COIN-BROOCHES OF EDWARD THE CONFESSION AND WILLIAM I

GARETH WILLIAMS

Two very similar objects were sent separately to the British Museum in 2000 and 2001. Each was a coin of Edward the Confessor which had been gilded on the reverse, and had had a pin and catchplate attached to the obverse, the overall effect being to turn the coins into brooches, each of which displayed a form of stylised cross. Both coins were metal detector finds, and were sent to the British Museum for examination under the terms of the Treasure Act (1996). One, discovered near Winchester in August 2000, was a penny of the Expanding Cross type, of the moneyer Brand of Winchester. The other, discovered in the parish of Great Bedwyn, Wiltshire, was of the Sovereign type,\(^1\) of the moneyer ælfscige of London. Although single coin finds are not normally considered Treasure under the terms of the Act, single items of Anglo-Saxon jewellery normally are, unless they contain less than ten per cent of precious metal. Since the coins had been modified into brooches, they were considered as items of jewellery, and both were declared Treasure by HM coroners for the respective areas.

Photographs of a similar brooch, also utilising a coin of the Expanding Cross type, had been sent to the British Museum earlier in the year, and examining three such similar objects within a short period prompted a wider study. In 1990, Paul Robinson published a similar brooch found at Edington in Wiltshire, made from a penny of the Pyramids type, of the moneyer Sæbode (or possibly Sigebode) of Salisbury. In his publication of the brooch, he noted the existence of four other similar pieces, all made from coins of the later types of Edward the Confessor (1042–66) or the early types of William I (1066–87), and he discussed the five coins as a group.\(^2\) Since then, the number of recorded objects of this type and period has more than trebled, and although many of the brooches have been published individually, it seems worthwhile to publish the group as a whole.

Coin-brooches of similar construction are known from Anglo-Saxon England from the ninth-century onwards. At the time of writing, the Corpus of Early Medieval Coin Finds database records one of Beornwulf of Mercia, one of Edward the Elder, two of Æðelræd II and one of Harðacnut,\(^3\) and similar brooches are also known intermittently under William II and Henry I, but the cluster of eighteen examples from the third quarter of the eleventh century provides a more focussed group to study.

**Coin-brooches of Edward the Confessor and William I**

1 Provenance: Alfriston, Sussex.
Ruler/type: Edward the Confessor, Expanding Cross.
Mint: Gloucester.
Moneyer: Leofnoth.
Obverse: Illegible.
Reverse: \(+LEOFNOE\times YNGLE\times PIL\)
Gilded: Yes.
Visible face: Reverse.
Disposition: Not recorded.

Acknowledgements: I am grateful to Paul Robinson of Devizes Museum for useful discussion of, and references to, some of the finds; to Mark Blackburn of the Fitzwilliam Museum, Ian Piot of Chichester District Museum and John Clark of the Museum of London for providing photographs and information; and to Marion Archibald, Mark Blackburn, Barrie Cook, Paul Robinson and Susan Youngs for commenting on the paper in draft. Any mistakes which remain are, as ever, my own.

\(^1\) This type is known variously as Sovereign, Sovereign/Martlets and Sovereign/Eagles. I use the simpler Sovereign, since the representations of the birds in the quarters of the reverse cross do not permit a great degree of ornithological accuracy. Indeed, on the basis of this particular example, the birds somewhat resemble pelicans, but I do not intend to propose renaming the type Sovereign/Pelicans.

\(^2\) P. Robinson, 'Two Medieval Coin Brooches from Wiltshire', Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine 83 (1990), 208–10.

Comments: Only part of the brooch fitting remains. This is a copper alloy catchplate, attached to the coin by two copper alloy rivets. The coin was pierced for two further rivets, and it seems likely by comparison with other brooches in the group that these attached a separate support for a hinged pin, which would presumably also have been made of copper alloy. The brooch was cracked prior to its discovery.


Illustration: In Rudling, 'A Saxon Coin-brooch'.

2 Provenance: Trowbridge, Wiltshire.

Rules/ type: Edward the Confessor, Expanding Cross.

Mint: London.

Moneyer: Eadwig?

Obverse: +EDP[ ]/ R.DR[ ]X

Reverse: +EPHONLVNDV[N][E]

Gilded: Yes.

Visible face: Reverse.

Disposition: Trowbridge Museum.

Comments: Silver pin fastened to the wide end of a tapering silver plate extending across the whole width of the coin, secured by a rivet at each end. A catch plate was attached with the same rivet at the narrow end of the tapering plate, but only the base of this survives. The moneyer’s name is slightly problematic. The moneyer Ewi or Ewi appears at London on a number of coins of Edward and William I. In particular, there are at least three different reverse dies in his name in the Expanding Cross type, including this one, the next item in this list, and a die represented by BMC ii, p. 407, no. 925, and by SCBI 1: 870, although the die was modified at some point, since the BM example has pellets in two arms of the cross, while the example in the Fitzwilliam does not. Each of the reverse dies has peculiarities in the inscription, which do not encourage confidence in the accuracy of the name form. Michael Metcalf accepts the name as it stands, as Ewi or Epi.5 However, Olof von Feilitzen suggested that the name could represent an otherwise unrecorded name-form Eawig, or a blundered or curtailed version of Eadwig, a known London moneyer under Edward and both William I and II.6 And the BM example is listed as Eadwig in the trays. BMC suggests the further possibility that it might represent Eadwine (also a known London moneyer under Edward and William) which would fit with the form EPII on the next coin in this list. Freeman allows for the possibility that it could represent either Eadwig or Eadwine, but notes that the existence of a moneyer at Hertford using forms of “EPI” to the exclusion of Eadwig or Eadwine, and therefore suggests that this moneyer should perhaps be regarded as distinct from both Eadwig and Eadwine.6 Whatever the name represents, it is notable that within this small group of brooches, two utilised coins of the same moneyer and the same type.


Illustration: In Robinson, ‘Coins, Jetons and Tokens’.

3 Provenance: Unrecorded.

Rules/ type: Edward the Confessor, Expanding Cross.

Mint: London.

Moneyer: Eadwig?

Obverse: +EDP[ ]/ R.DR[ ]X

Reverse: +EPHONLVNDV[ ][E]

Gilded: Yes.

Visible face: Reverse.

Disposition: Not recorded.

Comments: Photos sent to BM by Mr P.D. Spencer of The Searcher magazine, in March 2000. Both the pin attachment and the catchplate are missing, with only the bases for each of these surviving. Both pin and catchplate were attached to two separate plates, each of which was riveted to the coin. For the moneyer’s name, see previous entry.


Illustration: In Spencer, ‘Valuation Desk’.


| 4 | Provenance: | Walpole St Peter, Norfolk. |
|   | Ruler/type: | Edward the Confessor, Expanding Cross. |
|   | Mint: | London. |
|   | Moneyer: | Godwine. |
|   | Obverse: | +EDP/REX |
|   | Reverse: | +GODP/LEONLVNDENI |
|   | Gilded: | No. |
|   | Visible face: | Reverse. |
|   | Disposition: | Not recorded. |
|   | Comments: | The coin is broken into two fragments. A single straight bar with catchplate running across the whole diameter of the coin was attached with two rivets, set in a short distance from either end. The pin also survives, but the mechanism for attaching it to the plate is broken. Material of pin and plate are not recorded. |
|   | Illustration: | *BNJ* 64, PI. 20, no. 226, and on *EMC* website. |

| 5 | Provenance: | Near Winchester. |
|   | Ruler/type: | Edward the Confessor, Expanding Cross. |
|   | Mint: | Winchester. |
|   | Moneyer: | Brand. |
|   | Obverse: | [+EDDRE/XANG | [+BRAND|ON|PINES[T|] |
|   | Reverse: | Yes. |
|   | Gilded: | Reverse. |
|   | Visible face: | Winchester Museums Service. |
|   | Disposition: | Winchester Museums Service. |
|   | Comments: | The coin was struck from the same dies as BM 1998, 11-1, 458, from the Appledore hoard. The brooch attachment is a hinged pin and a separate catchplate, both of which appear to be made of silver, and each of which has a base plate attached to the coin with two rivets. |
|   | References: | – |
|   | Illustration: | Plate 5, 1. |

| 6 | Provenance: | Unrecorded. |
|   | Ruler/type: | Edward the Confessor, Pointed Helmet. |
|   | Mint: | Chester. |
|   | Moneyer: | Alcsige? |
|   | Obverse: | +E | |
|   | Reverse: | +[E]L|ONL|E||CC |
|   | Gilded: | Yes. |
|   | Visible face: | Reverse. |
|   | Disposition: | Winchester Museums Service. |
|   | Comments: | A large fragment of the brooch is missing, leaving around two thirds of the coin. The brooch fitting had separate attachments for the hinged pin and catchplate, each probably mounted with two rivets, but the catchplate fitting was attached to the missing fragment. The hinged attachment for the pin survives, and is made of silver, but the pin itself has been lost. |
|   | References: | Shown at the BM, June 1990. |
|   | Illustration: | Plate 5, 2. This illustration is taken from a polaroid and is therefore not of the highest quality. |

| 7 | Provenance: | Winchester, Hampshire. |
|   | Ruler/type: | Edward the Confessor, Pointed Helmet. |
|   | Mint: | Uncertain, possibly Winchester. |
|   | Moneyer: | Alfswine. |
|   | Obverse: | [JED] [OKE] |
|   | Reverse: | +[E] [PINEON[P] | |
|   | Gilded: | Yes. |
|   | Visible face: | Reverse. |
|   | Disposition: | Winchester Museums Service. |
|   | Comments: | The brooch fittings are made of silver, and are of the standard two-piece variety, with the hinge attachment and the catchplate each attached to the coin with two rivets. Only the fragment of the pin within the hinge attachment has survived. The mint is uncertain, as it is partially obscured by one of the rivets, and the quality of the surviving photograph is poor. |
|   | References: | Shown at the BM, 15.2.1994. |
|   | Illustration: | Plate 5, 3. This illustration is taken from a polaroid and is therefore not of the highest quality. |
Provenance: Hose, Leicestershire.
Ruler/ type: Edward the Confessor, Pointed Helmet.
Mint: Winchester.
Moneyer: Godwine.
Obverse: +EDPER./DREX
Reverse: +GODPINEONPI[ ]:
Gilded: No.
Visible face: Reverse.
Disposition: Unrecorded.
Comments: The brooch attachment appears to have been a single bar attached by two rivets, slightly inset from either end, although only the rivets themselves, which appear to be made of silver, have survived. The finder noted that there was a lump of green corrosion (possibly copper) on the obverse which disintegrated during cleaning, and Blackburn and Bonser surmise that this may indicate that the pin and mount were made of bronze rather than silver.

Illustration: In Blackburn and Bonser, 'Single Finds', Pl. 2, no. 31 and on EMC website.

9 Provenance: Unrecorded.
Ruler/ type: Edward the Confessor, Pointed Helmet, AAAA variety (N826/1).
Mint: Oxford.
Moneyer: Hergod.
Obverse: +EADV/ERDR[GA]EX
Reverse: +H/ERGODONOX:ENE:
Gilded: Yes.
Visible face: Reverse.
Comments: The sale catalogue entry for this object is misleading on several accounts. It suggests that it is an imitation coin, and that the reverse inscription is a blundered copy of a Taunton coin, presumably on the basis that the reverse design variety is only recorded by North for Taunton, whereas this is a genuine, perfectly legible and literate coin of Oxford. Noting that the coin has been cracked and repaired, the catalogue suggests that this is a ‘contemporary Saxon’ repair, although undertaken with a modern adhesive. The brooch fitting has a separate hinged pin and catchplate, both made of silver, and each attached to the coin with two rivets. This variety of the Pointed Helmet type is extremely rare, with only three other examples recorded, although mules using the same obverse dies are also known. 

References: Bonhams Sale Catalogue, 12 September 1996, lot 231.
Illustration: Plate 5, 4 and 7.

10 Provenance: Hadstock, Essex.
Ruler/ type: Edward the Confessor, Sovereign.
Mint: Cambridge.
Moneyer: Badward.
Obverse: EDPARD R ANGLO
Reverse: +EADPA[R]NCRANT
Gilded: Yes.
Visible face: Reverse.
Disposition: Not recorded.
Comments: Traces of mounting are recorded on the obverse, but the details of these are not recorded.
Illustration: Plate 42, 83.

11 Provenance: Avebury, Wiltshire.
Ruler/ type: Edward the Confessor, Sovereign.
Mint: Exeter.
Moneyer: Lifinc.
Obverse: Not recorded.
Reverse: +LIUNUCONEXECUTE
Gilded: Yes.
Visible face: Reverse.
Disposition: Not recorded.

---

2 A more detailed discussion of this variety and its mules is to be published by Mark Blackburn.
COIN-BROOCHES OF EDWARD THE CONFESSOR AND WILLIAM I

Comments: Found in garden near Avebury, Wiltshire and shown briefly to Paul Robinson at Devizes Museum in 1991. The present whereabouts of the coin are unknown. Details of the type and material of the brooch fitting are not recorded.

References: Devizes Museum Day Book 1662.

Illustration: Not available.

12 Provenance: Great Bedwyn, Wiltshire.
Ruler/ type: Edward the Confessor, Sovereign.
Mint: London.
Moneyer: Elfsige.
Obverse: __REXAN[___]
Reverse: +ELFSIEONLV[DJ][E];
Gilded: Yes.
Visible face: Reverse.
Disposition: British Museum, in process of acquisition.
Comments: The brooch attachments are of the typical hinged pin and separate catchplate type, both apparently made of silver. Each was attached to the coin with two rivets. The pin itself is missing, although the other attachments remain.

References: -
Illustration: Pl. 5, 5.

13 Provenance: Edington, Wiltshire.
Ruler/ type: Edward the Confessor, Pyramids.
Mint: London.
Moneyer: Saebode or Sigebode.
Obverse: +EADPARDREX[ ]
Reverse: +SIEBO[ON]ERS[ ]
Gilded: Yes.
Visible face: Reverse.
Disposition: Devizes Museum.
Comments: The brooch attachments have a separate pin fitting and catchplate, both made of silver. The pin fitting and the catchplate were attached to the coin with two rivets each, but the fittings are longer and thinner, and the rivets smaller, than on most of the comparable fittings. Another distinction is that instead of the end of the pin looping around a bar supported between two uprights, the pin fitting is a single plate, pierced so that the pin could be looped through. The pin itself is missing, as is part of the catchplate.

Illustration: In Robinson, 'Two Medieval Coin-brooches' and on EMC website.

Ruler/ type: William I, Profile/ Cross Fleury.
Mint: London.
Moneyer: Wulfgar.
Obverse: [__] [I] [M] [V] [S] [I]
Reverse: +PV[O] [G] [A]R [O] [N] [L] [V] [D] [A] [O]
Gilded: No.
Visible face: Reverse.
Disposition: Not recorded.
Comments: Discovered in the spoil from excavations at Billingsgate, and shown at the Museum of London. The brooch attachments are a separate hinged pin and catchplate, both made of copper. Unlike most of the other comparable fittings, both the pin attachment and the catchplate appear to have been soldered to the coin rather than riveted.

Illustration: In Stott, 'Saxon and Norman Coins', p. 316, and on EMC website.

15 Provenance: Chichester, West Sussex.
Ruler/ type: William I, Bonnet.
Mint: Oxford.
Moneyer: Æthelwine.
Obverse: Illegible.
Reverse: [+]IEGLP[N]ONOXEN
Gilded: Yes.
Visible face: Reverse.
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Disposition: Chichester District Museum.

Comments: The brooch attachments are a separate hinged pin and catchplate, both made of silver, each of which is attached to the coin with two rivets. The catchplate has survived intact, as has the pin, but the hinge attachment has been lost. The brooch was discovered during excavations in the north-west quadrant of Chichester in 1974. The coin itself has been repaired and conserved, and the repairs obscure some detail on the obverse. It appears that the obverse may have been gilded, although more lightly than the reverse, but this colouration may be a by-product of the conservation process.


Illustration: Not available.

16 Provenance: West Walton.
Ruler/ type: William I, Canopy.
Mint: Thetford.
Moneyer: Probably Osbeorn or Orbeorn (Authbjorn).
Obverse: illegible.
Reverse: [\ ];RII[ ];OTFO
Gilded: No.
Visible face: Reverse.
Disposition: Not recorded.
Comments: The coin itself is fragmentary, and all that is visible of the brooch attachment is the remains of a copper alloy mount riveted through the centre of the coin, and running across the diameter of the coin. It would appear from this that the brooch attachment was of the type with a hinged pin and catchplate attached to a single bar.

Illustration: On EMC website.

17 Provenance: Unrecorded.
Ruler/ type: William I, Two Sceptres.
Mint: Winchester.
Moneyer: Godwine.
Obverse: +PI [ ];LEM [ ];N
Reverse: +GODPINEOPINCS
Gilded: Yes.
Visible face: Reverse.
Disposition: Fitzwilliam Museum.
Comments: Struck from the same dies as SCBI 12, 76. The coin itself is chipped. The brooch fastening, made of silver, is of the type with separate hinged pin and catchplate, each attached with two silver rivets. Part of the pin attachment survives, but the pin is lost, as is the catchplate, although one surviving rivet and a hole for the other show where it was attached.

Illustration: Plate 5, 6.

18 Provenance: Marlowe, Canterbury.
Mint: Sandwich.
Moneyer: Ælfgaet.
Obverse: Not recorded.
Reverse: +ÆLFGTSONSANDI
Gilded: Yes.
Visible face: Reverse.
Disposition: Unrecorded.
Comments: Found in excavations at Marlowe car park, Canterbury. The brooch fittings are lost, although scrape marks show where they were attached. Since there are scrape marks on either side of the king's head, this implies that the fitting was of a two-part type, with separate mounts for hinged pin and catchplate. However, since no rivets are recorded, it seems likely that these were soldered on, contrary to the normal pattern.


Illustration: No illustration available.
Another possible example, found at West Rudham in Norfolk, is recorded in the Coin Register for 1996, no. 268 (EMC 1996.0268). The coin itself is of indeterminate date, and has tentatively been assigned to the eleventh century. It has been made into a brooch by attaching a copper alloy bar, held in place by a single rivet through the centre. Unlike the other coin-brooches under discussion, the coin had a bronze plate clamped across the front. The fragmentary condition of the object makes the original size and shape of this plate unclear, but it certainly covered a substantial portion of the coin. The appearance of the brooch would thus have been very different from the main group under discussion, and since the dating is also imprecise, it seems best to regard it as distinct from the main group.

Another brooch which may well be closely related to, but distinct from, the main group is one from the 1989 Vintry excavations in London. Two other similar brooches were found in the Vintry excavations, both based on coin types of Henry I, but the one of interest here is one which imitates the Expanding Cross type of Edward the Confessor, the type most heavily represented in the group under discussion here. Unlike the main group, which all utilise genuine coins, the brooch is a piece of brassy coloured base metal, with the design pressed separately into each side from the same reverse die or mould. The design copies the reverse of an Expanding Cross penny of the moneymayer Othgrim (Auðgrim) of Lincoln, but it is clear from the crude letters and blundered legend that this is not the product of an official die. The legend reads: +ODRIWONLINEOL. Traces of solder show where the brooch fittings were attached, and the brooch may have been silvered or tinned, which would have enhanced its resemblance to a genuine coin, although the brassy metal of the brooch itself may imitate the gilded finish of the genuine coin-brooches. It seems reasonable to interpret this as a cheaper version of the main type of brooch under discussion, apparently produced at the time when the greatest quantity of these brooches was produced, and presumably responding to whatever stimulated the growth of this particular fashion in brooches. The brooches using blundered coins of ‘EPI’ of London (nos. 2 and 3) may perhaps fit between the Vintry brooch, with its pseudo coin, and those which utilise coins struck from official dies.

The Corpus of Early Medieval Coin Finds database also records a number of coins from this period which are pierced for suspension. Once again there appears to be a higher concentration of these in the reigns of Edward and William than in the Anglo-Saxon and Norman periods as a whole. However, none of these have any recorded signs of gilding, the piercings show little stylistic unity, and in most cases there is nothing to indicate which side would have been visible. The author therefore has no intention of discussing them in detail, but would merely note their existence as another form of coin jewellery prevalent at the same time.

Fabric and fittings

Of the eighteen examples listed, fourteen are gilded and four are not, suggesting that gilding was more common than not, which reverses the situation as noted by Robinson in 1993. Gilding is characteristically limited to the display side, although it often extends over the edges of the brooch, while the find from Chichester may possibly have been gilded on both sides. The gilding often extends over the rivet heads, indicating that the gilding was normally applied after the coin had already been transformed into a brooch. Chronologically there is a greater tendency for the brooches to be gilded in the earlier types and not in the later types. However, the numbers are too small to draw firm statistical conclusions, and all that we can say with any certainty is that both gilded and ungilded brooches were produced throughout the period as a whole. It may possibly be significant that all but one of the finds from south of the Thames were gilded, while all but one of the finds from north of the Thames were ungilded, but this may also be reading too much into too little evidence. The relationship between mint and gilding is completely inconclusive, since both London and Winchester have both gilded and ungilded examples.

---

8 Full publication of the three coin-brooches, together with other numismatic material from Vintry, is awaited. The information here is based on information from Marion Archibald, for which the author is grateful.
9 Robinson, 'Coins, notes and jetons', as in reference to Trowbridge brooch (no. 2).
All the brooch fittings which survive combined a simple pin with a curved catchplate. They fall into two main categories. These do not, however, support a clear pattern either chronologically or geographically. One type (nos 4, 8, 16) has a single baseplate, usually attached to the coin with two rivets, with a hinged pin attachment at one end and the catchplate at the other (Fig. 1a and Pl. 5, 7). The other (nos 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17), which is more common, has a hinged pin at one edge of the coin, and the catchplate diametrically opposite, with each of the fittings normally attached with two rivets (Fig. 1b). Within this type there appears to be a distinction between hinge attachments in which the support for the hinge is made of a single piece of metal and those in which it is made of two, but too few details have been recorded to make statistical comparisons possible. A variant of this form, seen only on the brooch from Edington (no. 13), has a single pierced plate to hold the pin, rather than a bar between two uprights (Fig. 1c). Where the material of the fittings is recorded, the majority appear to be silver (nos 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 15, 17), but fittings of bronze or copper (nos. 1, 8, 14, 16) do not seem to have been particularly unusual.

**Chronological and geographical distribution**

It is generally accepted that there was a substantial recoinage every few years in late Anglo-Saxon and Norman England, and that a major purpose of this was to increase royal revenue through the king's share of the income of individual moneys, although opinions differ on exactly how this system functioned, the extent to which it was regular, and the extent to which individual coin types can be precisely dated. It is not unlikely, given the frequent recoinage, that the coins were current when they were used for brooches. However, the existence of a number of multi-type hoards of the third quarter of the eleventh century must act as a warning against assuming that all coins were melted down when they were no longer current. One might also argue that, assuming the existence of a premium on the exchange of obsolete and current coin, it would make sense to make brooches from obsolete coins rather than current ones.

In either case, the coin types used ranged from the early 1050s to the mid-1070s, and it seems reasonable to assume that all the brooches were manufactured in the period c. 1050–75, or perhaps a little later. Within that period, it is notable that twelve of the recorded examples date from the first three types represented and five of them from a single type (see Fig. 2). Once again, it would be dangerous to exclude the possibility that this simply reflects chance survival, but within the small total group, this concentration appears significant. If this is a genuine concentration within the broader group, it may reflect the adoption of this style of jewellery in reasonably large quantities in the early to mid-1050s, and the continuation of the style on a smaller scale for the next twenty years or so.

---

10 For discussion of this issue, see I. Stewart, 'Coinage and Recoinage after Edgar's Reform' in *Studies in Late Anglo-Saxon Coinage*, edited by K. Jonsson, *Numismatiska Meddelanden* 35 (1990), pp. 455–85, and the further references given there.
Of the fourteen recorded provenances, four came from Wiltshire, two each from Hampshire, Norfolk and Sussex, and one each from Essex, Kent, Leicestershire and London. A total of five brooches utilised coins of London moneyers, three (possibly four) used coins of Winchester, two of Oxford, and one each of Cambridge, Chester, Exeter, Gloucester, Sandwich, Salisbury and Thetford. Since all of the Wiltshire finds were recorded by one museum curator, the apparent prevalence of finds from that area may reflect success in encouraging people to report finds, or the curator's numismatic interests, rather than a particular local trend in jewellery. The overall spread of objects of this type suggests that coin-brooches were in use across much of England, at least into the Midlands. It is interesting to note that there are as yet no recorded finds from either Lincolnshire or north of the Humber, nor do any of the brooches utilise genuine coins of Lincoln or York, despite the fact that both were major mints, and both Lincolnshire and Yorkshire see a significant number of reported finds in general. However, one must once again be cautious about drawing conclusions on the basis of such limited evidence.

Robinson noted that the brooch from Edington (no. 13 above) was made from a coin struck by a Salisbury moneyer, and inferred from this that the brooch was made by a goldsmith working in south Wiltshire. He also noted a parallel with another coin of the Expanding Cross type found at Aldbourne in Wiltshire. This had been gilded and pierced for use as a pendant, possibly for use in a larger piece of jewellery, and also involved a local coin, since that brooch was made from a coin struck by the Malmesbury moneyer Baldwina. From this he inferred a second goldsmith producing coin-jewellery in north Wiltshire. However, correlation between mint and findspot is not typical of the group as a whole. Apart from the Edington brooch, only three of the brooches were certainly made from local coins: the brooch from Billingsgate (no. 14) used a London penny, the West Walton (Norfolk) brooch (no. 16) used a penny of Thetford and the brooch from near Winchester (no. 5) used a Winchester penny. A second find from Winchester (no. 7) may also have used a Winchester penny but the reading of the mint inscription is uncertain, and the author has

---

11 The Vintry brooch used an irregular die in the name of a genuine Lincoln moneyer, but since this was irregular, there is no guarantee that it was actually produced in Lincoln.

been unable to match the dies. A slightly less local coin was used for the Avebury brooch (no. 11), but this can be interpreted at least as a 'regional' coin, since coins of Exeter are common in Wiltshire. The find (no. 10) from Hadstock (Essex) can also be interpreted as a 'regional' coin, since the brooch incorporated a coin from Cambridge. The find from Marlowe, Canterbury (no. 18), can also be broadly interpreted as a local find, since it used a coin of Sandwich, although Canterbury itself was both the most local mint and the dominant mint for the surrounding area. Apart from the finds using local coins, it is notable that altogether there were five brooches using London coins and three (or possibly four) using Winchester coins. Thus the overall pattern includes a substantial proportion of coins from major mints, a slightly smaller proportion of coins from mints comparatively local to where the brooches were deposited, and a smaller proportion with no correlation, or no recorded provenance. This broadly reflects the circulation of currency as a whole, with a predominance of coins from major mints, and a lesser tendency towards the use of fairly local coins, but some circulation right across the country. The only brooch which goes against the general trend of the currency is the one from Alfriston, Sussex (no. 1), which used a coin of Gloucester, which was a minor mint some distance away, and which runs contrary to the trend of an east to west drift identified by Metcalf. However, a single coin going against the trend is not particularly problematic, and it seems reasonable to assume that in general the coins selected for use in the brooches reflected the currency as a whole.

The minor variations in construction technique suggest a lack of centralised standardisation, and, considering this together with the geographical distribution, it is probable, although not susceptible to proof, that the brooches were independently produced around the country. The one piece of evidence which might seem to run contrary to this is the existence of two brooches (nos. 2 and 3), both gilded, using coins of the same type issued by the same, comparatively rare moneyer. This might point to them being produced in the same workshop, although it should be noted that the two brooches have different types of brooch fittings, which argues against mass production. However, as the coins were not struck from the same dies, and were presumably therefore issued a short period apart, it is also possible that the brooches were made at different times, in which case the minor difference in the type of brooch fitting may be less significant. It is even possible, given the assumption that the role of moneyer was sometimes undertaken by individuals who also worked as goldsmiths or silversmiths, that the moneyer 'EPI' was responsible for the construction of the brooches as well as the original coins. Again, however, this is a hypothesis which is not susceptible to proof.

**Appearance and function**

There is nothing in the form of the brooches to indicate whether they were intended to be worn by men or women or both. Given both the small size of the coins themselves and of the brooch fittings, it seems likely that their purpose was decorative or symbolic rather than functional, as they would probably have been too lightweight to have been effective in fastening clothes. In the event that their purpose was symbolic, they should perhaps be regarded as badges rather than brooches, but the term brooch has been used throughout this article to avoid confusion, since such items have traditionally been referred to as coin-brooches. It is immediately striking that all the recorded examples from this particular period show the reverse, and that the reverse design of all the coins features some sort of cross as the main feature. It may or may not be significant that, although the style of brooch straddles the Norman Conquest, no example has yet been found which utilises a coin of Harold II, the one coin type from this period which does not feature a cross in the reverse design.

---

13 Paul Robinson, *pers. comm.*
14 For general patterns of circulation in this period, see Metcalf, *Atlas*, as in n. 4, *passim*.
15 Both the brooch from Hose (no. 8) and the unprovenanced brooch (no. 16) were issued in the name of Godwine of Winchester, and it is just conceivable that the same individual may have been involved in both cases. However, since no coins were issued in the name of Godwine in the last types of Edward or the earliest types of William, and since the name itself is a common one, it is more likely that two different moneyers of the same name were involved, although there may have been some form of familial relationship.
The cross obviously suggests a link with Christianity, and Robinson notes a broader tendency to reflect Christianity in Anglo-Saxon coin-related jewellery, but it is difficult to see a link between this group of brooches and any particular movement or religious change within the English Church. It is true that the concentration of brooches using the Expanding Cross type coincides with the advancement of the Norman Robert of Jumièges to the archbishopric of Canterbury, and of another Norman, the royal clerk William, to replace him at London, and that this style of brooch continued to be produced after the Norman Conquest. However, although Edward’s preference of Norman churchmen is documented in contemporary accounts, there is nothing in the written sources to suggest that this was linked with any major changes either in the patronage or the ecclesiastical practices of the English Church.

The apparent popularity of this type of jewellery in the early 1050s might possibly also be linked with some sort of political symbolism. That period saw major conflicts between Edward himself, a faction of Norman ‘favourites’ and the powerful houses of Godwine of Wessex and Leofric of Mercia. However, it is hard to see how any of the political factions of the early 1050s could have inspired a fashion which continued after the Norman favourites were expelled, Edward himself died, and the power of both Wessex and Mercia were crushed in the aftermath of the Norman Conquest, unless the use of such brooches or badges began as an expression of political affiliation but continued purely as a fashion. Furthermore, the symbolism of the cross is strongly associated with Christianity, but not obviously with any of the political factions, and so while the possibility of political symbolism should not be ignored, it can probably be discounted. It therefore remains unclear whether the particular popularity of this type of coin-brooch c. 1050–75 simply reflects a temporary fashion in religious jewellery, or whether it provides evidence for an otherwise unrecorded religious movement or activity of indeterminate nature.

KEY TO PLATE

1. Edward the Confessor, Expanding Cross, Brand of Winchester, © Trustees of the British Museum.
2. Edward the Confessor, Pointed Helmet, probably Alcsige of Chester, © Trustees of the British Museum.
3. Edward the Confessor, Pointed Helmet, Elfwine, possibly of Winchester, © Trustees of the British Museum.
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