend is even more marked in the following Short Cross type. Owing to the number of moneyers known only for the Quatrefoil or Pointed Helmet issues, a complement at Huntingdon no greater than three can be claimed at the beginning of the Pointed Helmet issue (Eadnoth, Godleof and Godric), with only one moneyer, Ada, definitely continuing to operate in Short Cross. He could be the same person who struck coins at Cambridge in the first two substantive issues of Cnut. The twenty-five known Pointed Helmet reverse dies produce an ‘equivalent’ die estimate of twenty-nine. However, since five of the eight known moneyers (Ada, Godman, Godric, Leofric and Wynsige) are represented by solitary coins, the calculation may be an underestimation even though Metcalf estimated twenty-seven reverses. Almost seventy per cent of the known coins have a Scandinavian provenance. Amongst the others, the ‘Cnut’ hoard only contributes ten coins, although a handlist of 1739 coins from the hoard inspected in Australia records nine Pointed Helmet coins of Huntingdon. As in the previous type, the main moneyers were Eadnoth and Godleof. The former is only represented by two die-linked obverses (Aa, Bb), struck in the weight range 1.11 g to 1.01 g, so he may have ceased to operate early in the issue. Godleof, in contrast, struck coins over a wider range (1.13 g–0.81 g), employing fourteen obverses and seventeen reverses. His pattern of die usage is also complex, reminiscent of Eadnoth in the Quatrefoil type. He uses two obverses (D,E) with two

---

42 Jonsson and Van der Meer, ‘Mints and moneyers’, as in n. 37, pp. 59 and 123.
43 See Table 1.
44 Private correspondence.
reverses \((i, j)\) but reverse \(i\) also in the combination \(Jsi\). It may be that the leading moneyer had greater freedom at this period than his fellow moneyers in calling off and deploying the dies under his control. Godleof’s die D is known in two states, the second flaunting a large, crude pellet in front of the bust. Seven coins struck from the die in its original state weigh between 1.06 g and 1.02 g, but the two from the pelleted obverse 1.13 g and 1.14 g respectively. Obverse die alteration at the mint here seems to be linked to striking coins at a higher weight than standard, in contrast with the altered obverse of Godleof (A1/A2) in the Quatrefoil issue.

**Pointed Helmet type – Weight standards**

Godleof’s die D demonstrates that the mint personnel had lost nothing of their skill in striking to fine limits of accuracy. This may be an important factor in interpreting weights in the Pointed Helmet issue because it is difficult to identify well defined weight standards from the available sample, particularly towards the end of the issue. Instead of reducing the standards by clearly defined steps, the weight seems to drift downwards, possibly reflecting a complex gradual reduction in the standard. In marked contrast with the Quatrefoil issue, apart from Godleof’s obverse D, the suspected harbingers of weight manipulation, in the form of added pellets and so forth, are conspicuously absent.

There are five coins struck at a weight above 1.10 g (average 1.13 g). These could be representative of an initial standard for the type, but could equally well signify strikings at the upper end of a lower initial standard. Looking at the output of the two main moneyers, Eadnoth struck twenty-two coins in the range from 1.11 g to 1.02 g, averaging 1.06 g. Grouping Godleof’s output according to die-linked coins, he struck forty-four coins ranging from 1.14 g to 0.98 g at the average weight of 1.04 g. This may have been the standard in the early part of the issue, although it could also have been slightly higher at 1.06 g, with a second standard at around 0.98 g, by which time Eadnoth had ceased to operate. The five remaining intact coins of Godleof range from 0.92 g to 0.81 g, averaging 0.87 g and representing a distinctively lower standard. The coins of the six other moneyers all weigh below 1.00 g, as Table 17 shows.

**TABLE 17: Cnut, Pointed Helmet type.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Number of coins</th>
<th>(Average) Weight (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godric</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leofric</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leofwine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.86-0.76 (0.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynsige</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considerably more coins would obviously be needed before attempting to estimate how many steps were involved in the reduction from 1.06 g (or 1.04 g) to coins in the region of 0.87 g or below.

**Pointed Helmet type – Bust styles and inscriptions**

If the Huntingdon dies are divided into those used to strike to a 1.06 g standard (‘early’) and the remainder (‘late’), the styles of bust, as identified by Dolley and Ingold, employed at those weight levels are as shown in Table 18.\(^\text{45}\)

TABLE 18: Cnut, Pointed Helmet type. Distribution of obverse dies by bust style.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bust</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>Late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>IIc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moneyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadnoth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godleof</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godric</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leofric</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leofwine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynsige</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table implies that at Huntingdon bust style IIa preceded IIb, and that IIc preceded IIb and spanned the weight reduction. This does not correspond with the tentative conclusions of Dolley and Ingold. A similar analysis of the available material does not reveal any time or weight related significance in the use of REX and RECX, solid or ornamented straps to the helmet, sceptres with heads of three or four pellets, or use of the ethnic A(NG), although at present the reading ANGL is only known from an early die (Eadnoth A). The mint inscriptions are unremarkable, reading HV with the addition of one or more of the letters VNTED, except on the coins of Godric (HVHDT) and Wynsige (VNTDNE).

**Short Cross type**

A further contraction in the activity at Huntingdon mint is clear in the Short Cross type (BMC xvi, Hild. H). Thirty-nine coins are in the study, emanating from four moneyers, and nine obverse and eight reverse dies. Actually is, however, less neat than the near 1:1 ratio in that Wynstan provides die-links Aab, Ba, and Wulfwine ABCa, Ce. The sample yields only nine ‘equivalent’ reverse dies. More than one moneyer in office at the same time cannot be claimed with any certainty. The pattern of waning activity at different mints through the main issues of Cnut is, however, variable. Metcalf’s calculations for the mints closest to Huntingdon are set out in Table 19 with adjustments suggested for Huntingdon in this paper shown in parentheses.\(^{46}\)

TABLE 19: Cnut. ‘Equivalent’ reverse dies at mints near to Huntingdon: Metcalf (Eaglen).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Quatrefoil</th>
<th>Pointed Helmet</th>
<th>Short Cross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
<td>40 (77)</td>
<td>27 (29)</td>
<td>7 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cambridge, and to a lesser extent Huntingdon, were particularly busy during the Quatrefoil issue, and Huntingdon appears to have declined less in the Pointed Helmet type than Cambridge, Bedford and Northampton. The most substantial mint at Stamford, on the other hand, shows

greater resilience on Metcalf's calculations, even increasing its die usage in the Short Cross issue. The 'Cnut' hoard contributes nineteen of the thirty-nine Huntingdon coins in the sample, resulting in the thirteen with a clear Scandinavian provenance being outnumbered. The hoard, however, only supplies one hitherto unknown die (Wulfwine g).

As Table 20 shows, the coins of Ada, Ælfgar (other than one coin of dies Bc) and Wulfstan were struck to a standard of approximately 1.12 g, but those of Wulfwine average 0.93 g. Not only were his coins lighter but he is the only moneyer whose coins are so far known in the following reign, illustrating that lightness is again equated with lateness in the Short Cross issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Dies</th>
<th>Average Weight (g)</th>
<th>Number of coins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bc</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfgar</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bc</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfstan</td>
<td>Aab, Ba</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfwine</td>
<td>ABCa, Cg</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inscriptions are again unremarkable, except for a grotesquely blundered obverse of Ælfgar (B), reading +[N]HILL RICIC+N. The reverse spelling is also slightly botched but the bust is of good style. Only one die, Wulfwine (A), bears the ethnic abbreviated to A, and two of his three obverses read REX instead of RECX, which may be a late change.

Harold I (joint king 1035–1037; sole, 1037–1040)

On the untimely death of Cnut, his only legitimate son, Harthacnut, was unable to leave Denmark to claim his inheritance owing to fears of a Norwegian invasion. Accordingly, his half-brother Harold was made regent, but Cnut's widow, Emma, was installed at Winchester to look after her son's interests during his absence. This led to coins of the first substantive Jewel Cross type (BMC i, Hild.A) being issued by southern mints in the name of Harthacnut and in the more northerly, including Huntingdon, in the name of Harold. Before the end of 1037, however, Harold had been recognised as sole king and Emma had taken refuge in Flanders. Harold himself died in 1040 when Harthacnut, by then at Bruges with his fleet, was contemplating invasion.47

Huntingdon is no exception to the scarcity of surviving coins of Harold's reign. This study contains only six coins of the Jewel Cross type and fourteen of the following Fleur-de-lis type (BMC v, vi, Hild. B). Wulfwine continued in office from the previous reign. Unless a coin of Harthacnut, to be discussed below, can be attributed to his erstwhile colleague, Wulfstan, no evidence exists of other Huntingdon moneyers at the beginning of Harold's reign. This may simply reflect the miniscule sample of survivors. It is improbable that Huntingdon had suddenly plummeted to single moneyer status, especially as Wulfwine was joined by Wulfwig in Harold's Fleur-de-lis type and both men struck coins of Harthacnut. In the Stockholm sylloge, however, both the PVLFINE and PVLFINI readings in the Fleur-de-lis type are taken as referring to Wulfwine. But given the number of common Anglo-Saxon personal names ending in either -wig or -wine, it would be strange indeed if die engravers had used -wi endings to mean indiscriminately either -wig or -wine or to mean -wine alone. In the author's opinion, where several dies of both -wi(i) and -wine endings occur in the same coin type to discount the likelihood of isolated slipshod die-cutting, any -wi(i) endings may properly be expanded to -wig, leaving -wine endings freestanding.

There appears to have been more than one weight standard in operation, but the paucity of coins and ambiguity in the weights of different die combinations reduces any attempt to define standards into a cockshy.

---

Table 21 shows the Huntingdon moneyers known to have struck the coinages of Harold I and Harthacnut.

**TABLE 21: Huntingdon moneyers under Harold I and Harthacnut.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Harold I</th>
<th>Harthacnut</th>
<th>Ed the Conf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short (BMC)</td>
<td>Harold I (BMC)</td>
<td>Harthacnut (BMC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i, vi</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>xvii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfwine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfwig</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfwine</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfstan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O. dies: 3, 5, 3, 2, 13
R. dies: 3, 6, 4, 2, 15

Equivalent R. dies = 21
(Metcalf 16)

**Harthacnut (joint king 1035–1037; sole, 1040–1042)**

Because Huntingdon issued no coins of Harthacnut during his absence, his only coins belong to his brief sole rule between his arrival in England in June 1040 and his death, following a convulsion ‘as he stood at his drink’, barely two years later. Only nine coins are in this study, seven from the Arm and Sceptre type (BMC ii, Hild. B) and two from the same type with the obverse reading ‘Cnut’ (BMC xvii, Hild. I). The obverse design and size of lettering was well-suited to a monarch’s name with four characters, but less so for one with eight. BMC ii obverse dies of the moneyers Ælfwine (A), Wulfwig (A) and Wulfwine (A) bear the king’s name only, without his title or an ethnic. Even the name is abbreviated in two of the three readings. The BMC xvii obverses of Ælfwine (A) and Wulfstan (A), in contrast, both provide space for the title R. EX by contracting the king’s name to CNVT. This contraction could also have been thought to conjure up favourable resonances. Although Talvio has suggested that coins of BMC ii are heavier and thus earlier than BMC xvii, that distinction is not evident from the small sample of Huntingdon coins.

Two die combinations merit special mention. Wulfwine Aa was placed by Hildebrand under Langport, but Van der Meer in 1961 boldly stated ‘the mint is Huntingdon’. This confidence is justified by the obverse die-link to a reverse (Ab) reading +PVLPLINE ON HVN. The other coin is that of Wulfstan of the Arm and Sceptre type inscribed ‘Cnut’ (Aa) in the Copenhagen Royal Collection. This is included without further comment under Huntingdon in the Copenhagen syllinge for Cnvt. The attribution is difficult, however, because the reverse is struck off-centre with only the base of the letters of the mint name showing and these are susceptible to various interpretations. Wulfstan is confirmed as a Huntingdon moneyer in Cnut’s Small Cross type and Edward the Confessor’s Radiate–Small Cross type, with at least eight years separating them, and this coin would fall in the centre of that period. Although Wulfstan is not an uncommon name he is not
listed under Harthacnut for any mint in Jonsson and Van de Meer’s review of mints and moneyers (973–1066). This inconclusive evidence is irksome because, if the coin is correctly attributed to Huntingdon, it would seem to follow that Wulfstan remained in office after Cnut’s death through the reign of Harold I.

The ‘equivalent’ reverse die calculation for both reigns is twenty-one compared with twenty-three estimated by Metcalf. Coins from Scandinavian hoards again predominate.

Edward the Confessor (1042–1066)

Table 22 shows the moneyers operating in each type at Huntingdon in the reign of Edward the Confessor. The assemblage of coins from the reign reveals some unusual features. Of the 101 coins in this study over a third are of the Hammer Cross type, including mules with the preceding and following issues. Of the remaining coins, each type is represented by between one and twelve examples. The Scandinavian hoards virtually cease to figure after the second, Radiate-Small Cross, type. Instead the extensive City of London or ‘Walbrook’ hoard of 1872 becomes a significant contributor to survival. Although Thompson records no less than forty-one Huntingdon coins, matching them to the coins in the study is problematical. In fact, a total of only eight coins can be confidently attributed to the hoard, the origins of the remainder being largely unknown. This is clearly illustrated in the Hammer Cross type for which eleven coins of Godric are recorded and an unspecified number of Godwine, but none of the twenty-nine known coins of these two moneyers can be so attributed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 22: Huntingdon moneyers under Edward the Confessor, by BMC type.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edward the Confessor number of coins</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ha'cnum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfwig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfwine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfwine (Dunwig)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfstan (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leofwine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulfceel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godwine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of moneyers  | 2+ | 2+ | 2    | 2    | 2  | 3    | 3  | 2  | 8    |
| Number of moneyers  | 2+ | 2+ | 2    | 2    | 2  | 3    | 3  | 2  | 8    |
| O. dies             |     |   | 3    | 5    | 3  | 2    | 5  | 4  | 30   |
| R. dies             |     |   | 6    | 4    | 3  | 2    | 4  | 3  | 2    | 29    |
| R. dies ('equivalent') | 20 (Metcalf 12) | -  | -   |      | -  | -    |    |    |      | 32    |

² Recorded by Seaby (BNJ 30 (1955), at p. 141) but not traced.

M = mule

---

³ Jonsson and Van der Meer, ‘Mints and moneyers’, as in n. 37, 47–136. See Tables, pp. 54–119.

The earlier types

In the initial PACX (BMC iv, Hild. D) type both Wulfwig and Wulfwine continue from the reign of Harthacnut. Wulfwig uses one obverse with three reverses, each carrying a pellet after the L of his name (Aabc). His other known set of dies (Bde) employs two reverses reading PSCX instead of the usual PACX. These are doubtless idiosyncracies of a die engraver and illustrate how reverse dies were prepared and issued together.

In the next, Radiate-Small Cross, type (BMC i, Hild. A) Wulfwig and Wulfwine are again at work and the separate identity of the two is placed beyond doubt by full PVLFPiG and PVLFPiNE readings. Wulfstan also appears, raising again the currently unanswered question whether he had remained in office, but relatively inactive, from the end of Cnut’s reign. In this type Seaby also recorded the moneyer Dunwig, but no coins or other references have been found to advance his claims to inclusion as a Huntingdon moneyer.54

In the Trefoil-Quadrilateral type (BMC iii, Hild. C) only the moneyer Ælfwine is known. As he is recorded for both of Harthacnut’s types, it would not be surprising if coins struck by him came to light from the PACX and Radiate-Small Cross issues. His output is represented by four dies, in the combinations Aab and Ba. Reverse a has a pair of additional pellets in the inner circle and reverse b in the field. There is no weight-related explanation for the accretions, dies Aa weighing between 1.12 g and 1.10 g and Ab between 1.13 g and 1.10 g. The only intact coin of obverse B is barely heavier, at 1.16 g.

Ælfwine provides most examples of the Small Flan type (BMC ii, Hild. B) which maintained the weight levels of the previous two issues despite the reduced diameter of the coins. He is joined by Ulfcelte who is otherwise unknown at the mint, and only the fourth example of a name of Old Norse origin to have come to light at Huntingdon. Another candidate for inclusion in this type is Leofwine, but the mint reading is ambiguous and could refer equally to Hythe. A moneyer of that name was active at Huntingdon in Cnut’s Helmet type and again when the Sovereign-Eagles type was being supplanted by the Hammer Cross type, but is otherwise unknown in the intervening period or at Hythe at any time.

Expanding Cross type and weight considerations

In the Expanding Cross type (BMC v, Hild. E) it is well known that a dramatic change in the weight standard occurred, although the debate continues as to whether the heavy preceded the light, in the traditional fashion, or vice-versa.55 Although the number of Huntingdon coins known for the first four issues is too meagre to justify any attempt at weight analysis by type, the pattern of weights at Huntingdon throughout the period appears to be very similar. Twenty of the known intact coins weigh between 1.16 g and 1.05 g, with an average of 1.11 g. A further eight coins weigh between 1.00 g and 0.87 g, with an average of 0.94 g. Exceptionally, one intact Small Flan coin (Ulfcelte Aa(2)) weighs only 0.63 g. The number of dies and light coins struck from them is obviously too few at Huntingdon to reveal whether they represent a late lowering of the standard in each type, as had happened in earlier reigns. In the PACX issue the die set Aabc of Wulfwig, issued (as suggested above) together, were used to strike coins at both weight levels, as were his dies Aab, Ba in the Radiate-Small Cross type. A similar construction could be placed on Ælfwine’s use of dies Aa in the Small Flan type. The conventional explanation would be that sporadic output caused both moneyers to keep their dies through changing weight periods, but, in theory at least, two separate weight standards could have been in concurrent use. This could account for the difficulty in resolving the question whether the light coins preceded or followed the heavy in the Expanding Cross type. This heretical thought would need to be tested (and possibly borne away in a tumbrel) at mints with greater numbers of moneyers and surviving coins than Huntingdon can provide.

At present, only two light Expanding Cross coins are known, of Ælfwine Ce, at 1.13 g with added pellets in the reverse field, and Godwine Aa, at 1.14 g. The remaining seven intact Huntingdon coins weigh between 1.78 g and 1.43 g, and average 1.64 g. They provide no helpful evidence on the possible sequence of light and heavy coins. Ælfwine is known for the Small Flan and not the Pointed Helmet type, but struck both light and heavy coins in the Expanding Cross issue. Godric is not recorded before the Expanding Cross type and his six known coins are all of the heavy issue, whereas Godwine, who also on current evidence began his career in the Expanding Cross type, is only known by a coin of the light issue.

With the introduction of the Pointed Helmet type (BMC vii, Hild. F) the two-tier weight standard, whether concurrent or sequential, appears to have been abandoned at Huntingdon. Instead, a standard of approximately 1.30 g seems to have been adopted and to have lasted until after the Hammer Cross type had appeared.

Later types and mules

The Sovereign-Eagles type (BMC ix, Hild. H) is only represented by two coins, one each of Godric (1.35 g) and Godwine (1.34 g). Retrograde Ns figure on the reverses of both, possibly again reflecting the hand of a single craftsman. The importance of this issue, however, lies in its heralding two remarkable chains of mules at the mint. These involve three moneyers: Godric, Godwine and Leofwine, and three consecutive types: Sovereign-Eagles, Hammer Cross (BMC xi, Hild. G) and Facing Bust (BMC xiii, Hild. Ac). Figure 6 shows how the dies were deployed.

Thus both Godwine and Leofwine used a Hammer Cross reverse with Sovereign-Eagles and Hammer Cross obverses. The Hammer Cross obverse used by Leofwine was also used by Godric with both a Hammer Cross and Facing Bust reverse. Since the career of Godric apparently began before that of Leofwine and ended later, it may be that Leofwine operated in a dependent capacity to Godric, sharing his workshop, and was not issued with his own obverses. A coin of Godric struck from Leofwine's Sovereign-Eagles obverse would be needed to substantiate this hypothesis. The close-knit chains involving these three consecutive types must show that Huntingdon was passing through a period of low activity extending either side of the Hammer Cross issue. Ironically, such circumstances might be expected to produce the opposite of muling. Here, as so often in Anglo-Saxon numismatics, the seeds of research germinate into tantalising ambiguities.

The two recorded Hammer Cross pence of Leofwine conform with the 1.30 g standard but the well-represented output of Godric (Aa) and Godwine (Aa) cover a broad weight range of 1.53 g to 1.25 g and 1.44 g to 1.18 g, respectively. This phenomenon has been noted at other mints, particu-
larly in the eastern part of the country. It is difficult to surmise what the standard might have been and why, especially as the coins struck from Facing Bust dies by Godwine return to the 1.11 g standard.

**Complement of moneyers**

Turning to the complement of Huntingdon moneyers at work during the reign, the coins of Wulfstan and Leofwine leave doubts, as voiced above, except for the latter in the Sovereign-Eagles/Hammer Cross mule and Hammer Cross type proper. The moneyer Leofric has also to be expelled from the Hammer Cross type. Represented by **BMC** 564, the reverse was regrettably, if understandably, construed to read LIORIC, but is clearly a coin struck from Godric’s dies Aa. Taking these observations into account, no watertight case can be made for more than two moneyers in any types except the transition between Sovereign-Eagles and Hammer Cross, when Godric, Godwine and Leofwine were intermittently at work. Freeman in his painstaking study of the moneyers and mints in the reign of the Confessor opines that

‘the balance of the evidence might suggest (...) two phases of the mint’s life under Edward the Confessor: as a two-or four-moneyer mint until the end of the Radiate/Small Cross type, and as a two-moneyer mint from Expanding Cross to a point in the middle of William I’s reign.’

Against this view, the Domesday Book states that TRE ‘in this borough were three moneyers who paid forty shillings’. Domesday Book entries may be notoriously difficult to interpret or rely on, but the statement is unambiguous and should be the touchstone for any analysis of the complement. Freeman arrived at four moneyers in the first two types by counting in the dubious Dunwig and Wulfstan and at two by excluding them or having them replace Wulfwig and Wulfwine, who are known for both types. A more convincing scenario would be to picture Wulfwig and Wulfwine operating alone or alongside Ælfwine. For the next four types the surviving coins do not substantiate more than two moneyers. However, the existence of a second moneyer in the Expanding Cross and Pointed Helmet types depends upon a single coin of Godwine in the former type, a salutary reminder that one or two coins can have a disproportionate impact. After the clear activity of these moneyers in the transition between the Hammer Cross and Facing Bust issues, the material (if not the activity of the mint) suffers a decline and eventual eclipse, with no coins of the final Pyramid type (**BMC** xv. Hild I). Their absence may be due to the short period of issue, as suggested by Dolley, but Freeman lists the type for fifty mints and there is evidence that the issue was more plentiful than is generally believed. It would thus not be at all surprising for Huntingdon coins of this type eventually to emerge. In particular Godwine is known for the Facing Bust type and for the fleeting reign of Harold II and the name Godric for a Facing Bust reverse and the first type of William I. On the current evidence, therefore, there were three but at times possibly only two moneyers up to and including the Facing Bust issue. The evidence also points to fewer persons being engaged as moneyers and remaining longer in office, also a feature after the Conquest.

**The extent of known material**

Freeman provides an invaluable starting point for any mint study in the Confessor’s reign, with his tables of moneyers by type and the references he has traced for each monotype (i.e. the individual type(s) by which each moneyer is known). After adjusting for duplicate recordings of the

---

59 Domesday Book, fol. 203b.  
61 Anthony Freeman, *The Moneyer and the Mint*, as in n. 57, *passim*. 
same coin passing from one owner to another, Freeman lists eighty-six coins in his Huntingdon table, compared with one hundred in this study. The differences, however, are greater than the numbers imply because twenty-six coins cited by Freeman cannot be traced or verified and must therefore be catalogued purely as references. This may account for his inclusion of sixty-five ‘recorded’ coins of Huntingdon in his Appendix V. Forty-eight unverifiable coin references are listed in the catalogue appended to this study. It has to be remembered, of course, that Freeman was writing in 1985, and new coins and information are constantly coming to light.

**Links between Huntingdon and neighbouring mints**

One of Freeman’s most interesting (and potentially dangerous) contributions is to speculate on the extent to which moneyers may have moved from one mint to another; mainly to neighbouring centres, but sometimes further afield. A *prima facie* case can be made when a moneyer with an unusual name ceases to operate at a mint in a given type and his namesake then appears at a nearby mint in the same or next type. If the same obverse dies were used in both places, regardless of the rarity of the moneyer’s name, that could be taken as conclusive. So far, however, no examples of this have been found at Huntingdon. Equally, the contemporaneous occurrence of a moneyer with an unusual name at neighbouring mints may also refer to the same person. Where the activity at one location is markedly greater than at another, it clearly reveals his home base. This phenomenon is exemplified by the brief appearance of Cnht, the Cambridge moneyer, at Huntingdon in the Helmet type of Æthelred II. Where, however, the name is common and no obverse die links exist, the rigours of scholarship require that the concurrent or sequential occurrence of moneyers of the same name at adjoining mints without other extraneous evidence should not merit more than factual noting. Indeed, the dangers of speculation are illustrated by the moneyer Leofric whom Freeman pictured travelling across Eastern England during the Hammer Cross type, coining at Huntingdon, Leicester and Norwich, and possibly Stamford. Without speaking for the other locations, Huntingdon can, for the reasons given above, definitely be removed from what Freeman describes as ‘this extraordinary itinerary’. Table 23 shows conceivable relationships between moneyers at Huntingdon, Bedford, Cambridge, Northampton and Stamford in the Confessor’s reign.

Freeman notes that both Wulfwig and Wulfwine ‘cease work at Huntingdon in the Radiate/Small Cross type’ (sic) and the name-forms immediately recur at Bedford and Cambridge. However, he lists no Bedford coin of Wulfwig under the Trefoil-Quadrilateral type. Wulfwine represents a more plausible candidate, but given his activity at Huntingdon from the Short Cross type of Cnut and Freeman’s belief that he could have ended his days at Bedford in the Facing Bust type, we are contemplating a career possibly spanning thirty-six years. Ælfwine presents greater difficulties. Although Freeman treats him as appearing briefly at Cambridge in the Long Cross heavy issue, Jacob has argued persuasively that the coin alluded to (BMC 473) is of the moneyer Ælfwine, not Ælfwine. A connection between Leofwine at Huntingdon and a Stamford or Northampton moneyer of that name is recognised by Freeman as difficult to identify. The case for Ulfcecel, known at Bedford in the PACX, Small Flan and Helmet types, having worked briefly at Huntingdon is more credible. His proximity to Huntingdon allied to his unusual name are supporting arguments. Of Godric, Freeman states that ‘the least fanciful proposition is that (he) [...] moved temporarily and briefly to Bedford’. It would seem equally unfanciful that we are contemplating two persons. Freeman himself takes the view that Godwine (an equally common name) at Huntingdon was not the same person or persons who minted at Bedford, Cambridge and Stamford during part of his tenure. Although the argument for shared or transferred moneyers is not strong, other than in the case of Ulfcecel, it is nonetheless noteworthy that six of the eight Huntingdon moneyers in the Confessor’s reign have namesakes at neighbouring mints.

---

63 Freeman, *The Moneyer and the Mint*, as in n. 57, p. 287.
TABLE 23: Edward the Confessor. Occurrence of Huntingdon moneyers' names at neighbouring mints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>iv</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>iii</th>
<th>ii</th>
<th>Type (BMC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>vii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>v</th>
<th>vii</th>
<th>ix</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>xiii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wulfwig</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfwine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfwine</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfstan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leofwine</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulfcel</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godric</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godwine</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible hereditary relationships between Huntingdon moneyers

Another line of enquiry on the moneyers is to consider how far possibly related persons filled and succeeded to their role. Blood relationships could be indicated by a common first element (such as God-) or, less usually, a common second element (such as -wine). The same name could also be used to represent lineal descent but for obvious reasons normally missing out a generation. At the beginning of the Confessor's reign two moneyers were at work who could well have been related; Wulfwig and Wulfwine. Interestingly, they were joined or succeeded by Wulfstan and Ælfwine. Later Godric and Godwine operated together, and were possibly related to the earlier group by the -wine element. They in turn were joined by Leofwine. The only stranger in their midst is the Old Norse Ulfcel. Perhaps he was indeed the third man who came, as Freeman suggests, from Bedford and whose office was later swept into the family circle by Leofwine. Linked names also occur under Æthelred II at Huntingdon where the odd men out were the Old Norse Osgud and the Cambridge moneyer, Cnith, and under Canute where two of the four unlinked moneyers, Færthen and Thürcecel, also bear Old Norse names.

Mint ranking of Huntingdon

In an attempt to estimate the relative importance of Bury St Edmunds as a mint in the reign of the Confessor, the author has used certain data set out in Freeman's tables. The statistics extracted were the number of coins recorded and the number of monetypes, namely the sum of the number of types in which each moneyer struck coins, from all seventy-six recorded mints. From this

---


data Huntingdon appeared in the thirty-first position, rating as a lesser but not minor mint. Its position was only marginally lower than its neighbours, except for the important mint of Stamford, as Table 24 shows.

TABLE 24: Edward the Confessor. Ranking of Huntingdon and neighbouring mints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Total Coins</th>
<th>Total Monotypes</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a The total coins are extracted from Freeman, ‘Appendix V: Number of recorded coins by mints (The Moneyer and the Mint’, pp. 540–2). The Huntingdon figures have not been adjusted to take account of the present study.

b The sum of the number of types for which the known moneyers are represented.

Apart from any limitations arising from the raw data, the results obviously portray a composite picture for the reign and thus cloak any rise or fall in each mint’s activity in the course of the reign.

Harold II (1066)

The brief rule of Harold II has so far yielded three surviving coins of the PAX type (BMC ia, without a sceptre). All are from the same dies of the moneyer Godwine and of variety C under Pagan’s classification.67 As he was active in the Facing Bust issue of the Confessor it would, as already pointed out, be logical to expect coins in his name of the unrepresented Pyramid type to turn up some day. Although this coinage must have been introduced in haste, it is remarkable for the realistic quality of the king’s bust. The three coins, at 1.38 g, 1.37 g and 1.30 g, were clearly all struck to the same weight standard.

William I (1066–1087)

The reign of William I yields a scant harvest of Huntingdon coins, but not approaching the near famine of the following three reigns. The thirty-six coins shown in Table 25 provide nineteen obverse, twenty reverse and thirty ‘equivalent’ reverse dies, a manifest decline from the peak of seventy-seven in the Quatrefoil type of Cnut. The difference is obviously explained by the need to meet the onerous gelds in the earlier period, but other influences could also have been at work. In particular, there may have been an urban decline as the population felt less need to congregate for safety once the threat of repeated Viking raids was removed. East Anglia and the Eastern Midlands had suffered as much as any area from these incursions. The relative scarcity of silver, allied to coin circulating more freely, could also have led to a slackening of demand upon the lesser minting centres other than at the issue of a new type. This may be reflected in the tendency, seen towards the end of the Confessor’s reign, for dies at Huntingdon either to be represented in considerable numbers or by very few examples.

The Mint of Huntingdon

Table 25: Huntingdon moneyers under William I, by BMC type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>EC xiii</th>
<th>Hd II ia</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>ii</th>
<th>iii</th>
<th>iv</th>
<th>v</th>
<th>vi</th>
<th>vii</th>
<th>viii</th>
<th>Will II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Godric</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godwine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurgrim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfwine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælftric (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1(?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total     |         |          | 4  | 7  | 3   | 9  | 1  | 2  | 2  | 7   | 36      |
| Number of moneyers | 3  | 2  | 2  | 2  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 2  | 1  | 2(?) | 5       |
| O. dies   | 4       | 6  | 2  | 2  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 2   | 19      |
| R. dies   | 3       | 7  | 2  | 3  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 2   | 20      |
| R. dies ('equivalent') | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   | 30      |

M = Mule

It should be noted, in passing, that a mule exists of the moneyer Godric (Ba) between the Profile-Cross Fleury (BMC i) and Bonnet (BMC ii) types.

Urban decline at Huntingdon

The evidence for urban decline at Huntingdon is shadowy, but perceptible. The thirty 'equivalent' reverse dies estimated for William I are comparable with thirty-two for the reign of the Confessor. Given the configuration of the surviving examples, both estimates may be somewhat conservative. The similar level of mint activity is consistent with the Domesday Book statement that in 1087 the town rendered £30, as it had done in 1066.66 There were also, if somewhat implausibly, said to have been 256 burgesses at both dates. Despite this, there are clear signs of decline with 112 unoccupied messuages (mansiones wastae), eight of which are recorded as being occupied in 1066. Additionally, the residence of the bishop of Lincoln and twenty others had been cleared when William erected a new castle in 1068.67 The drift of this evidence is that the decline had set in during the more settled times of Cnut and the Confessor and had virtually levelled out by 1066.

Ranking of Huntingdon as a borough

The Domesday Book entry mentions two churches and a mill in the town but nothing of a market, although it is hard to believe one did not exist. As with the entry for Cambridge, there is a distinctly rural flavour to the description. The borough lands included 240 acres of arable and ten of pasture. There were also three fishermen who paid three shillings in dues. By several yardsticks, Huntingdon appears to have at least held its own, compared with its neighbouring mint towns. Table 26 shows Huntingdon so measured against Bedford, Cambridge, Northampton and Stamford at the end of the Conqueror's reign.

Stevenson's ranking of boroughs was based on the number of mansiones recorded in Domesday Book for each.68 From the information provided for the Confessor's reign he placed Huntingdon

66 Domesday Book, fol. 203b.
68 Carl Stevenson, Borough and Town, a Study of Urban Origins in England (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1933), p. 221, Appendix III.
### TABLE 26: Ranking of Huntingdon and neighbouring boroughs, c. 1086 x 1090.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Ranking⁵</th>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Estimated Population ('000)ᵇ</th>
<th>Stevenson Rankingᶜ</th>
<th>BMC i–viii Ranking</th>
<th>Monotypesᵈ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>2.0–3.0+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
<td>&lt;2.0+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1.6+</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>1.5+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>(1.5+)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ᵃ Based on population estimates, adjusted for other yardsticks.  
c Based in Appendix III of C. Stephenson, *Borough and Town* (Massachusetts, 1933).  
d Calculated from listings published by Dr E. Harris (SCMB, 1983–7).

In tenth position. This arose from treating, amongst others, 100 smallholders (*bordarii*) on an equal footing with the burgesses. He did not show a figure for the end of William’s reign, possibly taking it to be unchanged. But, using the more meaningful figure of 275 *mansiones*, Huntingdon would have ranked as inferior both to Cambridge and Northampton. As Table 26 shows, however, the population and monotype figures do not support so great a downgrading. Stevenson was unable to position Bedford because of the lack of information provided in Domesday Book. Darby, on grounds of analogy, has given it a population of about 1,500 persons, and this would indeed seem to be supported by other measurements.⁷¹ The overall ranking of the towns in the left hand column of the Table is based on a synthesis of the yardsticks, taking population estimates as the starting point and the number of monotypes as an indicator of economic vigour. In doing so it would, of course, be a mistake to assume a simple linear relationship between mint activity and urban importance at this period. The analysis results in diminishing the status of each borough, other than Stamford, compared with Stevenson’s ranking. It shows that, apart from Stamford, the towns were fairly similar in size and importance at the end of the Conqueror’s reign, with perhaps Huntingdon taking a slight lead. Their status as county towns was assured, with, ironically, only Stamford being eclipsed by Lincoln, its mightier rival to the north.

**Domesday Book entries on the mint**

Regrettably, the references to mints and moneyers in Domesday Book are not abundant, but two occur under the entry for Huntingdon, as follows:

The Borough of Huntingdon answered for the King’s tax for a fourth part of Hurstingstone Hundred, for 50 hides. But it does not now pay tax in that Hundred, since King William placed a mint tax on the Borough.

In this Borough there were 3 moneyers who paid 40s, shared between the King and the Earl, but they are not there now.⁷²

These entries have, as Carlyon-Britton recognised, to be read together.⁷³ In the reign of Edward the Confessor there were three moneyers, as is known to be so towards the end of his reign, but subsequently the king farmed the mint to the burgesses against a mint tax (*geldum monete*). Henceforth the moneyers became accountable to the burgesses and in the eyes of the Domesday Book compilers had, for fiscal purposes, ceased to exist. Carlyon-Britton suggests the farm was created after the execution of Earl Waltheof in 1076.⁷⁴ It would certainly have been simpler to

---

⁵ Based on population estimates, adjusted for other yardsticks.
⁷ Based in Appendix III of C. Stephenson, *Borough and Town* (Massachusetts, 1933).
⁸ Calculated from listings published by Dr E. Harris (SCMB, 1983–7).

---

⁷² *Domesday Book*, fol. 203b, translated by John Morris as in n. 8.
⁷⁴ Carlyon-Britton gives the date as 1075.
eliminate the earl’s entitlement to the third penny at a time when all his rights had escheated to the king. The concept of farming out minting rights was only practicable where the currency was no longer subject to frequent manipulation as it had been in the past. Weight adjustments would have been prompted either by fluctuating supplies of silver or as an act of policy. As such it was capable of being a fruitful source of income for the king. He stood to benefit in two further ways from control of the coinage: first, from the fees payable by those enjoying minting rights and, secondly, from a change in type (renovatio), itself probably linked to weight adjustment. The Huntingdon entry in Domesday Book shows that an unspecified fee was paid by the burgesses for their minting rights. Undoubtedly the burgesses, or possibly the moneyers themselves, would still have had to pay for individual dies, since their issue was by this period under the control of Otto the Goldsmith and his heirs.\(^7\) In comparison, the potential revenues from weight and type changes were far greater and William appears to have introduced major reforms to both sources.

Attempts had been made to stabilise the weight of coinage in the Confessor’s reign, and this is reflected in the surviving coins from Huntingdon. Grierson has identified the obscure monetagium tax by analogy with continental practice as compensation for stabilising the currency at 22.5 gr (1.46 g), or slightly lower, from the sixth type of William I.\(^7\) The main difficulty about this is, on Grierson’s own reckoning, that the first five types had already been at a single standard of 21.5 gr (1.39 g). If those were so, does it mean that the king was effectively being compensated for increasing the weight of the coinage? This would have been a strangely circuitous means of arriving at the same end. Perhaps the impetus behind the tax, which Grierson considers to have had a brief lifespan, was a change in the other main but associated source of revenue, the renovatio.

Self-evidently recoinages continued after the Conquest, in the sense that the coin type changed periodically as in the past, but no studied attempt is made to differentiate each type by immediately recognisable design changes or alterations in the size of flans. The designs of the successive Bonnet (BMC ii) and Canopy (BMC iii) types, and of the Two Sceptres (BMC iv) and Two Stars (BMC v) type, and for that matter also the Sword (BMC vi) type, are superficially so similar that it is hard to believe they were meant to replace each other as legal tender. However, the king would still require any fiscal dues payable by tale to be made in the latest or even newly minted coin which had not lost bullion value through wear and tear. The type changes were sufficiently distinctive to enable the king’s officers to confirm that this requirement was being fulfilled. The curtailment of revenue-raising opportunities, explicit in these changes, fades into insignificance compared with the untold wealth both in lands and intangible rights falling into the king’s hands as the fruits of conquest. Placing the currency on a more rational footing, even if at a cost to the king, was easily affordable.

Weight analysis

Insufficient coins of each moneyer, or even type, are known to enable a detailed analysis of weights to be made. The most variation, between 1.29 g and 1.01 g, is found in the first three issues of the reign (BMC i–iii). Greater consistency is evident in the next three types (BMC iv–vi) showing, with the exception of one coin at 1.10 g, a spread of 1.38 g to 1.28 g. The similarity of design between these types has already been noted. The last two types (Profile-Cross and Trefoils, BMC vii, and PAXS, BMC viii) are again consistent, with a spread of 1.45 g to 1.40 g. Although the sample is small, Grierson’s view that a single lower weight standard applied in the first five issues of William I is not supported at Huntingdon.

Complement of moneyers

Although Domesday Book tells us nothing of the complement of moneyers at Huntingdon after 1066, it does reveal that, at some stage, responsibility for them passed from the king’s officials to


the burgesses. This change would not be expected to result in removal of the moneyers hitherto operating on behalf of the king, and there is no obvious sign of this happening. The scanty material available shows three moneyers in office in the first type, then two for the next three types and one for the final three types, when Godwine may have been succeeded by Ælfwine. On the evidence available it is only at this point that Ælfwine could be construed as the burgesses' replacement for Godwine. Since at least two moneyers were in operation at the mint in the early years of William II, however, the reduction to one may purely be a reflection of coin survival. Indeed, if a coin of Ælfric in St Petersburg is correctly attributable to Huntingdon, at least two moneyers were in office together in the PAXS type. It could still mean that the burgesses were entitled to less than three moneyers or in practice found it convenient to reduce the number they engaged.77

Involvement of the earl of Huntingdon at the mint

Another insight provided by Domesday Book into the operation of the Huntingdon mint at this period is the reference, under the Confessor, to the forty shillings, or three marks in moneyer's dues, shared between the king and the earl of Huntingdon. Presumably, with the farming of the mint to the burgesses, under William the earl would have been deprived of his third penny, and his involvement with the mint severed. Had this not occurred a curious situation would have arisen, since from early in the twelfth century the kings of Scotland had pursued, largely successfully, their claimed entitlement to the earldom. Its early history is bound up with other geographical areas. In a charter datable to 1050 × 1052, Earl Siward of Northumbria was also addressed as earl of Huntingdon. On his death his son, Walthere, was still a minor, and Edward the Confessor accordingly granted the earldoms of Northumbria, Northampton and Huntingdon to his brother-in-law Tostig. When Tostig withdrew into exile in 1065, he was succeeded by Walthere who by then was of age. In 1070 Walthere married William I's niece, Judith, but in 1076 he was executed for conspiracy. Judith then refused to marry Simon de St Liz, according to legend because he was lame, whereupon her daughter, Maud, was married to him instead and he was created earl of Huntingdon. Judith's influence in Huntingdon was not, however, extinguished. The Domesday Book records her as possessing the former residence of Earl Siward besides sixteen other houses, with full jurisdiction over them. When Simon de St Liz died, leaving an infant son, Maud married David, king of Scotland, whom Henry I created earl of Huntingdon. By also bearing a son to her second husband the seeds were sown for a dispute over the earldom lasting until Simon de St Liz III died without issue in 1184.78

William II (1087–1100)

Table 27 shows the moneyers operating under William II. For the purposes of this paper the traditional attribution of the PAXS type to the end of the Conqueror's reign, rather than the beginning of that of William II, is observed.79 With that caveat, only eight coins are known of two moneyers from Huntingdon in the reign. No examples have been found of the Cross Voided (BMC iii) or Cross Fleury and Piles (BMC v) types, but since the moneyer Siwate struck in both the Cross in Quatrefoil (BMC ii) and Cross Pattée and Fleury (BMC iv) types, he may be expected also to have coined in BMC iii. There are, moreover, unverifiable references to the moneyers Ælfwine and Godwine in that type. Doubt particularly surrounds Godwine who is otherwise unknown at Huntingdon after the sixth (Sword) type of William I. Ælfwine is known for the PAXS type and the second (Cross in Quatrefoil) type of William II, so his operation in the third (Cross Voided) type would not be surprising and in the first (Profile, BMC i) type may fairly be assumed. From this scant evidence a complement of two moneyers can be seen in the first two types, but no more then one (or none) for each of the remaining three. Lax workmanship allied to the poor condition

77 See W.C. Wells, 'The Pipe Rolls and Dedita Monetariorum', NC³, 9 (1931), 261–90.
78 Victoria County History, I, pp. 4–7.
of some of the coins, subverts any attempt to draw conclusions from their weights. The mint name is rendered as, or as a contraction of HVTED. This contrasts with William II’s reign where the mint is represented by a wide range of variant readings. The convention of the die engravers to use two upright bars on occasion, both in the reigns of William I and II, to represent the letters A, H, N and V may lay the names of moneyers and mint towns open to ambiguity. But this foible is not considered to throw doubt on any of the coins listed without qualification in the catalogue as having a Huntingdon origin. The known dies are all in unlinked pairs, as in the last four issues of William I. This may reflect stricter control over the issue of dies to locally rather than royally managed moneyers.

**Henry I (1100–1135)**

In common with other mints, the surviving coinage is insufficient to afford a reliable picture of coinage at Huntingdon during the reign of Henry I. Metal-detector finds in recent years have both increased knowledge and accentuated awareness of gaps. The reign has been one of the last bastions in the post-Conquest period to resist an accepted ordering of the coin types, with general agreement only on the relative position of eight from the total of fifteen.80 In the following, these types will be referred to by their *BMC* numbering (i–xv).

The only extensive attempt to survey the coinage of Henry I is the deeply flawed work of Andrew, published in the *Numismatic Chronicle* for 1901.81 Under Huntingdon he assumes that the farm of the mint to the burgesses would have been automatically revoked after Simon de St Liz had been invested, no later than 1090, as earl of Huntingdon, following his marriage to Judith’s daughter, Maud. The flaw in Andrew’s argument is that the earl’s rights to a third penny were dependent upon the king’s rights to a full penny. It is inconceivable that the grant of the earldom as such should have had the effect of revoking a grant made by the king independently to the burgesses. Based on the hypothetical revocation and a further notion that minting rights to individuals fell into abeyance not only when the grantee died but also when he was absent from the country, Andrew deduced the years in Henry’s reign when the mint could have been in operation. These were from 1100 to 1102/3, 1107/8 to 1109 and 1129 to 1130. Despite the lack of surviving coins, and any residual doubts about the sequence of types and uncertainty surrounding their dating, the recorded examples of Huntingdon coins types (*BMC* i, ii, iii, x, xiii, and xiv) are sufficient to disprove Andrew’s reasoning. They are set out in Table 28. The last three known types would all

---

---


TABLE 28: Huntingdon moneyers under Henry I, by BMC type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>number of coins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xiii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godric</td>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sefwine)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfwine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godwine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derlig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of</td>
<td>i?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moneyers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. dies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. dies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

have been struck after David of Scotland had assumed the earldom in 1113 and, on Andrew's own reckoning, only in 1129–30 was he in England more than fleetingly.

Fifteen coins are in the study, compared with three known to Andrew. These yield five or six types and moneyers and assemble into a very skeletal framework. No continuity of moneyers from previous reigns can be advanced with any confidence, the gap involving Godric and Godwine being too great to be credible. Ælfwine presents a more complex problem. Recorded for the penultimate type of William I, the second and possibly third type of William II and then from types iii, x, xiii and xiv of Henry I, the name seems unlikely to represent the career of one man. But, if not, the break resulting in his namesake taking office could plausibly have occurred at various points in a span exceeding, on the evidence of known coins, four decades. A complement of more than one moneyer cannot be claimed at Huntingdon at any time in the reign, although two moneyers are recorded for types x, xiv and, possibly, ii. If Ælfwine's career were shown to span the reigns of William II and Henry I, a complement of not less than two moneyers would be established.

So far, no coins have appeared of Henry I's last type (BMC xv) or with certainty of the first substantive issue of Stephen. This lends support to Blackburn's view that Huntingdon was one of up to twenty-eight centres which lost their minting rights following the purge of moneyers at Christmas 1124. The closure of the Huntingdon mint would have been straightforward for the king if the farm to the burgesses, set up under William I, still obtained, rather than his having to deal with the rights of David, king of Scotland, as earl of Huntingdon.

The meagre representation by type, the distressed state of some of the known coins and the divergent weights of the remainder dispel any temptation to consider the weight standard(s) at Huntingdon during the reign. As under William II, the dies so far coming to light were used in unlinked pairs.

Harris's tables of the moneyers of the Norman kings and the types they are known to have struck provide interesting statistics for Huntingdon and its neighbouring mints in the reign of Henry I. Table 29 shows the number of moneyers and monotypes recorded. For all the limitations of this exercise, the figures show a remarkable surge by Northampton and the lingering terminal decline of the Cambridge mint, for which only one coin has so far come to light from the next reign. The increased importance of Northampton doubtless provided the foundation for its survival as a mint long after the other five had closed.

---

82 Blackburn, 'Coinage and Currency under Henry I', as in n. 80, p. 70, Table 6.
83 E.J. Harris, 'The Moneyers of the Norman Kings and the Types they are Known to have Struck', SCMB (January 1983), 11: (June 1983), 149–50; (December 1984), 315–16; (January–February 1986), 9 and (April, 1987), 88–9.
TABLE 29: Henry I. Activity at Huntingdon and neighbouring mints, based on Harris' listings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Number of Moneysers</th>
<th>Number of Monotypes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The catalogue of coins in this study includes five or six moneyers and between seven and nine monotypes.

Stephen (1035–1054)

At his uncle’s death, when Stephen opportunistically seized the throne, David, king of Scotland was earl of both Northampton and Huntingdon. David supported the rival cause of his maternal niece, the Empress Matilda. Stephen was thus keen to secure an understanding with David and in 1136, under the Treaty of Durham, confirmed the earldom of Huntingdon upon David’s son, Henry. According to Davis, soon after 1136 the neighbouring earldom of Northampton was conferred on Simon de St Liz II who, apart from his lineal claims to both earldoms, was a steadfast follower of Stephen. Simon also may have succeeded to the earldom of Huntingdon in 1141 and continued to hold it until his death in 1153.\(^84\) At that time, his son being under age, the Scottish faction was restored, in the person of King Malcolm. It thus appears that for most of Stephen’s reign Huntingdon was either in hands loyal to the king or at least not antagonistic towards him at a local level.

No mention is made of Huntingdon in the accounts of the ferocious rebellion mounted in 1143 by Geoffrey de Mandeville, earl of Essex, from his base at Fordham in Cambridgeshire. Ramsey Abbey, barely ten miles from Huntingdon, was seized and fortified and Cambridge sacked and burnt.\(^85\) Presumably Simon’s castle at Huntingdon acted as a sufficient deterrent. Nevertheless, the prosperity of the town was not immune from the effects of the hapless reign, its taxable value plummeting by one half between 1135 and 1144.\(^86\)

The economic facts contrast with Henry of Huntingdon’s idyllic description of Huntingdon at about that time:

> It is remarkable … for its sunny aspect as well as for its beauty, besides its contiguity to the Fens and the abundance in wild fowl and animals of chase.\(^87\)

Its semi-rural mien is reflected here as in Domesday Book.

Table 30 shows the moneyers and types known for the reign. Of Stephen’s substantive issues (BMC i, ii, vi and vii) only the Awbridge type (BMC vii) is certainly known from Huntingdon. In the Watford type (BMC i) there is a coin reading +GOIMER: ON[N, which could be an early striking of the moneyer Godmer, but a die duplicate with a clearer reading would be needed to be sure. In the Profile-Cross and Piles type (BMC vi) there is also a coin from the Wicklewood hoard of 1989 (see catalogue of coins (324)) which could also be a Huntingdon emission. The Awbridge type is represented by three coins of Godmer, struck from two pairs of dies, and two (or three) coins of Waltier, struck from one (or two) pairs of dies. Waltier is also known from two coins struck from the same dies in the Cross and Fleury type (BMC iii), thought to be a local rather than


\(^{85}\) *Victoria County History*, 1, p. 5.


TABLE 30: Huntingdon moneyers under Stephen, by BMC type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Number of coins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Godmer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltier</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derlig</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of moneyers:
- O. dies: 2
- R. dies: 3

substantive issue. Mack dates it to between 1143 and 1152. Blackburn has perceptively identified this type with Simon de St Liz II becoming earl of Huntingdon. It may also have signalled the reopening of the mint, but this must be less certain. Although Waltier appears to have been in office from the Cross and Fleury type through to the last (Abridge) type, clear evidence is lacking whether he operated alongside or was succeeded by Godmer. If the coin reading GOIMER is correctly attributed to Huntingdon, the mint clearly enjoyed at least two-moneyer status for most of Stephen’s reign.

The scarcity of Huntingdon coins for the reign applies equally to the neighbouring mints. Apart from Cambridge, for which no coins are listed, Table 31 shows the moneyers and monetypes for the other mints, taken from Harris’s tables.

TABLE 31: Stephen. Activity of Huntingdon and neighbouring mints, based on Harris’ listings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Moneyers</th>
<th>Monetypes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2⁹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ The catalogue of coins in this study includes three monetypes.

With the introduction of the Tealby or Cross and Crosslets type of Henry II in 1158, Huntingdon ceased its minting activities, together with at least thirty-three other centres, as part of a deliberate policy to reduce the number of mints. The casualties included a number of middle-ranking boroughs, such as the county towns of Nottingham, Warwick and Worcester. The number also included Stamford, surprisingly, bearing in mind its earlier importance as a mint. Bedford and Northampton both survived, the former briefly but the latter continuing until the early years of Henry III’s Long Cross coinage introduced in 1247.

THE CATALOGUE OF COINS

Explanatory Notes

The catalogue was finalised in January 2000 and makes no pretence to be a complete record of the known coins of Huntingdon at that date. Such an aspiration would be inimical to publication at all. Nevertheless, the main likely sources of material have, as far as practicable, been tapped, with two caveats. The author visited Stockholm in 1978 to study their unpublished hoard material. Coins discovered since that date have been identified from the computer lists at Stockholm. Because these are still incomplete, as well as being constantly added to, Eva Wiśniewska kindly identified some of the omitted coins, but others have undoubtedly eluded the trawl. The second caveat relates to the ‘Cnut’ hoard of c.1993, discussed in the text. Huntingdon coins from this hoard continue to appear and are likely to do so unquantifiably into the foreseeable future.

No coin has been included in the catalogue unless the author possesses it or has adequate photographic or other illustrations to enable the dies to be identified and to ensure that it is not recorded more than once. Descriptions of coins for which no concrete image could be found are recorded under ‘Other references’.

Catalogue numbers have been given to each die combination identified. When the attribution to Huntingdon of a moneyer is uncertain, the numbers given to the relevant die pairings are shown in parentheses. Such coins are illustrated in the plates to help resolve the uncertainty if further relevant coins come to light. Where, in the author’s opinion, a die pairing is doubtfully attributable to Huntingdon, no catalogue numbers are given and the moneyer’s name is placed in parentheses. These die pairings are likewise illustrated. Where, in the author’s opinion, the Huntingdon origin of a coin should be rejected, details are given under ‘Other references’ and the coin is not illustrated.

The obverse (O.) and reverse (R.) readings are represented as closely as the limitations of typesetting permit. In particular, variations in the apostrophes in Mö(N), the ligature of Ox in ANGOLX, the shape of S and distinction between barred and unbarred As are not shown. Illegible or obscure portions of the legends are shown within brackets by a blank or putative letters. Special features of an obverse or reverse die are described immediately below the transcription of the legend, together with pointers to die identification where this may be helpful.

Each coin struck from the same pair of dies is given an arabic number in parentheses. The coin chosen to illustrate the die combination in the plates is marked by an asterisk. The illustrations have been chosen for their capability to show the salient features of the dies rather than to publish previously unillustrated coins.

The initial reference for each coin states the most recently known owner or documentary reference. This is followed, when known, by the hoard or find and date of discovery of the coin. The ownership pedigree and any illustrations are then briefly referenced. When, however, a coin is published in an accessible source, the pedigree is only given to the extent needed to guard the reader against mistaking such references for evidence of separate coins.

The die axis (in degrees) and weight (in grams) is given for each coin, where known. The author has not in many instances been able to verify this information, and certain of the irregular die axes are clearly suspect. When they occur amongst a number of die duplicates of regular axis, the readers will be able to draw their own conclusions.

Where a coin has been cut into fractions, or is obviously damaged, corroded or worn, the weight is shown within brackets and all such coins have been excluded from any weight analysis.

EADWIG (955–959)

Three Line Horizontal type (BMC ii, HT3 (see CTCE, p. 148))

Dunne:

(1) Aa O. +EADVVG RE+ R. DVN +HV+N+ NCMS

(2) Bc O. +EADVVG RE+ R. DVN

EADWIG (955–959)

Three Line Horizontal type (BMC ii, HT3 (see CTCE, p. 148))

Dunne:

(1) Aa O. +EADVVG RE+ R. DVN +HV+N+ NCMS

(2) Bc O. +EADVVG RE+ R. DVN

(1)* Lyon collection. The mint signature in the middle line appears to be inverted, the V reading as A. Fragment. 180°

| 1.20 |
(1)*  SCBI British Museum 811 (BMC 12, Plate XII, II). Ex Tyssen. 
Ruding. Plate 20, no. 5. In CTCE, p. 149, the coins of Dunne 
are 'tentatively attributed to Huntingdon', but in SCBI this coin is 
given to Huntingdon without qualification. Chipped. 180°

(3)  Ce  O.  
\text{EADVV[ I E+} 
\text{DVN[} 
\text{HV+H+} 
\text{NCN}^\circ 
\text{ }^\circ

(1)*  SCBI British Museum 812. Ex Lawrence 15 (?), Armitage 
bequest, 1956. Fragment. 90°

Other references: Mints, Dies and Currency, edited by R.A.G. 
Carson (London, 1971), p. 98 records a fragment owned by the 
Society of Antiquaries and now missing, transcribed by Blunt 
in his card index as reading 
\text{:/DVN[HV-N]} /[NC]/[;

Hildulf

(4)  Aa  O.  
\text{EADVVIG REX :} 
\text{HLDV.} 
\text{HVH.} 
\text{LF MG} 
\text{ }^\circ

(1)*  Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. Ex Carlyon-Britton, Wells and 
Blunt. Like Dunne, the moneyer is 'tentatively attributed to 
Huntingdon' in CTCE, p. 149. 270°

(Wineman)

(5)  Aa  O.  
\text{EADVVIG RE+} 
\text{PINEM} 
\text{HV̇N+} 
\text{VIIIMO} 
\text{ }^\circ

(1)*  SCBI British Museum 809. Chester hoard (1950), 288. Because 
of other coins of Wineman reading HAH. this and the next coin 
(Ba) has been attributed to 'Hampton' in CTCE, p. 149 and 
'Hampton (Northampton)' in SCBI. The reverse appears to have 
one or both of the A's upside down. 0°

(5A)  Ba  O.  
\text{EADVVIE RE} 
As above

(1)*  Grosvenor Museum, Chester. Chester hoard (1950), 289. 0°

(Dudeman)

(-)  Aa  O.  
\text{EADVVIG RE+} 
\text{DVDEWVN O HA+H+} (division of reading unknown).

(1)  Carlyon-Britton 1009. Not illustrated or traced. The MA of 
DVDEHAN appears to have been inverted, increasing the 
ambiguity of the mint name HAH (or HVH?). 0°
THE MINT OF HUNTINGDON

Other references: Wells *(BNJ 19 (1927–8), p. 85)* refers, possibly erroneously, to another example in the British Museum, which has not been found.

**EADGAR (959 (Mercia from 957)–975)**

Two Line type *(BMC ib; HP1)*

No coins

Other references: Grantley 1089, reading 'HILDVLHV' and described as cracked; Grantley 1087, reading 'INGOLFHV' and described as broken in half. These readings are not considered to allude to a mint location.

Circumscription Cross type *(BMC iii)*

*Aethelsige*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>Aa</th>
<th>O.</th>
<th>+EADGAR REX HTNVH+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ÆDELZGE MO+HVNTM-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N in inner circle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1)* SCBI British Museum 1087. Ex Grantley 1103. Described in SCBI as 'of no identifiable mint'. Blunt considered it was from a South-Western source *(England before the Conquest, edited by Peter Clemoes and Kathleen Hughes (Cambridge, 1971), p. 187)*. See also *CTCE*, p. 175. 180° 1.39

*Beorhtferth*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>Aa</th>
<th>O.</th>
<th>+EADGAR REX ANGoV+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+BREHTFERDN MO-4HN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1)* SCBI British Museum 1088. Chester hoard (1950), 452. Again assigned a South-Western origin in *England before the Conquest*, p. 189 and *CTCE*, p. 175. Corroded. 90° 1.37

*Borthmuth*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>Aa</th>
<th>O.</th>
<th>+EADGAR REX NTAVHV+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+BHTNO-5 M5+NVTIHH+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1)* National Museum of Ireland, Dublin. Smarmore, County Louth hoard (1929). Similarly assigned a South-Western origin. 270° 1.33

*Hardbrit*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(9)</th>
<th>Aa</th>
<th>O.</th>
<th>+EADGAR REX ANG[L]ORX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+HARDBRIT MO[N]ETA H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1)* Found at Irthlingborough, Northants (1985), see *BNJ* 55, p. 64 no. 33, illustrated, with the comment that Huntingdon or Northampton was the most likely mint, although certain features were associated with a Southern die-cutting centre. In *CTCE*, p. 183, it is assigned to Northampton. 210° 1.09

*Bust Crowned type (BMC V)*

*Duding*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(10)</th>
<th>Aa</th>
<th>O.</th>
<th>+EADGAR REX+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+DVDING MONETA-VN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. Lough Lane, County Neath hoard (1843). Ex Samnallt, Allen, Lawrence, Granville 1094, Lockett 629 and Blunt. In CTCE, p. 196, a Huntingdon attribution is 'regarded as doubtful'. 1.28

Pirim

11 Aa O. +EADGAR REX
   A further away from inner circle than following D.
R. +P+IRIM MONETA HVNTE

(1)*

SCBI British Museum 1151, (BMC 19, Plate XIII, 9). Ex Thoresby 92(7). Fairfax, Hollis. Forgeries exist of this coin. 270° 1.31

12 Be O. +EADGAR REX
   A closer to inner circle than following D.
R. +PRIM MONETA HVNTE
   Reverse corroded.

(1)*

Grosvenor Museum, Chester. Chester hoard (1950), 494, 115° 1.28

The last two coins are the only ones from the reigns of Eadwig and Eadgar that may be assigned unequivocally to Huntingdon.

ÆTHELRED II (978–1016)

First Hand type (BMC iia, Hild. B1)

Ælfric

13 Aa O. +ÆÆDELRED REX ANGLOX
   Neat bust with S-shaped tunic folds.
R. +ÆRLIC M-O HVNTAN
   Deep square sleeve with pellet. East Anglian style.

(1)*


(2)

National Museum of Ireland, Dublin. Castle Street 1 hoard (1993). Fragment. 90° [0.77]

Obverse A was also used by Oswig of Bedford, (ex Castle Street 2 hoard (1993), 1.35 g).

14 Ab O. As above
R. +ÆÆRLIC H-O HVNTAN
   Shallower, wider, partly solid square sleeve. Wide final N. East Anglian style.

(1)

Hild. 1355. Chipped. 0° [1.60]

(2)*

RJE (H073). Ex Spink (1992). 270° 1.56

15 Be O. +ÆÆDELRED REX ANGLOX
   Small, crude bust with U-shaped tunic folds.
R. +ÆÆRLIC M-O HVNTAN
   Square sleeve. Spread fingers. East Anglian style.

(1)*


(2)

SCBI Copenhagen 437. Kulhusgaard hoard (1863). 90° 1.55
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>O.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Cf</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>+ÆÆFRIC M·O HVNTAN</td>
<td>Square sleeve. Thumb points to first upright of N. East Anglian style.</td>
<td>Hild. 1357. 270° 1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Dg</td>
<td>+ÆBELRED REX ANGLOX</td>
<td>+ÆÆFRIC M[-]O HVNTAN</td>
<td>Hair and forehead misaligned. Square sleeve. Hand inclined to sinister. East Anglian style.</td>
<td>RJE (H079). Ex Elmore Jones 372, Arnot 92. Cracked. 45° 1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ei</td>
<td>+ÆBELRED REX ANGLOX</td>
<td>+ÆÆFRIC M·O HVNTANN</td>
<td>Tunic with neat V-shaped folds. Square sleeve. East Anglian style.</td>
<td>Hild. 1355 var. 0° 1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Fk</td>
<td>+ÆBELRED[E]D REX ANGLOX</td>
<td>+ÆÆFRIC M·O HVNTAN</td>
<td>Crude, untidy bust and tunic folds. Square sleeve. East Anglian style.</td>
<td>Hild. 1356. 90° 1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>+ÆBELRED RE ANGLOX</td>
<td>+ÆÆFRIC M·O HVNTAN</td>
<td>Other references: Ipswich (1863 hoard, see BCH No. 199, p. 73 and BNJ 33, p. 36. 2 Montagu 8 (pt), Taffs 81 (pt). Wulfgar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other references: Ipswich (1863 hoard, see BCH No. 199, p. 73 and BNJ 33, p. 36. 2 Montagu 8 (pt), Taffs 81 (pt). Wulfgar |
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**Second Hand type (BMC ii, Hild. B2)**

**Ælfric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 24 Aa | O. +ÆBELRÆD REX ANGLÓX  
| 25 Aa | O. +ÆBELRÆD REX ANGLÓX  
R. +ÆLFRIC M-O HVNTA  
Initial + overlaps limb of initial letter. Sceptre by chin.  
V above dexter limb of cross. T and initial cross close together | Hild. 1359. 0° 1.61 |
| 26 Be | O. +ÆBELRÆD REX ANGLÓX  
R. +ÆLFRIC M-O HVNT  
Large pellet under ear. Sceptre by chin. Small X of REX.  
V opposite lower dexter limb of cross. | BM (1915). Ex Morgan (Evans). 0° 1.61 |
| 27 Ce | O. +ÆBELRÆD REX ANGLÓX  
R. +ÆLFRIC M-O HVNT  
Small face. Pellet in nape of neck.  
V opposite upper dexter limb of cross. | Gotlands Fornsal (Läroverk/35). 270° 1.67 |
| 28 Da | O. +ÆBELRÆD REX ANGLÓX  
| 29 Ec | O. +ÆBELRÆD REX ANGLÓX  
R. As above | Dolphin (List 7, Summer 1995. 149 (illustrated)). Ex Elmore Jones 373, Amot 112. – 1.55 |

**Crux type (BMC iii, Hild. C)**

**Ælfric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 24 Aa | O. +ÆBELRÆD REX ANGLÓX  
| 25 Aa | O. +ÆBELRÆD REX ANGLÓX  
R. +ÆLFRIC M-O HVNTA  
Initial + overlaps limb of initial letter. Sceptre by chin.  
V above dexter limb of cross. T and initial cross close together | Hild. 1359. 0° 1.61 |
| 26 Be | O. +ÆBELRÆD REX ANGLÓX  
R. +ÆLFRIC M-O HVNT  
Large pellet under ear. Sceptre by chin. Small X of REX.  
V opposite lower dexter limb of cross. | BM (1915). Ex Morgan (Evans). 0° 1.61 |
| 27 Ce | O. +ÆBELRÆD REX ANGLÓX  
R. +ÆLFRIC M-O HVNT  
Small face. Pellet in nape of neck.  
V opposite upper dexter limb of cross. | Gotlands Fornsal (Läroverk/35). 270° 1.67 |
| 28 Da | O. +ÆBELRÆD REX ANGLÓX  
| 29 Ec | O. +ÆBELRÆD REX ANGLÓX  
R. As above | Dolphin (List 7, Summer 1995. 149 (illustrated)). Ex Elmore Jones 373, Amot 112. – 1.55 |

Note: BM = British Museum; SCBI = Society of Canadian Bimetallists; NCirc = Nordic Circular.
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30 Fk O. +Æ-DELÆRÆD REX ANGL[O]X
Nose and chin equidistant from sceptre head.

R. +ÆLFRIC M•O HVNT
V above dexter limb of cross. Gap between T and initial cross.

(1) SHM 16295–17. Djuped, Stymas, Ångermanland hoard (1919). 270° 1.49
Chipped and bent. 270° [1.46]

Light issue. These coins lack the sceptre dissecting the drapery (except for obverse J, used by Ælfric) and back-swept hair associated with Hildebrand variety Ca. See B.H.L.H. Stewart, "The Small Crux Issue of Æthelred II", BNJ 28 (1957), 509–17.

Ælfric

31 Gm O. +Æ-DELÆRÆD REX ANGL[O]X
Straight horizontal folds to tunic.

R. +ÆLFRIC M•O HVN[X]
V slightly below lower dexter limb of cross. Initial cross and Æ close together.

(1)* SHM 18744–1062. Digeråker, Barlingbo, Gotland hoard (1928). 180° 1.28
(2) SHM 8503–18. Garestad, Edestad, Blekinge hoard (1888). 180° 1.18

+ÆDELÆRÆD REX ANGL[O]X
Sceptre against lips.

R. +ÆLFRIC M•O HVNTA
V opposite lower dexter limb of cross. Gap between initial cross and Æ.

(1)* RJE (H062). Ex Glendining, 11 October 1993, 236 (pt). 90° 1.21

32 Ho O. +Æ-DELÆRÆD REX ANGL[O]X
Full depth limb to Æ.

R. +ÆLFRIC [II]•O HVNT

(1) Lund. -/3024. Igelösa hoard (1924). 60° 1.18
(2)* Hild. 1360. Broken. 270° 1.12

34 Js O. +Æ-DELÆRÆD REX ANGL[O]X
Sceptre dissects drapery. Sceptre head of pellets on short stems.

R. +ÆLFRIC M•O HVNTA

(1)* Lund. -/3023. Igelösa hoard (1924). 60° 1.01

Other references: 1 Montagu 779, 'ÆLFIC MO HVNT' (sic); CNS, Myrände, Atlingbo, Gotland hoard (1893), coin dispersed; NCirc, October 1972, 9241, 'ÆLFRIC M•O HVNT'.

Leofric

35 Aa O. +Æ-DELÆRÆD REX ANGL[C]X
Sceptre head in front of nose.

R. +ÆLFRIC M•O HVNTA
F opposite upper sinister limb of cross.

(1)* SHM 11385–1. Prostarve, Hogrän, Gotland hoard (1896). 180° 1.24
(2) Stockholm. "D/13". Fragment. 180° [0.66]

36 Ab O. +ÆLFRIC M•O HVNTA
F above sinister limb of cross.

(1)* SCBI South-Eastern Museums 835. Norris Museum, St Ives. 0° 1.16
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37 Be O.  
\[+\text{ÆELRÆD REX ANGLOX}\]
Sceptre head partly below nose.

R.  
\[+\text{ÆELFRIC M-O HVNTA}\]
F opposite sinister limb of cross.

\((1)\)  
Hild. 1382. 270°  
1.24

Osgut

38 Aa O.  
\[+\text{ÆELRÆD REX ANGLOX}\]
Gap between sceptre head and nose and mouth.

R.  
\[+\text{OSGOD M-O HVNTA}\]
M beneath bottom limb of cross.

\((1)\)  
Hild. 1386. 180°  
1.32

\((2)\)  
BM (1928). Ex Spink, Vogel 4615. 180°  
1.20

39 Be O.  
\[+\text{ÆELRÆD R[ A]NGL}O\]
Sceptre head close to nose and mouth, large chin pellet above tunic pellet.

R.  
\[+\text{OSGOD M-O HVNTA}\]
M offset to sinister of bottom limb of cross.

\((1)\)  
Grosvenor Museum, Chester. Ex Pritchard. 180°  
1.26

There are three fragments, apparently of Huntingdon, which have not been matched with existing dies:

\((1)\) [ ] VNTA. SHM 13867-34. Gudings, Valstena, Gotland hoard (1909f). 180° [0.36g]

\((2)\) [ ] NTA.  

\((3)\) [ ] TA.  

\(\text{SCBI}\)  
St Petersburg 566. 90° [0.25 g]

\(\text{SCBI}\)  
St Petersburg 567. 270° [0.22 g]

Long Cross type (\textit{BMC} lva, Hild. D)

Owing to typeface limitations it is not possible in many instances to represent accurately the central element of the M\(\text{J]\)O copulative in this and subsequent types. The various comma/crescent shaped characters occurring in the copulative and elsewhere in the inscriptions are rendered passim as ".

\(\text{Æ}\text{elfric (standard issue)}\)

40 Aa O.  
\[+\text{ÆELRÆD REX ANG}O\]
Large eye. \(\Theta\) overlaps shoulder.

R.  
\[+\text{ÆELFRIC/M-O NVNT}\]

\((1)\)  
Lund.--3561. Igelösa hoard (1924). 0°  
1.80

\((2)\)  
\textit{SCBI} South-Eastern Museums 908. Norris museum, St Ives. 270°  
1.69

\((3)\)  
\textit{SCBI} Copenhagen 441. 90°  
1.67

\((4)\)  
Hild. 1370. 180°  
1.66

\((5)\)  
1.66

\((6)\)  
Gotlands Fornsal. 90°  
1.57

41 Be O.  
\[+\text{ÆELRÆD REX ANG}O\]
Small eye, \(\Theta\) touches shoulder.

R.  
\[+\text{ÆELFRIC/ME-O NVNT}\]

\((1)\)  
SHM 16200–103. Sigsgave, Hejde, Gotland hoard (1918f). 0°  
1.72

\((2)\)  
SHM 17234–1. Koparve, Rue, Gotland hoard (1923f). 90°  
1.71

\((3)\)  
\textit{SCBI} West Country Museums 527. Shaftsbury hoard (1940). 180°  
1.69

\((4)\)  
\textit{SCBI} St Petersburg 696. 180°  
1.67

\((5)\)  
1.67

\((6)\)  
RIE (H030). Ex Baldwin (1980). 90°  
1.67
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Bd O. As above R. +Æ/FRIC/M O/NVNT Bar of copulative lower than foot of M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Be O. As above R. +Æ/FRIC/M O/NVNT Tall final N. Upright of R tucked under F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Bf O. As above R. +Æ/FRIC/M O/NVNT Wide final N. R parallel to F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Cg O. +Æ/ÆBELÆR/ÆD REX ANGLO Small head, prominent nose. R. +Æ/ÆBELÆR/ÆD O/NVNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Ch O. As above R. +Æ/ÆBELÆR/ÆD H O/NVNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Ci O. As above R. +Æ/ÆBELÆR/ÆD O CH VNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Dj O. +Æ/ÆBELÆR/ÆD REX ANGLO Small jaw, hook-shaped ear. R. +Æ/ÆBELÆR/ÆD O/Ñ/NN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>El O. +Æ/ÆBELÆR/ÆD REX ANGL Tall bust, eye set back. R. +Æ/ÆBELÆR/ÆD O/VNII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7) SHM 14935–63. Sandtorp, Vibly, Närke hoard (1913). 90°</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Lund ρ3558. Igelösa hoard (1924). –°</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) SCBI Finland 209. Hämmeinen (Tavastehus), Linnaniemi hoard (1894). Remains of suspension loop. 180°</td>
<td>[1.65]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) SHM 20879–195. Kämmings, Hellvi, Gotland hoard (1934). 0°</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) SCBI South-Eastern Museums 909, Norris Museum, St Ives. Ticket reads incorrectly 'found at Hemingford Grey'. 90°</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Elmore Jones 374.</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Williams collection. Ex Oman, N Circ, September 1994, 7162 (illustrated), Arnot 143, Dolphin (List 7, Summer 1993, 152 (illustrated)). 180° 1.67 |
(2) Lund ρ3556. Igelösa hoard (1924). –° | 1.64 |
(3)* RJE (H023). Ex Spink (1980). 270° 1.61 |
(1)* RJE (H020). Ex Baldwin (1979). 90° 1.57 |
(4) SCBI Glasgow 850, 90° 1.52 |
(1)* SCBI St Petersburg 697. 270° 1.56 |
(2) SCBI South-Eastern Museums 911, Norris Museum, St Ives. Glendining, 11 October 1993, 241(pt), withdrawn. 90° 1.51 |
50  Em  O.  As above
R.  +Æ/FR/IC M'O/NVNT
(1)* Hild. 1369. 270° 1.44
(2) Uppsala University 131. 90° 1.43

51  En  O.  As above
R.  [Æ/FR/C/M'O/N]
(1)* SCBI St Petersburg 699. Vikhmiaz hoard (1934). Fragment. 90° [1.22]

52  Fl  O.  +ÆÆLÆÆ REX ANGO
R.  Lund O superimposed.
(1)* Lund 30311/11777. –° 1.38

53  Gl  O.  +ÆÆLÆÆ REX ANGLO
Long backward-sloping nose, hook shaped ear.
R.  As above
(1) Lund –/3565. Igelösa hoard (1924). –° 1.36
(2)* St Petersburg (Inv. 81975). –° 1.34

54  Hi  O.  +ÆÆLÆÆ REX ANGLO
Small jaw. Crescent shaped ear.
R.  As above
(1)* Hild. 1367. 90° 1.58
(2) SCBI St Petersburg 698. 90° 1.52
(3) SHM 9392–1319. Myrande, Atlingbo, Gotland hoard (1893). 90° 1.52

55  Ho  O.  +ÆÆÆÆÆÆ REX ANGLO
Bar of copulative higher than foot of M.
R.  As above
(2) Hild. 1371. 180° 1.56
(3) KMK 101743–0. Sälle, Fröjel, Gotland hoard (1987). –° 1.55
(4)* RJE (H001). Ex Baldwin (1977). 180° 1.52
(5) Hild. 1372. 0° 1.52
(6) SCBI Reading 83. 180° 1.49
(9) Barsham hoard (1986). Corroded. 0° [1.22]
(10) Bergen, Nesby hoard (1891). Fragment. 180° [1.12]
(11) Barsham hoard (1985). Corroded. 180° [0.97]
(12) KMK 100975. Koparve, Rute, Gotland hoard (1923f)? Cut half penny. 0° [0.81]

56  Hp  O.  As above
R.  +ÆÆÆÆÆÆ REX ANGLO
Bar of copulative points to middle of O.
(1)* Glendining, 11 October 1993, 242 (pt). –° 1.46
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numeral</th>
<th>Scrutiny</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>As above. R. +ÆLFRIC/ÆN/ÆN/NVNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)* RJE (H022). Ex Baldwin (1980). Corroded. 0° [1.42]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>'Æ-ÆBELÆRÆX ANGL Neat rounded bust. R. +ÆLFRIC/ÆM/ÆN/NVNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)* Hild. 1363. 0° 1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Schleswig. List hoard (1937) 181. –° 1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obverse I is also used by Eadwerd at Rochester. Stavanger, from Æinges hoard (1923). 1.38 g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>As above. R. +ÆLFRIC/ÆM/ÆN/NVNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)* Lund 30311/11778. 0° 1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+ÆBELÆRÆX ANGLO Neat bust, offset to sinister. R. +ÆLFRIC/ÆM/ÆN/NVNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)* Lund –/3559. Ægelûsa hoard (1924). 0° 1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) SHM 8503–59. Ægarestad, Æedestad, Æeklinge hoard (1888). 270° 1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obverse J is also used by Eadwerd at Rochester (Elmore Jones 670).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+ÆBELÆRÆX ANGLO Straight line of hair pellets from nape of neck. Small Ø. R. +ÆLFRIC/ÆM/ÆN/NVNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)* Lund –/3557. Ægelûsa hoard (1924). 0° 1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Schleswig. List hoard (1937) 182. –° 1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Hild. 1366. 0° 1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Bird 142. –° 1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) SHM 1984–220. Ammunde, Burs, Gotland hoard (1931). Buckled. 0° 1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) SCMB January 1967, 1138 (Plate 8). Probably not Bird 142. –° [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additionally two fragments in SCBI Poland 81 appear to be from dies Kv. 0° [0.66 g].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obverse K is also used by the following four moneyers: ÆÆelwerd, London (SCBI St Petersburg 760); Æedmund, London (Hild. 2346); ÆGodman, London (SCBI St Petersburg 791) and ÆHeawulf, London (Lund, from Ægelûsa hoard (1924), 1.31 g).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+ÆBELÆRÆX ANGLO Small cranium, crescent shaped ear. R. As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)* RJE (H075). Ex Glendining, 11 October 1993, 243. Dolphin (List 5, 1994, 6087 (illustrated) and List 6, 1995, 93 (ditto)). 0° 1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+ÆBELÆRED RE ANGO Tall, narrow bust with straight nose. R. +ÆLFRIC/ÆM/ÆN/NVNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)* SHM 26697–88. Ækeskogs, Heide, Gotland hoard (1961). 180° 1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) SCBI St Petersburg 700. Lodejno Pole hoard (1949). 180° 1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
64 Ba O. +ÆDELÆD REX AIGO
Tall, narrow bust with pugilistic face and curving nose.
R. As above
(1) SHM 20879–196. Kännungs, Hellvi, Gotland hoard (1934). 180° 1.38
(2) SCBI Copenhagen 440. 180° 1.38
(3) Hild. 1365. 180° 1.25

65 Ca O. +ÆDELÆD REX AN
Compact bust with narrow shoulders.
R. As above
(1) SHM 14565–17. Amlings, Linde, Gotland hoard (1911). 90° 1.32
(2) SHM 16009–13. Fardume, Rute, Gotland hoard (1917). 270° 1.30
(3) Hild. 1361. 270° 1.30
(4) SCBI South-Eastern Museums 907, Norris Museum, St Ives. 90° 1.30
(5) SHM 15152–20. Kve, Lojsta, Gotland hoard (1914). 0° 1.28
(6) SHM 23228–45. Botarve, Väste, Gotland hoard ('new find'). 180° 1.28
(7) KMK 100601. Garde, Stenkyrka, Gotland hoard (1935f). 90° 1.28
(8) Details ex BM, 16 October 1984. No provenance. 90° 1.28
(9) KMK 100601. Garde, Stenkyrka, Gotland hoard ('new find'). 90° 1.27
(10) SCBI Copenhagen 439. Stolpehuse hoard (1837). 270° 1.26
(11) Details ex BM, 17 January 1984. Everlov hoard (c.1900). 235° (sic) 1.25
(13) SHM 14935–62. Sandtorp, Vibi, Närke hoard (1913). 90° 1.18
(14) Private collection. Hemmesstorpp hoard (pre 1945). CNS 3 April 1959, 558 or 559. -°... [–]

66 Dg O. +ÆDELÆD REX ANG
Neck line runs from ear lobe.
R. +ÆL/FRIC/M'O/HVN
(1)* Hild. 1362. 270° 1.33
Obverse D is also used by the moneyer Eadwine at Southwark (SCBI Estonia 306).

67 Ei O. +ÆDELÆD RE AIGO
Startled face with marked jaw line.
R. +ÆL/FRIC/II'O/HVN

68 Ej O. As above
R. +ÆL/FRIC/M'O/HVN[II]
(1)* KMK 0/26. No provenance. Chipped. 180° 1.14

69 Fk O. +ÆDELÆD REX ANG
Three (?) horizontal garment folds.
R. +ÆL/FRIC/M'O/HVN
(1)* Lund -/3564. Igelösa hoard (1924). -° 1.25

70 Gm O. +ÆDELÆD REX ANG
Five horizontal garment folds.
R. +ÆL/FRIC/M'O/HVN
(2) Lund -/3562. Igelösa hoard (1924). -° 1.06
THE MINT OF HUNTINGDON

Other references (where it is not possible to distinguish between the standard issue and subsidiary variety): 1 Montagu 788 (pt). 'ÆLFRIC MO HVNT'; 1 Montagu 790 (pt), 'ÆLFRIC MOO HVNT'; 2 Montagu 23 (pt), 'ÆLFRIC MOO NVNT'; 2 Montagu 24 (pt), 'ÆLFRIC MOO HVNT'; Carlyon Britton 514 (pt), 'ÆLFRIC MOO HVNT'; 3 Granby 1128 (pt), 'ÆLFRIC MOO HVNT'; Parsons 167 (pt), 'ÆLFRIC MOO NVNT'; Taffs 85 (pt), 'ÆLFRIC MOO HVNT'; NCirc, December 1972, 11654, 'ÆLFRIC MO NVNT'.

Eadwine

71 Aa O. +Æ-DERÆ REX ANGL
R. +Æ-DP/INELI/M'O HVNT

(1)*

Hild. 1378. 180° 1.34

Obverse A was also used by the London moneyer Leofnoth (Hild. 2670).

72 Ba O. +Æ-DERÆ REX A
R. As above

(1)*

RJE (H027). Ex Baldwin (1980). Fragment. 270°

[0.74]

Obverse B was also used by the moneyer Eadric (or Godric) at London (see NCirc, September 1979, p. 380, for cut half penny found at Compton, near Winchester).

73 Ca O. +Æ-DERÆ REX ANGLOI
R. As above

(1)*

Lund. -/3566. Igelösa hoard (1924). 0°

1.02

Obverse C was also used by the moneyers Ælfwige of Buckingham (Hild. 115) and Godric of Hertford (SCBI Glasgow 849).

Osgut (standard issue)

74 Aa O. +Æ-DERÆ REX ANGLO
R. Lips immediately under nose.

+ÆS/GVT/MÔO/NVNT

Pellet in fourth quarter.

(1)*

RJE (H040). Ex Sotheby, 6 December 1983, 94 (illustrated). Purportedly from a 'Scandinavian hoard'. 0° 1.80

(2)

SCBI South-Eastern Museums 916, Norris Museum, St Ives. Incorrectly ticketed 'found at Hemingford Grey'. 0° 1.55

75 Ab O. As above
R. +ÆS/GVT/MÔO/NVNT

(1)

SHM 23228–46. Botarve, Väte, Gotland hoard (1943). 270° 1.69

(2)

Uppsala university 132. 180° 1.68

(3)

Lund 30311/11780. –° 1.58

(4)

SHM 22468–75. Bosarve, Stänga, Gotland hoard (1939f). Fragment. 0° [1.44]

(5)*

Lund. –° 1–1

76 Ba O. +Æ-DERÆ REX ANGLO
R. Nose and forehead in continuous curve.

As above

(1)

SHM 14955–8. Frigsarve, Grötlingbo, Gotland hoard (1913). 180° 1.70

(2)

Lund –/3560. Igelösa hoard (1924). –° 1.69

(3)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>O. As above&lt;br&gt;R. As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Lund 13563. Igelosa hoard (1924). 90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)* Bergen. Slethei hoard (1866). Broken but complete. 90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>O. +ÆBELÆD REX ANGLO&lt;br&gt; +O5/GV'T/M° O/N/VNT&lt;br&gt;Pellet in first quarter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Lund 30311/11779. -°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)* BMC 120. 0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)* RJE (H037). Ex SCBI Mack 924. Spink (1982). 90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) KMK 100604–9. Tune, (Tystebols), Stenkyrka, Gotland hoard (1916f). -°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Hild. 1388. 90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) SCBI South-Eastern Museums 912, Norris Museum, St Ives. Incorrectly ticketed ‘found at Hemingford Grey’. 0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7) SHM 14955–9 Frigerarve, Gröttingbo, Gotland hoard (1913). Cut half penny. 90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Cf</td>
<td>O. As above&lt;br&gt;+O5/GV'T/M° O/N/VNT&lt;br&gt;V lower than adjacent N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)* SHM 14091–1564. Stora Sojdeby, Fole, Gotland hoard (1910f). 0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Dg</td>
<td>O. +ÆBELÆD REX ANGLO&lt;br&gt; +O5/GV'T/M° O/N/VNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)* SCBI Copenhagen 445. Enner hoard (1849). 235°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) RJE (H077). Ex Glendining, 11 October 1993, 242 (pt), Dolphin (List 6, 1995, 94 (illustrated)). 90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Dh</td>
<td>O. AS ABOVE&lt;br&gt;+O5/GV'T/M° O/N/VNT&lt;br&gt;V aligned with following N. First N wide and almost an H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) SHM 20879–200. Kännungs, Hellvi, Gotland hoard (1934). Bent. 0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)* Hild. 1387. 270°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) RJE (H051). Ex Doubleday 169. 90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Glendining, 11 October 1993, 242 (pt), withdrawn. -°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) BM (1915). Ex Morgan (Evans). 0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) RJE (H029). Ex Baldwin (1980). Pierced. 270°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7) SCBI South-Eastern Museums 914, Norris Museum, St Ives. Incorrectly ticketed ‘found at Hemingford Grey’. 0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8) SHM 20879–201. Kännungs, Hellvi, Gotland hoard (1934). Cut half penny. 270°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Di</td>
<td>O. As above&lt;br&gt;+O5/GV'T/M° O/N/VNT&lt;br&gt;Pellet in third quarter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) BM (1922). 180°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Stockholm, ‘D/28’. 180°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) SHM 14565–18. Amlings, Linde, Gotland hoard (1911). 0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Legend</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Dj</td>
<td>O. As above&lt;br&gt;R. +O'S/GVT/M'O N/VNT&lt;br&gt;(N) aligned with following (N). First (N) conventionally barred.&lt;br&gt;(1)* SCBI Glasgow 851. Chipped and pierced. 180°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Ek</td>
<td>O. +E-Æ-ELRED REX ANGL&lt;br&gt;R. +O'S/GVT/M'O V/VNT&lt;br&gt;Pellet in annulet in second quarter.&lt;br&gt;(1)* Gotlands Fornsal 1383/29. Österby, Öthem, Gotland hoard (1920). 90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Fm</td>
<td>O. +E-Æ-ELRD REX ANGL&lt;br&gt;R. +O'S/GVT/M'O N/VNT&lt;br&gt;Pellet in first quarter.&lt;br&gt;(1) SHM 14091-1565. Stora Sojdeby, Fole, Gotland hoard (1910f). 0°&lt;br&gt;(2)* SCBI South-Eastern Museums 913, Norris Museum, St Ives. 270°&lt;br&gt;(3) SHM 14091-108. Stora Sojdeby, Fole, Gotland hoard (1910f). 0°&lt;br&gt;(Osgu) (subsidary variety)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>O. +Æ-Æ-ELRED REX ANGL&lt;br&gt;R. +O'S/GVT/M'O V/VNT&lt;br&gt;Pellet in second quarter.&lt;br&gt;(1)* Hild. 1390. 0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Ba</td>
<td>O. +Æ-Æ-ELRD REX ANGL&lt;br&gt;R. As above&lt;br&gt;(1)* SCBI St Petersburgh 702. Pierced. 270°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>O. +Æ-Æ-ELRD REX AN&lt;br&gt;R. +O'S/GVT/M'O/V/HVN&lt;br&gt;Pellet in second quarter.&lt;br&gt;(1)* SCBI St Petersburgh 701. Vaskovo hoard (1923), 270°&lt;br&gt;Other references (where it is not possible to distinguish with certainty between the standard issue and subsidiary variety): 2 Montagu 25 (pt), ‘OSGVT MO HVNT’; 5 Montagu 12 (pt), ‘OSGVT MO HVNT’; Bruun 144 (pt), ‘OSGVT MO HVNT’; Talbot Ready 119; Drabble 469, ‘OSGVT, extra pellet in one angle’; Grantley 1128 (pt), ‘OSGVT MO HVNT’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helmet type (BMC viii, Hild. E) <br>Æthelstan
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90 Aa O. :Æ-BELÆÐ REX ANG
Peaked helmet.
R. +Æ/ELST/AN M/Æ OV.
Free-standing apostrophe.
(1) Everlo (c.1900) or Hemmestop hoard (pre 1945)?
Whereabouts unknown. 90° 1.51
(2) Hild. 1351. 90° 1.49
(3)* SHM 9392–1390. Myrande, Atlingbo, Gotland hoard (1893). 90° 1.48

91 Ba O. :Æ-BELÆÐ REX ANG
Peakless helmet. Elongated upright to first R.
R. As above
(1)* RJE (H078). Glendining, 11 October 1993, 248 (pt), withdrawn. Catalogued as ‘Elfnoth’. 180° 1.50
(2) SCBI South-Eastern Museums 952, Norris Museum, St Ives.
Glendining, 11 October 1993, 248 (pt), withdrawn. Catalogued as ‘Elfnoth’. 90° 1.46
(3) BMC 121, Russian hoard (1850). 180° 1.43

92 Bc O. As above
R. As above
+Æ/ELST/AN M/Æ OV.
Large Ø. Apostrophe superimposed on cross.
(1) SCBI Mack 984. Ex Shand 336. 0° 1.47
(2) Lund 30311/11782. 270° 1.45
(3)* RJE (H049). Spink Auction, 19 November 1986, 803. Ex Lockett 3742 (pt), Elmore Jones 376 (illustrated). SCBI American Collections 465. 0° 1.44
(4) Stockholm ‘LV38/33’, 0° 1.42

R. As above
(1)* Hild. 1374. 90° 1.47

94 Dc O. +Æ-DÆRD REX EIGO
Geometric design by forehead.
R. As above
(1)* SCBI Copenhagen 442. 0° 1.43
(2) SCBI St Petersburg 1007. 0° 1.40

95 Dg O. As above
R. +Æ/ELST/AN M/Æ OV
Proportionately sized Ø touching apostrophe.
(1)* SHM 16295–499–71. Djuped, Styrnäs, Ångermanland hoard (1919). 0° 1.44

96 Eg O. +Æ-DÆRD RE+ EIGO
Helmet not joined to head.
R. As above
(1)* SHM 16504–119. Ocksarve, Hemse, Gotland hoard (1920f). 270° 1.44
(2) Gotlands Fornsal (Läroverk/217). 270° 1.43

97 Ei O. As above
R. +Æ/ELST/AN M/Æ OV
(1) Hild. 1375. 180° 1.28
(2)* SCBI St Petersburg 1008. 90° 1.27
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Numeral</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference 1</th>
<th>Reference 2</th>
<th>Reference 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Fk</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+ÆDELÆD REX AN</td>
<td>Ornate helmet.</td>
<td>(1) Lund 30311/11781. 0°</td>
<td>SCBI St Petersburg 1009. 180°</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+Æ/ÆST/ANM/O VNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Gm</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+ÆDELÆD REX ANG</td>
<td>Pellet in first and third quarters.</td>
<td>(1) Hild. 1373. 0°</td>
<td>(2) SCBI St Petersburg 1009. 180°</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+Æ/ÆST/AN M/O HV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+ÆDELÆD REX ANGL</td>
<td>Pellet crowded between L and shoulder.</td>
<td>(1) Trondheim. Drøningens Gate hoard (1950). Broken. 0°</td>
<td>SCBI St Petersburg 1006. 0°</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+Æ/ÆST/AN M/O HVNT</td>
<td>Trefoil points towards V of HVNT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obverse H was also used at Huntingdon by Osgut (see obverse C).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Iq</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+ÆDELÆD REX ANGL</td>
<td>Pellet well-spaced between L and shoulder.</td>
<td>(1)* SHM 11300–49. Mannegårds. Lye, Gotland hoard (1900). 0°</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+Æ/ÆST/AN M/O HVNT</td>
<td>Trefoil points towards V of HVNT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other references: 2 Montagu 30 (pt), 'Æ/ÆST/AN MO HV'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Cniht</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+Æ/ÆST/AN M/O HVNTAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+ÆDELÆD REX ANGL</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)* SCBI Copenhagen 444. Hess 664. 45°</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+Æ/ÆST/AN M/O HVNTAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Eadwine</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+ÆDELÆD REX AN</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)* RJE (H043). Glendining, 19 September 1984. 52. 180°</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+Æ/ÆST/AN M/O HVNTAD</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Uppsala University 133. 0°</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Hild. 1391. 270°</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Bc</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+ÆDELÆD REX ANGL</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)* Hild. 1384. 270°</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+Æ/ÆST/AN M/O HVNTAD</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) SCBI Finland 393. Broken. 90°</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Obverse B is also used by Leofsfige at Cambridge (see Kenneth Jacob in SCMB February 1984, p. 40 and Plate I, 18).

Obverse C was also used at Huntingdon by Ælfgifu (see obverse H).

Scewine

Obverse A was also used by the moneyer Godwine of London. See BNJ 31 (1962), p. 173 and 68 (1998), p. 38 and Plate 5, 7–8.
### Elfwine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Aa O. | +Æ-BELRÆD R·EX·A·NEL- | Classified by Dolley as 'uncertain'. Lyon, Exeter B.
| R. | +ÆLFNO-Ø ON HVNTA |
| (1) | Hild. 1353. Fragmented square planchet. 90° |
| | The dies used to strike this coin appear to have fallen into Scandinavian hands, as represented by a striking recorded by Brita Malmer in *The Anglo-Scandinavian Coinage, c. 995-1020*, Commentationes de Nummis Saeculorum IX–XI in Suecia Reperitae, Nova Series 9 (Stockholm, 1997), p. 235, no. 610: 1701 (illustrated), weighing 2.26 g. |
| (3) | B. Ahlstrom Myntandel AB, 11 December 1989, 435.6° |
| (4) | RJE (H076). Ex Glendining, 11 October 1993, 249. Dolphin (List 6, 1995, 95 (illustrated)), 270° |
| (5) | SHM 23228-132. Botarve, Vite, Gotland hoard (1943f). 270° |
| (6) | SHM 12079-258. Stige, Indal, Medelpad hoard (1904). Bent. 0° |
| (7) | SCBI St Petersburg 1203. 270° |
| (8) | Hild. 1352. Cracked (and corroded?). 0° |
| (9) | SHM 5247-72-27. Burge 2, Lummelunda, Gotland hoard (1972f). Fragment. 270° |

### Bc O. |
| +Æ-BELRÆD R·EX·ANG | Northern 'A' bust. Lyon, Lincoln Cm. Forehead points to G. |
| R. | +ÆLFNO-Ø ON HVNT |
| (1) | SCBI Copenhagen 436. Stolpiluse hoard (1837). 180° |
| (2) | SHM - 16504-146. Ocksarve, Hemse, Gotland hoard (1920f). 180° |

### Ce O. |
| +Æ-BELRÆD R·EX·ANGL | Northern 'B' bust. Lyon, Lincoln B. |
| R. | +ÆLFNO-Ø ON HVNTED |
| (1) | RJE (H063). Ex Glendining, 11 October 1993, 250. 270° |
| (2) | Hild. 1354. 270° |
| (3) | BM (1915). Ex Morgan (Evans). 180° |
| (4) | Trondheim. Dronningens Gate hoard (1950). Bent. 0° |

### Dg O. |
| +Æ-BELRÆD R·EX·ANG | Northern 'A' bust. Lyon, Lincoln Cl. Forehead points to N. |
| R. | +ÆLFNO-Ø ON HVNT |
| Lyon, East Anglian reverse. Tower. D. |
| (1) | Hild. 1379. Pierced. 270° |

### Ei O. |
| +Æ-BELRÆD R·EX·ANG | Northern 'A' bust. Lyon, Lincoln Cl. |
| R. | +ÆLFNO-Ø ON HVNT |
| Lyon, East Anglian reverse. |
| (1) | Grayburn collection. ‘Cnut’ hoard (c.1993). 45° |

### Ethelston

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aa O.</td>
<td>+Æ-BELRÆD R·EX·ANG</td>
<td>Classified by Dolley as Northern 'A'. Lyon, Winchester A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+ÆEDSTAN ON HVNTAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obverse A is also used by the Huntingdon moneyer Sewine (see die B).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Obverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Be</td>
<td>O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Ba</td>
<td>O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE MINT OF HUNTINGDON

124 Dg O.  
+ÆÆLÆÆD REX ANG:
Northern ‘A’ bust. Lyon, Lincoln CI. Elongated square head.
R.  
+SÆPINE MO+O HVNTE:
(1)*
SCBI Glasgow 877. 0°
Details arrived too late for incorporation into the body of this study of the following coin:

124A Dh O.  
As above
R.  
+SÆPINE [M]QO HVNTE:
(1)*
Hild. 1398A. 0°

125 Ei O.  
+ÆÆLÆÆD REX ANGLO:
London bust. Lyon, London DI.
R.  
+SÆPINE MOHVNT:
(1)*
Oslo, Årstad hoard (1836). 180°

126 Fk O.  
+ÆÆLÆÆD REX ANGLO:
South Eastern bust? Lyon, London A.
R.  
+SÆPINE MO+O HVN
(1)*
SHM 12447-7. Blommenhov, Flen, Södermanland hoard (1905). 0°

127 Gm O.  
‘+ÆÆLÆÆD REX ANGL
Classified by Dolley as South Western. Lyon, Exeter A.
R.  
+SÆPINE MOHVNT:
(1)
Lyon collection. Remains of mount. 180°
(2)*
Hild. 1394. 180°

128 Ho O.  
+ÆÆLÆÆD RÆX ANGLO:
R.  
+SÆPINE MONHVNT:
(1)*
Hild. 1398. Fragment. 0°

Obverse H is also used by the moneyers Ælfwig of London (Hild. 2105) and Brantinc of Sudbury (Hild. 3644). See BNJ 68 (1998), p. 39 and Plate 5, 9–11.

129 Iq O.  
+ÆÆLÆÆD RÆX ANGLO:
Small crude bust, allotted by Dolley to London, Lyon, London DI.
R.  
+SÆPINE MONHVNET
Blundered reverse (imitative?).
(1)*
Hild. 1397. 270°

Other references: Grantley 1110, ‘SÆPINE ON HVNFTANV’.

In Commentationes p. 170, Dolley refers to a die link between Huntingdon and Hertford mints in the Last Small Cross type, discovered by Van der Meer at Stockholm. This has not been traced.

CNUT (1016–1035)

Quatrefoil type (BMC viii.x; Hild. E)
[Jo/c indicates the position of the initial cross in the obverse legend. The die-cutting centres and styles are classified according to the analysis of Blackburn and Lyon in ‘Regional

Æthelstan

130 Aa O. +CNVT REX ANGLOX
12o/c. Thetford Ae. Crown separate from head.
R. +Æ/D/ST/AN M/HVN
(1)* RJE (H080). Arnot 191. Probably from 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). Crimped. 90° 1.46
(2) St Petersburg (Inv. 112867). 180° 1.24
(3) Bergen. Hårr hoard (1894). Cut half penny. 0°

131 Bc O. +CNVT REX ANGLOX
7o/c. Lincoln e.
R. +Æ/B/STA/N M/HVN
Cross in fourth quarter.
(1)* Grayburn collection. 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). 90° 0.99

132 Ce O. +CNVT REX ANGLOX
12o/c. Thetford Al.
R. +Æ/B/ST/AN M/HVN
(1)* RJE (H099). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). Ex Baldwin (1998). 0° 0.99

Ælfneth

133 Aa O. +CNVT REX ANGLOX
12o/c. Thetford Ae. Neckline points to E.
R. +Æ/FNO/D M/HVN
(1)* Hild. 1225. 270° 1.50

134 Bc O. +CNVT REX ANGLOX
12o/c. Thetford Ae.
R. +Æ/FNO/D M/HVN
(1)* Grayburn collection. 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). 180° 1.48
(2) Williams collection. Probably ex 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). 0° 1.48
(3)* Hild. 1226. 270° 1.45

Other references: Two coins from the 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993) with the reverse c reading were recorded in Australia in 1994.

135 Bd O. As above
R. +Æ/FNO/D M/HVN]
(1)* Hild. 1224. Pierced and damaged. 180° [1.34]

136 Ce O. +CNVT REX ANGLOX
12o/c. Thetford Ae (or m). Neckline points to R.
R. +Æ/FNO/D M/HVN
(1)* RJE (H094). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). Ex Dolphin (1997). 180° 1.32

137 Dg O. +CNVT REX ANGLOX
7o/c. Stamford B. Pellet before and cross behind bust.
R. +Æ/FNO/D M/HVN
Additional pellet in each quarter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalog</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>138 Aa</td>
<td>+CNVT REX ANGLORVM 6o/c. Lincoln e. Pellet by chin (cf. aie F). R. +EA/DNO/B MO/HVN</td>
<td>180°</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 Ba</td>
<td>+CNVT REX ANGLORVM 4o/c. Bedford. R. As above</td>
<td>180°</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 Ce</td>
<td>+CNVT REX ANGLORVM 9o/c. Northampton A. R.</td>
<td>180°</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 Dg</td>
<td>+NVEBVTON/EO+N</td>
<td>180°</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142 Aa</td>
<td>+CNVT REX ANGLORVM 6o/c. Lincoln e. Pellet by chin (cf. aie F). R. +EA/DNO/B MO/HVN</td>
<td>180°</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143 Ab</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>180°</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144 Bc</td>
<td>+CNVT REX ANGLORVM 12o/c. Thetford Am (or l). R. +ED/NOD/M O/HVN</td>
<td>180°</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 Ce</td>
<td>+CNVT REX ANGLORVM 10o/c. Northampton A. R. +ED/NOD/M O/HVN</td>
<td>180°</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
146  Dg  O.  +ECTNOVTAR
7o/c.  Northampton B. Pellet before and behind bust. See
Anglo-Saxon Monetary History, p. 240.
R.  +EA/DH0/R  H0/NVN
(1)*  RJE (H092). 'Cnut' hoard (c. 1993). Ex Baldwin (1997). Dark
toning. 180°

147  Dh  O.  As above
R.  +ED/NO/D/0N  H/VNT
London late style reverse.
(1)*  Hild. 1230. 270°

148  Ei  O.  +CNVT REX+ GN ANGEL
1o/c.  Northampton A.
R.  +ED/NOD/M  0/HVN
Space between abbreviation mark and M.
(1)*  Grayburn collection. 'Cnut' hoard (c. 1993). 270°

149  Ec  O.  As above
R.  As above
(1)*  Hild. 1236. 180° (?)

150  Ej  O.  As above
R.  +ED/NOD/M  0/HVN
London Ce style reverse.
(2)*  RJE (H086). 'Cnut' hoard (c. 1993). Ex Dix and Webb, 24 April
1996, 16. 45°

151  Fk  O.  +CNVT REX+ ANGLORVM
6o/c.  Lincoln m. Pellet at chin (cf die A).
R.  +EA/DNO/D  N'0/NVN
(1)*  Hild. 1235. Cracked. 180°

152  Gm  O.  +CNVT REX ANGLO'
7o/c.  London Cl.
R.  +EA/DNG/B  HV/NTD
London Cm.
(1)*  RJE (H090). 'Cnut' hoard (c. 1993). Ex Dolphin (List 10 (1996), 34). O°
(2)  Hild. 1231. 270°

153  Gn  O.  As above
R.  +EA/DNO/B  HV/HTD
(1)*  Hild. 1231A. 270°

154  Hp  O.  +CNVT REX ANGLORV
7o/c.  London Al.
R.  +ED/NOD/M  0/HVN
Crescent shaped abbreviation mark.
(1)*  SCBI Copenhagen 1269. 180°
155  Ir  O.  +CNVT REX ANGLORV
   5o/c. Lincoln I.
   +EADNOD( ) N/H/VNT
   London late style reverse.
   (1)*  SHM 17352–1. Pilgårds, När, Gotland hoard (1874f). 180°  1.05

156  Jj  O.  +CNVT REX ANGLOX
   12o/c. Thetford Am.
   +ED/NO/B/MΩO/H/VN
   (1)*  RJE (H110). ‘Cnut’ hoard (c.1993). Ex Vesper (1999). 180°  1.01

157  K:  O.  +CNVT REX ANGLOR
   8o/c. London Cl.
   +EAD/NOD/ON/H/VN
   (1)*  SCBI Copenhagen 1266. Enner hoard (1849). 90°  0.96

158  Kh  O.  As above
   R.  As above
   (1)*  SCBI Copenhagen 1271. Enner hoard (1849). 90°  0.95

159  Lu  O.  +CNVT REX ANGLOR:
   7o/c. London Cl. Four folds to front drapery.
   +EAD/NO/Ω ON/H/VN
   Stamford B style reverse? Two pellets (colon) in fourth quarter.
   (1)*  RJE (H119). ‘Cnut’ hoard (c.1993). Ex Griffin (1999). 90°  0.96

160  Mv  O.  +CNVT REX ANGLO
   7o/c. London Cl. Pellet behind bust.
   +EAD/NO/ON/H/VNT
   (1)  SHM 16295–502–160. Djuped, Styrnas, Ångermanland hoard (1919). 90°  0.88
   (2)*  RJE (H088). ‘Cnut’ hoard (c.1993). Ex Vecchi, 12 September 1996, 1153. 0°  0.87

161  Nx  O.  +CNVT[ ]O:
   7o/c. London Cl.
   +EA(/) ]/ ]HV
   (1)*  Oslo. Brøholt hoard (1867). Cut half penny. 90°  0.52

162  Oz  O.  +CNVT REX ANGLO
   7o/c. London Cl. Pellet behind bust.
   +EAD/NO/ON/N/VNT
   Extra pellet in cusps of quatrefoil.
   (1)*  RJE (H108). ‘Cnut’ hoard (c.1993). Ex Vesper (1999). 0°  0.85

Other references: the following reverse readings were recorded from a batch of coins from the ‘Cnut’ hoard (c.1993) in Australia in 1994:
   EDNO/Ω M O HVN
   EADNO/Ω NO HVN
   EDNO/Ω ON HVNT
   EADNO/Ω MO HVN
   EADNO/Ω ON HSVTDI
   EADNO/Ω ON HVNT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 163 Aa | O. | +CNVT REX ANGLOX  
120c: Thetford Am.  
R. | +FA/BE/NO/HV |
| | (1)* | SCBI Finland 620. Nousiainen, Nikkila hoard (1895). 270° |
| 164 Be | O. | +CNVT REX ANGLORVM  
70c: Lincoln m.  
R. | +FA/BE/NO/HV |
| | (1) | SCBI Copenhagen 1272. Kelstrup hoard (1859). 0° |
| | (2) | Grayburn collection. 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). 270° |
| | (3)* | RJE (H101). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). Ex Baldwin (1998). 0° |
| | (4) | KMK 101844-310. Stunke, Alva, Gotland hoard (1989). 0° |
| | (5) | Hild. 1238. 180° |
| 165 A1a | O. | +CNVT REX ANGLORVM  
70c: London Cl.  
R. | +GOD/LEOF/ON H/VNT |
| | (1) | Hild. 1249. 90° |
| | (2) | SCBI Copenhagen 1281. 180° |
| | (3) | Stockholm 'X-70'. 90° |
| | (5) | Oslo. Arstad hoard (1836). 0° |
| 166 A2b | O. | As above, but with four pellets added behind head, as if intended as a sceptre head. (cf obverse D below).  
R. | +GOD/LEOF/ON H/VNT |
| | (1) | Hild. 1249 var. 0° |
| | (2)* | Grayburn collection. 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). 0° |
| 167 Be | O. | +CNVT REX ANGLORVM  
70c: London Cl.  
R. | +GOD/LEOF/ON H/VNT |
| | (1)* | RJE (H097). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). Ex Baldwin (1997). 180° |
| | (2) | Griffin (1999). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). 180° |
| | (3) | Grayburn collection. 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). 0° |
| | (4) | SCBI Copenhagen 1283. Lubeck hoard (1875). 270° |
| 168 Cel | O. | +CNVT REX ANGLORVM  
50c: Lincoln l.  
R. | +GO/DEL/EOF MO HV (M ligulated to cross). |
| | (1) | SHM 16181A, B-1003. Snuvalds, Alsacog 6, Gotland hoard (1918F). 0° |
| | (2)* | Bergen. Haar hoard (1894). Chipped. 180° |
169  Ce 2  O.  As above  
R.  As above but with a gouge in the fourth quarter, partly obliterating the small cross.

(1)* RJE (H107). ‘Cnut’ hoard (c. 1993). Ex Baldwin (1998). 180° 0.91
(2) Hild. 1242. 180° 0.88

170  De 2  O.  +CNVT REX ANGL’O:  
80c. London Cl. Sceptre behind bust.  
R.  As above  
(1)* Grayburn collection. ‘Cnut’ hoard (c. 1993). 180° 0.91

171  Ei  O.  +CNVT REX ANGLORVM  
50c. Thetford C variety.  
R.  +GDE/LOF/ON H/VNT  
Pellet in fourth quarter.  
(1)* Grayburn collection. ‘Cnut’ hoard (c. 1993). 315° 0.59

A cut half penny with one corner missing (0.39g) at Bergen from the Härr hoard (1894) reads ] ELE/OM[, possibly of Stamford.

_Godric_

172  Aa  O.  +CNVT REX ANGLO’  
70c. Anomalous. Lincoln m?  
R.  +G6/DR/E MO/HVN  
(1)* BMC 249. Ex Hodsall and Tyssen. Broken. 0° 1.14  
(Leofric)

Other references: Hild. 361, reading +LEOFRIC M DVH (0.84g), alloted to Dunwich by Hildebrand, was reassigned in _Anglo-Saxon Coins_, p. 177 to ‘Huntingdon or Buckingham’. This coin with an Oxford style bust is not considered by the author to originate from Huntingdon.

Man

173  Aa 1  O.  +CNVT REX ANG  
20c. Bedford. Group of pellets behind bust?  
R.  +M/A N/ON/HV.  
Thetford style reverse?  
(1)* SHM – 4091–431. Store Sojdeby, Fole, Gotland hoard (1910f). 180° 1.18

174  Bal  O.  +CNVT REX ANGLO’  
80c. London Al.  
R.  As above

(1)* Bergen. Härr hoard (1894). 90° 1.00

175  Ba 2  O.  As above  
R.  As above, but with small gouge at edge of third quarter.

(1)* Grayburn collection. ‘Cnut’ hoard (c. 1993). 0° 1.03
(2) RJE (H111). ‘Cnut’ hoard (c. 1993). Ex Vosper (1999). 0° 1.08

_Scewine_

176  Aa  O.  +CNVT REX ANGLORVI  
80c. London Cl.  
R.  +S/E/PINE MO/HVN
Lincoln style reverse?
Gouge in second quarter partly obliterating a dagger shaped symbol.

(1)* SCBI Copenhagen 1288. Enner hoard (1849). 270° 0.85

Stamnmeer

177 Aa O. +CNVT REX ANGLORVM
6o/c. Lincoln (or Stamford) m.
R. +STA/NMA/R MO/HVN:

(1) Grayburn collection. 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). Ex Myntgalliert, 20 May 1995, 506. 90° 1.11
(2) Baldwin (1998). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). -° 1.06
(3)* RJE (H084). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). Ex Baldwin (1995). 90° 1.02
(4) Grayburn collection. 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). The reverse of this coin may have been struck from a repaired die. 270° 1.02

178 Bc O. +CNVT REX ANGLORVM
5o/c. Lincoln (or Stamford) m.
R. +ST/AH[!]-!-ER M/OHV
Annulets in each quarter.

(1)* Grayburn collection. 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). Ex Myntgalliert, 20 May 1995, 507. 0° 1.11

179 Bd O. As above
R. +ST/ANMER W/O HV: (M ligulated to cross)

(1)* St Petersburg. Lodeinoe Pole (3) hoard (1949), 116. 270° 1.09

180 Be O. As above
R. +CT/AN[-]/ER M/O HV
Initial letter overpunched? Diagonal limbs of M intercept. In Anglo-Saxon England 4, 160, Smart construes the reverse reading as +STANMER.

(1)* Hild. 1253. 270° 1.04

181 Bf O. As above
R. +ZT/ANMER M/O HV (M ligulated to cross)
Pellets in the fold of each quarter.

(1)* RJE (H104). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). Ex Baldwin (1998). 90° 0.94

182 Cg O. +CNVT REX ANGLORVM:
6o/c. Lincoln m.
R. +ST/ANMER M/O HVN/ (N ligulated to cross)

(1)* RJE (H085). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). Ex Finn (1996). 270° 1.11

Thurcetel

183 Aa O. +CNVT REX ANGLORVM
6o/c. Stamford B.
R. +BVR/CETL/-ON N/VNT
London late style reverse.
Gouge in third quarter reverse.

(1) Oslo. Årstad hoard (1836). 0° 0.95
(2)* Lyon collection. 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). 90° 0.93
184 Ab O. As above
R. [+DVRC/ET]H/ON H/VNT
London style reverse.
Gouge in second quarter touching horizontal of cross.
Additional pellet in third quarter.

(1)* Trondheim. Dronningens Gate hoard (1950). 270° 0.79

185 Bc O. +CNVT REX ANGL-
7o/c. London Cl.
R. [+DVRC/ET]H/ON H/VNT
Gouge in second quarter, touching upright of cross.

(1)* Grayburn collection. 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). 180° 0.93

186 Ce O. +CNVT REX ANGLGR
8o/c. London Cl. Pellet behind bust.
R. [+DVRC/ET]H/ON H/VNT
Gouge in third quarter with small pellet to dexter.

(1) Grayburn collection. 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). 90° 0.89
(2)* RJE (H098). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). Ex Baldwin (1998). 90° 0.88

Wulftric

187 Aa O. +CNVT REX ANGL-GI
8o/c. London Cl. Pellet behind bust.
R. +PVLFRIC/Q H/ON H/VN
London Cm style reverse.

(1)* RJE (H103). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). Ex Baldwin (1998). 180° 0.89

188 Ab O. As above
R. +PVLFRIC/ON H/VNTI

(1)* SCBI Berlin 611. 0° 0.81

A cut quarter penny at Stockholm (SHM 16295–684–161 (0.35g) from the Djuped, Styrnas, Angermanland hoard (1919)) of London late style with a reverse reading [H VN] could conceivably be of Huntingdon but no die links have so far been found.

Pointed Helmet type (BMC xiv, Hild. G)

The bust styles are based on the classification by Dolley and Ingold (Commentationes, 187–222).

Ada

189 Aa O. +CNVT R/EX AN
Bust IIIc.
R. +ADE THON H/VNTN

(1)* Hild. 1220. 0° 0.96

(Ælfsige)

Other references: Both Carlyon-Britton 546 (pt) and Lockett 3761 (pt) included a coin purportedly reading `ÆLFSIGE ON H/VNDEN'. Neither the coin(s) nor illustrations have been traced.
A moneyer 'Ælfsige' is recorded at London in the Small Cross type (Hild. 1981).
### Eadnoth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>190</th>
<th>Aa</th>
<th>O.</th>
<th>‘CNVT R/EX ANGL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+EADNO-B:O HVNTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>BM (1915), Ex Morgan (Evans), 0°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)*</td>
<td>Hild. 1221, 270°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>SCBI Glasgow 915, 180°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Hild. 1234, 180°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>RJE (H067), Ex Glendining, 11 October 1993, 254 (pt), 180°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>St Petersburg (Inv. 83561), 180°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>SCBI Copenhagen 1262, 180°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>SCBI Copenhagen 1263, 270°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>Grayburn collection, 'Cnut' hoard (c. 1993), 270°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1060, Norris Museum, St Ives, Ex Glendining, 11 October 1993, 255 (withdrawn), 180°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>SHM 6620–72, Aspinge, Hurva, Skåne hoard (1880?), Cut halfpenny, 180°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>191</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>O.</th>
<th>As above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+EADNO-B:O HVNTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)*</td>
<td>SCBI Copenhagen 1268, Lübeck hoard (1875), 0°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Hild. 1233, 0°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>192</th>
<th>Bb</th>
<th>O.</th>
<th>+CNVT:RECX AN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>RJE (H068), Ex Glendining, 11 October 1993, 254 (pt), 0°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>SCBI Copenhagen 1267, Lübeck hoard (1875), 180°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>SHM 16295–286–311, Djuped, Styrnäs, Ångermanland hoard (1919), 0°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>SHM 16295–229–310, Djuped, Styrnäs, Ångermanland hoard (1919), 90°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Åmot 213, 0°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)*</td>
<td>Hild. 1232, 270°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>SHM 8503–185, Görestad, Edestad, Blekinge hoard (1888), 270°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>Gotlands Formsal, Gandarve, Alva, Gotland hoard (1952?), 270°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>SHM 16295–205–309, Djuped, Styrnäs, Ångermanland hoard (1919), 0°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>SHM 16295–179–308, Djuped, Styrnäs, Ångermanland hoard (1919), 270°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other references: Talbot Read, 133. Two coins from the 'Cnut' hoard (c. 1993) were recorded in Australia in 1994 with the following reverse readings 'EADNO-B:O HVNTE' and 'EADNO-B:O HVNTE'.

### Godleof

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>193</th>
<th>Aa</th>
<th>O.</th>
<th>-CNVT:REX ANGL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+GOD'EL'EOF:ON HVNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>SCBI Berlin 684, 180°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)*</td>
<td>Hild. 1246, Pierced, 180°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>194</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>O.</th>
<th>As above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+GODEL' A:B:ON HVNTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Hild. 1239, 180°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>St Petersburg (Inv. 83562), 270°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(3) Oslo. Årstad hoard (1836). 0° 1.03
(4) SCBI Copenhagen 1274. 180° 1.02
(5)* SCBI Copenhagen 1273. Kelstrup hoard (1859). 0° 1.01

195 Ac O. As above
R. +"GODELEOF:ON HVNT
(1)* Hild. 1247. 90° 1.00

196 Be O. +"CNVT:/RECX:
Bust IIa.
R. +"GODELEOF:ON HVNT
(1) SHM 8503–856. Garestad, Eidestad, Blekinge hoard (1888). 180° 1.10
(3) Hild. 1251. 270° 1.08
(4) Oslo. Årstad hoard (1836). 270° 1.08
(5)* RJE (H112). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). Ex Vosper (1999). 270° 1.07
(6) Hild. 1251. var. 270° 1.05
(7) SCBI Copenhagen 1282. 270° 1.04
(8) Lund. Böringekloster, Böringe, Skåne hoard (pre 1892). –° 1.01
(9) SHM 6620–74. Äsinge, Hurva, Skåne hoard (1880f). Cut halfpenny. 270° [0.57]

197 Ce O. +"CNVT:/R-EX ANG:
Bust IIIc.
R. As above
(1)* RJE (H006). Ex Baldwin (1978). 0° 1.08
(2) BMC 250. Cracked. 0° 1.07

198 Ch O. As above
R. +"GODL' EOF:ON H.V.NT
(1)* SCBI Copenhagen 1279. Kelstrup hoard (1859). 180° 1.07
(2) SCBI Copenhagen 1280. Haagerup hoard (1943). 90° 0.98

199 Dli O. +"CNVT/RECX A
Bust II (or III)c. Foot of A touches limb of initial cross.
R. +"GODELEOF:ON HVN
First H overstruck by D?
(1)* Hild. 1241. 0° 1.06

200 D2i O. As above, with pellet by forehead.
R. As above
(1) SHM − 14091–535. Stora Sojdeby, Fole, Gotland hoard (1910f). 0° 1.14
(2)* RJE (H069). Ex Baldwin (1994). 270° 1.13

201 Dlj O. As above
R. +"GODELEOF:ON HVN
(1) SCBI Berlin 685. 90° 1.06
(2) Gotlands Fornsal. Gandarve, Alva, Gotland hoard (1952). 0° 1.05
(3) SCBI Copenhagen 1277. 0° 1.05
(4)* RJE (H116). 'Cnut' hoard (c. 1993). Ex Griffin (1999). 90° 1.05
(5) SCBI Copenhagen 1276. Store Valby hoard (1839). 0° 1.02
(6) KMK 0–19 = 711–478–1999 (Halsegarde). –° 1.02
(7) SHM 6620–73. Åsinge, Hurva, Skåne hoard (1880f). Half penny fragment. 0° [0.62]

202 Ei O. +"CNVT/RECX A
Bust IIIc. Gap between A and initial cross.
R. As above
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Ej</td>
<td>O. As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Hild. 1244, 180°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Glendining, 11 October 1993, 256, −°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Fk</td>
<td>O. +CNVT / RECX A: Bust IIIb. Sceptre head opposite tip of nose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+GODLIOF ON HVNTDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)*</td>
<td>SCBI Copenhagen 1285. Top of F missing. 90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>SCBI Copenhagen 1284, 90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>SHM 11945–25. Störingle, Gärdslosa, Öland hoard (1902), 90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Gm</td>
<td>O. +CNVT / REX AN Bust IIIb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+GODLIOF ON HVNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Oslo. Årstad hoard (1836). 270°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)*</td>
<td>RJE (H114). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). Ex Vosper (1999). 0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Oslo. Brøholt hoard (1867). Fragment. 90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Gk</td>
<td>O. As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)*</td>
<td>SCBI Copenhagen 1286. Monksjorup hoard (1829), 180°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Bergen. Nesbo hoard (1891). Fragment. 180°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>O. +:CNVT R/EX AN: Bust IIIc (or b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+GODEL-ADL'A'D O HVN Blundered inscription.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Iq</td>
<td>O. + CNVT R/EX AN Bust IIIc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+GODELEOF ON HVTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)*</td>
<td>St Petersburg (Inv. 113576). 90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+GODEL' FOF ON HV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)*</td>
<td>Hild. 1243. 0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Ji</td>
<td>O. As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)*</td>
<td>Oslo. Årstad hoard (1836). 270°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Ku</td>
<td>O. +CNVT /EX AN: Bust IIIc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+GODELEOF ON HVTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)*</td>
<td>RJE (H113). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). Ex Vosper (1999). 270°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Lw</td>
<td>O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>My</td>
<td>O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Nz</td>
<td>O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Godman

215 Aa O. +CNVT / REX ANG | GODMAN ON HVN |
| R. | Hild. 1248. 270° | 0.77 |

Godric

216 Aa O. +CNVT / REX A | GODRIC ON HVHD |
| R. | SCBI Copenhagen 1287. Lübeck hoard (1875). | 0.88 |

Leofric

217 Aa O. +CNVT / REX AN | Leofwine (so classified in Numismatiska Meddelanden XXXV, p. 75, but as Steorwine in Commentationes, p. 209). |
| R. | SHM 11300–143. Mannegårda, Lye, Gotland hoard (1900). | 0.92 |

Leofwine (so classified in Numismatiska Meddelanden XXXV, p. 75, but as Steorwine in Commentationes, p. 209). |

218 Aa O. +CNVT / REX A | Leofwine (so classified in Numismatiska Meddelanden XXXV, p. 75, but as Steorwine in Commentationes, p. 209). |
| R. | SHM 23695–75. Rossvik, Nora. Ängermanland hoard (1946). | 0.84 |
| (2)** | Hild. 1252. 180° | 0.77 |
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219 Ba O. +CNVT / RECX A:
Bust IIb.
R. As above
(1)* BMC 251. Wedmore hoard (1833). 0°
0.76

220 Ce O. +CNVT / RECX Al
Bust IIIc.
R. +LEOPINE ON HVN[ ]
(1)* Trondheim. Dronningens Gate hoard (1950). 0°
0.86

221 Aa O. +CNVT / REC AN
Bust IIb.
R. +PYNSIGE O VNTDNE
(1)* BMC 252. Ex Miles (1820). 0°
0.99

Short Cross type (BMC xvi, Hild. H.)

Ada

222 Aa O. +CNV-/T RECX
R. +ADA- ON HVNTED:
(1) Dolphin (List, September 1998, 34). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). 0°
1.18
(2)* RJE (H089). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). Ex Vecchi, 12 September
1996, 1166, 0°
1.14
(3) Hild. 1219, 270°
1.13
(4) Dolphin (1993). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). 0°
1.13
1.13
(6) Vosper (1999). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). 0°
1.13
(7) St. Petersburg (Inv. 83563), 270°
1.13
(8) Grayburn collection. 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). Myntgalliert, 20 May
1995, 503, 270°
1.12
(9) Williams collection. 270°
1.12
(10) SCBI Copenhagen 1260. 270°
1.11
(11) SCBI Copenhagen 1261. 90°
1.10
1.09
(13) Dolphin (List 4, Summer 1993, 5067). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). 0°
[–]
(14) Metal detector find. 'Kent/Surrey Borders' (1991). Fragment. 0°
[1.10]
(sic)

223 Be O. +CNV / T RECX:
R. +ADA- ON HVN TED:
(1)* SCBI Copenhagen 1259. Lübeck hoard (1875). 0°
1.14

Ælfgar

224 Aa O. +CNVT / R RECX:
R. +ÆLFGAR ON HVNT
(1) RJE (H081). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). Ex Arnott 231, 270°
1.17
(2) SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1086, Norris Museum, St Ives. 270°
1.13
(3) SCBI Copenhagen 1264. 0°
1.11
(4)* Griffin (1999). 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). 180°
1.11
(5) SCBI Copenhagen 1265, 90°
1.09
(6) SCBI South Eastern Museums 1087, Norris Museum, St Ives.
Glendinning, 11 October 1993, 257 (withdrawn). 180°
1.09
(7) Grayburn collection. 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993). Myntgalliert, 20 May
1995, 504, 270°
1.09
Other references: a coin from the 'Cnut' hoard (c. 1993) was recorded in Australia in 1994 with reverse reading A.

**Bc O.**

+ [N]flII/RCIIi+)N

R. +ACIGAR ON HVNT

(1)* BM (1960). Ex Lockett 3765 (pt). 90° 1.00

Other references; Talbot Ready, 141; Brunn 175, 'ÆLFGAR ON HVN[T].

**Aa O.**

+CNVT / RECX:

Sceptre by bridge of nose.

R. +PVLSTAN ON HVN

(1) Grayburn collection. 'Cnut' hoard (c. 1993). 270° 1.16

(2) Stockholm. Radimöös hoard (1904). 270° 1.14

(3) Griffin (1999). 'Cnut' hoard (c. 1993). 270° 1.14

(4) Vosper (1999). 'Cnut' hoard (c. 1993). 90° 1.11

(5)* RJE (H105). 'Cnut' hoard (c. 1993). Ex Baldwin (1998). 270° 1.10

Other references: a coin was recorded from the 'Cnut' hoard (c. 1993) in Australia in 1994 with the reading Aa.

**Ab O.**

As above

R. +PVLSTAN ON HV

(1) SHM 11300–172. Mannegårda, Lye, Gotland hoard (1900). 0° 1.12

(2)* RJE (H016). Stuttgart, 9 June 1978. 90° 1.08

**Ba O.**

+CNVT / RECX

Sceptre by tip of nose.

R. As above

(1) Hild. 1254. Broken. 180° 1.19

(2)* Grayburn collection. 'Cnut' hoard (c. 1993). 0° 1.14


**Aa O.**

+CNV /T RECX [A].

R. +PVLFINE OH HVNT

(1) SHM 11619–63. Garde, Stenkyrka, Gotland hoard (1902). 180° 1.00

(2)* RJE (H106). 'Cnut' Hoard (c. 1993). Ex Baldwin (1998). 90° 0.97

(3) SCBI Copenhagen 1290. 90° 0.84

**Ba O.**

+CNV/T RECX:

R. As above

(1)* Grayburn collection. 'Cnut' hoard (c. 1993). Myntgalliert, 20 May 1995. 508. 90° 0.91

**Ca O.**

+CNVT/RECX:

R. As above

(1)* SCBI Copenhagen 1289. Kongso plantation hoard (1904). 90° 0.82

**Ce O.**

As above

R. +PVLTINE ON HVNT

(1)* RJE (H117). 'Cnut' hoard (c. 1993). Ex Griffin (1999). 180° 0.92
Other references; a coin was recorded from the 'Cnut' hoard (c.1993) in Australia in 1994 with the obverse reading 'CNV.T R' and reverse 'PV/LPINE ON HVNT'.

HAROLD I (joint king 1035–1037, sole king 1037–1040)

Jewel Cross type (BMC i, Hild. A)

The busts are classified according to T. Talvio, 'Harold I and Harthacnut's Jewel Cross type reconsidered', Anglo-Saxon Monetary History, pp. 273–90.

Wulfwine

233 Aa O. +HARO/ LD RE-X: 
R. +PV/LPINE ON HVNT:

(1)* Hild. 314. See SCBI Stockholm 236, where the coin is mistakenly described as from the same obverse die as the preceding coin, Stockholm 235, of the moneyer Wulfsige at Hereford. 270° 1.08

234 Ab O. As above
R. +PV/LPINE ON HVNT:

(1) SCBI Copenhagen 177. 180° 1.04
(2)* Hild. 313. SCBI Stockholm 237. 90° 1.00
(3) St Petersburg (Inv. 112944). 270° 1.00

235 Bb O. +HARO/ LD RE-X: 
R. Variety L1”B”. Widely spread folds at dexter shoulder.

(1)* BM (1898). Ex 5 Montagu 196 (pt). 0° 0.97

236 Ce O. +HAROL/ OLD REX
R. Variety L2”B”. Not recorded by Talvio for mint.

(1)* RJE (H096). Ex Baldwin (1997). Edge cracked. 90° 0.96

Fleur-de-lis type (BMC v, vi, and Hild. B)

Wulfwic

237 Aa O. +HAROL/ RECX E/N:
R. +PV/LPFL/ ON H/VNT:

(1)* Hild. 312. SCBI Stockholm 885. 90° 1.12
(2) SHM 6620/-. Aspinge, Hurva, Skåne hoard (1880f). Cut halfpenny. 90° [0.58]

238 Ab O. As above
R. +PV/LPFL/ ONH/VN:

(1) Hild. 743 (allotted to London). SCBI Stockholm 886. 0° 0.98
(2)* BM (1898). 180° 0.97

239 Bc O. +HAROL/D RECX A
R. +PV/LPFL/ ON H/VNT

(1)* Oslo. Brøholt hoard (1867). 90° 1.10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>O.</th>
<th>R.</th>
<th>Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)*</td>
<td>Hild. 742 (allotted to London). SCBI Stockholm 887. 90°</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Hild. 742 (duplicate). SCBI Stockholm 888. 270°</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+HAROLD RX[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+PV/LPII/ ON N/VNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)*</td>
<td>St Petersburg. Lodeinoe (3) hoard (1949) 311. 180°</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wulfwine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+HAROLD[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>Sceptre head by forehead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+PV/LPIIE ON HVT First N ligulated to cross.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>SCBI Berlin 36. Juura/Odenpäh hoard (1888). 180°</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)*</td>
<td>SCBI Copenhagen 178. Kongso plantage hoard (1904). 270°</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>KMK 6200/-. Åsringe, Hurra, Skåne hoard (1889f). The reverse die is A, the obverse less certainly A. Cut half penny. 270°</td>
<td>[0.50]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Bc</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+HAROLD RECX [··]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>Sceptre head by nose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+PV/LPN/E ON HVN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Hild. 315. SCBI Stockholm 884. 180°</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)*</td>
<td>RJE (H639). Metal detector find at Titchmarsh, Northants (1982). Earlier finds from the same spot were auctioned at Sotheby, 16 April 1980, 420-5. Ex Green (1983). Corroded. 180°</td>
<td>[0.85]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1112, missing from Norris Museum, St Ives.</td>
<td>[ - ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other references: Carlyon-Britton 1094, ‘+HAROLD RECX’, +PVLPNE ON HVN’. Possibly same coin as missing from Norris Museum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HARTHACNUT (joint king 1035–1037, sole king 1040–1042)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arms and Sceptre type (BMC ii, Hild. B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ælfwine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+HAR/CNVTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+Æ-LPN/E ON HVN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)*</td>
<td>Hild. 69. SCBI Stockholm 1625. Probably from the Findarve, Rome (not Rome). Gotland hoard (1843). 180°</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Hild. 69 (duplicate). SCBI Stockholm 1626. Probably from the above hoard. 180°</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wulfwine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+HAR/BDACN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+PVLFPI ON HVNTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)*</td>
<td>Carlyon-Britton 1103 (Plate XXVI). Ex Brice, 2 Montagu 108 (Plate I) and Murdoch 149.</td>
<td>[ - ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wulfwine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+HAR/DCNW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+PV/LPN/E ON NV (wedge)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(1)* Hild. 73 (under Langport). SCBI Stockholm 1627 (as Huntingdon). Aspinge, Hurva, Skåne hoard (1880f). 270°

247 Ab O. As above
R. +PVLPIN-E ON HVN

(1) SCBI Copenhagen 644. Haagerup hoard (1943) 560 ('sic!'). Bent. 270°
(2)* SCBI Copenhagen 643. Brahetrolleborg hoard (1948). 90°
(3) SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1121. Norris Museum, St Ives (missing). Broken, repaired and set in silver collet. Find reference on photograph taken by Christopher Blunt in 1958 is illegible. 90°?

Arms and Sceptre type inscribed 'Cnut' (BMC xvii, Hild. I)

Ælfwine

248 Aa O. +CNVT / RECX.
R. +ÆLPINE ON HVN
(1)* BM (1952). Cracked 270°

(Wulfstan)

(249) Aa O. +CNVT / RECX:
R. +PV/LSTAN ON [HVN]
(1) SCBI Copenhagen 1291. 180°

EDWARD THE CONFESSOR (1042–1066)

PACX type (BMC iv, Hild. D)

Wulfwig

250 Aa O. +EDPERD/-REX A
R. +PV/L [F]II/ONW/NTA-
(1)* Hild. 243. 270°
(2) SHM 6620–92. Aspinge, Hurva, Skåne hoard (1880f). Cut quarter penny. 90°

[0.26]

251 Ab O. As above
R. +PV/L-FII/ON N/VNT
(1)* RJE (H058). Ex Spink (1990). 0°

252 Ac O. As above
R. +PV/L-FI/ON V/NTA
(1)* SCBI Copenhagen 902. Tærring hoard (1830). 90°

0.90

253 Bd O. +EDPA/D REX
R. +PV/L-FP[II] ON/VNT
Irregular reading PSX.
(1)* SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1132. Norris Museum, St Ives. 90°

1.00

254 Be O. As above
R. +PV/L-FP/I ON/VNT
Irregular reading PSX.
(1)* RJE (H025). Ticketed ‘Montagu’ (see below). Ex Baldwin (1980). 180°
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Other references: 1 Montagu 831 (pt), ‘+PVLFPi ON VNT’; 2 Montagu 135 (pt), ‘+PVLFPi ON HVNT’. Given the readings, coin Be (1) must be Montagu 135 and Bd (1) is possibly Montagu 831. A PACX penny in the collection of the Very Rev. H.R. Dawson, Dean of St Patrick’s College, Dublin, read as ‘+EDPAR’, ‘+PVLFPi ONVNT’ was dispersed through Sotheby in 1842.

Wulfwine

255 Aa O. +EDPA/RA DEX
R. +P.VLFPINE O HVN

(1) BMC 560. City of London hoard (1872). 0° 1.05
(2)* SCBI Copenhagen 905. Toerring hoard (1830). 0° 1.05

Radiate-Small Cross type (BMC i, Hild. A)

(−)

(Dawwig)


Wulfwig

256 Aa O. +EDPA/R'D DEX
R. +PVLFPIG ON HVNT:

(1) BMC 555. 180° 1.08
(2)* RJE (H070). Ex Baldwin (1994). 270° 0.95

257 Ba O. +EDER/D DEX A:
R. As above

(1)* SCBI Copenhagen 906. 270° 1.07

Wulfwine

258 Aa O. +EDER/D RE+:
R. +PVLFPINE ON HVN:

(1) SCBI Copenhagen 903. 180° 1.16
(2)* Hild. 244. 180° 1.06

(259) Bc O. [R'Y/DRE[X][[ R. ][V][LPINE]]

(1)* SCBI Copenhagen 904. Bonderup hoard (1822). Cut half penny. 0° [0.50]

This coin is attributed to Huntingdon in the Copenhagen sylloge, although no part of the mint name is showing and no die links have been identified. Wulfwine is also known in the type at Colchester, Hereford, Leicester, London and Southwark.

Wulfstan

260 Aa O. +EDER/D DEX A
R. +PVLSTAN ON HVNTE

(1)* SCBI Copenhagen 907. Bonderup hoard (1822). 270° 1.13
Trefoil Quadrilateral type (BMC iii, Hild. C)

Ælfwine

261 Aa  O.  +ÆLPINE OH HVNTE
         R.  +ÆL-FPINE OH HVNTE
Extra pellet in first and fourth quarter.

(1)  SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1155, Museum of London. City of London hoard (1872). 0°  1.12
(2)*  BMC 559. 90°  1.11
(3)  Baldwin, 4 May 1999, 444 (illustrated). 0°  1.11
(4)  Doubleday 171. Ex Carr 122. 90°  1.10
(5)  RJE (H026). Ex Carleyon-Britton 1108, Lockett 3792 (pt). Baldwin (1980). 0°  1.10
(6)  BM (details provided 21 May 1987). Fragment. 0°  0.89
(7)  Pheatt 582 (illustrated). Cut half penny. 0°  [0.59]
(8)  BM (photographs provided in 1987). Cut halfpenny reading O. +ÆLP[ ]EX A
         R. +ÆL-F[ ]NTE.  
As above

262 Ab  O.  As above
         R.  +ÆLPINE ON HVNT:
Extra pellets in trefoils of second and third quarters.


263 Ba  O.  +ÆLPINE ON HVNT:
         R.  As above

(1)*  Baldwin, 12–13 October 1998, 1315 (illustrated). 0°  1.16
(2)  RJE (H033). Ex Baldwin (1981). Cut halfpenny. Joined (when acquired by Baldwin) with another cut halfpenny not of Huntingdon. 90°  [0.51]

Uncertain moneyer

264 Aa  O.  [ÆLPINE ON HVNT]
         R.  [ÆLPINE ON HVNT]

(1)*  SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1165, Norris Museum, St Ives. Cut quarter penny. 0°  0.21

Although listed in the sylloge as from an 'uncertain mint', Huntingdon appears to be intended.

Other references: 2 Montagu 133 (pt), 'ÆLPINE ON HVNT'; Moon 34; Crowther 47 and Walters 115 (pt); Wheeler 1056. BCH, p.93, City of London hoard (1872). 'Ælfwine, 1: uncertain moneyer 1.'

Small Flan type (BMC ii, Hild. B)

Ælfwine

265 Aa  O.  +ÆLPINE ON HVNT
         R.  +ÆLPINE ON HVNT
Pellet on neck.

(1)  BMC 556. Thwaite hoard (1832). 180°  1.11
(2)  Private collection. Ex Elmore Jones 380 (illustrated).
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Baldwin (1980). 180° 1.11
(3)* RJE (H002). Ex Baldwin (1977). 90° 1.11
(4) Phraat 588 (illustrated). – 0.99
(5) SCBI Copenhagen 901. Haagerup hoard (1943). Broken. 180° 0.96
(6) Dolphin (List 7, Summer 1995, 167 (illustrated)). – [-]
(7) BMC 558. Thwaite hoard (1832). Cut quarter penny. 270° [0.27]

Other references: Bliss 118 (pt), 'ÆLFPINE ON HV';
Carlyon-Britton 1776 (pt), 'ÆLFPINE ON HV'. NC, New Series,
16 (1876), 323–94 at p. 351, records two coins from the City of
London hoard (1872) reading 'ÆLF[ ]NG ON HV'.

(Ælfwine?)

266 Aa O. +ÆDP/ÆRD RC
R. +ÆLFP[ ]NE ONHV (or NHy)
Huntingdon or Hythe.

(1)* BMC 568. 180° 0.91

Ulfceol

267 Aa O. +ÆDPÆ/ÆRD RE
R. +ÆLFCTL ON HVNT

(1)* RJE (H052). Ex Duke of Argyll. Doubleday 172. Baldwin (1987). 0° 0.87
(2) BMC 557. 0° 0.63

Other references: Berge 276 (pt), 1 Montagu 827 (pt), 'ex Brice',
Grantley 1190 (pt), '+ÆLFCTL ON HVNT'. BCH p. 92, City of
London hoard (1872), 'uncertain moneyers, 2'.

Expanding Cross type (BMC v, Hild. E)

Struck as light and heavy issue.

Ælfwine

268 Aa O. +ÆDPERÆR/D REX:
Sceptre crowded between bust and legend.
R. +ÆLFPINE ON HVNTEN#

(1)* RJE (H082). Ex Elmore Jones 382, N Circ, May 1972, 5345
(illustrated), October 1972, 9249 (illustrated), Arnot 291
(illustrated). Baldwin (1995). 0° 1.69
(2) BMC 561. City of London hoard (1872). See North, English
Hammered Coinage 1, (London, 1994), Plate 14, 26. 270° 1.65

269 Ba O. +Æ[ ]EP/ÆREEX:
Sceptre well spaced between bust and legend.
R. As above

(1)* Photographs provided by K.A. Jacob (1980). Coin not traced.
Fragment. 270° [-]

270 Ce O. +ÆDPÆ/ÆRD RE
R. +ÆLF[ ]NE ON HVNTT
Pellet in first and fourth quarter.

(1)* Elmore Jones 381. – 0° 1.13

Other references: 1 Montagu 835 (pt), 'ÆLFPINE ON HVNTEN'.
BCH, p. 93, records 'Ælfwine, 1' from the City of London hoard (1872).
Godric

271 Aa O. +EDPER/D REX:
R. +GODRIC ON HVNTE

(1) SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1214, Norris Museum, St Ives. 270° 1.78
(2)* RJE (H017), City of London hoard (1872). Ex Glendining, 14 March 1973, 275 (illustrated). SCMB June 1973, H3626:
(Plate 41). Broken and repaired. 270° [1.67]
(3) BMC 562. City of London hoard (1872). 270° 1.65
(6) SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1215, Norris Museum, St Ives. Cut half penny. 270° [0.87]
(7) SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1216, Norris Museum, St Ives. Cut half penny. 270° [0.79]

Other references: Briggs 220 (pt), City of London hoard (1872) (?), see BNJ 47 (1977), p. 73; Carlyon-Britton 597 (pt); 2 Roth 91 (pt); Lockett 2810 (pt); BCH, p. 93 recording ‘Godric, 3’ and 91 (pt); Lockett 2810 (pt); BCH p. 93 records ‘Godric, 3’ and p. 97 (supplementary list) ‘Godric’. All described as reading ‘+GODRIC ON HVNTE’.

Godwine

272 Aa O. +EDPNE+R[ ]IRE
R. +GODPHE ON HVNIN-

(1)* SHM 11300–277. Mannegärde, Lye, Gotland hoard (1900). 0° 1.14

Pointed Helmet type (BMC vii, Hild. F)

Godric

273 Aa O. +EDP/D REX
R. +GODRIC ON HVNTE

(1) Elmore Jones 383. −° 1.33

274 Bc O. +EDPER/D REX
R. +GODRIC ON HVNTE:

(1)* BM (1915). Ex Morgan (Evans). Corroded. 90° [1.25]
(2) Museum of London. City of London hoard (1872). −° [−]

Other references: 2 Montagu 143 (pt); Carlyon-Britton 1135 (pt); Lockett 3808 (pt); all described as reading ‘+GODRIC ON HVNTE’. NC, New Series. 16 (1876), p. 351 records three coins, purportedly from two different reverses, reading ‘GODRIC ON HVNTE’ from the City of London hoard (1872). BCH, p. 121, also records ‘Godric, 1’ from the Sedlescombe hoard (1872).

Godwine

275 Aa O. +EDPER/D REX
R. +GODPHE ON HVNNT

(1) Glendining, 11 October 1993, 261. −° 1.33
(2)* SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1281, Norris Museum, St Ives. 90° 1.31
(3) Vienna. −° [−]
Other references; Briggs 234 (pt), City of London hoard (1872) (?), see BNJ 47 (1977), p. 74; Bliss 118 (pt); Carlyon-Britton 1791 (pt), all described as reading *GODPINE ON HVNTE*. NC, New Series, 16 (1876), p. 351 records two coins reading *GODPINE ON HVNTE* and NC 5 (1885), p. 265 another reading *GODPINE ON HVNTE* from the City of London hoard (1872).

Sovereign-Eagles type (*BMC* ix, Hild. H)

**Godric**

276 Aa  
O.  
**EDPARD REX ANGLO**  
R.  
+**GODRIC ONHVNT**

(1)*  

Other references: Parsons 202 (pt).

**Godwine**

277 Aa  
O.  
**EADPARD RE ANGL**

R.  
+**GODPINE ON HVNTE**

(1)*  
Hild 242. 180* 1.34

Other references: E.H. Willett in ‘Notes on the Sedlescombe find’, Collections of the Sussex Archaeological Society, 33 (1883), 20–38, at p. 29, lists the reading ‘LID:ON HVNDO’ (sic). See also *BCH*, p. 121. Under the City of London hoard (1872), *BCH*, p. 95 lists ‘Godwine, 9; Leofwine, 1’ as *BMC* ix, in error for *BMC* xi.

Sovereign-Eagles and Hammer Cross type mule (*BMC* ix/xi, Hild. H/G)

**Godwine**

278 Aa  
O.  
**EADP** [ND]**PA RE+ ANGLO**

R.  
+**GODPINE ON PVHTE**

Reverse a is from the same die as Godwine Hammer Cross Aa.

(1)*  

(2)  
*SCBI* South-Eastern Museums 1414, Museum of London. City of London hoard (1872). 270* 1.32

**Leofwine** (Liofwine)

279 Aa  
O.  
**EAFPA R-X [A]NGLO**

R.  
+**LOPINE ON HVNT**

Reverse a is from the same die as Leofwine Hammer Cross Aa.

(1)*  
Elmore Jones 385. Ex Carlyon-Britton 1152 (Plate XXVII). Ryan 859 (illustrated), where reading is given as ‘LOEPINE (sic) ON HVNT’. – 1.32

Hammer Cross type (*BMC* xi, Hild. G)

**Godric**

280 Aa  
O.  
**+EADPAR/RD RE**

R.  
+**GODRIC OH HVNTE**

Obverse A is also used by the moneyer Leofwine (Aa), and by Godric with a Facing Bust reverse (Aa).
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(1) Doubleday 175. 180° 1.44
(2) BMC 564. Incorrectly construed as 'Liofric'. 270° 1.39
(4) SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1489, Norris Museum, St Ives. Crack in centre. 270° 1.35
(5) SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1491, Norris Museum, St Ives. Glendining, 11 October 1993, 264 (withdrawn). 180° 1.35
(6) Dolphin (List 6 (1995) 106 (illustrated)). Ex Glendining, 11 October 1993, 263. 1.34
(8)* RJE (H045). Ex Elmore Jones 386, SCMB August 1971, H2004, SCBI American Collections 632, Norweb 93. 90° 1.30
(9) SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1490, Norris Museum, St Ives. 180° 1.18
(10) Baldwin (1990). 180° 1.14

Other references: Briggs 229 (pt), City of London hoard (1872) (?), see BNJ 47 (1977), p. 75; 1 Montagu 149 (pt); Carlyon-Britton 625 (pt); Bliss 118 (pt). All described as reading 'GODRIC ON HVNTE'. The City of London hoard (1872) is recorded as containing eleven coins reading 'GODRIC ON HVNTE' (sic) in NC, New Series, 16 (1876), p. 351.

Godwine

281 Aa O. +EADPAR/RD RE R. +GODPINE ON HVHTE

The reverse is from the same dies as used in the Sovereign-Eagles and Hammer Cross mule, Leofwine Aa.

(1) BM (1946). Oldroyd bequest. 180° 1.53
(2) Vecchi, 4 September 1998, 1677, where stated as 'possibly from the Castor hoard, found near Peterborough in 1759'. SCBI Mack 1249. 225° 1.36
(3) Baldwin, 12-13 October 1998, 1747 (illustrated). 1.35
(4) SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1493, Norris Museum, St Ives. 0° 1.34
(5)* RJE (H010). Ex Baldwin (1978). 90° 1.33
(6) BMC 563. 90° 1.33
(8) Dolphin (List 7 (Summer 1995) 177, (Summer 1997) 73 and (September 1998) 43, illustrated). Ex Lockett 3816, Arnot 331. 1.32
(9) Trenerry (1982). Ex Sudley Castle, Sotheby, 8 May 1970, 61 (pt). Damaged. 0° 1.31
(10) SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1495, Norris Museum, St Ives. Glendining, 11 October 1993, 266 (pt) (withdrawn). 90° 1.30
(11) Doubleday 176. 0° 1.29
(12) Glendining, 11 October 1993, 266 (pt) (withdrawn). 1.28
(13) SCBI Ashmolean 950. 270° 1.25
(14) BNJ 68 (1998), Coin Register 144, p. 174. Bent (and damaged?). 90° 1.21
(15) SCBI Ashmolean 949. Damaged. 180° 1.18
(16) SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1494, Norris Museum, St Ives. Fragment. 270° 1.01
(17) Martin, Christmas 1985, H.18. 1.01
(18) NCirc, March 1987, 1363 (illustrated). 1.00
(19) Dolphin (List 7 (Summer 1995) 180, (November 1997) 72 and (September 1998) 44, illustrated). 1.00

Other references: Briggs 229 (pt). City of London hoard (1872) (?), see BNJ 47 (1977), p. 75; 1 Montagu 844 (pt); Bliss 118 (pt); Carlyon-Britton 1156; Roth 82 (pt); Carlyon-Britton 1803 (pt);
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Talbot Ready 173; Glendining, 24–5 May 1972, 666; NCirc, April 1973, 3107; Glendining, 14 March 1973, 278 (pt). The City of London hoard (1872) is recorded as containing ten coins of Godwine, nine listed by Willett (NC, New Series, 16 (1876), p. 351 and one by Evans (NC 3, 5 (1885), p. 268. Most of these references give the reading '+GODPINE ON HVNTE'.

Leofwine (Liofwine)

---

282 Aa O. +EADPAR/RD RE +LIOPINE ON HVNTE:
R. Obverse A is also used by the moneyer Godric (Aa) and reverse a with a Sovereign-Eagles and Hammer Cross mule, Leofwine Aa.

(1) BMC 565. Chancton hoard (1866). 270° 1.30
(2)* RJE (H064). Ex Glendining, 11 October 1993, 269 (pt).
Baldwin (1993). Cracked. 0° 1.26

Other references: BCH, p. 95, refers to Leofwine under the Sovereign-Eagles type from the City of London hoard (1872). In BNJ 47 (1977), p. 66 n. 1, this is amended to the Hammer Cross type. A Hammer Cross penny of Leofwine was included by Spink in Anglo-Saxon and Norman mint towns of England: a fixed display of Anglo-Saxon and Norman pennies, now dismantled. See Freeman, The Moneyer and the Mint, p. 283.

Hammer Cross and Facing Bust type mule (BMC xi/xiii, Hild. G/Ac)

Godric

---

283 Aa O. +EADPAR/RD RE +GODRIC-ON HV-NT
R. 3CB1 South-Eastern Museums 1563, Museum of London.

(1) City of London hoard (1872). 270° 0.90
(2)* BM ((1915). City of London hoard (1872). Ex Morgan (Evans). 90° 0.68

Other references: there is no mention of this mule in the reports on the City of London hoard (1872).

Facing Bust type (BMC xiii, Hild. Ac)

---

(Godric)

No Facing Bust penny of Godric has been traced, but one appears to have been offered in Roth 91 (pt), with a reverse reading ‘+GODRIC ON HVNTE’. NC, New Series, 16 (1876), p. 351, records three coins purportedly from the City of London hoard (1872) reading ‘+GODRIC ON HVNTE’.

Godwine

---

284 Aa O. EADPARD RE:
Pellet above dexter shoulder.
R. +GODPINE- ON HVNT

(1) SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1596, Norris Museum, St Ives. 180° 1.12
(2) Dolphin (List (November 1997) 76, (September 1998) 42 and (April 1999) 44), Ex Elmore Jones 387, SCMB February 1972 (H 2527, Plate 19), July 1972 (H 3098, Plate 56), December 1972 (H 3393) and March 1973 (H 3483, Plate 17), Glendining, 19 June 1990, 810, Arnot 344. – 1.10
(3)* RJE (H046). Ex National Museum of Wales. 270° 1.09
**HAROLD II (1066)**

**PAX type, bust without sceptre (BMC ia)**

The following coins are of variety C identified by Hugh Pagan in *Numismatiska Meddelanden* XXXV, 177–205.

### Godwine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+HAROLD REX ANG:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+GODPINE ON HVNED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**WILLIAM I (1066–1087)**

In the Norman series the die axis has been determined by the position of the initial cross on the reverse.

### Profile-Cross Fleury type (BMC i)

#### Godric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+PILLEMVS REX N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+GODRIC ON VNETDV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other references: Berge 283, Carlyon-Britton 1832; Bruun 190 (pt), all reading ‘+GODPINE ON HVNED’. BCH, p. 90, also lists an ‘uncertain mint (HVVID)’ from the St Mary Hill Church, London hoard (1775).

### Thurgrim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>+PILLEMHIS REX AI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+DVRGRIM ON HVN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Profile-Cross Fleury and Bonnet type mule (BMC i/ii)

**Godric**

(1)*

289 Ba  O.  As 287 above
R.  +GODRIC ON HVNTED

Probably from same reverse die as a (290) below.

(1)*

289 (1)*  

290 Aa  O.  +PILLEMV REX
R.  +GODRIC ON HVNTED

Overstruck on a PAX reverse of Harold II, but apparently not the only other known die (Godwine a).

(1)*

290 (1)*  

291 (B)c  O.  +PILLEMV REX
R.  +GODRIC ON JTVN

Possibly from the same die as A above.

(1)*

291 (1)*  

292 Ce  O.  +PILLEMVS REX
R.  +GODRIC ON HVNTI

(1)*

292 (1)*  

293 Dg  O.  +PIL[ ]VS REX
R.  +GODRC ON VNTE

(1)*

293 (1)*  

294 Aa  O.  +PILLEMV REX
R.  +GODPINE ON HIII

(1)*

294 (1)*  

295 Ab  O.  As above
R.  +GODPINE ON HVN

(1)*

295 (1)*  

296 Bc  O.  +PILLEMVS REX
R.  +GODPINE ON IINT

**Bonnet type (BMC ii)**

Godric

(1)*

287 BMc 72. Corroded. 180°

287 (1)*  

**Other references:** in *BNJ* 7 (1910), p. 3, P.W.P. Carlyon-Britton in his 'Numismatic History of the Reigns of William I and II' includes three readings not known from traced coins: 'GODRIC ON HVNT', 'HVNT' and 'HVNTI'.

**Godwine**

(1)*

290 RJE (H024). Ex Martin (1980). Chipped and worn. 225°

290 (1)*  


291 (1)*  

*By a misalignment within a table, BMC, Norman Kings I, p. cciv refers to a coin of Siwate instead of this coin.*

295 SCBI Yorkshire Collections 1119, The Yorkshire Museum. 180°

295 (1)*  

296 SCBI Ashmolean 24. In Lockett 3834 erroneously transcribed as reading HVNTED. 315°

296 (1)*

*SCBI* Yorkshire Collections 1118, The Yorkshire Museum. Jubbergate hoard (1845). 135°

296 (1)*


296 (1)*
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Canopy type (BMC iii)

Godric

297 Aa O. +PILLEMV REX I-
Sinister canopy ball between V and R.
R. +GODRIC ON HVNTE
(1) Baldwin (1995), 1.29

Godwine

298 Aa O. +PILLEMII REX I-
Sinister canopy ball between upright and tail of R.
R. +GODPINE ON VNTE1
(1)* BM (1955). Ex Drabble 565 (Plate XVI), Lockett 904 (illustrated). 0° 1.02

Two Sceptres type (BMC iv)

Godric

299 Aa O. +PILLEM REX IINGLI
R. +GODRIC ON HIINTHEN
(1)* BMC 236. Ex Carlyon-Britton 1102, Plate IX, 2. See also VCH
Huntingdonshire, II, Plate opposite p. 123, 3. 90° 1.35
(2) Martin, March 1998. H69. Ex Doubleday 703. 315° (sic) 1.35
(3) Glendining, 11 October 1993, 272. 0° 1.30
(4) RJE (H041). Ex Elmore Jones 1301. 0° 1.10
(5) Lockett 3842. Ex Carlyon-Britton 698. See BNJ 7 (1910), Plate XVIII, 4. 0° 1.36

Other references: SCBI Yorkshire Collections M135, missing coin from Monkgate, York hoard (1851), reading ‘+PILLEM REX ANG’, not otherwise known, and ‘+GODRIC ON HVNTE’; Lloyd (1857), 45; 5 Montagu 71, Drabble 908.

Godwine

300 Aa O. +PILLEM REX ANGLO
R. +GODPINE ON HVNTE
(1) RJE (H059). Ex Baldwin (1991). 0° 1.31
(2)* RJE (H074). Ex Finn, List 3 (1994-5), 66. 0° 1.27
(3) Finn List 7 (1996), 115, (illustrated). 0° 1.10

301 Ab O. As above
R. +GODPINE ON HIIN
(1)* RJE (H066). Glendining, 11 October 1993, 273 (catalogued as ‘Godric’). 90° 1.36

Two Stars type (BMC v)

Godwine

302 Aa O. +PILLEM REX IIINIII
R. +GODPINE ON HITTEND
### THE MINT OF HUNTINGDON


Other references: Cuff 669, two coins: 'GODPINE ON HVT' and 'another'.

#### Sword type (*BMC vi*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Aa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1)* RJE (H055). Ex Morrison 52 (see also *BNJ* 7 (1910), p. 4). Wills 315. Doubleday 704, 180°. 1.32

(2) BM (1955). Ex Carlyon-Britton 1246 (see also *BNJ* 7 (1910), p. 4 and Plate XVIII, 5, and *VCH* Huntingdonshire II, Plate opposite p. 123, 4). Lockett 947 (illustrated). 90°. 1.28

#### Profile-Cross and Trefoils type (*BMC vii*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Aa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1)* RJE (H056). Ex Dangar 251 (pt). Doubleday 705. 270°. 1.40


Other references: Cuff 682, referred to in *BNJ* 7 (1910), p. 4 and described as reading '+IELFPNE ON H'.

#### PAXS type (*BMC viii*)

Here included under its conventional position as the last type of William I but in the view of the author more likely to have been the first type of William II. (*Ælfriic (ielfriic)*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Aa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1)* SCBI St Petersburg 35. Beaworth hoard (1833). Ex Brumell (1850) 154, Stroganov. SCBI states 'appears to be Huntingdon although it could be a contracted form of Hamtun (Northampton)'. 180°. 1.46

Other references: *BMC Norman Kings* I, p. ccxiv, cites Ælfriic, recorded as 'ÆLFRIC ON HVTI' in NC 4 (1904), p. 264.

#### Ælfriic (ielfriic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Aa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Glendining, 11 October 1993, 274. —°. 1.45

(2) Elmore Jones 1626 (illustrated). Ex Youde. —°. 1.45


(4) *BMC* 710. Beaworth hoard (1833). See *BNJ* 7 (1910), p. 4 and *VCH* Huntingdonshire II. Plate opposite p. 123. 5. 0°. 1.41
Other references: BCH p. 12, Beauchamp hoard (1833): ‘Elfwine, 6’; 2 Montagu 227 (pt), ‘IELFPINE ON HVT’. Carlyon-Britton also gives the following unconfirmed readings in BNJ 7 (1910) p. 4:
- EIELFPINE ON HV (HV ligulate)
- EIELFPINE ON HVN (VN ligulate) reading retrograde
- EIELFPINE ON HVN

WILLIAM II (1087-1100)

Profile type (BMC i)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>307</th>
<th>Aa</th>
<th>O.</th>
<th>+PILLELRREX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+SIPHTE ON HITTED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1)* BMC 17, Plate XXVIII, 18. Ex Carlyon-Britton 746. See also BNJ 1 (1910), p. 4 and Plate XVIII, 7 and VCH Huntingdonshire II, Plate opposite p. 123, 6. 270° 1.38

Other references: Carlyon-Britton 1278: ‘PILLELMR EX (MR ligulated), +SIPATE ON HNTED’.

Cross in Quatrefoil type (BMC ii)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>308</th>
<th>Aa</th>
<th>O.</th>
<th>+PILLELRREX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+IELFPINE ON HIIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1)* BM (1919). Ex Lawrence. See VCH Huntingdonshire II, Plate opposite p. 123, 7. 270° 1.38

Cross Voided type (BMC iii)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>310</th>
<th>Aa</th>
<th>O.</th>
<th>+PILLELRREX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>+SIPHT ON HI[N]TD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) BMC 97. Ex Christmas 209, Allen 314. See BNJ 7 (1910), p. 4 and Plate XVIII, 8. 180° 1.22

(2)* RJE (H031). Ex Bispham. Baldwin (1981). Broken, repaired and lacquered. 0° [1.06]

No coins indentified.

Other references: Carlyon-Britton in BNJ 7 (1910) p. 4, includes a coin reading ‘+IELFPINE ON HVN’ under ‘Type 4’, citing Spicer MS. BMC Norman Kings I, p. ccxiv cites a moneyer of that name from the Clark sale, lot 62, with the
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comment 'perhaps London'. Carlyon-Britton also cites +GODFINE ON HVT'D' from Spicer MS, but BMC Norman Kings, I, p. cccxv, suggests the coin offered at Sotheby, 25 January 1860, 110, may have been an error for William I type BMC vi, for which the reading is known. Finally, Carlyon-Britton cites a coin reading "SIPATE ON HTV" and illustrates the reverse (Plate XVIII, 9). The coin, which is in the Fitzwilliam Museum is of type BMC iv, see 312 below.

Cross Patée and Fleury type (BMC iv)

Siwate

311 Aa O. +PILLEMRE
Pellet above sinister shoulder. Crown centred below upright of E.
R. +SIPHTOE ON HIIT
(1)* RJE (H047). Ex Elmore Jones 1654. Baldwin (1986). 0° 1.41

312 Bc O. +PILLEMRE
Crown centred below E.
R. +SIPHTOE ON HIIT
(1)* Fitzwilliam Museum. See BNJ 7 (1910), Plate XVIII, 9, where reverse is illustrated and shows intact coin. See also under Cross Voided type above, 'Other references'. Broken into three parts with small fragment missing. 0° [1.38]

Cross Fleury and Piles type (BMC v)

No coins identified.

HENRY I (1100–1135)

Only the types for which there are actual or putative coins are listed, BMC types iv, vi, vii, viii, ix, x, xii and xv being omitted.

Annulets type (BMC i)

(Godric?)

313 Aa O. \[REX\]
C [O[N] NIH
Huntingdon (or Northampton)?
R. \[GODRIC ON H[V][\]
(1)* BNJ 68 (1998) p. 176, Plate 25, 156. Found at Santon Downham, Suffolk, possibly from Thetford by-pass spoil (1994). Cut half penny. 0° [0.54]

Profile-Cross Fleury type (BMC ii)

Godric

314 Aa O. +HENRI RIEX
R. +SEFINNL ON HIIT
(1)* SHM 23040. Halsarve, Nar, Gotland hoard (1942). See SCBI Reading/Stockholm 241. 0° 1.44

(Señor?)

315 Aa O. +HENRI RIEX
R. +SEFINNL ON HIIT
Pellet in centre of reverse.
142 THE MINT OF HUNTINGDON

(1)* SCBI Scottish Collections 230, Glasgow. See Andrew, NC4 1 (1901), p. 227 and Plate II. 9. Also BMC Norman Kings, I, p. ccxv, where Brooke considered the reading doubtful and the coin 'probably' of Southampton, and perhaps from an altered die. 90°

**PAX (BMC iii)**

Ælfwine (Ielfwine)

316 Aa O. +HENR I REI
R. +IElfPINE ON HV

(1)* RJE (H071). Metal detector find. Ex Spink (1992). 180°

**Full Face-Cross Fleury type (BMC x)**

Ælfwine (Ielfwine)

317 Aa O. "+H[N]RICVS RE[X]
R. +AL[-]NE:ON hVN'


Godwine

318 Aa O. ]HENR[ R. ]ODPINE [ ] hV


**Star in Lozenge Fleury type (BMC xiii)**

Ælfwine (Ielfwine)

319 Aa O. ]HENRICVS R:
R. +Æ[ ][]NE:ON h[V]NTE

(1) Lincoln Museum. Lincoln hoard (1971–2). 180°

Other references: Vosper offered a coin (List 110, November/December 1999, not illustrated) construed as reading ‘hVN—’ in BNJ 19 (1927–8), p. 97. Ex Baldwin (1902), Carlyon-Britton. 160°

1.30

**Pellets in Quatrefoil type (BMC xiv)**

Ælfwine (Ielfwine)

320 Aa O. [ __]RICVS RE +
R. [ELFPINE:ON:hV]

(1) SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1917, Norris Museum, St Ives. ‘Canterbury’ (= Bournemouth) hoard (1901)? See YCH Huntingdonshire, II, Plate opposite p. 123, 8 and BNJ 33 (1964), p. 169. 1.41
(2)* SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1916, Norris Museum, St Ives. ‘Canterbury’ (= Bournemouth) hoard (1901). This coin is construed as reading ‘hVN—’ in BNJ 19 (1927–8), p. 97. Ex Baldwin (1902), Carlyon-Britton. 160°
THE MINT OF HUNTINGDON

Derlig

321 Aa O. [ ]NIFICVS RE
R. +DERLIG:ON:hVNTED:
Heel of L touches R.

(1)* BMC 131. Watford hoard (1818). Ex Rashleigh 414, where transcribed as '+DERLIG:ON:hVNTAN'. Andrew in NC (1901), p. 227, gives the reading '+DERLIG:ON:hVNTFO' from the Watford find, possibly a misreading of this coin — but see below for a similar transcription of a coin from the 'Canterbury' (= Bournemouth) hoard (1901), 225°

(2) Glendining, 11 October 1993, 280 (pt). Chipped...

322 Be O. +HENRICVS RE
R. +DERLIG:ON:hVN |
R and L separate.

(1)* SCBI South-Eastern Museums 1915, Norris Museum, St Ives. 160°

Other references: Andrew in NC (1901), p. 227, gives the reading '+HENRICVS R', '+DERLIG:ON hV:F:' from the Carlyon-Britton collection. This is doubtless the same coin as Carlyon-Britton 1927 (pt), reading '+DERLIG:ON hV:F:', broken; BNJ 19 (1927–8), p. 97, '+h[ENR]ICVS RE', '+[D]ERLIG:ON:hVN [TFO]' from the 'Canterbury' (= Bournemouth) hoard (1901) and purportedly bought by Carlyon-Britton from Baldwin in 1902.

(-) (Wulfred)
BNJ 19 (1927–8), p. 97, cites a coin reading

O. +HENRICVS R
R. +PVLFRED:ON:hVN

from the 'Canterbury' (= Bournemouth) hoard (1901), acquired by Carlyon-Britton from Rollin and Feuardent in October 1901 and sold as lot 1377 (not illustrated). This coin has not been traced.

STEPHEN (1035–1054)

Watford type (BMC i)

(-) (Godmer)
NC 2 (1922), p. 72 Plate iii is of a coin reading

O. JNE R.
R. +GOIMER:ON\|N

from the South Kyme hoard (pre 1922), described as from the Lawrence collection. The attribution of this coin is uncertain and its whereabouts unknown.

Cross and Fleurs type (BMC iii)

Waltier

323 Aa O. +STIEFNER
R. +PALTIER:ON:hVN

(2) Ballingal collection. London Bridge hoard (c. 1850). Ex
The Mint of Huntingdon

Rashleigh 612, Carlyon-Britton 1483, Lockett 3940. See BNJ 35 (1966), p. 51, where described as 'uncertain mint but possibly Huntingdon'. Illustrated in Plate III, 70. Cut half penny. 0°

Profile-Cross and Piles type (BMC vi)

(Uncertain moneyer)

(324)

A coin from the Wicklewood hoard (1989), weighing 1.40 g has been suggested as possibly from Huntingdon, but the reverse legend cannot charitably be so construed.

Awbridge type (BMC vii)

(-)

(Derlig)

A coin was shown to the BM in 1995 and construed as reading

O. +STIEFNE
Double struck.
R. +DELING:ON:hVN
Double struck.

The whereabouts of this coin is unknown.

Godmer

325  Aa
O. +STIEFNE:
R. +GOD[MER]:ON hVN:

(1)*  BMC 194, Plate LV, 14. Ex Berghe 330, Brice and Montagu 307. In both sales the obverse reading is given as '+STIEFNE RE' and the reverse as '+GODPINE ON HVN'. See also VCH Huntingdonshire, II, Plate opposite p. 123, 9. 45° 1.48

326  Bc
O. +ST[E]:
R. +GOI[ ]ON hV[ ]T


(2)  Moscow. See BNJ 36 (1967), p. 91, Plate IV, 29. 45° 1.48

Waltier

327  Aa
O. +STIEFNE
R. +PALTEIR ON hVN

(1)*  RJE (H042), Ex Drabble 995, where attributed to London. Elmore Jones 1399, 315° 1.20

(2)  BM (1958). Ex Lockett 2963, illustrated. 45° 1.11

Other references: BMC 228 from the Awbridge hoard (1902) reading

O. [ ]NE:
R. [P]ALTIER[

is attributed by Brooke to 'Norwich?' but he was unaware of a moneyer Waltier also striking at Huntingdon. The attribution of this coin must await a specimen with a fuller reverse reading.

Grantley 1300, illustrated. Ex Reynolds 62 and interpreted as reading

O. +STIEFNE
R. +ACEBI:ON VN[]
was catalogued as ‘Huntingdon’. Harris (SCMB December 1984, p. 315, construes the moneyer as ASEBI. The illustration, however, appears to read P rather than B and the illegible portion of the legend between that letter and N has space for an initial cross and three or four other letters.

Abbreviations

Well-known auction sales are described by the vendor’s surname, followed by the lot number. Sales up to 1984 can be more specifically identified by referring to Harrington E. Manville and Terence J. Robertson, British Numismatic Catalogues, 1710–1984 (Oxford, 1986).

In addition to the conventional abbreviations used in the BNI, the following are employed in the catalogue of coins:

- Bergen: Historisk Museum, Bergen University, Norway.
- BM (year): Coins acquired by the British Museum, London, since publication of the latest relevant catalogue; with year of acquisition.
- Copenhagen: Nationalmuseet, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Hild.: Bror Emil Hildebrand, Anglosachsiska Mynt (Stockholm, 1881) and the systematic collection therein catalogued.
- Oslo: Universitetets Myntkabinett, Oslo, Norway.
- RJE (H—): Eaglen collection with acquisition number.
- St. Petersburg: State Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg, Russia.
- Schleswig: Archæologisches Landesmuseum, Schleswig, Germany.
- Stavanger: Arkeologisk Museum, Stavanger, Norway.
- Trondheim: Vitenskapsmuseet, Trondheim, Norway.
- Vienna: Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, Austria.
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