

THE MINT OF AYLESBURY

WILLIAM N. CLARKE AND DAVID SYMONS

THIS article has been prompted by the acquisition by one of the authors (WNC) of a previously unrecorded coin of Aylesbury (see below, Corpus no. 10.5). However, rather than simply publishing this coin in isolation, it seemed an opportune moment to re-assess the activity of the mint and to assemble a corpus of the known coins.

*Ægelesburh*¹ is a town in Buckinghamshire, about seventeen miles south-east of the county town of Buckingham. It was recorded as one of the towns captured in 571 by Cuthwulf, the brother of Ceawlin of Wessex.² Little is known of its earlier history, but it must have become the site of a significant market since *Domesday Book* assesses the tolls at £25 in the time of Edward the Confessor, although this had fallen to £10 at the time of the survey.

The number of surviving coins is small. Only twenty-eight have been traced in the course of this study,³ that total breaking down as follows –

Æthelred II	CRVX (c.991–97)	4
Cnut	Quatrefoil (c.1017–23)	8
Edward the Confessor	Radiate/Small Cross (c.1044–46)	9
	Trefoil Quadrilateral (c.1046–48)	2
	Pointed Helmet (c.1053–56)	1
	Hammer Cross (c.1059–62)	2
	Facing Bust (c.1062–65)	2

No coins of the mint have been recorded in the successive issues of ‘Coin Register’ that have appeared in this *Journal* since 1987, nor have any been recorded in either the *Early Medieval Corpus of Coin Finds*⁴ or in the database of the Portable Antiquities Scheme.⁵

As these numbers suggest, Aylesbury seems to have made a comparatively minor contribution to the Late Saxon coinage pool. Basing his calculations on a total of some 44,350 English coins, Petersson estimated that, in each issue for which its coins were known, Aylesbury was responsible for only 0.1% or 0.2% of the recorded coins of the issue, except in Radiate/Small Cross when the figure rose to 0.7% (the total probably being inflated by a parcel of coins reaching Scandinavia, as we will argue below).⁶ Petersson also listed the mints represented in his study in order of the number of their coins that he had recorded: Aylesbury could manage only sixty-ninth place (based on the eighteen coins recorded by Petersson), below even

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank Professor Kenneth Jonsson, for telling us of the coins from the Torlarp and Ransgarve hoards, and for providing photographs of all the coins in Stockholm; Jens Christian Moesgaard, for checking the coins in Copenhagen on our behalf; Tuuka Talvio, for providing photographs of the coin in Helsinki; Lars Thor and Bertil Olsson for providing photographs of the coin in Växjö; Gareth Williams, for information on the coins in the British Museum, and for providing photographs of them; Elina Screen, for checking her records of finds in Norway for us; Stewart Lyon, for information on the dies of the Quatrefoil coins and for pointing out the London-Aylesbury die link published below. Thanks are also due to Marion Archibald, Edward Baldwin, Bill Lean, Spink and Son Ltd., Bonhams, and Mrs Dale Tatro of Classical Numismatic Group for help, advice or permission to reproduce images from sales catalogues. We are particularly grateful to Professor Jonsson, Stewart Lyon and Hugh Pagan for reading a draft of this paper and for making many helpful suggestions that greatly improved it; any sins of omission and commission that remain must be laid at our doors.

¹ ‘Ægel’s fortified place’ (Maver and Stenton 1925, 145).

² Garmonsway 1972, 18–19, *sub anno* 571.

³ Twenty-three of these are illustrated on Pl. 2; photographs of the other five will be found in the relevant Copenhagen *Sylloge* volumes (details in the Corpus, below).

⁴ <http://www-cm.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/coins>

⁵ <http://www.findsdatabase.org.uk>

⁶ Petersson 1990, 353, Table V.

such rare mints as Cadbury (sixty-seventh) and Langport (sixty-eighth). Coins of the two other mints known from Buckinghamshire are similarly scarce – in Petersson's list Buckingham, the county town, could manage only sixtieth place (with forty-two coins), while Newport Pagnell came in at eighty-second (just five coins).⁷ In fact, Buckinghamshire, with just sixty-five coins listed, ranked thirty-second out of thirty-three counties, just ahead of Cornwall with forty-four coins.⁸

TABLE 1. Coins of the Aylesbury mint by moneyer and type (numbers indicate the number of coins known for each moneyer/type combination).

	<i>Ælfgar</i>	<i>Leofstan</i>	<i>Ælfweard</i>	<i>Æthelwine</i>	<i>Eadric</i>	<i>Eadweard</i>	<i>Leofwine</i>	<i>Wulfrad</i>
<i>True Crux</i>	2							
<i>Transitional Crux</i>		2						
<i>Long Cross</i>								
<i>Helmet</i>								
<i>Last Small Cross</i>								
<i>Quatrefoil</i>			3	3	1	1		
<i>Pointed Helmet</i>								
<i>Short Cross</i>								
<i>Harold I / Harthacnut</i>								
<i>PACX</i>								
<i>Radiate / Small Cross</i>							9	
<i>Trefoil Quadrilateral</i>							2	
<i>Short Cross</i>								
<i>Expanding Cross</i>								
<i>Pointed Helmet</i>								1
<i>Sovereign</i>								
<i>Hammer Cross</i>								2
<i>Bust Facing</i>								2
<i>Pyramids</i>								

Table 1 sets out our current evidence for the Aylesbury mint. One must obviously be careful of drawing too firm conclusions from such skimpy evidence. For example, it looks likely that we have two moneyers in Crux, with one apparently following the other, since *Ælfgar* is known from two true Crux coins and *Leofstan* from two of the late Transitional Crux variety. However, it is possible that they actually worked simultaneously and that the coins to demonstrate this have not yet been discovered. It is interesting to note though that the apparent situation at Aylesbury exactly parallels that at Buckingham, where *Tunulf* strikes true Crux and *Sibwine* Transitional Crux coins.

After an approximately twenty year gap, there are no less than four moneyers known from the Quatrefoil issue, then another break of about twenty years, and finally there appears to be one moneyer at a time working at Aylesbury for much of the Confessor's reign, with *Wulfrad* succeeding *Leofwine* somewhere around 1050.

We may note that the names of the Aylesbury moneyers are uniformly Old English, unless a Scandinavian or Continental name is hiding behind a thoroughly anglicised form. When considering the moneyers at any mint it is also interesting to see whether any possible evidence can be teased out for hereditary moneying.⁹ However, there should probably be a presumption against it at Aylesbury given the episodic nature of minting there. Further, the name elements used by the Aylesbury moneyers (*Ælf*-, *Æthel*-, *Ead*-, *Leof*-, *Wulf*-, -*gar*).

⁷ Petersson 1990, 213–14.

⁸ Petersson 1990, 211.

⁹ For evidence of moneying as an hereditary occupation in the late Anglo-Saxon and Norman periods see Nightingale 1982.

-ræd, -ric, -stan, -weard, -wine) are among those most commonly used by late Anglo-Saxon moneyers,¹⁰ which makes it still more difficult to identify any relationships that might have existed.

When looking at the evidence for minting at Aylesbury in the reigns of Æthelred II and Cnut, Freeman decided that the presence of two moneyers in Crux and five [*sic*] in Quatrefoil was 'suggestive of a mint called into being solely to strike at speed a quantity of coin, perhaps the product of the taxable wealth of a locality',¹¹ and it has been suggested that these two periods of minting in Aylesbury should be related to the need to strike large amounts of coin very quickly to facilitate the payment of specific *gelds*. In Crux the large production levels seen at many mints have been associated with the Danegeld payments of £10,000 in 991 and £16,000 in 994,¹² while the large Quatrefoil issues have been related to the *gelds* levied by Cnut around the time of his accession.¹³ However, as others have already pointed out, the situation may not be as simple as it appears on the surface.¹⁴

For example, it is not certain that we have a full list of the payments made to the Danes – it is quite possible that our main source, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, simply does not record (the possibly numerous) regional or local *gelds* that did not impact on its authors. It is also not certain that the payments we do know about were actually paid entirely, or substantially, in coins – or in newly minted current coin if coin was demanded. (One doubts if the Danes were too concerned on this point as long as they got their silver.) Factors like this must lie behind the variations in production between mints that are becoming clear as more studies are done of individual mints. For example, while working on the Worcester mint, one of the authors (DS) used the method developed by Esty for estimating the number of dies used in a coinage to estimate the 95% confidence range for the number of reverse dies used to strike the Crux and Long Cross types at the mints of Worcester, Huntingdon and Lincoln (Table 2).¹⁵ Whatever factors lay behind the apparently large output in Crux at Worcester were not affecting Huntingdon, and vice versa in Long Cross. Lincoln seems to be unaffected in either issue. It will be clear that the situation was more complex than might at first appear and we can only agree with Eaglen's assessment that close analysis of the connection between *geld* payments and mint output is unproductive given the current uncertainties.¹⁶ (It is also salutary to note that no one, so far as we are aware, has yet suggested that the need to strike large quantities of coin to meet an urgent demand for taxation lies behind the short term opening of mints such as Berkeley, Droitwich or Pershore under Edward the Confessor.)

In their study of the Buckingham mint, Dolley, Elliott and Elmore Jones comment that there were few county towns where the mint was so comparatively unimportant and suggest that 'this is doubtless a measure of the extent to which Buckingham was overshadowed by London, and to a lesser degree, by Oxford and Wallingford', and speculate whether 'the mint may have operated not so much to meet a genuine local need for coin, but to serve as a reminder that the place had borough status'.¹⁷ All of these comments could be applied even more strongly to Aylesbury.

¹⁰ See the lists in Jonsson and Van der Meer 1990, 123–36.

¹¹ Freeman 1985, 211. Freeman's figure of five Aylesbury moneyers in Quatrefoil is derived from North 1980, 133. North listed Ælfwi among the moneyers, but the coin on which this depended was reattributed to Langport by Dolley and Strudwick 1955–7, 58. See Delenda, A., at the end of the Corpus below. Ælfwi no longer appears among the Aylesbury moneyers in North 1994, 172.

¹² Lyon 1976; Brand 1984, 31.

¹³ See, for example, Metcalf 1990, 169.

¹⁴ Metcalf 1998, 115–17 and 135.

¹⁵ Esty 1986 and 1997; see Crafter 2002, 239–41, for a fully explained, step-by-step application of the method. The data used to make the estimates set out in Table 2 were drawn from – Worcester: D.J. Symons, *Aspects of the Anglo-Saxon and Norman Mint of Worcester, c.973–1158* (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 2005); Huntingdon: Eaglen 1999 and 2002; Lincoln: Mossop 1970.

¹⁶ Eaglen 1999, 52. This situation also highlights the need for more studies of the larger and middling rank mints.

¹⁷ Dolley, Elliott and Elmore Jones 1965, 47–8.

TABLE 2. Estimated 95% confidence range for the number of reverse dies used at the Worcester, Huntingdon and Lincoln mints in the Crux and Long Cross issues.

	<i>Crux</i>	<i>Long Cross</i>	<i>Ratio of Crux: Long Cross dies based on the point estimates</i>
<i>Worcester</i>	25-38-59	9-11-12	3.5 : 1
<i>Huntingdon</i>	12-16-22	47-54-63	1 : 3.4
<i>Lincoln</i>	209-259-314	234-251-269	1 : 1

[In each case the three figures represent the low endpoint, point estimate and high endpoint respectively, rounded to the nearest whole number. The point estimate for Long Cross at Worcester is actually 10.65.]

Findspots

The provenances of the Aylesbury coins (set out in Table 3) offer no real surprises. They reflect the normal dominance of Scandinavian finds among the earlier issues, the coins coming mainly from Sweden and Denmark, with outliers from Finland and the Baltic coast of Germany. In the middle of the eleventh century this changes to a situation where most coins have no recorded provenance and a few are from English hoards. (The unprovenanced coins probably represent English single finds and dispersed hoards too.) The one slightly unusual feature is the Radiate/Small Cross coin (now no longer identifiable) which is known to have been found in Ireland in the Dunbrody, Co. Wexford, hoard.

TABLE 3. Findspots of Aylesbury coins.

	<i>Sweden (certain)</i>	<i>Sweden (probable)¹⁸</i>	<i>Denmark</i>	<i>Finland</i>	<i>Germany</i>	<i>British Isles</i>	<i>Unprovenanced</i>
<i>Crux</i>	1 coin (Kännungs, 1934)	2 coins (one probably Öster Ryftes, 1871)					1 coin
<i>Quatrefoil</i>	1 coin (Torlarp, 1875)	2 coins (probably Gerete, 1845, and Grönby, 1855)	2 coins (Enner, 1849, and Haagerup, 1943)	1 coin (Nousiainen, 1895)	1 coin (Lübeck, 1875)		
<i>Radiate/ Small Cross</i>	1 coin (Rangsarve, 1977)	2 coins	2 coins (Tørring, 1830, and Kirke Værløse, 1929)			(Dunbrody, Ireland, 1836 = one of 4 unprov. coins in Corpus?)	4 coins
<i>Trefoil Quadri- lateral</i>						1 coin (City of London, 1872)	1 coin

¹⁸ Coins preserved in the Stockholm Systematic Collection, without precise provenance, but almost certainly from Swedish finds.

	Sweden (certain)	Sweden (probable)	Denmark	Finland	Germany	British Isles	Unprovenanced
Pointed Helmet Hammer Cross						1 coin (City of London, 1872)	1 coin
Facing Bust						1 coin (Chancton, 1866)	1 coin

Æthelred II, Crux c.991–97

As we have seen, it is hard to advance any compelling reason why coins should have been minted in Aylesbury in the Crux issue, especially when the nearby mint of Buckingham scarcely appears to have been overworked at the time. In particular, we have seen that the assumption that it was opened to help strike large numbers of coins quickly to facilitate payment of a *geld* or *gelds* is not necessarily tenable.

There are two true Crux coins, struck from the same obverse die, by the moneyer Ælfgar, and a pair of die duplicates of the rare, late Transitional Crux variant (specifically Variety D, where the obverse bust has both a diadem and a sceptre) issued by the moneyer Leofstan.¹⁹ Exactly the same pattern appears at Buckingham, where Tunulf strikes true Crux coins and Sibwine Variety D of Transitional Crux, but there are no die links between the two mints.²⁰

Variety D of Transitional Crux was first published by Dolley, who identified these coins as Transitional Crux/true Crux mules because they have the copulative M-O on the reverse rather than the MΩO he regarded as characteristic of 'real' Transitional Crux coins.²¹ Dolley only knew of Variety D coins from Aylesbury, Buckingham and Totnes. In 1968 Stewart suggested that the use of MΩO was not an invariable feature of Transitional Crux and reclassified these coins as regular Transitional Crux pieces rather than mules. He also added Dorchester to the list of mints known to have struck Variety D coins.²² It is difficult to know what to make of the distribution of Variety D dies. They have been seen as providing evidence for some kind of link between Aylesbury and Buckingham, but it is hard to see what that link might have been, especially when we consider that dies of the same style were supplied to Dorchester and Totnes as well. In truth, it need mean no more than that Leofstan and Sibwine both travelled up to London (or wherever these dies were supplied from) at around the same time and were therefore both given Variety D dies because they happened to be what were on hand at that moment.²³

Although one would not want to lay too much stress on the evidence of just four coins, the weights of the known coins are of some interest. The two true Crux coins weigh 1.32 and 1.28 g, suggesting that they may have been struck late in the Crux issue.²⁴ By contrast, the three true Crux

¹⁹ Metcalf 1998, 120, suggests a date of c.995–7 for Transitional Crux.

²⁰ Dolley, Elliott and Elmore Jones 1965, 49.

²¹ Dolley 1958–9, 261–2, Figs 3–4.

²² Stewart 1968, 17–18. (A total of seven Variety D coins are known from these mints; see Jonsson 1987, 113–14).

²³ The Transitional Crux type is, as Metcalf has noted, 'complicated to define', with four main varieties and a lot of hybridisation (Metcalf 1998, 120). No location for the die-cutting centre has yet been proposed as far as the authors are aware.

²⁴ Crux seems to have been introduced at a modal value of c.1.65g, which was reduced to c.1.43g, and later fell to c.1.32g for the late Small Crux type (Metcalf 1998, 118; Petersson 1969, 107–8, 183 Fig. 5 upper).

coins known from Buckingham weigh 1.56, 1.54 and 1.45 g, which suggests production earlier in the issue. If one felt adventurous, one might suggest that we have here evidence that Aylesbury could have been opened in the course of Crux to *replace* Buckingham for some reason – but one would feel happier if one had more than just five coins on which to base the suggestion.

The Transitional Crux coins from Aylesbury weigh 1.64 and 1.58 g, whereas most others of this type appear to be struck to the late, light modal value of *c.* 1.32 g. However, as Metcalf has pointed out, at some mints (especially Winchester) Transitional Crux consists mostly of very heavy coins which seem to foreshadow the weight standard used at the introduction of the Long Cross type.²⁵ It would seem that Aylesbury is another mint where this holds true, as indeed is Buckingham, where the single Transitional Crux coin known weighs 1.54 g.

Jonsson has examined this weight variation in Transitional Crux and has shown that, while one group of mints (Aylesbury, Bath, Buckingham, Oxford, Wallingford and Winchester) seems to strike only heavy coins (1.50 g and above), another group (Dorchester, London, Totnes and Wareham) consistently strikes at a lower weight.²⁶ Lyon had previously suggested that such variation might have been controlled on a county basis, and Jonsson's results supported this in some cases, including that of Buckinghamshire (with Aylesbury and Buckingham). However, in other cases, the evidence did not seem so strong and, whatever the truth, the argument is based on very limited material.²⁷

Cnut, Quatrefoil *c.* 1017–23

Eight coins of this issue survive from Aylesbury, struck by four moneyers. For Ælfweard we have a pair of die duplicates and a third coin from the same obverse die, for Æthelwine another pair of die duplicates and a third coin from a different pair of dies, and singletons for Eadric and Eadweard. Although there are too few coins known to attempt any kind of statistical analysis of possible output, the impression is that this may not have been very high at Aylesbury in this issue. At Buckingham, by contrast, just two moneyers are known at present, Ælfweard, from a single coin, and Leofric, who is represented by eleven coins, but these are struck from no less than seven different pairs of dies, which suggests a reasonably large output in his case at least.²⁸ (He must presumably have worn out six pairs of dies before he received the seventh, and it is statistically likely that the surviving dies do not represent all those that he actually used.)

TABLE 4. Weights of the Quatrefoil coins from Aylesbury, with die-centre attributions for the obverse dies following Blackburn and Lyon 1986.

<i>Ælfweard</i>	1.36 g ¹ (LonA. <i>e</i>)	1.10 g ² (LonA. <i>e</i>)		
<i>Æthelwine</i>	1.16 g (LonA. <i>l</i>)	1.09 g ³ (Oxf. <i>l</i>)	1.01 g ³ (Oxf. <i>l</i>)	
<i>Eadric</i>				0.88 g (Win. <i>m</i>)
<i>Eadweard</i>				0.84 g (LonA. <i>l</i>)

(LonA. – London A; Oxf. – Oxford; Win. – Winchester; *e* – early; *m* – middle; *l* – late)

¹ The die duplicate of this coin is a broken fragment (roughly half the coin), which weighs 0.72 g.

² Struck from the same obverse die as the coin weighing 1.36 g.

³ These coins are die duplicates.

²⁵ Metcalf 1998, 120.

²⁶ Jonsson 1977; the weights are tabulated on pp. 178–9. Exeter, with one coin at 1.00–1.09 g and another at 1.70–1.79 g, does not conform to this pattern.

²⁷ Lyon 1971, 112–13, including Table 6; Jonsson 1977, 179. Jonsson's study was based on just twenty-nine Transitional Crux coins whose weights were known.

²⁸ The eleven coins of Leofric include the eight cited by Dolley, Elliot and Elmore Jones 1965, 50, plus three others – Glendining, 24–25 May 1972, 639, a third specimen of their die combination (12); Lyon collection, ex Spink 1992, a second specimen of their die combination (13); and *SCBI* 14, no. 2707 (there attributed to London). The authors are grateful to Stewart Lyon for drawing these coins to their attention.

Once again, we may be able to tease out a little from the weights of the Aylesbury coins (Table 4), providing that we keep firmly in mind how limited the evidence is with which we are working. Blackburn and Lyon suggested that the Quatrefoil issue began at a modal value of *c.* 1.50 or 1.40 g (the figure varying on a regional basis), and then fell via intermediate standards of *c.* 1.30 g, *c.* 1.20–1.15 g, *c.* 1.10–1.05 g, *c.* 1.00–0.95 g to end the issue at *c.* 0.90 g.²⁹ The weights of the Aylesbury coins could be taken to suggest that Ælfweard was active in the early-to-middle part of that sequence, Æthelwine in the middle part, and Eadric and Eadward at the end. However, it is important to realise that, while this may tell us something about the relative order of production, it does not give us any absolute chronological fixes, since we simply do not know how quickly one weight standard replaced another – it is equally possible that coins of the lowest standard began to be minted six months or four years after the issue began. Similarly we cannot tell, based on such limited evidence, what proportions of the Quatrefoil coins produced at Aylesbury may have been struck at the different standards. We may suggest, however, that the rate of production was probably not too high if Ælfweard used the same obverse die to strike coins weighing 1.36 and 1.10 g.

Table 4 also indicates the sources of the obverse dies used at Aylesbury in the Quatrefoil issue, based on the analysis of Blackburn and Lyon 1986. Only five dies were represented. Three of these were supplied by the London A die-centre, and one each by Oxford and Winchester. There is little more that can be said given the paucity of the material.

Finally we need to consider whether any of the Aylesbury moneyers of this period might have been active at other mints. There seem to be only two possible instances. The first concerns the name Ælfweard which is found on one coin of Buckingham and three coins of Aylesbury.³⁰ Dolley, Elliott and Elmore Jones certainly had no doubts about identifying the coins as struck by one individual, baldly stating in their corpus that 'Ælfward [*sic*] is the Aylesbury moneyer in this issue'.³¹ The Buckingham coin weighs 1.49 g, and on this rather insubstantial basis one could envisage Ælfweard as a moneyer who begins work at Buckingham and then moves to Aylesbury later in the issue, but there is as yet no die-link to confirm the connection and, in its absence, the suggestion should be regarded as unproven. The second possible link was suggested by Freeman, who noted that a moneyer called Eadward began what appears to have been an approximately thirty-year career at Wallingford in Quatrefoil.³² Wallingford is only some twenty miles from Aylesbury as the crow flies, but Eadward is a common name at this period and, in the absence of a die link, this suggestion should similarly be judged unproven.³³

There is, however, an obverse die-link for this issue between Corpus no. 6.1 (a coin of Æthelwine) and SCBI 14, no. 2235, a coin of Brunman of London, now in Copenhagen.³⁴ Brunman's career extends before and after Quatrefoil, so this does not help us to decide in which direction the die was passed, nor do the weights of the coins (1.16 g and 1.10 g) or the apparent state of wear of the die when used to strike them. On balance it is probably simpler to envisage a lightly-used die being returned from Aylesbury and re-issued to Brunman in London than vice versa, but we cannot be sure of this.

Under Edward the Confessor, *c.* 1044–65

After another gap of approximately twenty years, minting resumed at Aylesbury early in the reign of Edward the Confessor. (This is in contrast to the situation at Buckingham, where minting continued through the reigns of Cnut and his sons.)³⁵ This time the pattern is very different to that seen earlier. Instead of bursts of activity in single isolated issues, minting is

²⁹ Blackburn and Lyon 1986, 254.

³⁰ Dolley, Elliott and Elmore Jones 1965, 50 no. 7, for the Buckingham coin (*BMC* no. 493). We have not searched for coins of Buckingham for this article, so it is possible that more Quatrefoils of Ælfweard have come to light in the past forty years.

³¹ Dolley, Elliott and Elmore Jones 1965, 50.

³² Freeman 1985, 212.

³³ For Eadward's career at Wallingford, see Jonsson and Van der Meer 1990, 109.

³⁴ This link was first noticed by Stewart Lyon and is published here at his suggestion.

³⁵ Dolley, Elliott and Elmore Jones 1965, 50–1.

now continued for about the next twenty years, with first Leofwine and then Wulfræd evidently serving as sole moneyer in succession.³⁶ Coins are known of most issues from Radiate/Small Cross (*c.*1044–46) to Facing Bust (*c.*1062–65), the apparent gaps probably reflecting lacunae in the evidence rather than anything else.

The first moneyer, Leofwine, is known only from coins of Radiate/Small Cross and Trefoil Quadrilateral (*c.*1046–48). The first is represented by a group of six die duplicates (Corpus nos 10.1–6) and three singletons. Of the die duplicates two are certainly from Scandinavia, two are from the Stockholm Systematic Collection and so are almost certainly from Swedish finds, and one of the two unprovenanced coins is pecked, which suggests a possible Scandinavian origin for that as well. The unmistakable impression is of a parcel of coins that left the mint (or at least the Aylesbury area) and travelled to Scandinavia, where it was finally dispersed. We may also note the peculiarities displayed by two of the other dies. Corpus no. 12.1 has a small wedge or pellet in the second quarter of the reverse, while rather more noticeably 13.1 has four pellets placed around the king's head on the obverse.

The use of a minimum of four pairs of dies in an issue conventionally held to last approximately two years, suggests that Leofwine's output in Radiate/Small Cross was of at least a reasonable size. If we assume a possibly conservative output of 10,000 coins per pair of dies, we are talking about a figure of some £166, which will be a minimum amount since we almost certainly do not have coins from all the dies Leofwine originally used. For rest of reign the evidence largely fails us, but the fact that so few coins are known suggests that output was probably small.

Radiate/Small Cross seems to have been introduced at a weight of *c.*1.14–1.10g and then reduced at certain mints (for example, Metcalf detected standards of *c.*1.12g and *c.*1.02g at London and Canterbury).³⁷ Against this it is difficult to know how to interpret the (admittedly very slender) evidence for Aylesbury (Table 5). The first thing to strike one is the impressive grouping of the weights of the six die duplicates (10.1–6), which differ by only 0.03g. These certainly look as if Leofwine was attempting to strike to a standard of *c.*1.00g or thereabouts. Given this tight grouping, should we see the slightly heavier and lighter coins struck from the other dies as evidence of multiple standards, or of a rather less impressive adhesion to the *c.*1.00g standard on other occasions?

TABLE 5. Weights of the Radiate/Small Cross coins of Aylesbury.

<i>Corpus no</i>	<i>Weight</i>
11.1	1.05g
10.1	1.00g
10.2	1.00g
10.4	1.00g
10.3	0.99g
10.5	0.97g
10.6	0.97g
12.1	0.93g
13.1	0.93g

Trefoil Quadrilateral is represented by just two coins, from two different sets of dies. One of these is unremarkable, but the other (Corpus no. 15.1) is struck from an obverse die with a spectacularly blundered legend. This has been variously interpreted over the years but seems to read something like *NRNCIIDI IEN*►:I, which has frequently been taken as an attempt to represent 'Harthacnut' in past auction catalogues. There is also a 'bar' behind the king's head resembling an extra wreath tie. At 0.82g this coin is also at the bottom of the normal weight

³⁶ Freeman 1985, 211, comments on Aylesbury's 'relative permanency' in the Confessor's reign and points out that it is, in effect, a newly created mint at this time.

³⁷ Petersson 1969, 121–2 and 188 Fig. 10 (lower); Metcalf 1998, 153.

distribution for the type.³⁸ However, the reverse die used is unimpeachably normal, so there seems no reason to condemn the coin as irregular.

Leofwine provides another instance of an Aylesbury moneyer who may have been active at another mint since a moneyer of this name is attested at Buckingham from Harold I's Fleur-de-Lis issue (c.1038–40) until Expanding Cross (c.1050–53). This neatly brackets the two issues (Radiate/Small Cross and Trefoil Quadrilateral) when the same name appears at Aylesbury. Once again Dolley, Elliott and Elmore Jones were confident: '... in the period c.1045 Leofwine was also the Aylesbury moneyer, but there is no die-link with Buckingham'.³⁹ The fact that Leofwine is known from only one coin in each issue at Buckingham led Freeman to suggest that he probably had 'spare capacity to contribute to the rejuvenation of the Aylesbury mint'.⁴⁰ Freeman also raised the alternate possibilities that either the Leofwine at Aylesbury might have come from Wallingford, where the name is found under Harold I and in the PACX and Radiate/Small Cross issues under the Confessor, or that the Buckingham moneyer was active at all three mints.⁴¹ It is again hard to assess how likely any of these identifications are. The name is very common at this time, appearing at no less than forty-six mints in the period c.972/3–1066,⁴² and there are no obverse die-links between the three mints. On the other hand Leofwine's career at Buckingham certainly encompasses the periods of activity of his Wallingford and Aylebury namesakes, and the mints are close enough for this kind of connection to be credible. On balance, it does seem possible that a single individual was involved. If this is so, the situation did not continue under Wulfræd, his successor at Aylesbury, whose contemporaries at Buckingham are Theodræd (in Sovereign) and Æstan (in Hammer Cross).⁴³

Wulfræd must have taken over from Leofwine as the Aylesbury moneyer somewhere c.1050, possibly in or just after the Expanding Cross issue (c.1050–53) if the Leofwine of Aylesbury is identical to the moneyer at Buckingham, since Leofwine is known there for that issue. Coins of Wulfræd are then known from Aylesbury for three of the four following issues – Pointed Helmet (c.1053–56; one coin), Hammer Cross (c.1059–62; two coins, sharing a common obverse die), and Facing Bust (c.1062–65; two coins, from different dies). The absence of coins of the Sovereign issue (c.1059–62) is probably down to chance. The only peculiarity to note is that his name is misspelled PVLFRERD on both of the Hammer Cross reverse dies (which are definitely different, and not a single die which has been partly recut).

The name Wulfræd is relatively uncommon, being recorded by Jonsson and Van der Meer at just five other mints in the period c.973–1066.⁴⁴ In four of these cases there is unlikely to be a connection with Aylesbury, but if we examine the careers of the London and Aylesbury moneyers (Table 6), we find that there seems to be a remarkably neat fit between them. One would not like to push this point too far, however, without some supporting evidence. In particular, given that minting at Aylesbury generally seems to have been on such a small scale, it is hard to understand why a London moneyer should seemingly stop working there for the Confessor's Pointed Helmet issue and instead work at Aylesbury, only to go back to working solely at London for Sovereign, and then apparently work just at Aylesbury for Hammer Cross and Facing Bust. It would perhaps be more convincing if it could be shown that the London moneyer had been active at London throughout this period and had also worked at Aylesbury on the side, since this would be precisely the kind of situation that Dolley, Elliott and Elmore Jones suggested for the moneyer Sibwine in their study of the Buckingham mint.⁴⁵ (As we have seen, Sibwine is known at Buckingham only for Transitional Crux, but

³⁸ Petersson 1969, 121–2 and 189 Fig. 11 (upper).

³⁹ Dolley, Elliott and Elmore Jones 1965, 47 and 51. Metcalf 1998, 222, agreed that the identification was likely.

⁴⁰ Freeman 1985, 212.

⁴¹ Freeman 1985, 212. The suggestion that the Wallingford and Aylesbury moneyers were the same individual goes right back to Lindsay 1838/9, who noted the possibility, 'these two places being not far distant from each other'.

⁴² Jonsson and Van der Meer 1990, 131.

⁴³ Dolley, Elliott and Elmore Jones 1965, 51–2. (The Wallingford moneyers contemporary with Wulfræd are Æthelwig, Beorhtic, Beorhtwine, Brandr, Brunwine, Burhwine, Eadweard and Wulfwine: Jonsson and Van der Meer 1990, 108–9.)

⁴⁴ Jonsson and Van der Meer 1990, 135.

⁴⁵ Dolley, Elliot and Elmore Jones 1965, 46.

the same name also appears at London in First Hand, Crux, Long Cross and Helmet. Since the only other appearance of the name is in Quatrefoil at Oxford,⁴⁶ it looks convincingly as if we do have here a case of a London moneyer working temporarily/occasionally at a nearby, smaller mint, presumably because Tunulf, the moneyer who struck the true Crux coins at Buckingham, was no longer available or not wanted.)

TABLE 6. Attested issues in the name Wulfræd at London and Aylesbury.

	<i>Before Confessor</i>	<i>PACX</i>	<i>Radiate/Small Cross</i>	<i>Trefoil Quadrilateral</i>	<i>Short Cross</i>	<i>Expanding Cross</i>	<i>Pointed Helmet</i>	<i>Sovereign</i>	<i>Hammer Cross</i>	<i>Bust Facing</i>
<i>London</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		
<i>Aylesbury</i>							X		X	X

Remarkably, Edward the Confessor's reign saw yet a third mint open in an already over-supplied Buckinghamshire. This was the mint at Newport Pagnell, only fourteen miles from Buckingham and eighteen from Aylesbury. The moneyers Sigeræd and Sæman have no apparent connection with either of the existing mints, but Sigeræd may possibly have come from London.⁴⁷ Whatever the reason for opening the new mint, the impetus was not to last – Buckingham and Newport Pagnell are both last attested in Hammer Cross (*c.*1059–62), while the last coins of Aylesbury are from the succeeding Facing Bust issue (*c.*1062–65).⁴⁸ By the end of the Confessor's reign minting in Buckinghamshire had come to the end of its not very distinguished life.

The mint name

The forms of the mint signature found on the coins are tabulated as Table 7. The development seen over the seventy years or so between *c.*991–97 and *c.*1062–65 is unremarkable, the evidence revealing the gradual weakening and loss of the medial –g– in the first theme, Ægel-, a well-known shift in Old English pronunciation. (A similar transformation can be seen in the personal name Æthelwine, which changes to Ægelwine and ultimately to Ælwine.)⁴⁹

⁴⁶ Jonsson and Van der Meer 1990, 95.

⁴⁷ Freeman 1985, 214–16. The coins are signed only 'Newport', the attribution to Newport Pagnell follows Dolley 1955–7, 95, and Carlyon-Britton 1909, 33–4. The mint began to strike in Pointed Helmet (*c.*1053–56). See Blackburn, Bonser and Conte 1993 for the most recent comments on this mint.

⁴⁸ Jonsson and Van der Meer 1990, 58 for Buckingham and 91 for Newport Pagnell. Freeman 1985, 212, was not aware of the Aylesbury Facing Bust coins and so has both Aylesbury and Buckingham closing in Hammer Cross.

⁴⁹ Von Feilitzen 1937, 102–6; Colman 1984, 124–5.

TABLE 7. Forms of the Aylesbury mint signature found on the coins.

Crux	Quatrefoil	Radiate/Small Cross	Trefoil Quadrilateral	Pointed Helmet	Hammer Cross	Facing Bust
ÆGLSBY ÆGLS	ÆGEL ÆGEI ÆGL (2 dies) EGL	ÆGEL ÆGI	ÆGL:C	EGELE ¹	ÆGL	ÆGE
	ÆILSBR		ÆIE[. . .]		ÆEL	
		ÆEL				
		ÆE				Æ[. . .]

¹ Initial E ligate with N of ON.

APPENDIX: CORPUS OF COINS OF THE AYLESBURY MINT

Die combinations are numbered sequentially, and the known coins struck from each combination are listed. The entry for each coin indicates its location (where known), its provenance, and any publications.

An * following a reference to an auction catalogue or to a dealer's list indicates that the coin is illustrated there.

The weights of the coins published in Hildebrand 1881 are taken from Petersson 1990, 378 (for coins of Æthelred II), 399 (for Cnut) and 423 (for Edward the Confessor).

ÆTHELRED II

Type *iiia* (Crux)

Ælfgar

1. *Obv.* +ÆDELRAED REX ANGLOX
Rev. +ÆLFGAR M^{TO} +ÆGLS

(1.1) Stockholm (Hildebrand 1881, 37, no. 1). 1.28 g/19.8 gr. (Pl. 2, 1)

2. *Obv.* +ÆDELRAED REX ANGLOX
Rev. Same die as no. 1

(2.1) British Museum (*BMC*, 208, no. 2; registration no. 1890.6.5.1): bought Rollin and Feuardent, 1890. See Dolley and Strudwick 1955–7, 52, for the provenance. 1.32 g/20.3 gr.⁵⁰ (Pl. 2, 2)

Leofstan

3. *Obv.* +ÆDELRAED REX ANGLOX
Rev. +LEOFSTAN M^{TO} ÆGLSBY

Transitional Crux, Variety D, bust with sceptre and diadem.

(3.1) Stockholm (Hildebrand 1846, 35, no. 1; Hildebrand 1881, 37, no. 2). (This coin was published in Dolley 1958–9, 261, fig. 3.) 1.58 g/24.4 gr. (Pl. 2, 3)

(3.2) Stockholm; from the Kännungs hoard, Gotland, 1934 (Jonsson 1987, 21, find G107, 104, 113–14). 1.64 g/25.3 gr. Bent. (Pl. 2, 4)

⁵⁰ Rollin and Feuardent were a Paris-based firm of dealers. They had a London branch between the mid-1860s and at least 1914 (see Eaglen, Mitchell and Pagan 2001, 155: the commencement date of the late 1880s given there for the London branch is an error – Hugh Pagan, *pers. comm.*).

Crux – moneyer's name not recorded.

(a) From the Öster Ryftes hoard, Gotland, 1871 (SHM-KMK 4586. CNS 1.4.17, no. 1263). This coin cannot be either 3.1, which was already in the Royal Coin Cabinet by 1846, or 3.2, which was not discovered until 1934. It is probably therefore to be identified with either 1.1, which is not in Hildebrand 1846, but is in Hildebrand 1881, and so must have entered the Royal Coin Cabinet between 1846 and 1881, or 2.1, which was on the market by 1890.

CNUT

Type *viii* (Quatrefoil)

Ælfweard

4. *Obv.* +CNVT REX ANGLOR: (legend starts at 8 o'clock)
Rev. +ELF PER DON ÆGEL
Obv. die of London Ae style (Blackburn and Lyon 1986, 244–5)
(4.1) Stockholm (Hildebrand 1881, 203, no. 4). 1.36 g/21.0 gr. (Pl. 2, 5)
(4.2) Helsinki (*SCBI* 25, no. 594); from the Nousiainen hoard, 1895. 0.72 g/11.1 gr (large fragment – approximately half of coin). (Pl. 2, 6)
5. *Obv.* Same die as no. 4
Rev. +EIE PER DON AGEI (the A and G probable, but not certain)
The rev. die is similar to that of no. 4, but differs in detail.
(5.1) Copenhagen (*SCBI* 13, no. 1387 – published as a coin of 'Eteward' of Chester); from the Lübeck hoard, Germany, 1875 (but not listed in Dannenberg and Cohn 1877). 1.10 g/16.9 gr.

Æthelwine

6. *Obv.* +CNVT REX ANGLOR: (quatrefoil of pellets behind head; legend starts at 12 o'clock)
Rev. +ÆÐ ELP NEN ÆGL
Obv. die of London Al style (Blackburn and Lyon 1986, 244–5). This die was originally published by Blackburn and Lyon as an example of Lewes I (Blackburn and Lyon 1986, 242–5), but has subsequently been re-classified by Lyon (*pers. comm.*). The same *obv.* die was used to strike *SCBI* 14, no. 2235, a coin of Brunman of London; as noted above, this die-link was originally noted by Stewart Lyon and is published here at his suggestion.
(6.1) Stockholm (Hildebrand 1881, 203, no. 2). 1.16 g/17.9 gr. (Pl. 2, 7)
7. *Obv.* +CNVT REX ANGL-ORV (legend starts at 12 o'clock)
Rev. +ÆÐ EL·P· NN EGL
Obv. die of Oxford I style (Blackburn and Lyon 1986, 228–30)
(7.1) Copenhagen (*SCBI* 13, no. 4235, for text (precedes no. 6); *SCBI* 15, no. 4235, for illustration); from the Haagerup hoard, Fyn (Funen), 1943. 1.01 g/15.6 gr.⁵¹
(7.2) Smålands Museum, Växjö, Sweden; from the Torlarp hoard, Småland, 1875 (Thornstrom 1987, 112, as a coin of Gloucester). 1.09 g/16.8 gr. (Pl. 2, 8)

Eadric

8. *Obv.* +CNVT REX ANGLORVM (legend starts at 12 o'clock)
Rev. +EA DRI CMO ÆGL
Obv. die of Winchester m style (Blackburn and Lyon 1986, 228–9)
(8.1) Stockholm (Hildebrand 1881, 203, no. 3). 0.88 g/13.6 gr. (Pl. 2, 9)

Eadweard

9. *Obv.* +CNVT REX ANGLOR(V?)[. . .] (legend starts at 8 o'clock)
Rev. +EAD PERD ONÆI LSR
Obv. die of London Al style (Blackburn and Lyon 1986, 244–5)
(9.1) Copenhagen (*SCBI* 13, no. 6); from the Enner hoard, Jylland (Jutland), 1849. 0.84 g/12.9 gr.

⁵¹ During the preparation of the Copenhagen *Sylloge* volumes this coin was originally regarded as imitative and the photographs were mounted on plate 152. However, prior to publication it was reclassified as a genuine English coin and the description inserted on plate 1.

Cnut – uncertain type and moneyer.

(a) From the Gerete hoard, Gotland, 1845 (SHM-KMK 1219. *CNS* 1.4.1, no. 1235). According to *SCBI* 40, 10, the coins from the Gerete hoard were incorporated into the Stockholm Systematic Collection. This coin must therefore be one of 4.1, 6.1 or 8.1, all of which were added to the Royal Coin Cabinet between the publication of Hildebrand 1846 and Hildebrand 1881.

(b) From the Grönby hoard, Skåne, 1855 (SHM-KMK 2185. *CNS* 3.1.28, no. 992). *CNS* 3.1.28 records that the English coins from the hoard were 'mostly dispersed', but it is likely that this coin must be one of 4.1, 6.1 or 8.1 since all of the other recorded coins of Cnut come from known hoards.

EDWARD THE CONFESSOR

Type *i* (Radiate/Small Cross)

Leafvine

10. *Obv.* +EDPER DREX:

Rev. +LEOFFINE ON ÆEL

(10.1) Stockholm (Hildebrand 1881, 429, no. 2a). 1.00 g/15.4 gr. (Pl. 2, 10)

(10.2) Stockholm (Hildebrand 1881, 429, no. 2b).⁵² 1.00 g/15.4 gr. (Pl. 2, 11)

(10.3) Stockholm; from the Rangsarve hoard, Havdhem parish, Gotland, 1977 (KMK 101739). 0.99 g/15.3 gr. (Pl. 2, 12)

(10.4) Copenhagen (*SCBI* 18, no. 740); from the Tørring hoard, Jylland (Jutland), 1830. 1.00 g/15.4 gr.

(10.5) W. Clarke collection, Canada; bought Spink, May 2003; acquired by Spink from an unnamed collector who had bought it in the late 1960s (1968?) from a small-scale dealer whose location the vendor could not remember. 0.97 g/15.0 gr. (Pl. 2, 13)

(10.6) Ex R.J. Eaglen, Baldwin sale no. 18, 12–13 Oct. 1998, 1338*; ex Glendining, 8–9 Oct. 1990, 757; ex G.V. Doubleday, Glendining, 6 Oct. 1987, 22*. 0.97 g/14.9 gr. (Pl. 2, 14)

11. *Obv.* +EDPER DREX

Rev. +LEOFFINE ON ÆGI

(11.1) Copenhagen (*SCBI* 18, no. 741); from the Kirke Værløse hoard, Sjælland (Zealand), 1929. 1.05 g/16.2 gr.

12. *Obv.* +EDPER DREXA:

Rev. +LEOFFINE ON ÆGEL: (small wedge or pellet in second quarter of reverse field)

(12.1) Ex L.R. Stack, Sotheby, 22–3 Apr. 1999, 566*; ex E.M. Norweb (IV), Spink sale no. 59, 17 June 1987, 1249* (= *SCBI* 30, no. 561); ex F. Elmore Jones, Glendining, 12–13 May 1971, 62*; ex Lord Grantley, Glendining, 22–3 Mar. 1944, 1184 (first coin in lot, with mint signature ÆGEL). 0.93 g/14.4 gr. (Pl. 2, 15)

13. *Obv.* +EDPE RDREX: (four large pellets around face)

Rev. +LEOFFINE ON ÆE

(13.1) Ex F. Elmore Jones, Glendining, 12–13 May 1971, 63*; ex Lord Grantley, Glendining, 22–3 Mar. 1944, 1184 (second coin in lot, with mint signature ÆE). 0.93 g/14.4 gr. (Pl. 2, 16)

Edward the Confessor – Radiate/Small Cross

(a) The Dunbrody hoard, Co. Wexford, 1836 (Thompson 1956, 54, find no. 141; modified by Dolley in *SCBI* 8, 67–8) is recorded as containing a Radiate/Small Cross coin with rev. legend LEOFFINE ON EGEL. The coin is listed in the possession of J. Lindsay in Lindsay 1838/9, 146, no. 9.⁵³ It is presumably to be identified with one of 10.5, 10.6 or 12.1, which are the only Radiate/Small Cross coins not from Scandinavian sources, unless it represents another coin which has not been traced for this study. (The abbreviated mint signature on 13.1 would seem to rule this coin out of consideration.) The presence or absence of pecking on these coins does not help with the attribution since Marion Archibald informs me (*pers. comm.*) that some of the Dunbrody coins are themselves pecked.

Type *iii* (Trefoil Quadrilateral)

⁵² A second coin has been added to the Stockholm Systematic Collection since the publication of Hildebrand 1881. It is now impossible to be sure which is the original coin and which the addition, although it is likely that the better preserved specimen is the one that has been added (Professor K. Jonsson, *pers. comm.*). The original coin was already in the Stockholm collection by 1846 (Hildebrand 1846, 283, no. 1).

⁵³ The coin is described by Lindsay as a specimen of Ruding 1840, pl. 24.33, but this should be corrected to pl. 25.33.

Leofwine

14. *Obv.* +ED[. . .] ARD·R
Rev. [+]*L*-EOFPINE ON ÆIE[. . .]

(14.1) British Museum (*BMC*, 371, no. 430, as a coin of Ilchester; for the reattribution see Dolley and Van der Meer 1958, where the coin is also illustrated; registration no. 1876.2.4.26); presented by E.H. Willett, February 1876; from the City of London hoard, 1872 (Thompson 1956, 92–9, find no. 255; for the provenance see Dolley and Strudwick 1955–7, 55). This coin was omitted by Willett from the list of coins from the hoard that he published in *Numismatic Chronicle* (Willett 1876), probably because it was broken. Since it was not included in Evans's supplementary list either (Evans 1885), it did not appear in the summary of the coins from the hoard given in Thompson 1956, 0.67 g/10.3 gr (fragment). (Pl. 2, 17)

15. *Obv.* Blundered legend (Possibly +NRNCIIDI IEN►:I, but it has been variously read over the years – see below). There is a 'bar' behind the head, resembling an extra wreath tie.
Rev. +L·EOFPNE ON ÆGL:C (the second N reverse barred)

(15.1) Buckinghamshire County Museum, Aylesbury (= *SCBI* 42, no. 1152); ex F. Elmore Jones, Glendining, 12–13 May 1971, 64*; ex V.J.E. Ryan (II), Glendining, 22–3 Jan. 1952, 843* (as a coin of Harthacnut, *obv.* read as HRNCNVT IEM I, mint as ÆGL:C, Aylesbury); ex E.H. Wheeler (not in the Sotheby sales of 1930 or 1934, but the coin is listed as EH39 [as a coin of Harthacnut] in a duplicated Seaby list dated 6 Feb. 1931 of a portion of Wheeler's collection bought from him privately by the firm); ex J.G. Murdoch, Sotheby, 31 Mar. and 1–4 Apr. 1903, 148* (as a coin of Harthacnut, *obv.* read as FRNCNVT IENTI, mint as ÆL·LI:C, Aylesbury); ex H. Montagu, Sotheby, 11–16 May 1896, 118 (as a coin of Harthacnut, *obv.* read as HRNCVTIEMTI, mint as ÆGL:C, Aylesbury); ex W. Brice, collection sold *en bloc* to Montagu in 1887; ex W.H. Johnston, Sotheby, 3–6 and 8 May 1876, 50 (as a coin of Harthacnut, no *obv.* reading given, mint read as ÆCL:C, Aylesbury); ex J.B. Bergne, Sotheby, 20–24 and 26–31 May 1873, 257 (as a coin of Harthacnut, *obv.* read as HRNCNVT.IENE, mint as PECE, Watchet); ex Capt. R.M. Murchison, Sotheby, 28–30 May 1866, 325 (as a coin of Harthacnut, *obv.* read as HRNCNVTNEN'I (the HR ligate), mint as ÆCL:C, Aylesford). 0.82 g/12.6 gr. (Pl. 2, 18)

Type *vii* (Pointed helmet)

Wulfræd

16. *Obv.* +EDPER· DRE·
Rev. +PVLFRD ONEGELE·

(16.1) British Museum (*BMC*, 339, no. 1 – coin illustrated); ex Miles, 1820.⁵⁴ 1.20 g/18.5 gr. (Pl. 2, 19)

Type *xi* (Hammer Cross)

Wulfræd

17. *Obv.* +EDPAR RDREX·
Rev. +PVLFRERD ON ÆEL

(17.1) R.J. Eaglen, Baldwin sale no.18, 12–13 Oct. 1998, 1339* (not sold; subsequently bought privately by Spink and sold on to a private collector in 2001); ex F. Elmore Jones, Glendining, 12–13 May 1971, 65*; ex R.C. Lockett (I), Glendining, 6–9 June 1955, 841*; ex B. Roth, Sotheby, 19–20 July 1917, 79 (mint signature given as ÆGL; one of six coins in the lot). 1.10 g/17.0 gr (slightly chipped; small piercing in striking). (Pl. 2, 20)

18. *Obv.* Same die as no. 17
Rev. +PVLFRERD ON ÆGL·

(18.1) British Museum (not in *BMC*; registration no. 1915.5.7.2262); bought from the estate of J. Pierpoint Morgan, 1915; ex Sir John Evans; from the City of London hoard, 1872 (Thompson 1956, 92–9, find no. 255 – this coin is listed on p. 98). Evans 1885, 267. 1.12 g/17.3 gr. (Pl. 2, 21)

Type *xiii* (Facing Bust)

Wulfræd

19. *Obv.* +EADPARD RE·
Rev. +PVLFRD· ON ÆGE

(19.1) Ex W.J. Conte, Classical Numismatic Group Mail Bid Sale 60, closing on 22 May 2002, 2279*; ex Peter Spink, by private purchase, 1994, 1.03 g/15.9 gr. (Pl. 2, 22)

⁵⁴ Richard Miles, 1740–1819, a London dealer. See *SCBI* 34, xxxiv.

20. *Obv.* +[...]DPERD RE[...]
Rev. +[...]VLFRED ON [Æ...]

(20.1) British Museum (not in *BMC*; registration no. 1867.8.12.1); from the Chancton hoard, Sussex, 1866 (Thompson 1956, 25–7, find no. 81). *Rev.* legend published in Head 1867, 84, (and recorded on original BM ticket) as +[...]VLFRED ON Æ[...], so it is likely that a small chip has been lost from the broken edge at some point. For this reason, and because Aylesbury is the only mint where a moneyer of this name is attested for this issue (see Jonsson and Van der Meer 1990), the coin has been included in this corpus although nothing of the mint signature now survives. 0.78g/12.0gr (fragment; some corrosion adhering to *obv.*). (Pl. 2, 23)

(According to Evans 1885, 255, Aylesbury coins of two issues 'were present among the Chancton coins', but this is not the case. Head 1867, 79, clearly records only one Aylesbury coin from the hoard – a Facing Bust coin of Wulfræd, 20.1. It is probable that Evans misunderstood the layout of Head's list (on p. 84), which shows the finds from Chancton and the coins then in the British Museum in parallel columns, with an Aylesbury coin appearing in each column.)

DELENDIA

- A. *Cnut, Type viii (Quatrefoil)*.
 British Museum (*BMC*, 255, no. 1), undated acquisition. Published in *BMC* as a coin of Ælfwi of Aylesbury, but reattributed to Langport by Dolley and Strudwick 1955–7, 58.
 B. *Edward the Confessor, Type ii (Small Flan)*.
 Stockholm (Hildebrand 1881, 429, no. 1). Published in Hildebrand 1881 as a coin of Dægniht of Aylesbury, but reattributed to Maldon by Van der Meer 1961, 181.

REFERENCES

- Archibald, M.M., and Blunt, C.E., 1986. *SCBI 34. British Museum. Anglo-Saxon Coins Part V. Aethelstan to Eadgar's Reform* (London).
 Blackburn, M.A.S., Bonser, M.J., and Conte, W.J., 1993. 'A new type of Edward the Confessor for the 'Newport' mint', *BNJ* 63, 125–6.
 Blackburn, M.A.S., and Lyon, C.S.S., 1986. 'Regional die-production in Cnut's *Quatrefoil* issue', in M.A.S. Blackburn (ed.), *Anglo-Saxon Monetary History* (Leicester), 223–72.
BMC. See Keary 1893.
 Brady, J.D., 1982. *SCBI 30. Ancient British, Anglo-Saxon and Norman Coins in American Collections* (London).
 Brand, J.D., 1984. *Periodic Change of Type in the Anglo-Saxon and Norman Periods* (Rochester).
 Carlyon-Britton, P.W.P., 1909. "'Uncertain" Anglo-Saxon mints and some new attributions', *BNJ* 6, 13–47.
CNS 1. See Malmer 1982.
CNS 3. See Malmer 1985.
 Colman, F., 1984. 'Anglo-Saxon pennies and Old English phonology', *Folia Linguistica Historica* 5, 91–143.
 Crafter, T.C.R., 2002. 'A die study of the *Cross-and-Crosslets* type of the Ipswich mint, c.1161/2–1180', *NC* 162, 237–51.
 Dannenberg, H., and Cohn, S., 1877. 'Der Münzfund von Lübeck', *ZfN* IV, 50–124.
 Dolley, R.H.M., 1955–7. 'Three Late Anglo-Saxon notes', *BNJ* 28, 88–105.
 Dolley, R.H.M., 1958–9. 'Some further remarks on the Transitional *Crux* issue of Æthelred II', *BNJ* 29, 259–64.
 Dolley, R.H.M., 1966. *SCBI 8. The Hiberno-Norse Coins in the British Museum* (London).
 Dolley, R.H.M., Elliott, D.J., and Elmore Jones, F., 1965. 'The Buckingham mint', *BNJ* 34, 46–52.
 Dolley, R.H.M., and van der Meer, G., 1958. 'An illusory coin of Ilchester', *NCirc* LXVI.12 (December 1958), 253–4.
 Dolley, R.H.M., and Strudwick, J.S., 1955–7. 'The provenances of the Anglo-Saxon coins recorded in the two volumes of the British Museum Catalogue' *BNJ* 28, 26–59.
 Eaglen, R.J., 1999. 'The mint of Huntingdon', *BNJ* 69, 47–145.
 Eaglen, R.J., 2002. 'Further coins from the mint of Huntingdon', *BNJ* 72, 15–23.
 Eaglen, R.J., Mitchell, P.D., and Pagan, H., 2001. 'Coin tickets in the British hammered series', *BNJ* 71, 136–57.
 Evans, J., 1885. 'On a hoard of Saxon pennies found in the City of London in 1872. Appendix', *NC* 5, 254–73.
 Esty, W.W., 1986. 'Estimation of the size of a coinage: a survey and comparison of methods', *NC* 146, 185–215.
 Esty, W.W., 1997. 'How to estimate the original number of dies and the coverage of a sample' [Unpublished handout for the International Numismatic Congress, Berlin, 1997].
 Freeman, A., 1985. *The Moneyer and the Mint in the Reign of Edward the Confessor 1042–1066* (Oxford).
 Galster, G., 1970a. *SCBI 13. Royal Collection of Coins and Medals, National Museum, Copenhagen. Part IIIA. Anglo-Saxon Coins: Cnut mints Axburgh-Lymne* (London).
 Galster, G., 1970b. *SCBI 14. Royal Collection of Coins and Medals, National Museum, Copenhagen. Part IIIB. Anglo-Saxon Coins: Cnut mints Lincoln and London* (London).
 Galster, G., 1970c. *SCBI 15. Royal Collection of Coins and Medals, National Museum, Copenhagen. Part IIIC. Anglo-Saxon Coins: Cnut mints Lydford to the end* (London).

- Galster, G., 1972. *SCBI 18. Royal Collection of Coins and Medals, National Museum, Copenhagen. Part IV. Anglo-Saxon Coins from Harold I and Anglo-Norman Coins* (London).
- Garmonsway, G.N., (trans.), 1972. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (London).
- Head, B.V., 1867. 'An account of the hoard of Anglo-Saxon coins found at Chancton Farm, Sussex', *NC* 7, 63–126.
- Gunstone, A.J.H., 1992. *SCBI 42. South-Eastern Museums. Ancient British, Anglo-Saxon and Later Coins to 1279* (London).
- Hildebrand, B.E., 1846 (1st edn). *Anglosachsiska Mynt* (Stockholm).
- Hildebrand, B.E., 1881 (2nd edn). *Anglosachsiska Mynt* (Stockholm).
- Jonsson, K., 1977. 'An example of regional weight variation in the coinage of Æthelred II', *NC* 137, 177–80.
- Jonsson, K., 1987. *Viking-Age Hoards and Late Anglo-Saxon Coins* (Stockholm).
- Jonsson, K., (ed.), 1990. *Studies in Late Anglo-Saxon Coinage*, Numismatiska Meddelanden XXXV (Stockholm).
- Jonsson, K., and van der Meer, G., 1990. 'Mints and moneyers c.973–1066', in Jonsson 1990, 47–136.
- Keary, C.F., 1893. *A Catalogue of English Coins in the British Museum. Anglo-Saxon Series. Volume II* (London).
- Lindsay, J., 1838/9. 'On the styca, supposed of Huath of Northumbria', *NC* 1, 141–7.
- Lyon, C.S.S., 1971. 'Variations in currency in Late Anglo-Saxon England', in R.A.G. Carson (ed.), *Mints, Dies and Currency* (London), 101–20.
- Lyon, C.S.S., 1976. 'Some problems in interpreting Anglo-Saxon coinage', *Anglo-Saxon England* 5, 173–224.
- Malmer, B., (ed.), 1982. *CNS 1, Gotland, 4. Fardhem-Fröjel* (Stockholm).
- Malmer, B., (ed.), 1985. *CNS 3, Skåne, 1. Åhus-Grönby* (Stockholm).
- Mawer, A., and Stenton, F.M., 1925. *The Place-names of Buckinghamshire*, English Place-name Society II (Cambridge).
- Metcalf, D.M., 1990. 'Can we believe the very large figure of £72,000 for the geld levied by Cnut in 1018?', in Jonsson 1990, 167–76.
- Metcalf, D.M., 1998. *An Atlas of Anglo-Saxon and Norman Coin Finds 973–1086* (London).
- Mossop, H.R., 1970. *The Lincoln Mint* (Newcastle upon Tyne).
- Nightingale, P., 1982. 'Some London moneyers, and reflections on the organization of English mints in the eleventh and twelfth centuries', *NC* 142, 34–50.
- North, J.J., 1980 (2nd edn). *English Hammered Coinage. Volume I. Early Anglo-Saxon to Henry III c.600–1272* (London).
- North, J.J., 1994 (3rd edn). *English Hammered Coinage. Volume I. Early Anglo-Saxon to Henry III c.600–1272* (London).
- Petersson, H.B.A., 1969. *Anglo-Saxon Currency. King Edgar's Reform to the Norman Conquest* (Lund).
- Petersson, H.B.A., 1990. 'Coins and weights. Late Anglo-Saxon pennies and mints, c.973–1066', in Jonsson 1990, 207–433.
- Ruding, R., 1840 (3rd edn). *Annals of the Coinage of Great Britain and its Dependencies* (London).
- SCBI 8.* See Dolley 1966.
- SCBI 13.* See Galster 1970a.
- SCBI 14.* See Galster 1970b.
- SCBI 15.* See Galster 1970c.
- SCBI 18.* See Galster 1972.
- SCBI 25.* See Talvio 1978.
- SCBI 30.* See Brady 1982.
- SCBI 34.* See Archibald and Blunt 1986.
- SCBI 40.* See Talvio 1991.
- SCBI 42.* See Gunstone 1992.
- Stewart, I., 1968. 'Notes on the Intermediate Small Cross and Transitional Crux types of Ethelred II', *BNJ* 37, 16–24.
- Talvio, T., 1978. *SCBI 25. The National Museum, Helsinki, and other Public Collections in Finland. Anglo-Saxon, Anglo-Norman, and Hiberno-Norse Coins* (London).
- Talvio, T., 1991. *SCBI 40. Royal Coin Cabinet, Stockholm, Part IV. Anglo-Saxon Coins: Harold I and Harthacnut, 1035–1042* (Oxford).
- Thompson, J.D.A., 1956. *Inventory of British Coin Hoards AD 600–1500* (London).
- Thornstrom, S., 1987. 'Vikingatida myntfynd i Smalands Museum', *Fran Myntkabinettet i Vaxjo, Kronobergsboken* 1987, 79–144.
- Van der Meer, G., 1961. 'Some corrections to and comments on B.E. Hildebrand's catalogue of the Anglo-Saxon coins in the Swedish Royal Coin Cabinet', in R.H.M. Dolley (ed.), *Anglo-Saxon Coins* (London), 169–87.
- Von Feilitzen, O., 1937. *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names of Domesday Book* (Uppsala).
- Willett, E.H., 1876. 'On a hoard of Saxon pennies found in the City of London in 1872', *NC* 16, 323–94.

ILLUSTRATION CREDITS

- Pl. 2, 1, 3–5, 7, 9–12: Reproduced by permission of the Royal Coin Cabinet, Stockholm.
- Pl. 2, 2, 17, 19, 21, 23: Reproduced courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum. (© British Museum.)
- Pl. 2, 6: Reproduced by permission of the National Museum, Helsinki.
- Pl. 2, 8: Photograph supplied by and reproduced by permission of the Smålands Museum, Sweden. (Photograph taken by Mr Bertil Olsson.)
- Pl. 2, 13: Photograph supplied by Mr W. Clarke.
- Pl. 2, 14, 20: Reproduced from the catalogue of the Eaglen sale, Baldwin's auction no. 18, 12–13 Oct. 1998, by permission of A.H. Baldwin and Sons Ltd.
- Pl. 2, 15: Reproduced from the catalogue of the Norweb IV sale, Spink auction no. 59, 17 June 1987, by permission of Spink and Son Ltd.
- Pl. 2, 16: Reproduced from the catalogue of the F. Elmore Jones sale, Glendining, 12–13 May 1971, by permission of Bonhams.
- Pl. 2, 18: Reproduced from the catalogue of the Ryan II sale, Glendining, 22–3 Jan. 1952, by permission of Bonhams.
- Pl. 2, 22: Photograph supplied and published by permission of Classical Numismatic Group, Inc., of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and London.

