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Introduction

The Lunettes coinage of Alfred (871–99) is generally viewed as a relatively straightforward, and final, adjunct to the substantial, and difficult to interpret, Lunettes coinage of the mid-ninth century kingdoms of Mercia and Wessex. Although produced at one of the most critical times in English history by one of its most remarkable rulers, it has received limited coverage in four key studies: Pagan in his seminal work on the coinage of Burgred (c.852–73/4);1 Dolley and Blunt in their major review of Alfred's coinage and hoards,2 Blackburn in his work on the London mint in the 880s3 and his associated work with Keynes on the relationship between Lunettes coins and subsequent issues.4 None of these sought solely to assess this coinage in its own right. As a consequence Alfred's Lunettes coinage, otherwise referred to as his first or Phase I coinage, is regarded as short-lived issue of little relevance to the reign as a whole.

With a large number of new finds in recent years, the evidence relating to this coinage has grown substantially. The number of moneyers now known exceeds that for any English coinage type up to that date and is not surpassed for any subsequent phase of Alfred's issues. This, along with a wide variety of stylistic variation, suggests this was a highly significant time in the development of the English coinage. Because of these issues we believe it merits closer analysis and reappraisal.

Our recent study of the coinage of Æthelred I (865–71) noted that the Lunettes coinage, originally confined to the kingdom of Mercia, was adopted by the kingdom of Wessex some time around 866.5 This important monetary decision created a single design for all coins south of the Humber and marked the beginnings of the uniform English coinage. We identified, from analysis of obverse dies, that Æthelred I's Lunettes could be placed into two groups. The majority, the Wessex Regular Lunettes group (a category we designated Æthelred I Group 2: Pl. 1, 1–4) all have a distinctively Wessex obverse interpretation. This was without doubt a coinage struck using dies prepared at, or strongly influenced by, Canterbury.

A second group, the Wessex Irregular Lunettes group (a category we designated Æthelred I Group 3: Pl. 1, 5–7) forms a smaller portion of the surviving coins. A diverse group influenced by Mercian Lunettes styles, it seems to have been produced at London, at other mints under Mercian control, or at locations in Wessex using dies prepared at London or possibly elsewhere. Previously these coins had been proposed as posthumous or unofficial issues.6 Our conclusion, based essentially on the number of coins now known, was that these were issues almost certainly produced officially during the reign of Æthelred I and are the products of
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The Lunettes coinage operations and processes under pressure at a time of considerable military, economic and political upheaval caused by the Danish incursions.

We believe that we can demonstrate that under Alfred the Lunettes coinage of Wessex, shaped by the dramatic military and political situation in southern England in the early-mid 870s, developed further the patterns and trends we have already noted in the coinage of Æthelred I.

Scope of paper and approach to the study

This paper deals solely with the Lunettes coins struck in the name of Alfred. No Lunettes coins are known for Archbishop Æthelred of Canterbury, unlike his predecessor Archbishop Ceolnoth, who, amongst other types, struck Lunettes-style coins. The key issues that we investigate are to:

- determine how the Wessex Lunettes coinage and the monetary relationship with Mercia begun by Æthelred I evolved under his brother and successor Alfred;
- define a classification, using the same obverse-based assessment as applied to the coinage of Æthelred I, for the Alfredian Lunettes pennies; and to investigate in parallel whether there is any linkage between the obverse classifications and the use of various Lunettes reverse types and to seek to provide an explanation of the purpose of the various reverse types;
- investigate the development of the Wessex coinage under Alfred in the 870s, examining how the production of the coinage evolved in terms of moneyers, mints, weight, metallic content and flan size;
- explore when the Wessex Lunettes coinage ceased to be both minted and in circulation.

As with our work on Æthelred I we have constructed a corpus of surviving coins, which has been considered in light of the coinage of Æthelred I as well as Burgred. The Corpus has been subjected to a stylistic analysis focused on the obverse but also taking into account reverse characteristics of Lunettes A-D. From this analysis the coinage is classified into a hierarchy of groups, variants and styles.

Historical context of the coinage

The Lunettes coinage of Alfred was struck during a period of extreme and continuing crises for the kingdom of Wessex. The historical narrative of campaigns, truces and tributes is the backdrop against which this coinage was produced and is crucial to explaining many aspects of it. According to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and other sources the years 871–8 were marked by periods of intensive warfare with the Danish armies interspersed with periods of respite, usually initiated by the payment of tribute by the English. Warfare, centred in central and western Wessex, dominated the years 870–1, 875–7 and 878. The years 872–5, whilst the Danish armies were occupied elsewhere, seem to have been a time of relative peace in Wessex, as was the period from mid 877 to early 878, after Guthrum moved from Exeter to Gloucester, but before the final campaign that culminated with the Treaty of Wedmore in late 878.

With warfare concentrated in central and western Wessex the established centre of Wessex monetary production at Canterbury was free from raiding and distant from the principal areas of military activity. The status of London is less well understood. For both Wessex and Mercia, London was a key strategic location. At the border of the two kingdoms it was a centre of monetary production and of trade. Although historically a Mercian city, Wessex
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7 Lunettes E coins are not known for Alfred; see also Williams 2008.
8 Swanton 2000, 70-9. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle presents both a highly truncated version of events and, being written some time afterwards, benefits from the hindsight that Wessex survived and prospered from the crisis. For selected sources from the period see Whitelock 1979.
influence there had grown as the kingdom asserted control over southern England. Given this background, it is probable that Alfred sought to maintain and further increase Wessex influence in the city, taking advantage of increasing Mercian weakness as the 870s progressed. It is highly probable that Wessex interests in southern and eastern Mercia grew at this time for the same reasons. With the exception of the occupation of London in the winter of 871/2, evidence of Danish involvement is more tentative, but the concept of a Danish presence in the city throughout this period, even if only on a trading basis, is credible.

These events had an undoubted impact on the coinage. In particular the issues of paying tribute, the dispersed production of coinage, the increasing involvement in Mercian affairs by Alfred and the final demonetisation of the coinage all need to be considered from the wider strategic and political viewpoint.

The numismatic evidence

Hoards
A full list of hoards is presented in Appendix 1, Table 1A. Fourteen hoards definitely contain coins of Alfred. A further ten post-1850 hoards may possibly contain coins of Alfred. In view of the turbulence of the times the number of hoards from this period is, not unsurprisingly, higher in comparison with the period before the Danish invasions and subsequent years after the Treaty of Wedmore.

Overall, the hoard record shows the patterns we identified in our paper on Æthelred I continuing:

Lunettes coins of Mercia and Wessex circulated freely between the two kingdoms.

The Lunettes coinage was the principal coinage with earlier types almost completely absent.

Hoards comprise a mix of coins of other contemporary, or near contemporary, archbishops and monarchs. Coins of Alfred tend not to predominate although in some hoards they are the largest group.

Find locations for hoards containing Lunettes coins of Alfred, compared to Æthelred I, tend to be slightly more widespread. This may demonstrate the dispersal of tribute payments within the Danish war-bands. There are two possible hoards from outside modern-day England: ‘Burgred’, Ireland and Tolstrup, Denmark, but the evidence for these is not absolutely certain. Overall the pattern is that of a coinage that largely circulated within the area of modern-day England.

Gainford, Beeston Tor, Repton, Walmsgate Lincoln, Duddington and North-Yorkshire, all hoards from locations distant from the south east of England, tend to contain a higher proportion of Lunettes B to D coins (although the small Lower Dunsforth hoard 1861 is an exception to this pattern).

The Lunettes coinage completely disappears from the hoard record after the mid 870s both in English controlled areas and further afield. Blunt and Dolley’s analysis of the hoard evidence for Alfred made the important point that Lunettes hoards are a distinct
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9 Nine Lunettes period hoards (Beeston Tor 1924, Cheltenham 1924, Croydon No 2 1862, Lower Dunsforth 1861, Gainford 1864, Gravesend 1838, Hook Norton 1848, London, Waterloo Bridge 1883 and Trewhiddle 1774) were defined as a distinctive group and assigned as Alfred group 1 by Blunt and Dolley 1959, 220-47. To these can be added Abbey Orchard, St Albans 1968, Duddington 1994–5, Leckhampton 1924, Walmsgate, Lincoln 1985, North Yorkshire, 2004 and Suffolk 2008.

10 Alfred’s coins seem to predominate in Hook Norton 1848 and Repton 1892 and 1895, though the former is a somewhat anomalous group as it is found at the mass burial site thus is not really a true hoard. Lower Dunsforth 1861, Beeston Tor 1924, Abbey Orchard, St Albans 1968, Walmsgate, Lincoln 1985, and Duddington 1994–5 are hoards where Alfred’s coins form the largest single group.

11 The provenance of the ‘Burgred’ Ireland hoard (c.1870) is discussed in Dolley 1967 and the Irish location can only be considered tentative. The coins could be from English finds that acquired a local hoard provenance for a variety of reasons.

12 The latter is the more surprising as obsolete English coinage is often found in areas such as Ireland, Scotland and Scandinavia where no local currency existed at the time. The authors believe that the relatively poor quality of the Lunettes coinage (especially in comparison with contemporary Carolingian and Islamic silver issues) may have restricted its currency and circulation to the area of modern-day England.
There are two possible exceptions to this but they do not provide irrefutable evidence of Lunettes coinage in circulation after the mid 870s. The Alfred type xiv attributed to the Trewhiddle hoard was considered by Wilson and Blunt, who came to a view that this was a misattribution that had occurred while the coin was in the Rashleigh family cabinet. This was a contention later strongly supported by Pagan when he acquired what is almost certainly the coin in question. The later London Monogram coin (Verulamium Museum, St Albans: SCBI 42, no. 758) associated with the Abbey Orchard, St Albans hoard is also noted and the range of possibilities arising from its context in relation to this find must await the hoard’s publication by Marion Archibald.

If there is one difference it is that the number of small hoards (c. 10 coins) increases from the five known containing Æthelred I’s coins to at least eleven for Alfred. Their location, largely in Danish controlled areas where the raiding army was resident, most probably represents tribute payments paid out to junior members of war-bands indicating wide circulation of the coinage.

The hoard evidence has been interpreted to seek to explain the sequence of reverse types. Traditionally Lunettes B, C and D have been regarded as being later, probably after 873, with any hoard solely containing Lunettes A being from before this date. The position is further complicated by the view that Burgred’s Lunettes B to D should be dated to the 860s. We are reluctant to accept the contention that sole presence of Lunettes A should limit the dating of a hoard to before 873 and believe that other explanations for such hoards must be sought.

**Single finds**

The Early Medieval Corpus and other sources record thirty-four single finds of coins, three times as many as those recorded for Æthelred I. A full list is presented in Appendix 1, Table 1B.

The single finds can be placed into four geographical groups. Lindsey (Group 1) and Cambridgeshire/Bedfordshire (Group 2) can probably be aligned to the presence of Danish armies in 872–3 and 875. These coins would seem to be casual losses associated, in the main, with the Danes themselves. This suggests that tribute payments were widely distributed within Danish war-bands and the large numbers of coins, linked to frequent movement, resulted in a steady number of accidental losses. Finds in London/Kent (Group 3) and elsewhere (Group 4) are much more random and cannot be easily explained by a single cause but Group 3 might be linked to the Danish presence at London in 871–2. This analysis, although useful in defining loss patterns, must be made with two caveats. Firstly, it cannot be overlooked that find location clusters can reflect the activities of modern-day detectorists who have been particularly active in Lincolnshire, East Anglia and Kent. Secondly, the link with specific war-bands must be tentative for the precise circumstances of each loss cannot, of course, be established.

The only single find recorded outside the boundaries of modern-day England is the coin found at Burghead, Morayshire, formerly in the National Museum of Antiquities of Scotland, and now missing. The coin is noted as having been pierced twice indicating that it was probably in use as jewellery rather than as currency.19
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13 Blunt and Dolley 1959, 220. Also the proposal by Blunt (Blunt 1952) that BM 1950–2–1–1 was a mule of Alfred’s Lunettes and Alfred’s BMC type v was re-evaluated by Blackburn and Keynes 1998 and this very badly worn coin was re-designated as Two Emperors or Portrait Quatrefoil/Cross and Lozenge mule (see Blackburn and Keynes 1998, 133 and illustration 7*).
14 Wilson and Blunt 1961, 112: ‘Both (also referring to a coin of Offa) would be unexpected in the context of this hoard.’
15 Pagan 2000, where he notes that the Franbald coin from the Stack (1999) sale, and almost certainly the coin formerly owned by the Rashleigh family, does not have the same patination as other Trewhiddle hoard coins.
16 Lyons and MacKay 2007, 75, Table 2.
17 Pagan 1987, 17. In Lyons and MacKay 2007, we noted that Lunettes D coins were struck for Æthelred I before the end of his reign, with an obverse bust style not found on the Lunettes coins of Alfred.
19 One of the four Burgred coins in the Tlnotrie, Kirkcudbrightshire (1912) hoard is also pierced (SCBI 6, no. 60).
The Corpus of the Lunettes coinage of Alfred the Great

A comprehensive review of the *Sylloge of the Coins of the British Isles*, the Early Medieval Corpus, the British Museum collection, auction catalogues and dealers’ fixed price lists as well as a wide range of other sources has produced a Corpus (appendix to this article) of 197 coins. We believe our corpus contains the majority of recorded coins but we also list details for another fifteen to twenty untraced coins. These are principally listed in unillustrated auction catalogues from before 1950 and cannot be linked to modern records. There are, in addition, a number of forgeries.

There is a discrepancy in the reconciliation of recorded coins with the hoard and single find records. With 197 coins set against some 150 find records there are, in broad terms, forty more coins than there should be. We believe this discrepancy might be explained by three reasons:

Before the discovery of the Croydon No. 2 hoard in 1862, coins of Alfred’s Lunettes type were relatively scarce. Ruding’s 1840 list only includes sixteen moneyers, although he misses four others that definitely have a pre-1840 provenance. Lindsay adds a further moneyer. This total of twenty-one moneyers is only a third of those known today. There can thus be few additional coins with pre-1860 provenances.

Coins removed without record from Croydon and subsequent hoards because of the attractiveness of their Alfredian pedigree. This raises the possibility that major hoards, particularly Croydon No. 2 hoard (1862), may understate the number and variety of Alfred’s coins. Additionally several finds in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries are poorly recorded and may have contained coins of Alfred, e.g. Hitchin, Wandsworth and London, Wood Street.

Other unrecorded hoards and single finds. There is some suspicion that the appearance of a significant number of unprovenanced coins in the late 1980s and early 1990s may represent a find dispersed on the market piecemeal. Finally there is a supposition that there is at least one unrecorded nineteenth-century hoard from the 1850s or 1860s.
Distribution of coins since discovery

The British Museum Collection has by far the largest holding, totalling forty-seven coins (nearly a quarter of those currently recorded). The next largest holding, nineteen coins, is in the St Albans Museum, which derives from the 1968 St. Albans, Abbey Orchard hoard. The holdings at Cambridge in the Fitzwilliam Museum, including the Blunt collection, Corpus Christi College and Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology in total comprise fourteen coins. Lincolnshire County Museum has six coins from the Walmsgate, Lincoln hoard. All other institutions have fewer than five specimens, most with one or two. In all, around two thirds of all known Alfred Lunettes pennies are held in public collections.

Over the last 150 years most of the major private collections have contained an example of an Alfred Lunettes penny. Among the major collections of the last century Burstal, Maish, Elmore Jones and Thorburn each had one example.31 Bliss32 had two examples. Mack33 and Stack34 each had three. The largest groupings were Montagu (8),35 Murdoch (6),36 Lockett (7),37 Grantley (6),38 Carlyon Britton (5),39 and Drabble (4).40 Unfortunately many collections, most notably Murdoch, formed in the century to 1950, were tainted by the presence of false coins.41

The structure of the Lunettes coinage of Alfred the Great

The Corpus splits into two groups defined by distinctive obverse styles: Group 1, the ‘Wessex’ group (Pl. 1, 11–19) and Group 2, the ‘Mercian’ group (Pls 1 and 2, 20–43). In our study of Æthelred I’s coinage we designated the latter group as Wessex Irregular Lunettes on the grounds that they were a relatively small group (largely following Mercian styles) not conforming to Wessex standards. Following our examination of the much larger group of non-Wessex style coins of Alfred that seem to have a Mercian influence we believe designating these coins as Mercian style is a better description of this group. Finally a small number of coins are classified as Irregular (Pl. 2, 44–52), as although they have affinities to Group 1 or 2 they cannot readily be placed in either group. Both Group 1 and 2 are a continuation of the structure we defined for the Lunettes coinage of Æthelred I.

The majority of Æthelred I’s coins (96%) have the Lunettes A reverse with 4%, almost certainly of Mercian origin, using the Lunettes D reverse. Under Alfred, Lunettes B and C were used in addition to D. All occur in both the Wessex and the Mercian style groups. In all 27% of surviving Alfredian Lunettes coins have reverses B, C and D, with a much higher proportion (49%) found in Group 2 (Mercian style) than in Group 1 (Wessex style) (12%). The Irregular group, largely Mercian linked, is predominantly Lunettes B to D (70%).

References:
31 Burstal (1912), lot 51 (AFL1.49): Ethelred; Maish (1918), lot 24 (not currently traced): Herewulf; Elmore Jones (1971), lot 43 (AFL1.83): Herewulf; Thorburn (1887), lot 52 (not currently traced): Ethelred.
32 Lot 86, Bosa (AFL1.7), Ethelred (not currently traced).
33 Mack, SCBI 20, nos 727–9: Burel, Hebeca, Heremod. All from the Lower Dunsforth hoard (1861).
34 Lots 415–17: Diarelm (AFL1.13), Ethelred (AFL1.45), Heremod (AFL1.73).
35 1895 sale, lots 546–52: Sigestef (AFL2.48), Ethelred (almost certainly AFL2.32), Tata (a forgery: either coin 1, 3 or 4 in the footnote to the Tata coins listing forgeries), Dudd (AFL2.22), Heremod (not currently traced), Liabinc (not currently traced), Osric (a forgery), Lude (a forgery). Die duplicates of the Lude and Osric forgeries were lots 35 and 36 in the 1888 duplicates sale along with a coin of Bosa (lot 34 – not currently traced).
36 Lots 83–8: Iaia (Tata) (2 forged coins: either coins 1, 3 or 4 in the footnote to the Tata coins listing forgeries), Dudd (AFL2.22), Heremod (not currently traced), Liabinc (not currently traced), Osric (a forgery), Lude (a forgery). Die duplicates of the Lude and Osric forgeries were lots 35 and 36 in the 1888 duplicates sale along with a coin of Bosa (lot 34 – not currently traced).
37 Lots 83–8: Iaia (Tata) (2 forged coins: either coins 1, 3 or 4 in the footnote to the Tata coins listing forgeries), Lude, Osric, Oeamer, Herewulf. All false except for the Herewulf (not currently traced).
39 Lots 996–9: Iaia (Tata) (a forgery: coin 3 in the footnote to the Tata coins listing forgeries), Osric (a forgery), Sigestef (AFL2.48), Diarelm (AFL1.14), Hebeca (AFL1.60), Wulfheard (AFL2.64).
30 1913 sale, lots 336–7: Biarnred (AFL2.5), Herewulf (AFL1.84). 1916 sale, lots 927–8: Dudd (AFL2.20), Sefreth (not currently located). 1918 sale, lot 1644, Heremod (AFL1.70).
40 1939 sale, lots 382–3: Bosa (AFL1.10), Denemund (AFL1.8). 1943 sale, lots 836–7: Dunn (AFL1.21) and Tata (a forgery: coin 4 in the footnote to the Tata coins listing forgeries).
41 Pagan 1972.
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TABLE 1. The Lunettes coinage of Alfred: classification by reverse type.

Note: Unverified coin AfL2.7 allocated to Group 2, Lunettes D. Unknown moneyers and coin weights (less AfL1.26) excluded. Percentage figures in the rows refer to the proportion by type within each group. Percentage figures in the far right column refer to proportion by group of all coins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lunettes A</th>
<th>Lunettes B</th>
<th>Lunettes C</th>
<th>Lunettes D</th>
<th>Total % all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1, ‘Wessex’</td>
<td>108 (88%)</td>
<td>11 (9%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2, ‘Mercian’</td>
<td>33 (51%)</td>
<td>11 (17%)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>15 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of recorded corpus</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illustrations


Classification of the Lunettes coinage of Alfred the Great

The Lunettes coinage of Alfred is a direct continuation of that of his brother and predecessor, Æthelred I, which we have already noted can be split into two groups. The first, Æthelred I Group 2 (with Group 1 being his Four Line issue which preceded the Lunettes), is of consistent style using Canterbury-produced dies and comprises four variants, with variants i and ii representing the Standard Bonnet types (Pl. 1, 1 and 2) and variants iii and iv, the Bold Head types (Pl. 1, 3 and 4). The second, Group 3, a smaller group (17% of Æthelred I’s Lunettes coins), is diverse with a variety of styles, and is produced from dies that show Mercian influence and which were almost certainly cut at London or other locations within Mercia. This group comprises variants v, vi and vii (Pl. 1, 5–7).

Alfred’s coinage continues this pattern with a large group of Wessex coins (Group 1, Pl. 1, 11–19) and a smaller group (Group 2, Pls 1 and 2, 20–43) showing Mercian influence. The concordance in Table 2 below demonstrates the linkage between the types of the two kings.
Group 2, the Alfredian Mercian-style Lunettes, is a continuation of Æthelred I’s Group 3. Under Alfred the scale of this Mercian-style group is much more significant, accounting for 33% of all coins, as opposed to 17% for Æthelred I. The Mercian models for these are Burgred’s Horizontal and Vertical style coins (Pl. 1, 9 and 10).

In addition there is a cluster of ten irregular and barbarous coins, comprising 5% of the total (Pl. 2, 44–52), that although largely associated with the Mercian group are best considered separately. Consideration must be given as to whether all the coins in this cluster are official issues. Our view is that they are. As we have already observed in our consideration of the coinage of Æthelred I, that is not to say that some coins may be regarded as imitative inasmuch as they were locally-sanctioned, inexpertly-produced emergency issues of the Anglo-Saxon territories. However the intermingling in hoards of coins of varying production quality seems to indicate that crudely produced or anomalously designed coinage was widely accepted. Additionally, looking at the issue from another direction it is difficult to see why the Danes, or some other unofficial agency, would have set out to produce such a complex series of anomalous coins rather than just produce straightforward copies. Setting aside the fact that the Danes had little need to mint coins as the English were handing over large quantities in tributes, local copying would surely have concentrated on replicating a few existing coins rather than setting out to produce a wide variety of new interpretations of the coinage sometimes in good quality silver by the standards of the issue.

Whilst the pattern is one of continuity on the obverse, the major change between the Lunettes coinage of Æthelred I (where Lunettes A predominates with only a few Lunettes D non-Wessex coins) and Alfred is the adoption of Lunettes reverses B to D into the mainstream of the Wessex coinage. This seems to reflect some deliberate purpose. In parallel there

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Æthelred I</th>
<th>Alfred</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wessex bonneted bust</td>
<td>Group 2, variant i</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I</td>
<td>Alfred’s coins have a single-banded diadem in place of the double-banded diadem of Æthelred I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in good style</td>
<td>(Pl. 1, 1)</td>
<td>(Pl. 1, 11–15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wessex bonneted bust</td>
<td>Group 2, variant ii</td>
<td>Group 1, variant II</td>
<td>Alfred’s coins have a single-banded diadem as variant I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in cruder style</td>
<td>(Pl. 1, 2)</td>
<td>(Pl. 1, 16–19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wessex unbonneted bust</td>
<td>Group 2, variant iii</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(bold head) in good style</td>
<td>(Pl. 1, 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wessex unbonneted bust</td>
<td>Group 2, variant iv</td>
<td>Not known, except</td>
<td>Irregular type (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(bold head) in cruder style</td>
<td>(Pl. 1, 4)</td>
<td>as an irregular coin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercian neat style bust</td>
<td>Group 3, variant v</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Pl. 1, 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercian bonneted bust</td>
<td>Group 3, variant vi</td>
<td>Group 2, variant III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Pl. 1, 6)</td>
<td>(Pl. 1, 20–28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercian ‘horizontal’ bust</td>
<td>Group 3, variant vii</td>
<td>Group 2, variant IV</td>
<td>One coin noted in this style in the Æthelred I corpus (Ae3.12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Pls 1 and 2, 29–40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercian ‘vertical’ bust</td>
<td>Group 3, variant vii</td>
<td>Group 2, variant V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Pl. 1, 7)</td>
<td>(Pl. 2, 41–43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular group</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Irregular Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Pl. 1, 44–52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 2, the Alfredian Mercian-style Lunettes, is a continuation of Æthelred I’s Group 3. Under Alfred the scale of this Mercian-style group is much more significant, accounting for 33% of all coins, as opposed to 17% for Æthelred I. The Mercian models for these are Burgred’s Horizontal and Vertical style coins (Pl. 1, 9 and 10).

As happened to the London Monogram, Osnafoarda and Two Line types. Also none of the moneyers’ names are Danish in style or reflect the range of continental names seen on the St Edmund Memorial coinage of a decade later.

See Irregular AfLi9, a coin of Herewulf of ‘quarter-fine’ (i.e. around 25% silver).
is a deterioration in the silver content, from an already low starting point of a ‘quarter fine’ standard (i.e. around 25% silver), to a figure not much more than half of this. But other aspects of the coinage such as die-cutting, flan size and weight present inconsistent patterns that do not demonstrate a consistent decline in standards.

Finally, a subjective assessment of the variety of die-cutting styles indicates that there was die-cutting capacity far in excess of the coinage output actually produced. Overall we believe that this, linked to the large number of moneyers and a wide variety of obverse styles and four different Lunettes reverses, indicates that in addition to production at Canterbury and London much of this coinage may have been produced on a sporadic and dispersed basis to meet needs for coin as required.

Classification of the Wessex Lunettes coins of Alfred the Great – Group 1: the Wessex Standard Lunettes

Two principal obverse variants are found in this Group. Both incorporate a bust with a bonnet. Variant I has a neat and generally well-proportioned style contrasting with variant II which is marked by a cruder or coarser treatment of the bust. The royal title +ÆLBRED REX,\textsuperscript{44} occurs in all cases, with a number of minor stylistic variations, but always starting at 10 o’clock on every coin. Obverse lettering on the Alfredian coins tends to be slightly larger than on Æthelred I’s, but mainly because there are fewer letters in the regnal title. The appearance of the bust on the Wessex Lunettes changes in one aspect as a single-banded diadem immediately replaces the double-band of Æthelred I.

TABLE 3. The Lunettes coinage of Alfred the Great: Group 1 (Wessex Lunettes) variants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1. Wessex Lunettes, variant I; Standard Bonnet 1.</td>
<td>Variant I</td>
<td>Variant IA, Standard bonnet 1 with bold pellet chin. (AfL1.40/BMA 466)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well-proportioned but tall bust with clear bonnet with single-banded diadem surmounted by a crescent and pellet. Distinctive hooknose ending in a serif. The nose is usually a single line linking the diadem and nose. Frog eye, usually with ‘eyelid’ underneath. Two distinct crescents (curls of hair) in nape of neck with points that face upwards and to the left. Often with a clear attempt to show a chin using a boldly cut pellet (sub-variant A). Others understate or omit this appearing chinless (sub-variant B). Wessex style drapery in three panels with outer edges made up of curved lines, the right and left panel containing two horizontal bars and a central panel, a horizontal bar above a ‘T’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-variants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. With bold pellet for chin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Without or weak pellet for chin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Die cutting stylistic variations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Well-cut and balanced bust (Pl. 1, 11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Heavily rendered dies similar to i (Pl. 1, 12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Less confident style with eye rendered as a dot and without lower eyelid (Pl. 1, 13).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variant IB, Standard bonnet 1 with weak pellet chin. (AfL1.5/BMA 455)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{44} Bibire 1998, 163 states that this is the Kentish form of the name. This is borne out by the Mercian use of Elfred and similar forms on quite a number of coins of non-Wessex origin.
Seven obverse legend styles are found with Group 1 Wessex Lunettes coins of Alfred. (All the recorded legends start at seven o’clock. Where a style is recorded for three moneyers or fewer, their names are shown.) Legend styles 2 and 4 are most commonly found.

1. **REX +ÆLBRED** (Tidbald)
2. **REX +ÆLBRED**
3. **ÆX +ÆLBRED**
4. **ÆX +ÆLBRED**
5. **ÆX +ÆLBRED** (Biarnred, Cialmod, Herebald)
6. **ÆX +ÆLBRED** (Hebeca, Osgeard)
7. **ÆX +ÆLBRED** (Bosa, Liabinc)

The coins are usually struck on slightly smaller diameter flans, typically reduced by 1 mm compared with those of Æthelred I. Lunettes B, and much more rarely C and D, are now found within the Wessex Lunettes coinage as well as Lunettes A, already noted for Æthelred I. However Lunettes B to D remain the exception, with Lunettes A still dominant and accounting for 88% of the surviving Corpus of Group 1 coins.

Within variant I, standard bonnet 1, there are two distinctive sub-variants, perhaps the product of different die-cutting workshops. Sub-variant A has a bust with a boldly cut pellet above the drapery, looking like a goitre. On sub-variant B, the pellet is weakly cut and sometimes omitted. In addition three different stylistic ‘hands’ can be identified at work on both sub-variants. Overall, variant I shows a consistency in style and continuity with the coinage of Æthelred I, which suggests it was struck using Canterbury prepared-dies.

Variant II, standard bonnet 2, is distinct from variant I, with a bust that is poorly proportioned. Busts can be quite crude (Pl. 1, 17–18) or rather better produced (Pl. 1, 16, 19) but closer examination shows irregularities and coarse production standards, notably the failure to make the lines of the lunettes parallel on the latter two coins. We believe that, as with Æthelred I’s variant ii and iv, these coins were struck from dies prepared away from Canterbury. However there seems to have been a more determined attempt to sustain...
standards and there are fewer really poorly produced dies of Alfred compared to the output of Æthelred I (and certainly nothing like the wide variety of poorly executed coins of Burgred from the same period). Most of the moneyers using variant II dies are recorded for variant I.

Within Group 1, ninety-four variant I (77%) and twenty-eight variant II (23%) coins are noted (detailed in Appendix 2, Table 2A). This compares with seventy-four coins of variants i/iii (62%) and forty-three of variants ii/iv (38%) in the matching group (Group 2) of Æthelred I. This suggests that the dominance of Canterbury as the principal die-cutting and administrative centre for the Wessex Lunettes coinage was undiminished.

The mix of variants and sub-variants does not suggest that moneyers regularly used a single die-cutter. The dies seem to have been drawn for use as required. The overall impression given is one of die-cutting capacity that could be called on to produce sufficient dies when required. This further reinforces the pattern of sporadic surge production that seems to be a principal characteristic of this coinage. This is particularly noticeable with the coins of Herewulf where the dies of all the existing coins (AfL1.82 to AfL1.86) seem to have been cut simultaneously, possibly for some large-scale production project.

There has been some consideration in the past as to whether some of these coins, particularly those with Lunettes B to D reverses, could be 'mules' using Canterbury obverses with Mercian reverses. Appendix 2, Table 2C, shows that the evidence for this is inconclusive. Lunettes B has every appearance of being a Wessex-produced group, although with a higher than normal proportion of variant II coins. Whilst the very small number of Lunettes C and D coins have the appearance of 'muling', the evidence for this is not conclusive.

There are a few coins in Group I, notably the Repton Tidehelm (AfL1.116) and two coins of Wulfheard (AfL1.121 and 122), which have in the past been excluded from the Wessex Lunettes on the grounds of style. Overall, although we note the slightly anomalous nature of the reverses, we reject this view as unsustainable when the coins are set in the wider context of an analysis of obverse styles for all the surviving material. We have therefore assigned these coins to Group I.

Classification of the Wessex Lunettes coinage of Alfred the Great – Group 2: the Mercian Style Lunettes

The three principal obverse variants found in Group 2 are all a direct continuation of Æthelred I’s variants vi and vii. Variant III (Pl. 1, 20–28), aligns with Æthelred I variant vi (Pl. 1, 6) and copies the Canterbury Standard Wessex Bonnet, a style also found in the name of Burgred (Pl. 1, 8), reinforcing the Mercian link. Variants IV (Pl. 1, 29–36 and Pl. 2, 37–40) and V (Pl. 2, 41–43), align with Æthelred I variant vii (Pl. 1, 7). Variant IV uses the Mercian ‘Horizontal’ type, that is, the diadem of the bust is between forty-five and sixty degrees and the hair is unbonneted (Pl. 1, 9). Variant V (Pl. 2, 41–3) conforms with the Mercian ‘Vertical’ type (Pl. 1, 10), with the diadem between five and fifteen degrees from the vertical and the head lacking any signs of a bonnet. Æthelred I variant v (Pl. 1, 5), with an obverse bust design reminiscent of earlier types, does not reappear (although moneyers linked with this type are recorded for sub-variant IVD; Pl. 2, 39 and 40). Unlike Group 1, the double-banded diadem is often found on the Group 2 coins. Although this appears to be a complex structure, in comparison with the contemporary issues of Burgred the coins are well-executed and reasonably consistent in appearance.

As with the Group 3 Wessex Irregular Lunettes coins of Æthelred I, a wide range of obverse legend styles are found, some only recorded for single coins.

2. **REX +AELBRED** (Biarnmod, Biarnred, Bureel, Cialbred, Cialulf, Cuthulf, Deigmund, Dudine, Dunn, Ealmeit, Etheleah, Ethered, Ethelwulf, Heafreth, Mannine, Osgeard, Sigestef, Tata, Tirwald, Winberht, Wine)

3. **RE+ +AELBRED** (Biarnred, Biarnwulf, Cialulf, Denewald, Dudwine, Ethelhere, Ethered, Ethered, Ethelhere, Ethelwulf, Etheleah, Ethered, Ethelwulf, Heafreth, Mannine, Osgeard, Sigestef, Tata, Tirwald, Winberht, Wine)

4. **RE+ AELBRED** (Biarnred, Dealinc, Dudd, Ealhere, Herebald, Tirwald, Wine)

5. **REX+ AELBRED** (BMA 462)

6. **RELEXELBRED** (Dudd)

7. **REX +HLELFRED** (Sigestef)

8. **RE+AEL** (Ethelgar)
The sheer range of styles and the large numbers of moneyers involved suggests a wide and diverse approach to production. The problem of coming to any conclusions about Group 2 is best exemplified by the coin of Deigmund (AfL2.17 – Pl. 1, 33). It is the only recorded coin of Alfred known from the Gravesend 1838 hoard. It is thus almost certainly amongst the earliest dated coins in this Group. Although of good weight, it is one of the worst executed coins in the Group. This coin is thus of little assistance if a model of consistent coinage decline between 870 and the mid-870s is accepted.

Given this, there is every indication that this coinage follows on directly from Æthelred I’s Mercian-style coinage (Æthelred I Group 3), with the following pairs very similar stylistically (the obverses of the Alfred coins are somewhat better cut): Denewald, Æthelred I (Ae3.5) and Alfred (AfL2.18); Dunn, Æthelred I (Ae3.12) and Alfred (AfL2.27); Ealmund, Æthelred I (Ae3.13) and Alfred (AfL2.31).

### TABLE 5. Mercian-style Lunettes moneyers, stylistic variations and reverse types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Stylistic variation</th>
<th>Coin: moneyer, corpus reference and Lunettes reverse type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variant III</td>
<td>Sub-variant A (Long face)</td>
<td>Bureel (AfL2.9: A), Cialulf (AfL2.12: D), Etheleah (AfL2.32: C), Sigestef (AfL2.47: A), Sigestef (AfL2.48: B), Sigestef (AfL2.49: B), Tata (AfL2.53: C).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-variant B (Square head)</td>
<td>Dudwine (AfL2.25: A), Dunit (AfL2.26: D), Manninc (AfL2.44: C).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variant IV</td>
<td>Sub-variant A (Un-pelleted hair, bold head)</td>
<td>Biarnred (AfL2.6: C), Cialulf (AfL2.11: B), Tirwulf (AfL2.58: D), Wine* (AfL2.60: A).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-variant C (Two line hair)</td>
<td>Eathelstan (AfL2.36: D), Ethelwulf (AfL2.38: D), Osgeard (AfL2.45: D).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-variant D (Thin bust)</td>
<td>Ealmund (AfL2.31: D), Ethelgar (AfL2.33: D), Luhinc (AfL2.43: D).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group 2, Variant III: The ‘London Wessex’ Bonnet

There are three sub-variants. Sub-variants A (Pl. 1, 20–22) and B (Pl. 1, 23–25) are closely linked in style to the Wessex Group 1 coins which they seem to imitate. In comparison sub-variant C (Pl. 1, 26–28) seems to be less influenced by the Canterbury die cutting style.

Sub-variants A and B have the single-banded diadem, drapery and inscription largely following Wessex styles. There may be a case to be made that they were produced in a Wessex-run workshop in London. Lunettes A to D exist in largely equal quantities possibly indicating minting for a large number of purposes.

Sub-variant A is a better-produced coinage. Although the bust is ungainly there is little variability in design. This is possibly a short-term issue. The style is not noted for Æthelred I. A short period of production is reinforced by the fact that all the moneyers, with the exception of Bureel, are known to produce other coin types. A coin of Sigestef (AfL2.49) is recorded as being 15.9% silver.

Sub-variant B is more variable and seems to be cut by a wider variety of hands; however it follows on in general appearance from similar coins of Æthelred I (variant vi). The presence of Manninc (with a coin, AfL2.44, of 18.5% silver), a well-known Canterbury moneyer, may indicate a shift of some production from Canterbury to London in the early 870s. Overall the mix of moneyers and design characteristics both point to a London focus and that this style lasted for the duration of the coinage.

Sub-variant C, with its double-banded diadem bust and frequently crude die-cutting seems to be a coinage less under Canterbury control and possibly produced outside London. The fact that the coins are only known with Lunettes B and D reverses further suggests a provincial connection. There are wide variations in die-cutting. However, as so often with Alfred’s Lunettes coins things are not as straightforward as they seem. Three of the moneyers (Biarnmod, Ethered and Herebald) are mainstays of the Canterbury mint and Tata and Wine play a similar role in London. This sub-variant is most probably die-cut and struck away from London. This is yet another indication of established moneyers being deployed away from their normal workplaces in a deliberate policy to meet emergency requirements for coin production.

Group 2, Variant IV: ‘Horizontal’ bust

Variant IV (Pl. 1, 29–36, Pl. 2, 37–40) is a variation of the standard Mercian Horizontal type. One poorly executed example has already been noted for Æthelred I (Ac3.12). However it plays a major part in Alfred’s coinage.

Within Variant IV, sub-variant A (Pl. 1, 30–31 and possibly 29), is a very distinctive interpretation of the Vertical bust (AfL2.64: A). The authors have

---

46 There is a coin of Burgred that has a double diadem bust and bonnet that is cut in a manner more closely aligned to sub-variant B. See SCBI 20, no. 620 Lunettes A moneyer Liafwald. This moneyer is not known for Wessex issues.

47 Two of these coins come from the Somerset County Museum: AfL2.10, SCBI 24, no. 382 Calbred and AfL2.39, SCBI 24, no. 383 Ethered. Although without provenance it is tempting to consider a West Country origin for these coins. See also Pagan 1986b, 119.
not found any obverses of Burgred that match this design. There is also a die linkage between a Lunettes C coin of Biarnred (AfL2.6, Pl. 1, 31) and a Lunettes A of Wine (AfL2.60, Pl. 1, 30) both from the Beeston Tor hoard (1924). In common with variant III, sub-variant A, this small group looks to be a short-term issue struck with dies cut at London.

Sub-variant B (Pl. 1, 32–36, Pl. 2, 37–38) is the complete opposite, a sprawling series that seems to become a widespread standard for Mercian-style coins. Based on a Mercian prototype (cf. Cenred Lunette A, SCBI 1, no. 412) it developed into a standard interpretation for Mercian moneyers producing coins for Wessex. Out of the nineteen moneyers only one, Ethelhere, is an established Wessex moneyer. Ethelhere, who struck coins for Æthelberht, is only known for Mercian-style coinage in Alfred's Lunettes. Tirwulf, a moneyer of Æthelred I noted for Mercian-style coins, is one of the quite large group who use both Wessex and Mercian-style dies. Three new moneyers, Ealhere, Heafreth and Tirwald, although categorised as new Wessex moneyers, use both Wessex and Mercian-style dies and could have worked at a location or locations where dies could have been supplied from either London or Canterbury as needed.

About half of this sub-variant is in crude style that may indicate some die-cutting away from London or just a decline in quality of workmanship. Lunettes A predominates. We propose this coinage was struck in southern Mercia and possibly at London too.

Sub-variant C differs from IV A and IVB, having a square cut bust and two rows of hair reminiscent of some Vertical bust types. This seems to be another non-London issue with two established Mercian moneyers, Ethelstan and Ethelwulf, supplemented by one new moneyer, Osgeard, who uses both Wessex and Mercian dies. It is noteworthy that all three known examples are Lunettes D and we believe this may suggest an east or south-east Mercian location.48

There is a further sub-variant, D (Pl. 2, 39–40), again exclusively using Lunettes D reverses that includes two rare moneyers, Ealmund and Ethelgar, known for Æthelred I's variant v. An additional moneyer Luhinc is also noted and occurs for Wessex-style coins. The style has a thin bust reminiscent of some Vertical bust coins of Burgred. However the authors believe there is a closer affinity with the horizontal style, especially the use of the double-banded diadem and way in which nose and diadem are linked in a single line, and have placed it in variant IV. Whilst these coins do not match the style found on the Æthelred I variant v coins, they do seem to be related to them with the use of Lunettes D and the same moneyers not otherwise found. In our conclusions for Æthelred I variant v, made in the absence of these coins, we proposed that it was an 'emergency issue, possibly struck away from the monetary centres of London and Canterbury'.49 With these coins of Alfred it seems these must come from a stand-alone production centre possibly located in east or south-east Mercia.50

Group 2, Variant V: ‘Vertical’ Bust

Variant V (Pl. 1, 38–40) continues on from Æthelred I’s variant vii (Pl. 1, 7). The obverse dies are cut in a wide variety of interpretations and may represent a system of production where die-cutting was devolved to moneyers. All the moneyers, with the exception of Elelaf, are well-established. Lunettes A dominates. The only non-Lunettes A coin, the Lunettes C of Ethelere (AfL2.33) has a very uncertainly drawn bust and probably is a local copy; interestingly it comes from the group of crudely produced coins found at Repton.51

---

48 These coins seem to have characteristics in common with Æthelred I Group 3, variant v.
49 Lyons and MacKay 2007, 92.
50 The find spots of the Ealmund and Ethelgar coins are Norfolk and Suffolk respectively, reinforcing this attribution. Both coins are very recent finds: Ealmund, 2006, and Ethelgar, 2008. See MacKay and Lyons forthcoming.
51 Biddle et al. 1986, 117.
Irregular and barbarous coinage

There are ten coins in the corpus that do not fit within the Group 1 and 2 classifications. Each coin is stylistically idiosyncratic and in some cases unique. While most of these coins exhibit sufficient features in common to allow them to be linked with Group 1 or Group 2, nevertheless they are best classified as irregular issues. The coins can be allocated into seven types, (a)-(g), with types (a) and (b) associated with Alfred Group 1 Lunettes and types (c) to (g) with Alfred Group 2 Lunettes.

The irregular coins related to Group 1 (Pl. 2, 44–45) are by Diara, Herewulf and Wulfheard, all known Wessex moneyers. Group 1 irregular type (a) both have features that link them with Group 1, particularly the use of a literate inscription (Inscription 2: REX+AELBRED). The coin by Herewulf has a distinctive bonnet (Pl. 2, 44), whilst another by Wulfheard uses the Wessex drapery style with the vertical and two horizontal bars in the central panel. The coin by Herewulf is 24% silver, one of the highest levels recorded for a coin of Alfred. The coin by Diara could almost pass as a variant IB, but the treatment is much more tentative and the lettering rather coarse (Pl. 2, 45), hinting at irregularity. This is assigned as irregular type (b).

There are also two barbarous coins linked to irregular type (a). They differ from other irregular coins in having a crudeness in their execution not otherwise seen in the Alfredian Lunettes coinage (Pl. 2, 51–52). Both coins are by Dudda (the name seems, as with Æthelred I, to be a variant of Dudd) and have a peculiar treatment of the hair that is spiky and without a bonnet, along with a highly simplistic, almost shrunken, rendering of the facial features. Most notably they have in common use of a blundered obverse legend, style 15: R3XXAELBRED.

The Group 2 irregulars (Pl. 2, 46–50) are more diverse. There are five different moneyers, with a different moneyer for each surviving coin. As is to be anticipated the obverse titles used are, with the exception of Denemund, all irregular:

2. REX+AELBRED – Denemund
11. RE+AELBRED – Duni
17. ERX+ELFRED – Eadred
18. +(X)AELBREDX – Diarelm
26. AELBREDREX – Dudwine

Denemund, Duni and Eadred are not known for other Alfred Lunettes types. Denemund is known for Æthelberht’s Inscribed Cross type.

Irregular types (c) to (g) all have in common characteristics found on the Group 2 Alfred Lunettes. Type (c), by Denemund (Pl. 2, 46), is based on variant III, but the drapery is exaggerated and overlarge. Type (d), the coin of Duni (Pl. 2, 47), is marked by cruder die cutting than found for variant III, with the letters rendered in a heavy style and anomalous treatment of the drapery. On the reverse the moneyer’s name is inverted. Type (e), a coin of Dudwine (Pl. 2, 48), from the Repton mass-burial excavations, links with variant V but has an anomalous treatment of the central drapery panel which seems to comprise a cross of four triangular segments surrounded by pellets. Type (f), a coin of Diarelm (Pl. 2, 49 – the name is almost certainly a variant of Diarel), another Repton find, has a distorted bust with complex drapery showing affinities to Burgred coins. It is reminiscent of some of the more disconnected versions of a type of Burgred known principally for two coins of the moneyer Beorneah (BMC 165), Bird (1974) 55 and more particularly a coin of Tata (National Museum of Wales, E167). Type (g), a rather corroded coin of Eadred (Pl. 2, 50), has a crudely-produced bust with hair that runs backward in horizontal lines, similar to variant IV.

An explanation is needed for this exceptional group of coins that seem to stand out from the wider surviving Alfredian Lunettes coinage. The majority of the coins have sound provenances that would seem to rule out the possibility that they are modern forgeries. We can be certain that they are all coins of Alfred’s time.

---

52 Illustrated in Metcalf and Northover 1985, Pl. 25, no. 57.
They all have in common variations in style from the mainstream Group 1 and 2 Alfredian Lunettes coinage and this seems to suggest use of locally-cut dies copying officially produced coins. They can either be improvised or emergency issues, produced at short notice in the absence of official dies, contemporary copies designed to pass off as official coins or coins produced outside areas of Wessex control, possibly even in the emerging Danelaw. We are reluctant to consider them as Danish imitations, but it is possible they represent unofficial local production within areas slipping out of Mercian or Wessex control.

Half the coins have find locations. Three are from the Repton excavations and four others are finds from Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire and Warwickshire (only one is possibly from the south: AfIr1, the Denemund from the Hook Norton hoard (1848)). This concentration in areas increasingly coming under Danish control may well reinforce the concept of coins produced at a local centre or centres in Mercia and at the fringes of the English monetary system. The key point is that these irregular coins reinforce a model of widely dispersed production conducted with a sense of urgency that relied on locally-cut dies rather than waiting for supplies from either Canterbury or London.

The Lunettes coinage of Alfred the Great: analysis of the Corpus

*Weight*

Weights are recorded for ninety-seven full coins (Group 1: sixty-two, Group 2: thirty-three and Irregular: two). The poor quality of the coinage results in a very high proportion of chipped and broken coins: so much so that only half the coins in the corpus can be included in this analysis. By comparison the weights of over 70% of Æthelred I’s coinage could be analysed.53 Table 6 below lays out the distribution by weight and variant. However these figures must be treated with caution. They are a very small sample and most coins are so base that tightly-controlled weights would almost certainly have not been a high priority. Also the metallic content is prone to the effects of corrosion and leaching, reducing both coin weight and silver content.54

Two peaks in the weight distribution are present for Group 1 coins (Variants I and II). The first is the cluster around 1.20 g that reflects the standard established by Æthelred I when he introduced the coinage. But overall the coins are lighter. Excluding the coins under 1.00 g gives an average weight of 1.15 g. This is below Æthelred I’s comparable Group 2 average of 1.23 g. Also when compared with Æthelred I’s comparable Group 2 coins, there are a smaller proportion of coins above 1.20 g (24% of the total compared with the 63% of Æthelred I).

There is a second cluster around 0.90 g, much more marked in comparison with Æthelred I. This group of coins might be explained as the last stages of production where the need to save even base metal and exigencies of production converged to produce very debased and very light-weight coins. But the evidence does not support this. There are a very considerable number of coins of good execution and appearance, as well as good flan size, that are nevertheless light-weight. Variations in weight here may reflect only different practices in flan preparation and the availability of base metal to mix with the silver.55

However reduction in weight from 1.15 g to 0.90 g produces a very small silver saving when the debasement of the coinage reaches 12.5% silver content. A 0.25 g difference in absolute weight would only have produced silver savings of 3.13 g per hundred coins. In such circumstances saving on the base metal used might have seemed an equally important reason to reduce weight.

---

53 Lyons and MacKay 2007, Table 4.
54 This seems particularly noticeable in the Abbey Orchard, St Albans (1968) and Walmsgate, Lincoln (1985) finds. In the former no coin exceeds one gram and in the latter only one coin is over that weight.
55 Some examples of Variant I coins where this is so are Dunn (AfL1.17, 0.99 g, same dies as AfL1.18, 1.29 g.) and Ethelmund (AfL1.36/BMA 464), a coin of good appearance and struck on a large flan but which nevertheless weighs 0.98 g.
The smaller corpus of Variant II largely follows the pattern of Variant I but has proportionally fewer good weight coins above 1.20 g, and more light-weight coins below 1.00 g, than Variant I. Nevertheless the comparative weight profiles, continuing from Æthelred I, strongly support the concurrency of Variants I and II.

The patterns of Group 2 coinage weights show less change from Æthelred I. Variant III, the ‘London-Wessex’ group, seems to follow Group 1 quite closely. Variant IV includes some coins of higher and lower weight but has a marked grouping between 1.20 g to 1.29 g. Variant V is clustered around 1.20 g. The Irregular coins seem to be at the lower end of the weight spectrum but the sample is too small to establish any pattern.

Flan sizes

We have carried out an analysis of flan diameters for 161 coins. The result of this has to be subject to the caveat that many of the measurements have been taken from photographic evidence where some degree of distortion is always possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/Variant</th>
<th>&lt;17.9 mm</th>
<th>18.0–18.9 mm</th>
<th>19.0–19.9 mm</th>
<th>&gt;20.0 mm</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/I</td>
<td>9 (12%)</td>
<td>51 (80%)</td>
<td>14 (99%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/II</td>
<td>5 (24%)</td>
<td>13 (86%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil (100%)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/III</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>13 (61%)</td>
<td>6 (57%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/IV</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>8 (36%)</td>
<td>10 (76%)</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/V</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>3 (66%)</td>
<td>2 (89%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td>3 (37%)</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>1 (87%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The authors did however measure diameters of the actual British Museum and Fitzwilliam Museum coins.
This data shows a tendency for Group 1 coins to be struck on smaller flans with 80% of Variant I and 86% of Variant II coins on flans less than 19 mm in diameter. This contrasts with the Mercian Group 2 where Variant III and V seem to match the Wessex standard while Variant IV seems to stay with a rather larger than average flan size (in particular Lunettes D coins all tend to be on larger flans). This seems to suggest that a reduction in flan size was instituted in Wessex and implemented more determinedly by the Canterbury die cutters than those based elsewhere.

But, as with weights, whilst a pattern can be observed, the evidence is not conclusive. It does seem that the tendency to smaller-size flans for Canterbury-issued dies, begun at the end of the reign of Æthelred I, continued. Group 2 coins, especially variant IV, tended to be struck on larger flans and lay, as with the apparent weight reduction, outside a Canterbury flan/die size reform.

**Metallic composition**

The principal source for information on the metallic composition of the coinage is Metcalf and Northover's study. Ten coins of Alfred were analysed with silver content varying between 28.5% and 10.7%. A broad correlation was established that earlier coins contained better silver. However quality of design and execution is not linked to silver content. Whilst the data is slight it does show that the scale of debasement present in the Alfredian Lunettes coinage is more marked than for any of the preceding issues. The scale of debasement seems to suggest that limited supplies of silver were being stretched as far as possible to produce large volumes of coins. Nothing though can be proven as to how and when debasement occurred but the authors believe that the later coins were more likely to be debased than the earlier ones.

**Coinage in the early years of the reign of Alfred the Great**

*The circulation and use of coinage in the 870s*

The evidence almost certainly indicates that the Lunettes coinage was plentiful, widely produced and subject to successive debasement. It is also evident that the distribution of coin finds shows that it was a coinage that circulated in both English and Danish-controlled areas. There are two key issues regarding the coinage. The first was that the coinage circulated despite the fact that the contemporary precious metal Carolingian, Byzantine and Islamic coinages were of far superior weight and fineness. The second is that the coinage seems to disappear from circulation very quickly once the high silver content Cross and Lozenge coinage is introduced.

The focus of any consideration is how the Danish armies, settlers and English population in the Danish-conquered territories used the coinage. We know virtually nothing about the tribute payment system, except the survival of coin weights. But they tell us little more than that coins were used in certain transactions where large quantities of coins were measured by weight. As to the subsequent use of the coinage paid in tribute, it might on one hand have been melted to fit with a bullion-based form of exchange or on the other, might have continued in the form of coin acceptable for wider trading purposes between the emerging Danelaw and the areas remaining under English control.

We believe all these issues can be better considered once we have completed our study of the coinage of Burgred and we propose returning to this topic in due course. We also propose to look in more detail at the issues raised by coin weights at the same time.

---

58 Their concern (Metcalf and Northover 1985, 101) that a ‘Canterbury’ (Denemund, AFl.1r) coin had only 11% silver is in fact misplaced. This is clearly an irregular coin produced outside the Wessex mainstream.
59 A Group 1 Wessex coin of Ætheleah (AFl.133/SCBI I, no. 246a), of Variant I and quite well cut, has the same silver content as Dudwine (AFl.16/Repton 1982), a most irregular coin (Irregular e).
**Die distribution and minting estimates**

The corpus comprises 182 obverse and 177 reverse dies (dies and die linkages are listed in Appendix 3). Forty-five coins are die-linked (some 23% of the total). Inevitably producing any analysis from such a small sample, particularly where so many moneyers are represented by only one or two examples, is more of an art rather than an exact science. Nevertheless these dies (assuming the traditional 10,000 coins struck per die set) could represent a potential coinage production of some 1.7 to 1.8 million. If the actual number of dies used may be assumed to be two to three times the number of known dies, this gives a maximum theoretical production potential of 3 to 4.5 million coins.

This is a high figure. Our opinion is that actual production would have been considerably lower. This is because there are a large number of moneyers with only one or two coins known and most surviving coins do not show evidence of die wear or retouching suggesting dies were rarely used until they wore out. Furthermore more than half the moneyers are only known for this coinage and the inference must be drawn that they were authorised to produce coins for specific purposes and on a limited basis.

Overall therefore we would favour a total minting output for the Alfredian Lunettes coinage of between one and two million coins. This is some fifty per cent more than the comparable figure we proposed for Æthelred I.

**Lunettes reverses**

We are strongly of the opinion that the Lunettes reverses are a deliberate indicator of some purpose. The dominant type is Lunettes A but there are a considerable number of coins (27%) with Lunettes B, C and D reverses (see Appendix 2, Tables 2B and 2C for full details). As is to be anticipated with reverse types devised for the coinage of Burgred, Lunettes A is less frequent for Alfred Group 2 Mercian-style coins (33 out of 65, 51% of recorded coins as against Group I where only 14 out of 119, 11%, are not Lunettes A). The comparison between Group I and the Irregular coins is even starker where only 3 out of the 10 Irregular coins have a Lunettes A reverse. As noted earlier, although Group 1 Lunettes B coins seem largely to have been struck from Wessex dies, the small number of Wessex style Lunettes C and D coins may be ‘mules’ with Canterbury obverses and London reverses.

As noted in consideration of the hoard evidence, the established view is that Lunettes variation is a later development in Alfred’s Lunettes coinage. The numbers of coins and the way that they seem to be integrated into the coinage could perhaps lead to an alternate view that Lunettes variation was a characteristic of the coinage introduced at an early stage. It should be noted too that a precedent for reverse types other than Lunettes A already exists in the Lunettes D issues of Æthelred I. We would therefore suggest that an explanation for the reverse types based on sequential issues requires very careful re-consideration.

Attempting to link Lunettes variations to moneyers or die cutters is not sustainable. Not only do many moneyers use more than one reverse type, but there is at least one die linkage where the same obverse is used to produce a Lunettes C coin for Biarnred and a Lunettes A coin for Wine (AfL2.60: Pl. 1, 31 and AfL2.6: Pl. 1, 30). Metcalf and Northover also show that the Lunettes types do not represent different standards of fineness.

---

60 We are aware of the considerable body of work, and related controversy, on this subject: see in particular Buttrey 1993 and 1994 and subsequent debate, notably Calatauy 1995, for a good starting point. More relevant to the Anglo-Saxon series are the series of articles debating the mint output of Offa: Metcalf 1963a, 1963b and Grierson 1963a and 1963b, 1967 give some indication of the intensity of debate and the essential difficulty of building a mathematical model on limited information. Overall we believe our subjective, but pragmatic, proposals are a good a basis as any upon which to define a broad size for the coinage.

61 In Lyons and MacKay 2007 we suggested a total output at between one and one and a half million coins.

62 Metcalf and Northover 1985, 165. 'The adoption of a high tin alloy at the same stage of debasement in both Wessex and Mercia suggests that the silver reduction of 866 was coordinated. If so, one must reject the view that reverse varieties C and D were used to distinguish the better Mercian coins from those of Æthelred.'
With these options eliminated an alternative explanation is needed. The answer may lie in understanding how Mercian kingship operated. Although we know relatively little about this, in recent years a view has emerged based upon the Tribal Hidage, a Mercian document perhaps datable to c.880, surviving in eleventh-century and later manuscripts. The document seems essentially an assessment of the capacity of territories to provide tributes. Featherstone suggests it shows that Mercia consisted of a series of tribal territories that had come under the sway of Mercian kingship during the seventh and eighth centuries. Emerging from this was a model of Mercian kingship in which power was exercised through influence over leaders of client tribal territories who paid tribute to the king in return for his protection and rewards.

Keynes contrasted this model with that in Wessex where extensive evidence points to a kingdom with a stronger sense of the ‘state’ built around a king exercising purposeful leadership in kingdom building. By contrast with Mercia, Wessex was administered by royal officials working for the king.

The Lunettes coinage of Alfred shows precisely the same contrast. With the Group 1 Wessex-style coins there is a general consistency of coinage issues that can only have come through centralised administration. With the Group 2 Mercian-style coins (and the coinage of Burgred) we have the opposite, a diversity that entirely accords with the Mercian decentralised administration that Keynes and Featherstone identify. But how does this provide an explanation for the different Lunettes reverses?

Since the reverse Lunettes variation was a Mercian innovation, beginning before the Lunettes coinage was adopted by Wessex, then the explanation may lie in the exercise of kingship and power within Mercia. The Tribal Hidage suggests payments to the king by tribal leaders or ealdorman. The authors believe that the significance of the Lunettes reverse is linked to this, with the variations an administrative device to relate coin production to the territories from which the payment was raised. Coins may not necessarily have been produced within the territories to which the Lunettes style may refer (in fact many were evidently struck at London or with dies cut at London) suggesting the Lunettes style is primarily a Mercian accounting and control device linked to the collection of revenues in the form of coin.

One of the authorities was the king himself and we would propose that one reverse type was regal and related to payments made by the king, or raised by the king from his own territories and estates. The authors would suggest that the case for the regal type being Lunettes A explains why this is the dominant type in centralised Wessex.

The question then arises as to why Lunettes B to D reverses appear in Alfred’s coinage? Part of this, as our analysis of the surviving coinage shows, was a major increase in the numbers of coins of Mercian style in Alfred’s reign in comparison with Æthelred I’s output. From the early 870s when Mercian kingship showed itself increasingly unable to meet the Danish threat the leaders of these territories must have looked to the king most able to protect them and their people. A switch of allegiance may have taken place to the benefit of Alfred, who was then able to command tribute in cash payments from these lords. The authors, taking on Blackburn’s observation of increasing Wessex involvement in Mercian affairs, propose that the expansion in the Mercian content of the Wessex coinage might be explained by this, with the formerly Mercian leadership collecting tributes to pay to Alfred using already existing Mercian administrative methods. The introduction of Lunettes B and to a lesser extent Lunettes C and D in the Group 1 Wessex Lunettes coinage at this time might be explained by some dies being cut for this purpose at Canterbury or elsewhere in Wessex.

In summary then we propose that reverse Lunettes A was the regal issue with Lunettes B to D possibly relating to geographical areas or tribal territories within southern Mercia. The substantial number of Wessex-style Lunettes B coins, greater proportionally than Burgred’s coinage, may well derive from an area of monetary control along the borders of Wessex to

---

63 Featherstone 2001, 23–34, including discussion of the manuscript transmission at pp. 23–6. Dates between the mid-seventh and late ninth century have been suggested for the Tribal Hidage: see pp. 29–30.
65 Blackburn 1998, 120. But we believe the process started earlier than Burgred’s abdication in 874.
the west of London. Lunettes D, based on findspots and the use of an East Anglian style on one coin (Afl2.31: Ealmund), may relate to east or south-east Mercia. Lunettes C is harder to allocate as so few exist, but this may be because the territory involved was largely occupied by the Danes at an early stage and was only marginally under Wessex influence at any one time. This is reinforced by the fact that Table 2C shows that Lunettes C, although a common type for Burgred, is the scarcest, most anomalous and varied type for Alfred. The territory to which this type seems to relate is an area deeper into Mercia to the north or north-west of London.

The remaining issue is to reconcile Pagan’s belief that Burgred’s Lunettes variation belongs to the period 860–70 and that Alfred’s Lunettes only enter circulation c.873, with our proposed model. If it is accepted that the Lunettes variation was a tool of Mercian rule it is therefore entirely logical that this variation was in use before 870 in Mercia. It is, we believe, also entirely logical that the collapse of Burgred’s authority from 870 onwards led to the Lunettes B to D variations appearing in Alfred’s name as Mercian leaders switched allegiance from Burgred (in fact the evidence of Lunettes D coins for Æthelred I possibly indicates that this process started earlier). In view of this and the very significant numbers of Lunettes B to D coins we believe Lunettes variation started from the earliest stages of Alfred’s reign.

As a consequence we do not take the view that any Lunettes variations used by moneyers working for Alfred (or Æthelred I) have to be explained as anomalous or imitative coinage and in any event most of the coins appear to be entirely regular contemporary issues. Allied to this, if it is accepted that Lunettes A were the king’s coinage then the hoards containing issues of this type only are explained by these being related to payments made with money raised solely by the king from his estates or territories. This would reflect the location of the major Lunettes A only hoards. All are essentially in the south-east. This is the area where Lunettes A coins seem principally to have circulated. Local preference for the king’s money as well as mint output or fiscal reasons may explain the Lunettes A only content of hoards in these areas and thus does not preclude them being deposited at any time during the currency of the Lunettes coinage.

With no documentary evidence to explain it, the significance of the Lunettes variations remains largely conjecture. However interpretation of the evidence of the coinage of Alfred allied with the little we do know about Mercian kingship seems to suggest that Mercian practices were increasingly imported from Mercia into the Wessex coinage as Alfred increasingly took over as the de facto ruler of large areas of Mercia.

**Moneyers**

As we have noted elsewhere the numbers of moneyers known with certainty is sixty-eight. (A full list is at Appendix 2, Table 2A, which includes eight other possible names; a complete list of proposed locations and affiliation of moneyers is at Table 2D). Since the publication of the latest edition of North fourteen years ago a further seventeen moneyers have been noted. There is every possibility that further finds could increase this number further.

Forty-two moneyers produced Group 1, thirty-nine Group 2, and nine the Irregular types. Forty-six moneyers are known for one Group (or the Irregular category) only, the remainder are involved in a mix of variants across the two Groups or a mix of a Group with the Irregular category. Only one moneyer, Wulfheard, covers all three categories. The possibility of different moneyers with the same name working in different locations or names being copied, especially in the Irregular category, cannot entirely be ruled out (the Diarel/Diarelm
and Dudd/Dudda groups are a particular problem in this regard). Just under two-thirds (62%) of the moneyers are either only known from one (twenty-seven moneyers) or two coins (fifteen moneyers). This contrasts with 19% (13) of all recorded moneyers producing 47% of surviving coins.

Overall the pool of moneyers striking the Lunettes coinage of Alfred was substantial. It was more than double the thirty-one we noted for Æthelred I and is greater than the fifty-five moneyers recorded for Burgred, who represent more than twenty years of production.

A major issue is to understand and explain the expansion of moneyers under Alfred in the early 870s. The summary table below suggests a dramatic change in production of the Wessex coinage under Alfred after 871. Of the sixty-eight recorded moneyers, only a relatively small number, twenty-three, are former Wessex moneyers. An additional nine Burgred moneyers become involved with Alfred’s Lunettes coinage.

The most striking feature is the addition of thirty-six new moneyers who appear to have been brought in to expand coinage output. None of these thirty-six is recorded for any previous coinage either for Wessex or for Mercia, and very few go on to mint subsequent types. Most startling is that sixteen of these moneyers exclusively use Mercian-style dies (three of which are irregular types), but only strike coins in the name of Alfred. Overall the number of moneyers and the mix of their output not only indicates an expansion of coinage at this time, but also the extent to which Alfred drew on Mercian resources to achieve this.

The increase of moneyers and the calling on Mercian resources has every indication that the production of this coinage was part of an organised effort with moneyers being deployed to meet production needs for tribute and warfare when and where required. For instance, eight out of the twenty new Wessex moneyers also use Mercian-style dies and a number of well-established Wessex moneyers do the same.

**TABLE 8. Expansion of the Lunettes Coinage of Wessex in the 870s: moneyers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyers using Mercian-style dies known for Æthelberht or Æthelred I</th>
<th>Number of moneys</th>
<th>Moneys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ = includes an irregular coin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Wessex moneyers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Number of coins: 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* = also use Mercian dies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bosa, Diarel(m)†, Etheleah*, Ethelmund, Heremod, Sigestel†, Tirwald*.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ = includes an irregular coin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Wessex moneyers</td>
<td>7 major moneyers</td>
<td>Number of coins: 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biarnwald, Biarnwulf*, Cialmod, Ealhere*, Heafreth*, Heyse, Hildfret, Liab, Luhinc†, Osgeard*, Sigefret, Tidbald, Tidbeart.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 secondary moneyers</td>
<td>Number of coins: 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biarnred, Bureel, Cialbred, Cialulf, Cuthwulf, Deigmund, Diara†, Dudinc, Duinc, Duni†, Eadred†, Ealmeith, Elelaf, Sigeric, Tilefein, Winberht.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New moneyers using Mercian dies but not known for Burgred</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Number of coins: 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ = also noted for an irregular coin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Biarnred, Bereel, Cialbred, Cialulf, Cuthwulf, Deigmund, Diara†, Dudinc, Duinc, Duni†, Eadred†, Ealmeith, Elelaf, Sigeric, Tilefein, Winberht.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is of course possible that Biarnwulf, Ealhere, Etheleah, Heafreth, Luhinc, Osgeard, Sigestef and Tirwald were Mercian moneyers who for some reason used Wessex dies.
Places of production

Canterbury

There is one certain anchor in attributing coins to mints in that all Group 1, Variant I coins were produced from dies cut at Canterbury and the majority were almost certainly struck there. Seventeen Variant I moneyers are recorded for earlier Wessex types.\(^70\) Five are known for Æthelberht but not for Æthelred I, suggesting that there was a recall of lapsed moneyers to increase production.\(^71\) These moneyers are joined by at least seven new ones\(^72\) and up to four formerly only known for Burgred.\(^73\) Overall it seems that twelve to fifteen moneyers were active at any one time. There is a lot of change but two moneyers, Ethelred/Ethered and Torhtmund, seem to provide a remarkable thread of continuity across twenty-five years of minting.

About half these moneyers are known for Variant I only, with the others making considerable use of Mercian-style dies or use of the less well-cut Variant II dies. This continues a pattern we noted with Æthelred I’s coinage and it is notable that Wine, who produced both Wessex and Mercian-style coins for Æthelred I, continued to do so under Alfred. As already noted there is a variety of die-cutting styles at both Canterbury and London and there is every indication of die-cutting over-capacity in relation to the quantity of dies known. Peaks in demand, when large numbers of dies were needed quickly, probably explain this. Finally these moneyers or die cutters seem to have moved around, continuing, albeit on a somewhat larger scale, the pattern noted with Æthelred I’s Lunettes coins.

Elsewhere in Wessex

The significant numbers of new moneyers recorded for Wessex-style Group I coins make it implausible that they would all have worked at Canterbury, as that would have created an enormously cumbersome mint. The inference must be that some moneyers, perhaps those with small numbers of surviving coins and only known for this type, used dies prepared at Canterbury but struck coins at locations elsewhere. Use of Mercian-style rather than Canterbury dies by moneyers who seem to be Wessex based probably repeats a circumstance known from Æthelred I’s reign. During periods of disruption, London or even other south Mercian locations were frequently more accessible than Canterbury for many places in western Wessex.

With the major areas of fighting in the south-west it is clear that Alfred and his immediate court were largely located in western Wessex during this period. The Wessex financial system based on Canterbury, with close links to London, seems to have sustained high levels of coin production despite this separation from central direction. Nevertheless there has to be a case for mints operating in western Wessex, perhaps at the intermittently opened mint at Winchester,\(^74\) or even further west at Bath and Exeter. However Danish occupation of Exeter and possibly Bath would have temporarily halted production. In addition other locations could have been used as temporary mints to meet short-term urgent requirements that seem to have been a characteristic of this period.

\(^{70}\) Dunn, Eadwulf (not known for Æthelred I but a moneyer for Æthelberht), Elbere, Ethered (assuming this prolific moneyer is Ethelred), Hebeca (formerly an archiepiscopal moneyer), Heabearht (not known for Æthelred I but a moneyer for Æthelberht), Herebald, Herefreth (not known for Æthelred I but a moneyer for Æthelberht), Hereulf, Liabinc, Mannine, Oshere (not known for Æthelred I but a moneyer for Æthelberht), Sefreth (not known for Æthelred I but a moneyer for Æthelberht), Tirulf, Tohtmund, Wine and Wulfheard.

\(^{71}\) It is, of course, possible that these moneyers worked for Æthelred I but their coins have yet to appear.

\(^{72}\) The coin evidence for three of these (Diarwelm, Sigestef, Tirwald) might indicate that they were either never at Canterbury or moved into south Mercia at some point.

\(^{73}\) Diarwulf, Ethelwulf, Guthmund and Tithehelm.

\(^{74}\) Naismith 2008 reviews the existence of a Winchester mint during the reign of Egbert (802–839). In our study of Æthelred I we also noted the Four Line (Group 1) coin of Osric attributed to Winchester (Lyons and MacKay 2007, 84), as well as a possible non-Canterbury location or locations for the more crudely-produced coins (Lyons and MacKay 2007, 88–9). However, only one (Ethelmund) of the six Cross and Lozenge, Winchester-style moneyers listed by Blackburn and Keynes 1998, 143–6, is found for the Alfredian Lunettes coinage.
A mint may also have accompanied the court. As we proposed in our paper on Æthelred I the existence of poorly-cut coins in the names of well-known Canterbury based moneyers might indicate the existence of a military or court mint moving around with Alfred or other large military groups.

London

The key question that has to be addressed is whether the London mint was operating throughout the whole period of the currency of Alfred’s Lunettes coinage. The large number of moneyers that can be linked to London suggests it probably was, but disruption of operations during times of crisis, such as the Danish occupation of 871/2, and the temporary removal of production from London cannot be ruled out. We believe that London is the most likely source of many if not most Mercian-style (Group 2) dies. There seem to have been some transfers of moneyer affiliations to other mint locations. Conversely Biarnmod and Dudd, both prolific moneyers for Æthelred I’s Canterbury coins, are only known for Mercian-style coins of Alfred. Overall there is a pattern of intermingling and interchange between Wessex and Mercian moneyers. The overall trends are that of an increasing number of Mercian moneyers working for Alfred and around a quarter of the moneyers are known to use dies of both Wessex and Mercian style.

Finally we noted three distinctive variants that can be associated with London and which seem to reflect two different workshops (variants III and IV) and a group of moneyers (variant V) who seem to have cut their own dies. Of these the London-Wessex style variant III, especially sub-variants A and B, may have been the output of a Wessex-operated mint (continuing a practice that seems to have started during Æthelred I’s reign), with the other two variants being produced in Mercian-controlled establishments under a sharing of London production resources between the two kingdoms.

Elsewhere in Mercia

Blackburn notes that the increasing feebleness of Mercia led to an expansion of Alfred's power and that following Burgred’s departure he was recognised as the legitimate ruler in London and some other parts of southern Mercia. The coin evidence seems to suggest this expansion was underway before 874 with sixteen new moneyers producing coins in the Mercian style, over half of whom produce Group 2, sub-variant IVB. This seems to reflect use of a mix of London and locally-produced dies for production away from London. The high incidence of single coin moneyers might again be explained by a deliberate augmentation of production resources for short periods to meet expediencies such as tributes to the Danes or tax levies to the king of Wessex for defence.

The large number of Lunettes B coins of Alfred, proportionately greater than that encountered in the Burgred mix of Lunettes B to D, seems to represent a major involvement in the Mercian tribute activity associated with this reverse type. As has been noted above this may well indicate increasing Wessex activity in an area along the borders of Wessex to the west of London. The mix of Lunettes B moneyers using both Wessex and London dies as well as the large number of moneyers involved (See Appendix 2, Tables 2C and 2D) points to a continuing and developing relationship.

The small group of Lunettes C coins, of which the majority are anomalous in some way or another, as well as a scatter of findspots in the Derbyshire/Staffordshire/Nottinghamshire area (five out of the nine coins recorded) points, we believe, to an area right at the edge of Wessex influence. However the nine moneyers involved are with two exceptions (Ealmeit and

---

75 See Appendix 2, Table 2D for details of this complex pattern.
76 Lyons and MacKay 2007, 87.
77 Blackburn 1998, 120.
Eadred) known for other variants and there may be a case to be made for some of the coins (less the anomalous examples) being produced in London.

The exclusively Lunettes D sub-variants IVC and IVD with three out of the six moneyers only known for these types78 seem to indicate Wessex controlled monetary production in east and south-east Mercia on a significant and long-standing scale of activity. This is reinforced by the almost exclusively eastern English location of findspots (twelve out of the thirteen coins with known findspots).

Finally two moneyers that can be placed firmly in Mercia are Cuthwulf and Winberht, both of whom went on to produce Two-Line coins in the West Midlands style.

Subsequent moneyer affiliations

Seven Lunettes moneyers were involved in Alfred’s Phase II (Cross and Lozenge), two of whom also struck the same issue for Archbishop Æthelred. Two others struck Cross and Lozenge for Ceolwulf II. Of all these, five along with ten others not known for Cross and Lozenge, went on to produce Phase III of Alfred’s coinage, the Two-Line type. (See Table 9 and Appendix 2, Table 2D.)79 Interestingly there is some movement between London and Canterbury but this may reflect geographical dispersal of moneyers away from these locations, with the most convenient die-cutting centre becoming the source of supply.

TABLE 9. Lunettes Moneyers producing the Cross and Lozenge (Alfred Phase II) and Two Line Type (Alfred Phase III).80 Regional styles and moneyers’ locations are given in brackets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Number of Moneyers (% of total Alfred Lunettes moneyers)</th>
<th>Alfred Lunettes' moneyers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portrait Quatrefoil – Archbishop Æthelred (and possibly Alfred) Also Two Emperors or Portrait quatrefoil/Cross and Lozenge Mule – Alfred</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>Æthelred (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross and Lozenge – Alfred</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>Ciolwulf (Ciolwulf?) (L), Eadwulf (Eadulf?) (L), Ethel[ ] (Ethelmund?) (W?), Æthelred (Eadulf) (C), Herefreth (L), Tirwald (C), Torhtmund (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross and Lozenge – Archbishop Æthelred</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>Ethelmund (C), Torhtmund (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross and Lozenge – Ceolwulf II</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>Cuthwulf (WM), Dealinc (L), Beagstan (L), Cuthwulf (WM), Dealinc (L), Denewald (C), Ethelmund (C), Eadulf (L), Ethelred (C), Ethelstan (C), Ethelwulf (C), Heremod (C), Herewulf (L), Tilefien (Tilewine?) (L), Tirwald (C), Wine (C), Winberht (WM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Line – Alfred81</td>
<td>15 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

78 Ealmund, Ethelgar and Ethelstan. The first two are known for Lunettes D of Æthelred I and the latter is a scarce moneyer for Burged.

79 Two of these moneyers, Beagstan and Eadmund, are recorded on the Early Medieval Corpus but the coins have not been traced by the authors.

80 Moneyers and mint attributions of the Cross and Lozenge group are taken from Blackburn and Keynes 1998.

81 Details of the regional styles of the Two-Line type are taken from Blackburn 1998, Table 2.

82 Also strikes London Monogram type as Tilewine.
Cessation of production and demonetisation

The only single fact on which all can agree is that the demonetisation of the Lunettes coinage was rapidly implemented and highly effective. However it is difficult to be precise as to when this happened. The authors enter this debate with caution as the written sources (none of which shed direct light on the issue) and the numismatic evidence are contradictory.83

Dolley and Blunt thought that no Lunettes hoards could be dated later than Burgred's abdication.84 Blackburn85 and Keynes86 essentially supported this position, although slightly modified, by suggesting a short period when Alfred maintained production of the Lunettes coinage and took control of south Mercian production. They added that the departure of Burgred in 874 resulted in the relatively rapid withdrawal of Lunettes coins and their immediate substitution with Cross and Lozenge coinage. Blackburn argued cogently that to fit the coinage into the period before Ceolwulf II's presumed demise in 879, the Lunettes coinage would have had to cease production in 875 and that even an extension to 877, although 'tempting', was too late.

Although the documentary evidence for Burgred's abdication and Ceolwulf II's accession in 874 is well attested, the numismatic evidence does not easily match this. As we have shown, the Alfredian Lunettes coinage was a huge enterprise involving the largest number of moneyers recorded for a single issue up to that date and almost certainly produced in a much wider range of locations both in Mercia and Wessex, if only spasmodically, than any previous coinage. The coinage represents a dramatic change in scale in comparison with both the coinages of Æthelred I and Burgred. Set against this Blackburn and Keynes' comprehensive analysis of Cross and Lozenge coins only produces a total of sixty-one coins (twenty-five of which are from the Cuerdale hoard).87 These equate to less than a third of the surviving Lunettes coinage and about a quarter of the number of moneyers. Finally the political/military situation must be taken into account. The continuing crises of the years before 877 would seem to make any move to a higher quality coinage difficult to set up. The dramatic uplift in quality, with its significant deflationary economic effects, could only occur when there was some prospect of stability to enable its implementation.

The chronology proposed in Blackburn and Keynes that the Quatrefoil issue came first, followed by Two Emperors and Portrait Quatrefoil and then Cross and Lozenge seems to fit the pattern of surviving material.88 But how long were they produced for and what was their interaction with the Lunettes coinage? We agree with the general consensus that the Quatrefoil, Portrait Quatrefoil and Two Emperors are provisional or experimental types that for one reason or another never became substantive issues. These coins are completely different from the Lunettes and either represent a concurrent stream of experimentation while Lunettes coins were still in production, or a precursor phase once Lunettes coins had ceased production and before a decision was made to select Cross and Lozenge as the substantive type. Either course is possible but, whichever it was, the time to produce these tentative issues need not have been long.

The Cross and Lozenge issue marks the final break with the old Lunettes coinages for both Mercia and Wessex. As with the tentative issues, the die-cutting of busts, new styles of lettering and the sense of design and balance of the coinage suggest a desire for a completely fresh...
Instead of a utilitarian coinage with every sense of being produced by a kingdom facing great crisis the Cross and Lozenge series strives (not always successfully) towards higher artistic merit and is generally produced to standards that had not been in evidence in the English coinage for nearly a century. It is, not stretching the issue too far, a coinage for peace, not war. The rapid disappearance of Lunettes reflects this, pointing to a comprehensive and fast-paced re-coinage once the political and military situation was favourable. This however was not a particularly large-scale project, as the re-coinage could only have produced, at best, one new coin for every four or five old ones and in many cases one coin for ten or fifteen. On this basis fewer moneyers would have been needed, leading to a contraction in the numbers deployed compared with the Lunettes coinage. It is probable that the bulk of the re-coinage could have been completed within six months with renovatio production trailing off rapidly once the new coinage was established. The recoinage extended across both Wessex and what remained of Mercia and it seems to have been Wessex led with Ceolwulf II very much the junior partner with a much smaller scale of production.

Although the lack of firm evidence either way makes this debate essentially a matter of opinion the authors believe that based on the surviving material the most convincing model for the development of the coinage after 874 is that Alfred took control of the southern Mercian coinage shortly before or after Burgred’s departure and ran it for the next two years or so with production continuing until 876 or early 877. After some experimentation around a new coinage limited to Wessex with the Quatrefoil and Portrait Quatrefoil types in 876/7 and also a new joint coinage with Mercia at the same time with Two Emperors, it was the prospect of more stable times from mid-877 that led Alfred to initiate a major re-coinage with Cross and Lozenge. This makes the second half of 877 the earliest plausible start date for Cross and Lozenge coinage.

In Mercia, despite the documentary evidence for Ceolwulf II’s kingship between 874 and 877, he was not in a position to produce coinage in the remaining areas of Mercia under his control, but joined the great re-coinage as a junior partner sometime in 877/8 with Cross and Lozenge, having initially been party to the Two Emperors experimental type in 876/7.

Conclusions
Closer examination of the Lunettes coinage of Alfred reveals that it was the most complex single monetary issue struck by the English to that date. Building a corpus of 197 coins in public and private collections, we have been able to subject this largely neglected coinage to critical scrutiny. The most obvious characteristic is that the coinage clearly carries on with structures established under Æthelred I, with two distinct groups of coins, one produced in Wessex, based on Canterbury; the other using Mercian styles, based on London (see Table 2 above for a concordance of the types of Alfred and Æthelred). Within each group a number of variants exist. The Wessex-produced coins, Alfred Group 1, Variants I and II, continue the bonneted bust first used by Æthelred I Group 2 variants i and ii, whose Group 2 variants iii and iv, the bold head, are no longer used. Alfred’s Group 2, the Mercian-style Group,

---

89 The possible exception to this is an anomalous coin of Guthere (BMA 477) that seems to use Lunettes obverse style conventions.
90 It is of interest that the bust is non-military in appearance. If he had wished Alfred could have selected any one of a number of powerfully realised military prototypes from late Antiquity but chose not to do so.
91 We return to the fact that the demonetisation of Lunettes seems to have been carried out with great rapidity. There is no evidence that the two coinages circulated concurrently in either Wessex, Mercia or Danish controlled areas. The latter would seem to imply Danish co-operation in the process. Additionally if our broad estimate of between one and two million Lunettes coins for Alfred is broadly correct, this would suggest that the Cross and Lozenge minting was, at the most, a few hundred thousand coins.
92 The arguments in Blackburn 1998 that comparisons of die-cutting styles indicated that Ceolwulf II’s re-coinage followed that of Alfred are, we believe, still sustainable in our model.
93 If the pace of tribute payment had slowed and there was possibly a steady flow of coins back from trade with areas under Danish control, there would probably have been enough Lunettes coins in circulation to sustain economic activity through 877. For the latter point about lack of money see Keynes and Lapidge 2004, 22–3.
Variants III, IV and V align with Æthelred I Group 3 variants vi and vii (variant viii dividing into variants IV and V). Æthelred I variant v is discontinued (but two of the moneyers involved continue to strike coins with the same Lunettes D reverse). There is a small but diverse group of irregular coins that are almost certainly official issues but produced at the limits of royal control.

Under Alfred the coinage developed in a number of ways. Weights were reduced slightly within Wessex-based production and smaller flan coins, first introduced in the last months of Æthelred I’s reign, became dominant within the Wessex produced group. This reform was however largely confined to Canterbury with the Group 2 Mercian-style coins remaining generally unchanged in weight and flan size. Silver content is generally between 25% and 10%, with some evidence for progressive debasement. However there is no correlation between flan size, weight and variant to indicate that smaller and lighter coins are later.

The Alfredian Lunettes coinage was produced to meet the needs of the times, dominated by warfare and the payment of cash as tribute to the Danish invaders. Needs drove output and this required a deliberate expansion that doubled the number of moneyers compared with Æthelred I. There was a well-managed and tightly directed centre of die production and minting that almost certainly continued to be based at Canterbury, delivering styles and standards that retained the consistency in the Wessex Lunettes coinage. The relationship with Mercia through the monetary union established in 866 deepened with the Mercian style and produced coins becoming a major part of the overall surviving output, with Alfred increasing Wessex influence in Southern Mercia. The London-Wessex type (Group 2 variant III) indicates a Wessex die-cutting workshop was probably operating in London. Overall, despite this dispersion of effort a surprisingly high quality of output was achieved, certainly markedly more consistent than the contemporary coinage of Burgred.

A direct impact of this extension of Wessex influence into Mercian areas was that Mercian practices were adopted into the Wessex coinage, and reverse type variation, previously largely confined to Mercia, started to appear more widely within the Wessex coinage. Although the precise reasons for the use of the Lunettes reverse variations remains unclear, the most likely explanation is that they relate to Mercian territorial administration associated with tribute collection by the king and monetary production for this purpose. The Mercian-style coins of Alfred include a much larger proportion of Lunettes B to D coins in comparison with the Wessex style series. We believe this reflects the increasing extension of Alfred’s influence into areas of Mercia. This process starts from the beginning of his reign. In Wessex, Lunettes A, which we believe identifies the royal coinage, remains the principal type and its local predominance is reflected in the hoards located in or close to Wessex. We tentatively propose that Lunettes B derives from an area along the borders of Wessex to the west of London; Lunettes C, because of its rarity, is associated with an area largely outside Wessex influence, possibly deeper into Mercia to the north or north-west of London; with Lunettes D from east or south-east Mercia.

We believe that the sixty-eight recorded moneyers (and there were almost certainly more) could not have been restricted to the two minting centres of London and Canterbury. Obverse styles with differing variants suggest that, whilst Canterbury and London were major hubs in the monetary production system, there were other locations where coins were minted and possibly dies were being cut. These are most likely to have been elsewhere in Wessex, and in southern and eastern Mercia. However no specific mint locations can be identified. Furthermore just under two-thirds of the moneyers are only known for one or two coins and thirty-six are new moneyers not otherwise known for Burgred or earlier issues of Wessex. These factors suggest a coinage that was often produced in sporadic bursts to meet short-term, locally-driven requirements. Overall the wide variety of variants linked to the substantial number of moneyers involved gives the strong impression of monetary production being on a war footing meeting urgent needs for coin tributes whenever and wherever they were required.

Previously the end of the Lunettes coinage has been placed at 874/5 when Burgred abdi- cated. This date may be when the Mercian Lunettes coinage ended. However the sheer size and variety of Alfred’s Lunettes coinage and what we know of the continuing need to sustain
warfare against the Danes, as well as pay tribute, all point to the fact that Wessex needed to continue coin production and had no reason to cease. The coinage evidence suggests that Alfred filled the gap left in royal authority by the exile of Burgred by taking monetary production in southern Mercia and London under Wessex control. On this basis Lunettes coins could have continued in production until 876 or even early 877. We believe it was not until 876/7 that the first attempts were made to replace it with the tentative Wessex-only Quatrefoil and Quatrefoil Portrait coinage, as well as with a new joint Wessex-Mercian coinage in the Two Emperors type. On this timeline the earliest plausible date for the change to Cross and Lozenge coinage is most probably in the second half of 877. But at whatever date this occurred it was a successful recoinage, completely driving the poorer quality Lunettes coins out of circulation not only in English but also in Danish controlled areas.

Cross and Lozenge and its immediate precursors introduced a monetary revolution. Not only was artistic and silver quality restored but also the whole apparatus of coinage production set up for the later Lunettes coinage was disbanded. In place of dispersed production, a characteristic of the Lunettes coinage, the new coinage seems to have been produced by a few moneyers at a few locations.

From one viewpoint the Lunettes coinage of Alfred is the last chapter of the ninth-century coinages of Wessex and Mercia. It was clearly a coinage produced with great vigour and drive, hallmarks of Alfred’s reign. However under huge political and fiscal strain, the coinage became increasingly unsatisfactory and was demonetised in such a thorough way that it completely disappeared from circulation in a remarkably short space of time. But from another angle the unification of the coinage systems of Wessex and Mercia, begun in 866, was sustained through difficult times resulting in a very significant and generally well-managed coinage. The concept of a single coinage for England was established providing a clear precursor to the monetary reforms of Edgar a century later.

APPENDIX 1. HOARDS AND SINGLE FINDS.

TABLE 1A. Hoards containing Lunettes coins of Alfred.

(Note: Lunettes reverse types of Alfred only are shown in the last row of the hoard content column. Arbp = archbishop.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoard and date of find</th>
<th>Accepted date of deposition</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of coins</th>
<th>Hoard content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pre-1800 hoards.       | Not known                  | Not known, various | At least 21     | Almost certainly mixed but could include some coins of Alfred in addition to 11 coins of Æthelred I and Arbp Ceolnoth. 
Lunettes: A, B, D. |
| Trewhiddle, Cornwall, 1774. | 873?                      | Cornwall | 115             | Alfred: 1, Æthelred I: 2, Burgred: 52
Plus a wide variety of other material. 
Lunettes: A. |

94 This is a tentative attribution to explain the origin of a number of Lunettes coins known to the earliest scholars and collectors. At least twenty-one coins have pre-Gravesend 1838 provenances: Biarnred (AFL1.3/SCBI 2, no. 560), Cialmod (AFL1.11/BMC 161), Cialulf (AFL2.13/BMC 177), Dudd (AFL2.22/CNG Triton V), Dunn (last known at Dymock sale 1858), Duinc (AFL2.26/BMC 178), Ethelwulf (last known at Lewin Sheppard sale 1861), Hebeca (AFL1.58/BMC 163), Herebald (AFL1.65/SCBI 21, no. 985), Manninc (AFL1.98/BMC 164), Oshere (AFL1.101/BMC 165), Sefreth (AFL1.103/BMC 166), Sefreth (AFL1.105/SCBI 1, no. 543), Sigestef (AFL2.49/BMC 175), Sigestef (AFL2.48/Clonterbrook Trust 1974), Sigestef (last known at Rashleigh sale 1909), Tata (AFL2.50/BMC 172), Tilefein (AFL2.54/BMC 170), Tidbald (AFL1.110/BMC 169), Tirwulf (AFL2.58, last known in Barratt collection) and Wulfhead (AFL2.62/BMC 171). Ruding also notes Biarnwulf and Bosa but the specific coins cannot be traced. It is of interest that nearly half the coins are Group 2; this is a strong indication that the coins were found to the north of London.

95 Thompson 1956, no. 362, Fitzwilliam Museum 2008, 59, Blunt and Dolley 1959, 222 and Wilson and Blunt 1961. Blunt and Dolley 1959 excluded the Alfred Type xiv coin of Franbald that had been associated with the hoard but the comment in Wilson and Blunt 1961 was slightly more equivocal. The case for removal of this coin from the hoard is strongly made in Pagan 2000 and doubt is also placed on whether the coin of Sigestef should also be included. For the time being we have left the record unchanged.)
THE LUNETTES COINAGE OF ALFRED THE GREAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoard and date of find</th>
<th>Accepted date of deposition</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of coins</th>
<th>Hoard content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hook Norton, Oxon, 1848.</td>
<td>875?</td>
<td>Mercia</td>
<td>c.13</td>
<td>Alfred: 5, Burgred: 1. Details of 7(?) other coins lost.97 Lunettes: A, B, C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Dunsforth, Yorks, 1861.</td>
<td>872/3</td>
<td>Northumbria</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Alfred: 7, Æthelred I: 2, Burgred: 6.98 Lunettes: A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainford, Durham, 1864.</td>
<td>c.875</td>
<td>Northumbria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>‘Egbert and Alfred’ sold or lost.101 Lunettes: not known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satley, Durham, 1874.</td>
<td>c.874</td>
<td>Northumbria</td>
<td>6+</td>
<td>Possible Alfred: 2,103 Burgred: 96, Æthelred I: 1. Lunettes: A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, Wood Street, 1881.</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Mercia</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Alfred: 19102 Lunettes: A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, Waterloo Bridge, 1883.</td>
<td>872/3</td>
<td>Mercia</td>
<td>c.100</td>
<td>possible Alfred: 2,103 Burgred: 96, Æthelred I: 1. Lunettes: A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Burgred’ Hoard</td>
<td>c.875</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>6+</td>
<td>Alfred: 2 Æthelred I: 1, Burgred: 3.104 Lunettes: A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolstrup, Denmark? 1891.</td>
<td>880?</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>180?</td>
<td>Alfred: 1,105 Lunettes: A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeston Tor, Staffs., 1924.</td>
<td>872/3</td>
<td>Mercia</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Alfred: 21, plus Æthelwulf, Æthelred I, Arbp Ceolnoth and Burgred.108 Lunettes: A, B, C, D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

96 Thompson 1956, no. 176, Fitzwilliam Museum 2008, 64.
97 Blunt and Dolley 1959, 221, Fitzwilliam Museum 2008, 75 and Biddle et al., 1987, 26 n.39. In Biddle et al. 1987 a coin of Denemund is added to the four listed by Blunt and Dolley 1959.
98 Thompson 1956, no. 146, Fitzwilliam Museum 2008, 74 and NCirc March 1924 stock numbers 28866 to 28880. For some reason Blunt and Dolley 1959 omit the coin of Hebeca listed in NCirc.
100 Thompson 1956, no. 167; this was substantially amended by Pagan 1967. Fitzwilliam Museum 2008, 76.
102 Not in Thompson or Coin Hoards. From Bliss before 1916.
105 For details see SCB1 4, p25. The hoard was predominantly German (171 coins) with one Kufic, two Carolingian and two Danish. The coin of Alfred was recovered after the main hoard.
108 Thompson 1956, no. 40, Fitzwilliam Museum 2008, 73, Brooke 1924 and Blunt and Dolley 1959, 220. There is also a coin of Dudwine in the William Salt Library, Stafford that is stated to be from the hoard. See AfL2.25/SCB1 17, no. 117.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoard and date</th>
<th>Accepted date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of coins</th>
<th>Hoard content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Æthelred I: 2  
Burgred: 1 | |
| Leckhampton, Cheltenham, Gloucs., 1924. | 875 | Mercia | Said to be 5 coins but two only recorded | Alfred: 1, Burgred: 1, plus three other coins |
| Abbey Orchard, St Albans, Herts., 1968. | 873/4 | Mercia | 46 | Alfred: 19  
Æthelred I: 2  
Burgred: 14  
Arbp Ceolnoth: 1 (a fragment London Monogram halfpenny associated) |
| Repton 1, Derbyshire, 1982. | 873 | Mercia | 5 | Alfred: 2 also Æthelred I: 1 and Burgred: 2 |
| Repton 2, Derbyshire, 1985. | 874 | Mercia | 6 | Alfred: 4, Burgred: 2 |
| Walmgate, Lincoln, 1985. | 873 | Mercia/ Lindsey | 9 | Alfred: 6; also Æthelred I: 1; Burgred: 2 |
| Barkby Thorpe, Leics., 1987. | ? | Mercia/ Danelaw | 7+? | ‘Seven silver pennies fused together in a pile, Burgred (and possibly Alfred)’ |
| Duddington, Northants, 1994–5. | 875 | Mercia | 32 | Alfred: 13, also Æthelred I: 8 and Burgred: 10, plus Lunettes fragments |
| North Yorkshire, 2004. | 875 | Northumbrian | 9 | Alfred: 2 and Burgred: 7, plus Lunettes fragments |
| Suffolk, 2008. | 875 | East Anglia | 3 | Alfred: 2  
Burgred: 1  
All coins badly damaged |

109 Pagan 1986b, 118 and 119.
111 Fitzwilliam Museum 2008, 80. Coins illustrated SCBI 42, nos 628, 665 to 678, 733 to 753 and 758. The London Monogram halfpenny fragment (See SCBI 42, no. 758) has led to some difficulty in dating this hoard. The hoard report has yet to be published but for the purposes of this paper the working hypothesis is that the London Monogram coin was added later or became associated with the hoard by some other means.
113 Biddle et al. 1987, 16–19, 23 and 34, Fitzwilliam Museum 2008, 71. 3 coins from single grave 529 (Biarnwulf: AfL2.8, Dudda: AfL1.5 and Diarel: AfL1.3) and one coin from grave 651 (Guthmund: AfL1.55).
115 Pagan 1988, 179 and Fitzwilliam Museum 2008, 70a. The appearance of up to eighteen coins on the market in the late 1980s and early 1990s without earlier provenance might be related to this find, suggesting that it might be an incomplete report. These include Group 1: Diara (AfL1.12), Diarel (AfL1.13), Dunn, (AfL1.18), Ethered (AfL1.48), Hebeca (AfL1.63), Herefret (AfL1.69), Herewulf (AfL1.85), Hildefrith (AfL1.90), Manninc (AfL1.99), Sefreth (AfL1.104), Tirwulf (AfL1.114). Group 2: Biarnmod (AfL2.1), Cuthwulf (AfL2.15), Dudd (AfL2.21), Dunn (AfL2.27), Tata (AfL2.52 and AfL2.53), Wulfheard (AfL2.65). The spread of these coins between Groups 1 and 2 (as well as possible presence of an irregular coin) is consistent with the northerly location of the hoard.
116 Fitzwilliam Museum 2008, 76a. The authors are also indebted to Marion Archibald for this information.
117 The authors are grateful to Dr Gareth Williams for allowing this hoard to be examined at the British Museum in 2007. The hoard also contained Islamic dirhem fragments and seven Burgred pennies of which four are reverse Lunettes A and three reverse Lunettes E. See also Williams 2008.
118 Not yet formally recorded. Two Alfred coins (Heremod, AfL1.75 and Ethelgar, AfL2.33) with a coin of Burgred (Lunettes A Guthmund), bought from trade by one of the authors (Lyons); findspot reported as Suffolk.
### TABLE 1B. Single finds of Alfred Lunettes coins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Coin ref (EMC or other)</th>
<th>Variant/Lunettes type/Moneyer</th>
<th>Find Location</th>
<th>Inc in corpus</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey</td>
<td>2000.0344</td>
<td>Nk/Nk/Beagstan</td>
<td>Barton-on-Humber.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1987.0122</td>
<td>Nk/D/Biarnred</td>
<td>Torksey</td>
<td>AFL2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001.0693</td>
<td>II/A/Biarnwulf</td>
<td>Torksey area.</td>
<td>AFL1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1998.0092</td>
<td>Irregular (b)/D/Diara</td>
<td>Riby, Lincs.</td>
<td>AFL1r2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1983.0010</td>
<td>Nk/C/Dudwine</td>
<td>Barrow-on-Humber.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000.0263</td>
<td>Nk/D/Eadmund</td>
<td>Flixborough, Linics.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1998.0093</td>
<td>I/A/Elbere</td>
<td>Riby, Lincs.</td>
<td>AFL1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001.0935</td>
<td>Nk/A/Hebeca</td>
<td>Torksey</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1996.0199</td>
<td>I/A/Heremod</td>
<td>Nr Louth, Lincs</td>
<td>AFL1.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001.1100</td>
<td>Nk/Nk/Osfeard</td>
<td>Caistor on the Wolds.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970.1728</td>
<td>I/A/Sigefreth</td>
<td>Torksey</td>
<td>AFL1.106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCBI 27, no 1945</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1983.9946</td>
<td>I/B/Wine</td>
<td>Lincoln, St Paul-in-the-Bail church.</td>
<td>AFL1.120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge/Bedfordshire</td>
<td>2001.0708</td>
<td>Nk/A/..ear..</td>
<td>Lincs. (‘south’).</td>
<td>AFL1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bonser 1998</td>
<td>IA/A/Herebald</td>
<td>Flixborough, Lincs.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archibald forthcoming</td>
<td>Nk/Nk/Nk</td>
<td>Lincolnshire.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archibald forthcoming</td>
<td>Nk/D/Diarulf</td>
<td>Flixborough, Lincs.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001.1151</td>
<td>Nk/Nk/Nk</td>
<td>Torksey</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NC (1897), 248</strong></td>
<td>1997.0126</td>
<td>III/D/Cialulf</td>
<td>Girton, nr Cambridge.</td>
<td>AFL1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shillington, Bedfordshire.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1996.0200</td>
<td>II/A/Liabinc</td>
<td>Nr Cambridge.</td>
<td>AFL1.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEC 1350A</td>
<td>III/II/Di/mund</td>
<td>Great Shelford, Cambs.</td>
<td>AFL1U2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Nk = not known.

Details on the Flixborough coins kindly provided by Marion Archibald (publication forthcoming).
THE LUNETTES COINAGE OF ALFRED THE GREAT

APPENDIX 2. LISTS OF MONEYERS AND COINAGE, LUNETTES TYPE DISTRIBUTION AND AFFILIATIONS.

TABLE 2A. The Lunettes coinage of Alfred: moneyers and coin distribution by variant.

Moneyers in italics are known but not included in the Corpus as insufficient details are available. Moneyers not recorded in North 1994 are asterisked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Group 1. Wessex</th>
<th>Group 2. Mercian</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variant I</td>
<td>Variant III</td>
<td>Variant IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beagstan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biarmod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biarnred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biarnwald</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biarnwulf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burcel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cialbred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cialmod</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cialulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuthwulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealine*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deigmund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denemund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: EMC 2000.0344 Coinweight
5 Unallocated: AFl2.7
7 SCBI 27, no. 1945
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Group 1. Wessex</th>
<th>Group 2. Mercian</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variant</td>
<td>Variant</td>
<td>Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denewald*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diara*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarel/Diarelm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarwulf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dud/Dudda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudinc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudwine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duinc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadred*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadwulf</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealhere*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealmeit*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealmund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwald</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elbere</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elelaf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethelgar*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethelheah</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethelhere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethelmund</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethelstan*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethelwulf</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethered</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guthmund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heabearht</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heafreth*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healf</td>
<td>Croydon No. 2 hoard 1862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebeca</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herebald</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herefreth*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heremod</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herewulf</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heyse*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hildfreth*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubearn120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liab121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabinc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liwhinc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manninc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osfeard</td>
<td>EMC 2001. 1100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgeard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefreth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigeric</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigefreth*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigestef</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

120 Recorded in North 1994 as a moneyer for Alfred’s Lunettes but no coin has been located.
121 Either Liabinc or a new moneyer.
### Table 2B. Moneyers striking reverse types other than Lunettes A.

#### Group 1. Wessex Lunettes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Group 1. Wessex</th>
<th>Group 2. Mercian</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variant I</td>
<td>Variant II</td>
<td>Variant III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tata</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidbald</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidbearht</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilefein</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirwald</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirwulf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tithehelm*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torhtmund</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winberht*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfiheard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals** 94 28 22 33 9 10 1 197

- Total Group 1 122
- Total Group 2 64
- Irregular 10
- Unallocated 1

(AfL2.7)

#### Group 1. Wessex Lunettes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Lunettes B</th>
<th>Lunettes C</th>
<th>Lunettes D</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biarnwald</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarwulf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethelmund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guthmund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hildfreth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirwald</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirwulf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfheard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Group 1** 11 1 2 14

#### Group 2. Mercian-style Lunettes and Irregular

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Lunettes B</th>
<th>Lunettes C</th>
<th>Lunettes D</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biarnmod</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biarnred</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biarnwulf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cialbred</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cialwulf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuthwulf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denemund</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diara</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarelm</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudda</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudwine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duinc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadred</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealmeit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealmund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethelgar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etheljah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethelhere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lunettes B</th>
<th>Lunettes C</th>
<th>Lunettes D</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethelstan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethelwulf</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereald</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luhinc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manninc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgeard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigeric</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigestef</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tata</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirwulf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Group 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2C. Analysis of coins with Lunettes B to D reverses.

*Note:* Wessex-style coins are listed first in each Lunettes group with Mercian-style and Irregular coins listed subsequently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lunettes type</th>
<th>Coin reference</th>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Findspot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wessex style B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Diara (AfL1.12)</td>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>Crude bust and thick lettering but is similar to other Variant II coins. Certainly Wessex but possibly dies prepared away from Canterbury.</td>
<td>Findspot unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Dunn (AfL1.23)</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Cut in similar style to Diarwulf, Lunettes D (AfL1.16) and Tidbearht, Lunettes B (AfL1.111). Medium thickness lettering. Struck on a large flan. Certainly Wessex, but possibly dies prepared away from Canterbury.</td>
<td>Hook Norton (1848)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Ethelmund (AfL1.39)</td>
<td>IIB</td>
<td>Of slightly coarse appearance, may not be Canterbury cut. Obverse similar to Herewulf, Lunettes A (AfL1.82) and Wine, Lunettes B (AfL1.120). Thin lettering reverse.</td>
<td>Lower Dunsforth (1861)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Ethered (AfL1.53)</td>
<td>IIB</td>
<td>Bust inside small circle. Reverse medium thickness lettering with Ω almost rendered +) as seen on coins of Æthelred I. Dies prepared in Wessex, possibly not at Canterbury.</td>
<td>Walmsgate, Lincoln (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Guthmund (AfL1.55)</td>
<td>IIB?</td>
<td>As this coin is a fragment it is difficult to make a substantiave assessment but on balance would seem to be Wessex dies. In view of the medium thickness of the lettering on the reverse may possibly not be cut in Canterbury.</td>
<td>Repton no. 2 (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Hildefreth (AfL1.90)</td>
<td>IIB</td>
<td>Obverse in thickish lettering but not conclusively a London die.</td>
<td>Findspot unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Tidbearht (AfL1.111)</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Obverse and reverse very similar to Dunn Lunettes B (AfL.23), but slightly larger circle round head, and Diarwulf, Lunettes D (AfL1.16). Struck on a large flan. Certainly Wessex but possibly dies prepared away from Canterbury.</td>
<td>Beeston Tor (1924)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lunettes type</th>
<th>Coin reference</th>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Findspot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Tirwald (AfL1.113)</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>Of good appearance, very probably Canterbury dies.</td>
<td>Walmsgate, Lincoln (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Tirwulf (AfL1.115)</td>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>Of slightly coarse appearance.</td>
<td>Findspot unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Wine (AfL1.120)</td>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>Obverse of slightly coarse appearance. Similar to Ethelmund, Lunettes B (AfL1.39) and Herewulf, Lunettes A (AfL1.82). Thin lettering reverse. Dies prepared in Wessex but possibly not at Canterbury.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercian style</td>
<td>B Biarnmod (AfL2.2)</td>
<td>IIIC</td>
<td>This coin and AfL2.1 are of similar appearance. Bust relatively crudely cut with characteristic Mercian curved shoulders to bust, but nevertheless are cut in an approximation of the Canterbury style for Æthelred I. Reverse in London style lettering.</td>
<td>Findspot unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Biarnwulf (AfL2.8)</td>
<td>IIIC</td>
<td>A conventional London Wessex coin but with a double diadem.</td>
<td>Repton no. 2 (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Cialulf (AfL2.11)</td>
<td>IVA</td>
<td>A London coin attempting to copy the Wessex pattern bust.</td>
<td>Walmsgate, Lincoln (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Ethered (AfL2.39)</td>
<td>IIIC</td>
<td>A typical variant IIIC.</td>
<td>Possible West Country hoard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Herebald (AfL2.42)</td>
<td>IIIC</td>
<td>A square bold bust version of this sub-variant.</td>
<td>Thames Exchange, London single find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Sigeric (AfL2.46)</td>
<td>IVB</td>
<td>A typical IVB coin.</td>
<td>Gainford (1864)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Sigestef (AfL2.48)</td>
<td>IIIA</td>
<td>Slightly less assured bust in comparison with other IIIA coins.</td>
<td>Findspot unknown, pre 1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Sigestef (AfL2.49)</td>
<td>IIIA</td>
<td>Die duplicate of AfL2.48.</td>
<td>Findspot unknown, pre 1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Tata (AfL2.52)</td>
<td>IIIC</td>
<td>A square bold bust version of this sub-variant.</td>
<td>Findspot unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Wine (AfL2.61)</td>
<td>IIIC</td>
<td>A poorly drawn bust.</td>
<td>Duddington (1994–5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td>B Denemund (AfL.Ir1)</td>
<td>Irregular (c)</td>
<td>An anomalous coin in the irregular and barbarous category. Discussed and described in the relevant text above. Not Wessex and almost certainly not London produced.</td>
<td>Hook Norton (1848)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wessex style</td>
<td>C Wulfheard (AfL1.122)</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Inexpertly cut obverse. Reverse thick lettering. Similar to Elbere Lunettes A (AfL1.28). Unlikely to be Canterbury but completely unlike variant III coins. Possibly produced in Wessex.</td>
<td>Beeston Tor (1924)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercian style</td>
<td>C Biarnred (AfL2.6)</td>
<td>IVA</td>
<td>A well cut London die which although sub-variant IVA is influenced by the London-Wessex sub-variant IIIA.</td>
<td>Beeston Tor (1924)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ealmeit (AfL2.29)</td>
<td>IVB</td>
<td>A crudely styled version of this sub-variant.</td>
<td>Findspot unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Lunettes Coinage of Alfred the Great

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lunettes type</th>
<th>Coin reference</th>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Findspot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ethleah (AfL2.32)</td>
<td>IIIA</td>
<td>A well-produced coin within the context of the Wessex Lunettes C group.</td>
<td>Findspot unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ethelhere (AfL2.35)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>An anomalous variant V coin, particularly as diadem is double-banded.</td>
<td>Beeston Tor (1924)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Manninc (AfL2.44)</td>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>A well-produced coin within the context of the Wessex Lunettes C group.</td>
<td>Hook Norton (1848)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tata (AfL2.53)</td>
<td>IIIA</td>
<td>A well-produced coin within the context of the Wessex Lunettes C group.</td>
<td>Findspot unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Irregular     | Dudda (AfLIr4) | Irregular (a) | An anomalous coin in the irregular and barbarous category. Discussed and described in the relevant text above. Not Wessex and almost certainly not London produced. | Findspot unknown |
|               | Dudda (AfLIr5) | Irregular (a) | Die duplicate of AfLIr4. | Repton no. 2 (1985) |
|               | Eadred (AfLIr8) | Irregular (g) | An anomalous coin in the irregular and barbarous category. Discussed and described in the relevant text above. A Mercian local production. | Southwell, Notts. single find |

| Wessex style  | Diarel (AfL1.15) | IA | A well cut obverse in good Wessex style. Reverse thick lettering that could indicate a mule with London. | Walmsgate, Lincoln (1985) |
|               | Diarwulf (AfL1.16) | IA | Very similar in style to Lunettes B coins of Dunn (AfL1.23) and Tidbearht (AfL1.111). Medium thickness lettering. Struck on a large flan. Certainly Wessex, possibly dies prepared away from Canterbury. | Beeston Tor (1924) |

<p>| Mercian style  | Biarnred (AfL2.7) | No details available. | Torksey single find |
|               | Cialbred (AfL2.10) | IIIC | A typical variant IIIC coin with less assured diecutting. | Possible West Country hoard |
|               | Cialulf (AfL2.12) | IIIB | A IIIB coin that shows strong Wessex influence but nevertheless Mercian die cutting idioms (bold lettering, formation of mouth, broad shoulders and hooped bars in outer panels) strongly suggests London die-cutting. | Girton, Cambs. single find |
|               | Cialulf (AfL2.13) | IVB | A typical IVB coin. | Findspot unknown, pre-1800 |
|               | Cuthwulf (AfL2.15) | IVB | A typical IVB coin. | Findspot unknown |
|               | Duinc (AfL2.26) | IIIB | A typical IIIB coin. | Findspot unknown |
|               | Ealmund (AfL2.31) | IVD | An anomalous coin with a thin bust, seems to be part of a larger scale issue. Discussed and described in the relevant text above. Possibly east Mercian. | Norfolk c. 2006 |
|               | Ethelgar (AfL2.33) | IVD | As Ealmund (AfL2.31). | Suffolk 2008 |
|               | Ethelstan (AfL2.36) | IVC | One of three Lunettes D coins of this sub-variant found at Duddington and currently not known from any other source. | Duddington (1994–5) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lunettes type</th>
<th>Coin reference</th>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Findspot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Ethelwulf (AfL2.37)</td>
<td>IIIC</td>
<td>A well cut IIIC coin.</td>
<td>Findspot unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Ethelwulf (AfL2.38)</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>One of three Lunettes D coins of this sub-variant found at Duddington and currently not known from any other source.</td>
<td>Duddington (1994–5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Ethered (AfL2.40)</td>
<td>IIIC</td>
<td>A typical IIIB coin.</td>
<td>Findspot unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Luhinc (AfL2.43)</td>
<td>IVD</td>
<td>As Ealmund (AfL2.31).</td>
<td>Unknown findspot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Osgeard (AfL2.45)</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>One of three Lunettes D coins of this sub-variant found at Duddington and currently not known from any other source.</td>
<td>Duddington (1994–5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Tirulf (AfL2.58)</td>
<td>IVA</td>
<td>Appears to be a well cut IVA coin.</td>
<td>Findspot unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td>Diara (AfLIr2)</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td>An anomalous coin in the irregular and barbarous category. Discussed and described in the relevant text above. Almost certainly Mercian local production.</td>
<td>Ribu, Lincs. single find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Diarelm (AfLIr3)</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td>An anomalous coin in the irregular and barbarous category. Discussed and described in the relevant text above. Almost certainly Mercian local production.</td>
<td>Repton no. 2 (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Dudwine (AfLIr6)</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td>An anomalous coin in the irregular and barbarous category. Discussed and described in the relevant text above. Almost certainly Mercian local production.</td>
<td>Repton no. 1 (1982)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2D.** Location and affiliation of moneyers.122

Note: Moneyers recorded, but where the coin cannot now be located, principally on EMC, are noted in italics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Previous affiliation</th>
<th>Types of Alfred Lunettes</th>
<th>Possible Location</th>
<th>Subsequent affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beagstan</td>
<td>Burgred</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Presumed to be London</td>
<td>Two Line: London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biarnmod</td>
<td>Æthelberht: Inscribed Cross.</td>
<td>Group 2, variant III.</td>
<td>Canterbury moneyer who could have moved to London or worked elsewhere. His corpus of coins of Æthelred I (Lyons and MacKay 2007: Ae1.1 to Ae1.3 and Ae2.6 to Ae2.22) contains a variety of coin types possibly indicating a moneyer working away from Canterbury.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biarnred</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2, variant IV.</td>
<td>New moneyer, located Mercia almost certainly outside London. variant IV die links to Wine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biarnwald</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1, variant I.</td>
<td>New moneyer located Wessex, use of Variant I dies may indicate a location close to Canterbury in east Wessex.</td>
<td>Possibly Byrnwald recorded for Two Line: Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biarnwulf</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1, variants I and II. Group 2, variant III.</td>
<td>New moneyer located Wessex, possibly use of variant II and II dies may indicate west Wessex.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

122 Attribution of Two-Line moneyers taken from Blackburn 1998, 110, Table 2, and for Cross and Lozenge from the corpus of coins in Blackburn and Keynes 1998.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Previous affiliation</th>
<th>Types of Alfred Lunettes</th>
<th>Possible Location/Affiliation</th>
<th>Subsequent affiliation (where applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1, variants I and II</td>
<td>New moneyer, Canterbury and possibly elsewhere in Wessex.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burcel</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>New moneyer, located Mercia, possibly London.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureel</td>
<td>Group 2, variant III</td>
<td></td>
<td>New moneyer, located Mercia and because sub-variant IIC dies used almost certainly outside London.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cialbred</td>
<td>Group 2, variant III</td>
<td></td>
<td>New moneyer located Wessex, use of variant I dies may indicate a location close to Canterbury in east Wessex.</td>
<td>Alfred: Cross and Lozenges (in name of Ciolwulf). This moneyer may be linked to Ciolwulf at London which seems possible as his Lunettes record is strongly Mercian based.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cialmod</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I</td>
<td></td>
<td>New moneyer. With two Lunettes D and one Lunettes B coins noted may have been based in London working for sponsors of these two reverse types.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cialulf</td>
<td>Group 2, variants III and IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>In view of subsequent west Midlands affiliation for Two Line and distinctive Cross and Lozenge issues this moneyer almost certainly south or west Mercia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuthwulf</td>
<td>Group 2, variants III and IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ceolwulf II: Cross and Lozenge: west Midlands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deigmund</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2, variant IV</td>
<td>New moneyer, located Mercia almost certainly outside London.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denemund</td>
<td>Æthelberht: Inscribed Cross.</td>
<td>Group 2, Irregular (c)</td>
<td>Located Mercia or Wessex outside Canterbury or London.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diara</td>
<td>Group 1, Irregular (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>New moneyer located Mercia outside London.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarel(m)</td>
<td>Group 1, variants I and II, Group 2 Irregular (f)</td>
<td></td>
<td>New moneyer, Canterbury and elsewhere in Wessex. Irregular (f) may have been produced in or near the Northants/Derby area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarwulf</td>
<td>Burgred.</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I</td>
<td>London moneyer who seems to have worked in Wessex.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

123 Blackburn and Keynes 1998, 60.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Previous affiliation</th>
<th>Types of Alfred Lunettes</th>
<th>Possible Location/ Affiliation</th>
<th>Subsequent affiliation (where applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dudda/ Æthelberht:</td>
<td>Floriated Cross (as Dudda).</td>
<td>Group 2, variant IV and V. Group 1, Irregular (a).</td>
<td>A London based moneyer who may have worked elsewhere in Mercia or Wessex. May possibly be two moneyers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudd</td>
<td>Æthelred I (both Dudd and Dudda): Group 2, variants i-iv, Group 3, variants vi and vii.</td>
<td>Moneyer’s name also noted (Dudda) for King Eadmund of East Anglia and Burgred as Dudda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudinc</td>
<td>Group 2, variant IV.</td>
<td>New moneyer, located Mercia possibly outside London.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudwine</td>
<td>Burgred Group 2, variant III, Irregular (e).</td>
<td>Mercia almost certainly outside London.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duinc</td>
<td>Group 2, variant III.</td>
<td>New moneyer, located Mercia almost certainly outside London, possibly east Mercia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duni</td>
<td>Group 2, Irregular (d).</td>
<td>New moneyer, located Mercia almost certainly outside London.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn Æthelred I:</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I. Group 2, variant IV.</td>
<td>A moneyer who uses Canterbury dies but seems to retain a Mercian affiliation. Possibly moved from London to Canterbury at some stage.</td>
<td>Possibly Dunna recorded for Cross and Lozenge and Two Line: Winchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadmund King Edmund of East Anglia.</td>
<td>Only coin of this moneyer is very corroded. Possibly Group 2</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Two Line: Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadred</td>
<td>Group 2, Irregular (g).</td>
<td>New moneyer, located Mercia almost certainly outside London, possibly south east Mercia.</td>
<td>Two Line: Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwald</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Two Line: Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadwulf Æthelberht: Inscribed Cross.</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I.</td>
<td>Canterbury.</td>
<td>Alfred: Cross and Lozenge if this moneyer can be linked to a lead trial piece in the possible name of Eadulf; however, this is in London style.124 Two Line: London. St Edmund Memorial.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealhere</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I. Group 2, variant IV.</td>
<td>New moneyer, possibly located central or west Wessex, as he uses London and Canterbury dies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

124 Blackburn and Keynes 1998, 141, item 32.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Previous affiliation</th>
<th>Types of Alfred Lunettes</th>
<th>Possible Location/ Affiliation</th>
<th>Subsequent affiliation (where applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ealmeit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2, variant IV.</td>
<td>Mercia, possibly in view of style of lettering on coin and previous Lunettes D production, south-east or east Mercia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealmod</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealmund</td>
<td>Eðelred I: Group 3, variant v.</td>
<td>Group 2, variant IV.</td>
<td>Mercia, possibly in view of style of lettering on coin and previous Lunettes D production, south-east or east Mercia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elbere</td>
<td>Eðelred I: Group 2, variants i and iii.</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I.</td>
<td>Canterbury. Die links to Heabearht.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elelaf</td>
<td>Group 2, variant V.</td>
<td>New moneyer, located Mercia possibly outside London.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etheleah</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I.</td>
<td>New moneyer drawing dies from Canterbury and London, possibly central or west Wessex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethelgar</td>
<td>Eðelred I: Group 3, variant v.</td>
<td>Group 2, variant IV</td>
<td>As Ealmund.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethelhere</td>
<td>Eðelberht: Inscribed Cross.</td>
<td>Group 2, variants IV and V.</td>
<td>A Wessex moneyer who seems to have moved to London or elsewhere in Mercia or possibly central or west Wessex.</td>
<td>Alfred: Cross and Lozenge, Winchester, Archbishop Eðelred: Cross and Lozenge: Canterbury, Blackburn and Keynes 1998 note this may not be the same moneyer. Two Line: Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethelstan</td>
<td>Burgred</td>
<td>Group 2, variant IV.</td>
<td>London.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethelwulf</td>
<td>King Eadmund of East Anglia, Burgred.</td>
<td>Group 1, variants I and II. Group 2, variants III and IV</td>
<td>May be two moneyers, Canterbury and London.</td>
<td>Two Line: Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethered</td>
<td>Eðelberht: Inscribed Cross. Eðelred I: Group 2, variants i and ii (all as Ethelred). Group 3, variant v.</td>
<td>Group 1, variants I and II; Group 2, variant III.</td>
<td>May be two moneyers, Canterbury and London. Ethelred, working at Canterbury, seems to be the principal Lunettes moneyer there.</td>
<td>Alfred: Portrait Quatrefoil; Cross and Lozenge: Canterbury. Two Line: Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moneyer</td>
<td>Previous affiliation</td>
<td>Types of Alfred</td>
<td>Possible Location/ Affiliation</td>
<td>Subsequent affiliation (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heafreth</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I and Group 2, variant IV.</td>
<td>New moneyer located Wessex, use of variant I and variant IV dies may indicate a location between Canterbury and London.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebeca</td>
<td>Archbishop Ceolnoth.</td>
<td>Group 1, variants I and II.</td>
<td>Canterbury (archiepiscopal moneyer?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herebaldr</td>
<td>Æthelwulf: Canterbury coinage. Æthelberht: Inscribed and Floriated Cross. Æthelred I: Group 2, variant ii.</td>
<td>Group 1, variants I and II. Group 2 variant III.</td>
<td>Principally Canterbury based. Use of variants II and III indicates moneyer may have worked away from Canterbury.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herefreth</td>
<td>Æthelbearht Inscribed Cross.</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I.</td>
<td>Use of variant I dies may indicate Canterbury or a location close to Canterbury in east Wessex.</td>
<td>If same moneyer as Hereferth, also Alfred Cross and Lozenge: Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heremod</td>
<td>Group 1, variants I and II.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury but variant II may indicate moneyer working away from Canterbury elsewhere in Wessex.</td>
<td>Two line: Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herewulf</td>
<td>Æthelred I: Group 2, variant ii.</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I. Irregular (a).</td>
<td>Canterbury and possibly Irregular may indicate west Wessex or south Mercia activity.</td>
<td>Two line: London. Danelaw London Monogram imitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heyse</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I.</td>
<td></td>
<td>New moneyer located Wessex, use of Variant I dies may indicate a location either at Canterbury or close to Canterbury in east Wessex.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hildrefreth</td>
<td>Group 1, variants I and II.</td>
<td></td>
<td>New moneyer located Wessex, possibly east Wessex.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubearnt</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liab</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I.</td>
<td></td>
<td>If a new moneyer and not a variant of Liabinc probably Wessex and Canterbury based.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabinc</td>
<td>Æthelberht: Inscribed Cross. Æthelred I: Group 2, variants i and ii, Group 3 variants vi and vii (former as Lifinc).</td>
<td>Group 1, variants I and II.</td>
<td>Canterbury and possibly some activity away from Canterbury. This would match the pattern noted for Æthelred I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luhinc</td>
<td>Group 1, variant II. Group 2, variant IV.</td>
<td></td>
<td>New moneyer possibly working both in Wessex and south east or east Mercia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manninc</td>
<td>Æthelberht: Inscribed Cross (as Maninc).</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I. Group 2, variant III.</td>
<td>Known to be a Rochester moneyer could have continued to work from that location.(^{125}) Otherwise east</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{125}\) Lyon 1969, 220-2 and 229, believes that the Rochester mint was closed. In Lyons and MacKay 2007, 89, we concurred on the ground that there was no specific evidence but noted the continued employment of the moneyer Manninc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Previous affiliation</th>
<th>Types of Alfred</th>
<th>Possible Location/Affiliation</th>
<th>Subsequent affiliation (where applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Æthelred I:</td>
<td>Group 2, variants i–iii.</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I; Group 2, variant IV.</td>
<td>Wessex drawing dies from Canterbury and London.</td>
<td>New moneyer located Wessex, possibly west Wessex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigeric</td>
<td>Group 2, variant IV.</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I.</td>
<td>New moneyer, located Mercia almost certainly outside London, possibly south Mercia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigefreth</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I.</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I.</td>
<td>New moneyer located Wessex. Use of Variant I dies may indicate a location either at Canterbury or close to Canterbury in east Wessex.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigestef</td>
<td>Group 1, variants I and II. Group 2, variant III.</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I.</td>
<td>New moneyer, Canterbury and elsewhere in Wessex.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tata</td>
<td>Burged</td>
<td>Group 2, variants III and V.</td>
<td>Mercia, probably used London sourced dies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidbald</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I.</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I.</td>
<td>New moneyer located Wessex, use of variant I dies may indicate a location either at Canterbury or close to Canterbury in east Wessex/Kent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidbearht</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I.</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I.</td>
<td>New moneyer located Wessex. Use of Variant I dies may indicate a location either at Canterbury or close to Canterbury in east Wessex/Kent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirwald</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I; Group 2, variant IV.</td>
<td>Based on Canterbury but may operate elsewhere.</td>
<td>Alfred: Cross and Lozenge: Canterbury. Two Line: Canterbury.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirwulf</td>
<td>Æthelred I, Group 3, variant vii.</td>
<td>Group 1, variants I and II, Group 2, variant IV.</td>
<td>A moneyer using Mercian-style dies who seems to have worked exclusively for Wessex using dies sourced from Canterbury, London or possibly locally produced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tithehelm</td>
<td>Burged?</td>
<td>Group 1, variant I.</td>
<td>A Mercian moneyer who seems to work for Wessex. The only coin noted seems to be subject to both London and Canterbury influences. Possibly worked in south Mercia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE LUNETTES COINAGE OF ALFRED THE GREAT

APPENDIX 3. THE COINAGE OF ALFRED: DIE ANALYSIS.

Note: Total number of coins listed: 196 (AfL2.7 not recorded). Obverse dies: 182. Reverse dies: 177.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>No. of coins</th>
<th>No. of obv. dies</th>
<th>No. of rev. dies</th>
<th>Die duplicates</th>
<th>Die links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biarnmod</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biarnred</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (1 pair)</td>
<td>One obv. links to Wine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biarnwald</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biarnwulf</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>D/d-E/d, F/e-F/f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cialbred</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cialmod</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cialulf</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuthwulf</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealinc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deigmund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denewald</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denemund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diara</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarel/Diarelm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (2 pairs)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diawulf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudinc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudwine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duinc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 (1 pair)</td>
<td>D/d-E/d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadred</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadwulf</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealhere</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealmeit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealmund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This corpus includes all known coins of the following reference numbers:

Lunettes A: BMC type i, North 625, Spink 1057
Lunettes B: BMC type ia, North 626, Spink 1057 variety
Lunettes C: BMC type ib, North 627, Spink 1057 variety
Lunettes D: BMC type ic, North 628, Spink 1057 variety.

All coin details contained in the main Corpus have been sourced from actual coins, published sources or photographs. The BM and Fitzwilliam coins, in particular, were seen and individually recorded. Careful vetting has been undertaken to establish the identity of each coin on the basis of provenance, weight and images where available.

In addition, the authors note a number of principally pre-1920s auction catalogues and sales list entries that cannot with certainty be linked with coins in the Corpus. In total we believe that between fifteen and twenty coins found before 1925 may be unrecorded in modern times.

Each coin is given a unique reference number e.g. AFL1.3 is the third coin listed for Group 1, the Wessex Lunettes type. The entry then gives a reference, museum collection, private collection or latest known date when offered for sale. The Lunettes type is stated, followed by the weight, including observations on coin condition affecting weight, and flan size to the nearest 0.5 mm. The obverse style is noted on the basis of the variant to which
it belongs and the inscription style used. For example the coin AfL1.3 is noted as IIB/4 meaning it is a variant II coin (Wessex in a crude style) sub-variant B (chinless bust) with legend style REX+ AELBRED: (complete lists of bust styles and legends are given below). In Group 2 and the Irregular and Barbarous series the relatively lengthy obverse description results in the inscription being labelled as such for clarity. Other obverse characteristics may also be noted. The reverse is then described. The entry is then completed with any known provenance for the coin, followed by general remarks. Dies are lettered, but it should be noted that die lettering is inevitably arbitrary and the letter does not indicate the order in which the dies would have been used. A master list of dies and die linkages is given at Appendix 3 above.

Coins are numbered in the following series:

AfL1: Alfred Group 1. Wessex-style Lunettes.
AfLIr: Alfred Irregular Lunettes.
AfLU: Alfred unknown or uncertain Moneyer Lunettes.
AfLW: Alfred Lunettes Coinweights.

* indicates coin illustrated at reference shown.
Wnr indicates weight not recorded.
Underlined letters are ligatured.

TABLE 11. The coinage of Alfred: summary of classifications: Bust styles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Variants</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wessex-style Lunettes</td>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Wessex bonnet, neat style, two sub-variants A and B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Wessex bonnet, coarse style, two sub-variants A and B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercian-style Lunettes</td>
<td>III.</td>
<td>‘London-Wessex’ bonnet, three sub-variants A to C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>‘Horizontal’ bust, four sub-variants A-D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V.</td>
<td>‘Vertical’ bust, no sub-variants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td>Irregular types</td>
<td>Various irregular or barbarous coins.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inscriptions

All legends recorded reading from seven o’clock. Legends known for fewer than five moneyers have names indicated.

1. REX +AEBBRED (Tidbald)
2. REX +AELBRED
3. REX++AELBRED
4. REX+AELBRE:<
5. REX+AELBRED. ‘, (Biarnred, Cialmod, Herebald, Tirwald, Wine)
6. REX+AELBRED i (Hebeca)
7. REX+AELBRED :: (Denewald, Ethelere)
8. REX +AELBRED ‘: (Bosa,Herebald, Liabinc, Wine)
9. REXAELBRED (Dudd)
10. REX +ELFRED (Sigestef)
11. RE+AEILRED (Duni, Ethelgar)
12. REX++AEILBRED (Sigeric)
13. REX+HEILBRE :: (Tata)
14. RE (ILFRED :: (Denewald)
15. RJXXALEBRD (Dudda)
16. ELIRED RE (Tilefein)
17. ERI+ELFRED (Eadred)
18. +(X‘)AEILBREDX (Diarelm)
19. ELFEREDM-X+ (Tata)
20. REXHELBRED: (Wulfheard)
21. +ELFREDM+ + (Dudd)
22. +ELFREDMX+ (Wulfheard)
23. +ELFREDREX (Elelaf)
24. +ÆLBÆREDÆX (Ealmund, Ethelstan, Luhinc)
25. +ÆLBÆREDÆX (Tirwulf)
26. ÆLBÆREDÆX (Dudwine)
27. DÆÆLÆBÆRÆ (Tata)
28. ELFÆRÆD M XX (Tata forgeries)

Group 1. Wessex Lunettes

Biarnwulf

AfL1.1. BMC 173. Lunettes B. 1.15 g, mended, was in three pieces, weight before conservation 1.16 g. 19 mm. Obv: IA, style i/2. Rev: .DMO with four pellets surrounding BIARNV/NÆTA, of small pellets. Purchased E. Morris 1846. For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies A/a

Biarnwulf


Dies A/a


Dies B/b

AfL1.4. BMC 160. Lunettes A. 1.03 g, large chip at 9 o’clock. 19 mm. Obv: IA, thin bust with poorly cut mouth inner panels of drapery curve outwards at top, style iii/8. Rev: .MÆN/HÆBÆSÅ/ÆTA. Ex Hook Norton hoard (1848).

Dies: A/a


Dies: B/b

AfL1.6. National Museum of Ireland. Lunettes A. 0.74 g, coin flattened between 6 and 9 o’clock, either in production or later, latter more likely as brocages are very rarely encountered in the Anglo-Saxon series. 19 mm. Obv: IB, elongated bust/i2 but REx not visible. Rev: .MÆN/HÆBÆSÅ/ÆTA (assumed ‘Æ’) ‘Burgred’ Ireland hoard (c.1870).

Dies: C/c

AfL1.7. Lockett (1955), 485 (bought Seaby £9). Lunettes A. 1.17 g, weight derived from Bliss. 18 mm. Obv: IA, unusual bust with pellet eye/i2. Rev: .MON/HÆBÆSÅ/ÆTA,* of very small pellets. Ex Walters (1932) 53 bought Lockett £3 7s. 6d. Almost certainly Bliss (1916), 86a, bought Walters with a coin of Edered for 2 gns; (Walters (1932) 54). Bliss before 1916 records this coin as Clark (1898), 12 bought Verity, ‘very fine and rare’. Subsequently SCMB Jun 1957 5133* offered at £12 10s.

Dies: D/d


Dies: E/d

AfL1.9. Coats Collection, University of Glasgow (SCBI 2, no. 561)* Lunettes A. 1.04 g, chipped. 18 mm. Obv: IB, but very cramped bust/i4. Rev: .MÆN/HÆBÆSÅ trefoil of pellets apex left/ÆTA.

Dies F/e

AfL1.10. NCirc Oct 1993 item 7119* Lunettes A. wnr. ‘Very fine but cracked.’ 18 mm. Obv: IB/4, same die as AfL1.9/SCBI 2, no. 561. Rev: .MÆN/HÆBÆSÅ/ÆTA,* of small pellets. Ex NCirc Sep 1988 item 5421* coin has been cleaned; Glendining (13 Apr 1988) 111*, sold for £250; NCirc Apr 1987 item 2169* ‘in need of careful cleaning and has a slight edge chip’, offered at £490; NCirc Mar 1986 item 933, ‘a little corroded and the hint of a crack along line of one lunette,’ offered at £475; Drabble (1939), 382.*

Dies F/f

Beeston Tor hoard (1924): Brooke 1924 no. 31 wnr 72 Rev: .MON/HÆBÆSÅ/ÆTA:

Marchison (1866) 178 bought Webster.

Croydon No. 2 hoard (1862) (listed Blunt and Dolley 1859, 229 no. 147; Christmas (1864) 176 bought Montagu (1888) 34 bought Lincoln for JJ Num; Num (1896) 82 bought Verity.

Lower Dunsforth hoard (1861); NoCirc Mar 1924, item 28874 EF offered at £3.

Spink Auction (21 Nov 1995) 60, not illustrated, could be AfL1.10.
AfL1.11. BMC 161. Lunettes A. 1.23 g. 18 mm. Obv. IB, style iii/5. Rev. \textsc{Mon/Cialmod/Eta} • • Ex Tyssen (1802). Illustrated Ruding (1840) Pl. 15 Alfred 2.*

Dies A/a

\textbf{Diana}

See also Irregular style coin.

AfL1.12. Baldwin Argentum Auction (Jun 04) 93.* Lunettes B. 0.55 g, loss of fabric at top and bottom of \textit{obv}. 18 mm. \textit{Obv. IIA/2}. Rev. \textsc{Mon/Diaria} • •/\textsc{Eta} Ex \textit{NCirc}, Oct 1991, item 6461* (offered at £500). For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies A/a

\textbf{Diarel}

See also Irregular coin of Diarel.

AfL1.13. Stack (1999) 415* ('very fine' sold for £990). Lunettes A. 1.0 2g. 18 mm. Obv. IIB, but of crude appearance only one cross bar in central panel of tunic/4. Rev. \textsc{M} in shape of \textsc{E} on side \textsc{On/Diarel/Eta}.

Dies A/a

AfL1.14. Blunt Collection, Fitzwilliam Museum (Blunt 342).* Lunettes A. 0.65 g, chipped. Coin very battered 17 mm or thereabouts. Obv. IB, smaller head/4. Rev. \textsc{M} pellet above before next letter \textsc{MO}/\textsc{Diarel}/\textsc{Neta}.

Blunt bought London 1949. Ex Grantley (1944) 999a sold for £4 with coins of Hebeca and Wulfred. Almost certainly Mann (1917) 138c 'a damaged penny of the Mercian type reading \textsc{Diarel MMOne} \textsc{Ta}' from Blunt illustration final letter of middle line could be read as D rather than L. 126 Sold with two coins of Burgred from the Burstal collection for £2. Hugh Pagan notes, on grounds of patination, that from same hoard as this coin. Dies B but very similar to AfL1.13/Stack (1999) 415.

AfL1.15. Lincolnshire Museums Collection Lunettes D. 0.92 g. Diameter not recorded. Obv. IA, style i/2. Rev. \textsc{M} pellet over \textsc{O}/\textsc{Diarel}/\textsc{Eta} facing upwards under T. Ex \textit{Walmsgate}, Lincoln hoard (1985). For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies C/c

AfL1.16. BMA 456. Lunettes D. 0.90 g. 19.5 mm. Obv. IA, square bust, style i/2. Rev. \textsc{Mon/Diarvlf/Eta} Beeston Tor hoard (1924); Brooke 1924, number 49. For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies A/a

AfL1.17. BMA 457. Lunettes A. 1.29 g. 18.5 mm. Obv. IA, style i/2. Rev. \textsc{Mon/Dvnn/Eta} • • Ex Beeston Tor hoard (1924); Brooke 1924, number 32.

Dies A/a

AfL1.18. CNG 20 (25 Mar 1992), 1202.* Lunettes A. 0.99 g. 18 mm. Same dies as AfL1.17/BMC 457.

Dies A/a

AfL1.19. Verulamium Museum, St Albans (\textit{SCBI} 42, no. 736).* Lunettes A. 0.76 g, chipped. 18 mm. Obv. IB, style i/2. Rev. similar to \textit{BMA} 457. Ex Abbey Orchard, St Albans hoard (1968).

Dies B/b

AfL1.20. Ryan (1952), 711* (bought Scaby £8 10s.). Lunettes A. wnr. 18 mm. Obv. IA, but chin set back in neck, style i/2. Rev. \textsc{Mon/Dhvnn/Eta}.

Dies C/c

AfL1.21. CNG Triton 3 (30 Nov 1999), 1473* Lunettes A. 1.20 g. 18 mm. Obv. IA, style i/2, Rev. \textsc{Mon/Dvnn/Eta} • • Ex 'Ridgemount' (1989) 52* (sold for £1350); Lockett (1958) 2701* (bought Seiffert £20); Drabble (1943), 836* (bought Lockett £6 15s.); Peckover (1920), 182.

Dies D/d

AfL1.22. \textit{NCirc} May 1978 item 6342* (offered at £308). Lunettes A. wnr. 18 mm. Obv. IA, square bust, style i/2. Rev. same as AfL1.21.

Dies E/d

AfL1.23. \textit{BMC} 174. Lunettes B. 0.97 g. 19.5 mm. Obv. IA, style iii/2. Rev. \textsc{Mon/Dhvnn/Eta} • • Larger than normal flan for Alfred Group 1 Lunettes. Ex Hook Norton hoard (1848). For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies F/e

126 Pagan 1987, 19, in his listing of Lunettes B to D coins thinks the coin in the Mann sale might be a Lunettes D but we believe a linkage with the Blunt coin is more likely.

127 To be published by Marion Archibald in Loveluck forthcoming.
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AfL1.24. Wolfhead Galleries Jul. 2008 Lunettes A. wnr diameter not known. Obv: B/2. Rev: MON/ET\A formation of six pellets. This is the most complex reverse for any Lunettes A coin of this series.

Dies G/f
Dymock (1858) 115, ex Barclay (1831) ex Henderson (1818).

EMC 1991.0247, Stott 1991, item 68, noted as being found St Peter's Hill Excavations, City of London prior to May 1839 and recorded in Rev. Roach Smith's journals on 5 May 1839.\(^{128}\)

NCirc Mar 1924 item 2887, EF, offered at £2 10s., subsequently NCirc, Apr 1927, item 66998 offered at £2. Ex Lower Dunsforth hoard (1861).

Marchion (1866) 176 DVNN MON ETA; *, bought Webster. Croydon No. 2 hoard (1862), listed Blunt and Dolley 1959, 229 no. 153 subsequently Christmas (1864) 175.

Eadmund
Flixborough Lunettes C possibly Group I but very corroded. Found Flixborough, North Lincolnshire.\(^{129}\)

Eadwulf
AfL1.25. BMA 458. Lunettes A. 1.18 g. 18 mm. Obv. IA, style i/4. Rev. MON/EADVVL/ETA. Ex Beeston Tor hoard (1924); Brooke 1924, no. 33.

Dies: A/a

Dies B/b
Allen (1898), 186a Obv. +AELBRED RE+. Rev. +EADVVLF MON ETA Croydon No. 2 hoard (1862), listed Blunt and Dolley 1959, 229 no. 154. Subsequently possibly NCirc, Jan 1920, item 77823, fine, 'somewhat oxidised', offered at £1 15s.

Ealhere
See also Mercian style coin.
AfL1.27. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (MEC 1347).* Lunettes A. 1.04 g. broken and chipped. 18.5 mm. Obv. IA, style i/2. Rev. EMOND/\AELhE/\ETA Lewis (1891), bought Tunbridge Wells 2 Jul. 1872. Ex Croydon No. 2 hoard (1862) (listed Blunt and Dolley 1959, 229 no. 155).

Dies A/a
Edwald
Shillington, Beds. Lunettes B. Rev. EDVAL MONETA. Published NC (1897), 248, stated to be similar to Ruding Pl. XV no. 5: this is AfL12.49/BMC 175, a Lunettes coin in 'London Wessex' style, but the comparison may only refer to the reverse.

Elbere
AfL1.28. BMA 461. Lunettes A. 1.28 g. 18 mm. Obv. IA, style i/2, die appears to be clogged and worn. Rev. MON/\ELEBA/\ETA. Ex Morgan (1915); Evans (1908). Ex Croydon No. 2 hoard (1862) (illustrated Corbet Anderson no. 3*, listed Blunt and Dolley 1959, 229 no. 156).

Dies A/a
AfL1.29. EMC 1998.0093. Lunettes A. wnr. Full coin. Diameter not known. Obv. IA, style i/2. Rev. MON/E=!\L/\ETA. EMC records this as Lunettes C, but the top lunette and bottom right junction of the lunettes on this coin clearly show this to be Lunettes A. Found at Riby, Lincs, with coin of Diara, EMC 1998.0092.

Dies B/b

Dies C/c
AfL1.31. NCirc Feb 1990 item 187* (offered at £650). Lunettes A. 0.99 g. 18 mm. Obv. IA, style i/3. Die links to Heabearht BMA 467. Rev. MON/ELBER/\ETA. Almost certainly SCMB Jun 1957 offered at £12 10s. and ex Beeston Tor hoard (1924); Brooke 1924, coin no. 35.

Dies D, die linked to die A of Heabearht /d

SCBI 42, no. 738 stolen ex Abbey Orchard, St Albans hoard (1968). No further details available.

O'Hagan (1907) 235b sold with a Heremod for £3.

Boyne (1896) 1138a EBERMONETAE AELBRED REX

Loscombe (1855) 1072 bought Chester AELBRED REX 'very fine and rare'.

Etheleah
See also Mercian style coin.
AfL1.32. BMA 464 Lunettes A. 1.24 g. 18.5 mm. Obv. IA, style i/4. Rev. HM\E!\NEDE/\ETA. Ex Beeston Tor hoard (1924); Brooke 1924, no. 37.

Dies A/a

---

\(^{128}\) Details of Rev. Charles Roach Smith (1806-90) and his interests in City antiquities are given in Stott 1991, 325.

\(^{129}\) To be published by Marion Archibald in Loveluck forthcoming.
AFL1.33. Verulamium Museum, St Albans (SCBI 42, no. 739).* Lunettes A. 0.94 g. chipped 18.0 mm. Obv. IA, style i/4. Rev. JMOEDELEA/NETA. Ex Abbey Orchard, St Albans hoard (1968).

Dies B/b

AFL.1.34. EMC 2005.0060.* Lunettes A. 0.87 g. chipped. Diameter not known. Obv. IA, style i/4. Rev. HMO trefoil of pellets/DELEA/NETA. Noted as found Kent. Timeline Originals, 2005, offered at £650, also BNJ 76, Coin Register 2006, 195*.

Dies O/C

AFL1.35. Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (allocated reference SCBI 9, no. 246a in Metcalf and Northover 1985 but not listed in SCBI). Lunettes A. wnr. 18 mm. Obv. IA square bust, style i/4. Rev. HMOEDELEA/NETA. Shortt bequest. Metcalf and Northover 1985 note this coin is 18.14\% 'silver', an alloy of predominantly silver mixed with very small quantities of gold and lead. Coin is also illustrated at PL 27, no. 98.*

AFL1.36. BMA 464. Lunettes A. 0.98 g. 18.5 mm. Obv. IA square bust, style i/2. Rev. as BMA 464 but without pellets. Ex Lord Airlie (1897), 5. See also Boyd note on unpublished coins in his collection.130

Dies A/a

AFL1.37. Boyd (2005), 782* ('Mottled staining but very fine', sold for £780). Lunettes A. 1.14 g. 18.5 mm. Obv. IB, style i/2. Rev. as BMA 464 but without pellets. Ex Lord Airlie (1897), 5. See also Boyd note on unpublished coins in his collection.130

Dies C/c

AFL1.38. Lincoln Museums Collections. Lunettes A. 0.87 g. Diameter not recorded. Obv. IB, style i/2. Rev. NDMOEDELMEYN/ETON. As BMA 464 but without pellets. Ex Lord Airlie (1897). See also Boyd note on unpublished coins in his collection.130

Dies D/d

Ethelmund

AFL1.39. Ryan (1952) 712* (bought Seaby £7 5s. 6d.). Lunettes A. 0.87 g. chipped. Diameter not known. Obv. IA square bust, style i/4. Rev. as BMA 464 but without pellets. Ex Lord Airlie (1897), 5. See also Boyd note on unpublished coins in his collection.130

Dies B/b

AFL1.40. BMA 466. Lunettes A. 1.09 g. 18.5 mm. Obv. IA, style i/3. Rev. NDMOEDELMEYN/ETON. Ex Walmsgate, Lincoln hoard (1985).

Dies C/c

AFL1.41. Ryan (1952) 712* (bought Seaby £7 5s. 6d.). Lunettes B. wnr. 18 mm. Obv. IB/2. Rev. DMO with three spikes/ETELMVND/ETA. Unusual spelling for this moneyer. Probably ex Lower Dunsforth hoard (1861), in which case N Circ Mar 1924, item 28875, 'VF' offered at £2 5s. For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies D/d

Ethelwulf

See also Mercian-style coins.

AFL1.44. BMA 465. Lunettes A. 1.32 g. 18.5 mm. Obv. IA, style ii/3. Rev. MON/EDELVLF/ETA. Ex Beeston Tor hoard (1924); Brooke 1924, no. 38. (Pl. 1. 11)

Dies A/a

AFL1.42. Verulamium Museum, St Albans (SCBI 42, no. 741).* Lunettes A. wnr. 18 mm. Obv. IB, style i/2. Rev. similar to BMA 466. Ex Abbey Orchard, St Albans hoard (1968).

Dies B/b

AFL1.43. Verulamium Museum, St Albans (SCBI 42, no. 742).* Lunettes B. wnr. slightly chipped. 17 mm. Obv: II B/2. Rev. MON/EDELVLF/ETA. Obverse is very similar to La Riviere Sefreth. Ex Abbey Orchard, St Albans hoard (1968).

Dies C/c

Dies D/d

Ethedric

See also Mercian-style coins.


Dies B/b

130 Boyd 1900, 266. This coin described, but not illustrated, as no. 4.
AfL1.46. Royal Collection of Coins and Medals, National Museum Copenhagen (SCBI 4, no. 671).* Lunettes A. 0.65 g, corroded and chipped. Original diameter possibly 18 mm. *Obv. IB, style i/3. Rev. M inverted ., above M' and O'ON/EDERED/ETA. Ex Thomsen, noted Thomsen (1875), 8068.

Dies C/c

AfL1.47. Corbet Anderson 10.* Lunettes A. wnr. Diameter not known. *Obv. IB, style i/3. Rev. similar or same dies as AfL1.46 and 1.48. Croydon No. 2 hoard, listed Blunt and Dolley 1959, 229 no. 158. Subsequently Mrs Weller. Although it is difficult to compare line drawings with photographs, the quality of Corbet Anderson’s work is exceptional and the detail of this coin does not match others with this particular reverse. Although it is difficult to compare line drawings with photographs, the quality of Corbet Anderson’s work is AfL1.48. NCirc Feb 1990, 188 (offered at £650). Lunettes A. 1.20 g. 18 mm. *Obv. IB, style i/2. Rev. same or similar as AfL1.46 and 1.47.

Dies C/c

AfL1.49. NCirc Nov 1987, 6382* (offered at £1900). Lunettes A. 0.89 g. 18 mm. *Obv. IA, style i/3. Rev. similar to AfL1.45, 1.46 and 1.47. Norweb (1986) 779 ‘about extremely fine’, sold for £1500; Burstal (1912), 51* sold for £4. Illustrated and described (SCBI 16, no. 140).*

Dies E/d

AfL1.50. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (MEC 1348).* Lunettes A. 1.32 g. 18 mm. *Obv. II, very distorted forehead, possibly A/3. Rev. *MON/EDERED/ETA. Lewis (1891), bought Tunbridge Wells, 2 Jul. 1872. Croydon No. 2 hoard (1862), listed Blunt and Dolley 1959, 229 no. 159. Dies E/g


Dies G/f


Dies H/g

AfL1.53. Lincolnshire Museums Collections. Lunettes B. 0.92 g. Diameter not known. *Obv. IB/2. Rev. *MON/EDERED/ETA. Ex Walmgate, Lincoln hoard (1985). For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies I/h

Bergne (1873) 152 bought Douglas £2 10s. ‘nearly as fine. . .’ (as the Bergne Biarnwulf). Walters (1932) 54 ‘very fine but slight edge chip’, Lunettes A. Rev. *MON/EDERED/ETA. Ex Bliss (1916), 86 (wt 1.28g.), sold with a coin of Bosa for 2 gns, ‘fine, somewhat oxidated’. Bliss before 1916 states coin is from ‘Wood St City Find 1881’.

Guthmund

AfL1.54. Blunt Collection, Fitzwilliam Museum (Blunt 343).* Lunettes A, but with noticeable pellets where hoops join the straight line. wnr. 18.5 mm. *Obv. IB, style i/2. Rev. *DMON/GV5MVN/NETA. Bt London 1986, ex Harris (bought Spink 1982).

Dies A/a

AfL1.55. Repton no. 2 (1985), Grave 651. Lunettes B. 0.34 g. fragments comprising less than a third of the original coin. Diameter not known. *Obv. probably IB in view of fact that this type predominates in the Canterbury Lunettes B group? (Rev. *DMON/GV5MVN/ETA) Ex Repton 1985 excavation, see Pagan 1987, 23 and illustration at p. 34 no. 11*. Also recorded as EMC 1986.0402.* For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies A possibly/b

Heabearth

See also Mercian-style coin.

AfL1.57. Duddington hoard (1994–5). Lunettes A, wnr, but only 60% of coin remains. Diameter cannot be ascertained because of damage to coin. *Obv. IA, style ii/2?. Rev. *MON/HEABER/D/ETA.

Dies A/a

Hebeita

AfL1.58. BMC 163. Lunettes A. 0.74 g. extensively chipped at top and bottom. Probably 18 mm. *Obv. IB, style i/2. Rev. *MON/HEBEITA. Found at Wilmington, Kent, 1747, ‘in digging a grave.’

Dies A/a


Dies B/b
AFL 1.60. Blunt Collection, Fitzwilliam Museum (Blunt 344).* Lunettes A. 0.84 g, extensively chipped between 5 and 9 o’clock. 17.5 mm. Obv. IIA*, coarse head/2. Rev. similar to BMC 163. Grantley (1944) 999b sold for 4 gns with a Group 1 Diarel and Group 2 Wulfheard (described in Grantley as Wulfred), both now also Blunt. Pagan notes, ‘From same hoard, on grounds of patination, as Blunt Diarel(11).’

Obv. IIB, style i/2. Rev. as AFL1.60/ Blunt 344. Ex Walmsgate, Lincoln hoard (1885).

Dies C/C

AFL 1.61. Lincolnshire Museums Collection. Lunettes A. 0.67 g, chipped in two places, coin very corroded on obverse. Diameter not recorded. Obv. IB, style i/2. Rev. similar as AFL1.60/ Blunt 344. Ex Walmsgate, Lincoln hoard (1885).

Dies D/d


Dies E/d


AFL 1.64. Ex Reynolds (1954), 134. Metcalf and Northover 1985 note this coin is 28.52% ‘silver’, an alloy of predominantly silver mixed with very small quantities of gold and lead, and illustrated at Pl. 27, no. 95*. The only explanation the authors have is that the Brittovon coin, is thicker than the Rasmussen coin. The same coin from the eye to the nose supports this contention.

AFL 1.65. Leeds City Museum (SCBI 21, no. 985).* Lunettes A. 0.88 g. 18 mm. Obv. IIIB/2. Rev. same as AFL1.64/BMA 468. Ex Baron (1854); Durrant (1847), 17, bought Baron, bought Durrant from Young the dealer, 1821. (PI. 1, 18)

Dies B/a

AFL 1.66. BMA 469. Lunettes A. 1.01 g. 18 mm. Obv. IA, style i/4. Rev. DM0/HEREBAL/NETA. Croydon No. 2 hoard (1862) (illustrated Corbet Anderson no. 6*, listed Blunt and Dolley 1959, 229 no. 162). Ex Evans (1908) and Morgan (1915).

Dies C/b

AFL 1.67. Verulamium Museum, St Albans (SCBI 42, no. 743).* Lunettes A. 0.76 g, chipped. 18 mm. Obv: IA, style i/5. Rev. DM0/HEREBAL/NETA. Abbey Orchard, St Albans hoard (1968).

Dies D/c


Dies: E/d

Flixborough Lunettes A possibly Group I A but slightly corroded. Found Flixborough, North Lincolnshire.131

Hereford

See also Mercian-style coin.


Dies A/a

Heremod

AFL 1.70. British Museum. Lunettes A. 1.15 g. 18 mm. Obv. IA, style i/2. Rev. MON/HEREMOD/ETA. Ex Carlyon Brittton (1918) 1644* (bought by Baldwin on behalf of Lockett for £3 2s. 6d.); Lockett (1955), 486*. Although this and the Bruun Rasmussen coin are undoubtedly from the same dies the appearance of the lettering, particularly on the obverse of this coin, is thicker than the Rasmussen coin. The only explanation the authors have is that the Rasmussen coin represents a later striking where the dies are becoming clogged. A die crack line on the Rasmussen coin from the eye to the nose supports this contention.

Dies A/a

AFL 1.71. Bruun Rasmussen (Dec. 2006), 5435* (sold for £1850). Lunettes A. 1.01 g. Diameter not known. Same dies as AFL1.70/ BM Lockett, but see notes above.

Dies A/a

AFL 1.72. Ashmolean Museum (SCBI 9, no. 245).* Lunettes A. 1.36 g. 18.5 mm. Obv. IA, style i/2. Rev. similar to AFL 1.70/1. Ex Reynolds (1954), 134. Metcalf and Northover 1985 note this coin is 28.52% ‘silver’, an alloy of predominantly silver mixed with very small quantities of gold and lead, and illustrated at Pl. 27, no. 95*.

Dies B/b

AFL 1.73. DNW (16 Mar. 2005), 156*; ‘broken and repaired at 11 o’clock, otherwise good very fine with dark tone.’ Lunettes A. 1.02 g. 18 mm. Obv. IA, style i/3. Rev. MLN/HEREMOD/ETA*. Ex Stack (1999), 417* sold for £682; Mack (1975), 111* ‘rather corroded, fine and rare’ sold for £340; N’Circ Mar 1924, 28879, EF, offered at £2 5s.; Lower Dunsforth hoard (1861). Illustrated in SCBI 20, no. 729.* Although SCBI 20, no. 729 states that the coin

131 To be published by Marion Archibald in Loveluck forthcoming.
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Weighs 1.02 g. Stack (1999) gives weight as 0.93 g and DNW 2005 sale as 0.95 g. Undoubtedly this is the same coin but it has deteriorated over time.


**AfL1.75 Lyons. 0.65 g, but only 50% of coin extant. Diameter not known. Obv: \( \text{RE}+\text{ÆLBRE}\text{(D)} \). Rev. \( \text{DMON}/\text{HEREMOD}/\text{ETA} \). Ex Suffolk find (2008).**

**AfL1.76. Verulamium Museum, St Albans (SCBI 42, no. 744).* Lunettes A. 0.64 g, chipped. 18 mm. Obv: IB, style i/2. Rev. \( \text{DMON}/\text{HEREMOD}/\text{ETA} \). Abbey Orchard, St Albans hoard (1968).**

**AfL1.77. EMC 1996.0199. Lunettes A. 1.04 g. 18 mm. Same dies as AfL1.76/SCBI 42, no. 744. Found near Louth, Lincs. Subsequently NCirc. Dec. 1992, 7433* offered at £650. See also BNJ Coin Register 1996, no. 199.***

**AfL1.78. Cheltenham Museum (published Blunt and Dolley 1959, 221 and Pl. XVI no. 21*). Lunettes A. 0.97 g. 18 mm. Obv: IB, style i/4. Rev. same die as AfL1.76/SCBI 42, no. 744. Found Leckhampton, Glos. 1924. Coin subsequently lost but reappeared in NCirc Nov. 1992, 6358* (offered at £750) and NCirc May 1993.259.***

**AfL1.79. Corbet Anderson 7A.* Lunettes A. wnr. 18.5 mm. Obv: IB, a slightly dislocated bust/4. Rev. \( \text{MON}/\text{HEREMOD}/\text{ETA} \). Dr Cooper. Croydon No. 2 hoard (1862), listed Blunt and Dolley 1959, 229 no. 163.**

**AfL1.80. Corbet Anderson 7B.* Lunettes A. wnr. 18.5 mm. Same dies as AfL1.77. Dr Cooper? Croydon No. 2 hoard (1862), Blunt and Dolley 1959, 230 no. 164.**

**AfL1.81. British Museum. Lunettes A. 0.77 g, but coin broken with substantial part missing. 17.5 mm. Obv: IB, subvariant not known/2 but reading only (RE)+ÆLBRE(D). Rev. \( \text{DMON}/\text{HEREMOD}/\text{ETA} \). North Yorkshire hoard 2004.**

**AfL1.82. British Museum (T.G. Barnett bequest 1935, no. 416). Lunettes A. 1.10 g, chipped. 19 mm. Obv: IB, style i/4. Rev. \( \text{MON} \) horizontal line of three pellets over \( \text{HEREVLF}/\text{ETA} \).**

**AfL1.83. NCirc Jun. 1973 4855* (offered at £350). Lunettes A. 1.02 g. 18 mm. Obv: IB, style i/4, similar to AfL 1.82. Rev. similar to AfL 1.82. Ex Elmore-Jones (1971) 43* (sold for £230).**

**AfL1.84 University Collection, Reading. (SCBI 11a, no. 42) Lunettes A. 1.13 g. 18.5 mm. Obv: IB, style i/4, similar to AfL 1.82 and 1.83. Rev. same as 1.82. Bought Baldwin, ex Napier (1916) 41 (wrongly ascribed to HEREWIG) bought Daniels £2 18s.; NCirc Nov 1914, 24534 FDC, offered at £3 15s.; Carlyon Britton (1913), 337* (wrongly ascribed to HEREVIS) bought Spink £2 15s.; ex Waterloo Bridge hoard (1883), illustrated Heywood 1907, pl. facing p. 59; inadvertently the coin is combined with one of Æthelred I so the obv. is 24* and the rev. is 23*.**

**AfL1.85. CNG 29 (30 Mar. 1994) 1592.* Lunettes A. 1.32 g. 19 mm. Obv: IA, pellet well under chin, style i/2. Rev. very similar to AfL 1.82 but line of three pellets in top lunette over O and N. Ex CNG Classical Numismatic Review Vol. 18 Part 4, Q3 1993, item 345*.**

**AfL1.86. Duddington hoard (1994–5). Lunettes A. wnr. 19 mm. Obv: IA, style i/2. Rev. \( \text{MON}/\text{HEREVLF} \) line of three pellets over \( \text{Q}/\text{ETA} \). Very similar to AfL1.82 but with single pellets in top and bottom lunette.**

**Reverwulf**

See also Irregular style coin.

A moneyer who usually uses a three-pellet formation above the top line of the reverse to differentiate dies. It is of interest that the four obverse and reverse dies listed are very similar and seem to have been cut by the same hand at the same time. Furthermore dies A, B and a, b seem to have been used interchangeably.

**AfL1.87. British Museum (T.G. Barnett bequest 1935, no. 416). Lunettes A. 1.10 g, chipped. 19 mm. Obv: IB, style i/4. Rev. \( \text{MON} \) horizontal line of three pellets over \( \text{HEREVLF}/\text{ETA} \).**

**AfL1.88. SCBI 11a, no. 42. Lunettes A. 1.13 g. 18.5 mm. Obv: IB, style i/4, similar to AfL 1.82 and 1.83. Rev. same as 1.82. Bought Baldwin, ex Napier (1916) 41 (wrongly ascribed to HEREWIG) bought Daniels £2 18s.; NCirc Nov 1914, 24534 FDC, offered at £3 15s.; Carlyon Britton (1913), 337* (wrongly ascribed to HEREVIS) bought Spink £2 15s.; ex Waterloo Bridge hoard (1883), illustrated Heywood 1907, pl. facing p. 59; inadvertently the coin is combined with one of Æthelred I so the obv. is 24* and the rev. is 23*.**

**AfL1.89. Ex Montagu (1895) 550 bought O’Hagan. Brice (1887), Marchison (1866) bought Webster Rev: \( \text{HEREMOD}/\text{MON} \).**

‘Gentleman’ 7 Mar 1894 33 bought Spink: \( \text{HERELVF}/\text{MON} \).
Shand (1949) 313 sold for £1. This and the coin below are almost certainly AFL1.84 and 1.85 but it is not certain which is which.
Shand (1949) 314 sold for £7 5s. ‘differing in minor details’ from 313. See note against Shand (1949) 313 above.

Heyse
AFL1.87. Verulamium Museum, St Albans (SCBI 42, no. 745).* Lunettes A. 0.78 g, with only superficial chipping lying outside the design. 17.5 mm. Obv. IA, style i/2. Rev. MON/HEYSE vertical row of three pellets/ETA.*

Dies A/A
AFL1.88. Verulamium Museum, St Albans (SCBI 42, no. 745).* Lunettes A. 0.69 g, extensively chipped. 17.5 mm. Same dies as AFL1.87/SCBI 42, no. 745. Abbey Orchard, St Albans hoard (1968).

Dies A/A

Hildesfreth
AFL1.89. Duddington hoard (1994–5), Lunettes A. wnr. 18 mm. Obv. IA, style i/2. Rev. ETA.2

Dies A/A

Liab?
AFL1.91. British Museum. Lunettes A. 0.81 g, 20% of coin missing. 18 mm. Obv. IA, style i/4. Rev. MON/LIAB IN/ETA. A curious reverse with the ‘A’ of LIABINC inverted. Acquired by BM 1969. This coin shown at BNS meeting November 1966 by the then owner Mr F. Banks. See BNJ 36 (1967), 211 and Pl. 1.19.*

Dies: A/A

Liabic
AFL1.92. Royal Collection of Coins and Medals, National Museum Copenhagen (SCBI 4, no. 672)* Lunettes A. 0.86 g, extensively chipped. 17 mm? Obv. IB/8. Rev. MO/LIBINC/ ETA. For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies A/A
AFL1.93. EMC 1996.0200.* Lunettes A. 0.82 g. chipped. 17.5 mm. Same dies as AFL1.92. Found near Cambridge. See also BNJ Coin Register 1996 no. 200*, stated to be found on same site as a Coenwulf Tribrach and an Ecgberht Dorob C type. Also NC Apr. 1992, 1772* offered at £350.

Dies B/B
AFL1.94. NC Oct. 1988, 6310* (offered at £575). Lunettes A. 0.71 g. 17.5 mm. Obv. IA, style i/2. Rev. MON/LIABINC/ ETA.* Ex NC Oct 1986, 6856* offered at £575; NC Dec. 1985, 8651,* fine to very fine offered at £650; NC Jun. 1985, 3823* (about very fine, offered at £650).

Dies B/B
AFL1.95. Duddington hoard (1994–5). Lunettes A. wnr. 18 mm. Obv. IB, style i/2. Rev. MON two pellets over O/LIBINC/ ETA two pellets under T

Dies C/C

Montagu (1895) 551, bought Lincoln. Lunettes A. MON/LIABINC/ ETA.

Croydon No. 2 hoard (1862), listed Blunt and Dolley 1959, 230, no. 167, subsequently Evans. Murchison (1866) 175 bought Lincoln.

Parsons (1929) 92 Obv: AELBRED Rev: LIABINC bought Seaby 5s.

Luhinc
See also Mercian-style coin.

Dies A/A

---

132 If this attribution were correct this would be not only the sole Lunettes coin found outside the British Isles but also the only English coin from a hoard of predominantly German coins.
AFL1.97. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (MEC 1349).* Lunettes A. 0.68 g, broken and badly corroded. 17.5 mm. (?). Obv. II but very corroded bust so this attribution cannot be absolutely certain/4. Almost certainly same die as AFL1.96/Corbet Anderson. Rev. Same die as AFL1.96/Corbet Anderson. Lewis (1891), bought Tunbridge Wells, 2 Jul 1872. Croydon No. 2 hoard (1862), listed Blunt and Dolley 1959, 230, no. 169.

Dies A/a

Mann?

N Circ Mar. 1924, 28880 ‘much broken (offered at 5s.). Reading given, almost certainly incorrectly, as (D)ANN /M/ONETA Ex Lower Dunsforth hoard (1861).

Manninc

See also Mercian-style coin.

AFL1.98. BMC 164. Lunettes A. 0.99 g, chipped and broken. 18.5 mm. Obv. IA, style i/4. Rev. MON/OSGEAR/ETA. Ex Tyssen (1802) and Hodsoll (1794).

Dies A/a


Dies B/b

Osgeard

See also Mercian-style coin.

AFL1.100. Lavertine (1998) 1669*, ‘rough surfaces, almost very fine.’ Lunettes A. 1.30 g. 18 mm. Obv. IA, style i/4. Rev. MANN/NCirc Mar. 1924, 28880 ‘much broken’ (offered at 5s.). Reading given, almost certainly incorrectly, as (D)ANN /M/ONETA Ex Lower Dunsforth hoard (1861).


Dies A/a


Dies B/b

Sefreth

AFL1.103. BMC 166. Lunettes A. 1.19 g. 19 mm. Obv. IA, style i/4. Rev. MON/SEFRED/ETA.* Willett (1827) 19, sold for 3 gns.

Dies A/a

AFL1.104. UK Private collection. Lunettes A. 1.13 g. 18 mm. Obv. IA, style ii/4. Very similar to BMC 166 and very similar to Ethelwulf SCBI 42, no. 742. Rev. similar to BMC 166. Ex La Riviere, Spink auction, 160, Oct. 9–10, 2002, 996* (sold for £1725); Linzalone (1994) 2351,* ‘choice extremely fine, a beautiful example of the first coinage.’

Dies B/b

AFL1.105. Fitzwilliam Museum (SCBI 1, no. 543).* Lunettes A. 1.18 g. 18.5 mm. Obv. IA, very similar to Ryan 712, a Lunettes B of Ethelmund. Style ii/2. Rev. MON/SEFRED/ETA.* Ex Duncanson (1930); Smart (collection passed to Duncanson c.1920).133 Metcalf and Northover 1985 note this coin is 21.37% ‘silver’, an alloy of predominantly silver mixed with very small quantities of gold and lead. Coin is also illustrated at Pl. 27, no. 97*. Almost certainly Rashleigh (1909), 225a (bt Baldwin with a coin of Sigestef for £5 12s. 6d.) and therefore ex Shepherd (1885), 68 (sold for £5 15s.); Durrant (1847), 18 (bought Shepherd for 5gns); Dimsdale (1824), lot 473 (bought Durrant for £5 18s.). Very similar to Ryan (1952) 712, a Lunettes B of Ethelmund.

Dies C/c

Martin (1859) 11 bought Webster £1 5s., very fine. Rev. SEFRED MONETA

Whitbourn (1869) 78 bought Johnstone £2. Rev. MON/SEFRED/ETA.*

F Baldwin collection, no further details known.

Richardson (1895) 34 bought Whelan. Rev. SEFRED/MON/ETA.* Ex Doulton (1888) bought Whelan.

Carlyon Britton (1916) 928 Lunettes A. wnr. Obv. W as last (a Group 2 coin) except that bust is smaller and only top of diadem is visible. Rev. similar or same as BMC 166. Bought Baldwin £2 6s.

133 SCBI 1, p. xi, gives details of Frank G. Smart’s collecting history, which reinforces the connection with Rashleigh. The weight of the coin is also the same.
Sigefreth


Dies A/A

Sigestef

See also Mercian-style coins.

AfL1.107. BMC 167. Lunettes A. 0.90 g, pierced at 6 o’clock. 19 mm. Obv. IB, style i/4. Rev. MON/SIGESTEF/ETA

*D* Ex Boyne (1843) 106.

Dies A/A

AfL1.108. Verulamium Museum, St Albans (SCBI 42, no. 747).* Lunettes A. 0.86 g. 17.5 mm. Obv. II/A 2. Rev. similar to BMC 168 but pellets at ends of first and third lines. Ex Abbey Orchard, St Albans hoard (1968).

Dies B/b

AfL1.109. Murawski 2003 (offered at £1150). Lunettes A. 0.86 g. 17.5 mm.

Obv. IB, style i/4.

Rev. MON/SIGESTEF/ETA.

Dies C/c

Miller (1920) 65.

Rashleigh (1909) 225b, bought Baldwin with coin of Sefreth for £5 12s. 6d. Lunettes A. 1.23 g. Obv. ?. Rev. MON/SIGESTEF/ETA Stated as found near St Austell, Cornwall (i.e Trewhiddle hoard). Blunt and Dolley 1959 and Wilson and Blunt 1961, note this as a Trewhiddle Hoard coin but also see Pagan 2000 where he believes that the lack of early documentation of this coin when in the Rashleigh family’s possession strongly suggests that it is not from this hoard.

Bank of England (1877), lot 87b, bought Lincoln. Lunettes nk. wnr. Obv.?/2, Rev. MON/SIEFSTEF/ETA

Tidbald

AfL1.110. BMC 169. Lunettes A. 1.03 g, broken with 40% of coin missing. Very corroded and coppery. Too incomplete to determine flan diameter. Obv. IA, but details of drapery not visible, style i/1. Rev. MON/TIDBAL/DET(A) (BMC catalogue gives a complete reading that cannot be verified from the coin in its present condition, as it looks as though a piece is now missing). Ex Tyssen (1802) and Hodsdoll (1794).

Dies A/A

Tidbearht

AfL1.111. BMA 470. Lunettes B. 0.98 g. 20 mm. Obv. IA, style i/3. Rev. HTMO/TIDBEAR/NETA Ex Beeston Tor hoard (1924); Brooke 1924, no. 45. For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies A/A


Tirwald

See also Mercian-style coins.


Dies A/A

AfL1.113. Lincolnshire Museums Collections. Lunettes B. 1.03 g. Diameter not known. Obv. IB, style i/2? Rev. DM/O/TIRVAL/NETA Ex Walmsgate, Lincoln hoard (1985). For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies B/b

Tirwulf

See also Mercian-style coins.


Dies A/A


Dies B/b

SCBI 42. no. 750 stolen, ex Abbey Orchard, St Albans Find. No further details available.

Tithehelm (may be Tidehelm)

AfL1.116 Repton no. 1 (1982), 3386 (illustrated in Biddle et al. 1986, 115 no. 4*). Lunettes A. 0.82 g. 17.5 mm. Obv. IB, style i/4. Rev. MON/TIDHELMETA formation of six pellets. Ex Repton mass burial excavations 1982. Pagan notes this coin as having a Canterbury obverse but with a reverse in London style and categorises it as a mule.134

We note muling seems to have occurred for other Wessex-style obverse coins with Lunettes B and D reverses (see

134 Pagan 1986b, 117.
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Appendix 2, Table 2C). Also we would not absolutely categorise the reverse as London style. It is almost certainly not Canterbury but could be a locally-produced Wessex die. This coin is therefore placed in the Wessex group.

Metcalf and Northover 1985 note this coin is 30.17% ‘silver’, an alloy of predominantly silver mixed with very small quantities of gold and lead. Coin is also illustrated at Pl. 27, no. 104.* This is the highest silver content they record for a Lunettes coin of Alfred and may explain the light weight of the coin. It has a silver content equal to a normal weight coin of the more standard 15–20% fine group.

Dies A/a

Torthmund
AfL1.117. BMA 471. Lunettes A. 1.18 g. 19 mm. Obv. IA, style i/3. Rev. NDM*, TORHTMV/NETA Ex Morgan (1915) and Evans (1908), Croydon No. 2 hoard (1862). Illustrated Corbet Anderson no. 11.* Also listed Blunt and Dolley 1959, 230 no. 171.

Dies A/a
AfL1.118. BMA 472. Lunettes A. 1.03 g. 18.5 mm. Obv. IA, style i/3. Rev. NDM above O. TORHTMV/NETA Ex Beeston Tor hoard (1924), Brooke 1924, no. 42.

Dies: B/b

Wine
See also Mercian-style coins.

Dies A/a
AfL1.120. Lincolnshire Museum Collections (SCBI 27, no. 1946).* Lunettes B. 0.76 g. 17.5 mm. Obv. IB/2, Rev. MON./VVINE/ETA Found at St Paul-in-the-Bail Church, Lincoln 1978. Also EMC 1983.9946. For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C. EMC 2000.0299, based on Dr Blackburn's report in Blackburn 1993, 88 of St Paul-in-the-Bail church, Lincoln finds seems to be a duplicate entry.

Dies B/b
SCBI 6, no. 81 pierced twice and found Burghead, Moray; coin currently missing.

Wulfheard
See also Mercian-style coin. There is some debate whether the two coins below should be placed in this group rather than the Mercian style. The obverses clearly align to Group 1 and would be anomalous in Group 2 variant III. The reverses both show London influenced lettering but we are reluctant to assign these as Mercian style coins on these grounds alone.

AfL1.121. BMA 474. Lunettes A. 1.12 g. 18.5 mm. Obv. IA, style i/2. Rev. DMO*/.VVLFER/ETA. Beeston Tor hoard (1924), Brooke 1924, no. 44.

Dies A/a
AfL1.122. BMA 475. Lunettes C. 1.27 g. 18.5 mm. Obv. IA, style i/2. Rev. DMON/VVLFEAR/ETA Ex Beeston Tor hoard (1924), no. 48. Although the obverse places this coin in the Wessex series the reverse is clearly in a very ‘blocky’ London style. For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies B/b


Biarnmod
AfL2.1. Arnot (1995), 62* (sold for £320). Lunettes A although the effect of the design on the upper lunette looks like a partial attempt at a Lunettes B. 0.92 g, but ‘chipped rather severely.’ 18 mm. Obv. IIIC, tall, thin bust, double-banded diadem, Wessex style drapery. Inscription 2. Rev. OD – D inserted at top right of O – M inverted trefoil of pellets over OBIARNM/ETA This coin and AfL2.2 share stylistic affinities in bust design and lettering. The coins are cut in approximation of Canterbury style IIIB but have double diademed bust and in the case of AfL2.2 anomalous drapery.

Dies A/a
AfL2.2. Glendining (1 May 1985), 30.* Lunettes B. wnr, edges a little chipped. 18 mm. Obv. IIIC, double-banded diadem. Drapery comprises a central panel with three horizontal bars, panels are divided by curved double lines. Two or possibly one, two hooped horizontal bars in outer panels. Inscription 2. Rev. DMO*/.BIARMO/NETA. Ex NCirc May 1984, 2770* (‘Dark tone and edges a little chipped, and otherwise very fine’, offered at £1250). See also comments on coin AfL2.1. For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies B/b

Biarnred
AfL2.3. Hunterian Collection, University of Glasgow (SCBI 2, no. 560).* Lunettes A. 1.15 g. small chip at 11o'clock. 18 mm. Obv. IVR, double-banded diadem. Hair ends are pelletted. Wessex style drapery. Inscription 3. Rev. DMON./BIARNRE/ETA* Hunterian Collection, acquired before 1783. Illustrated Ruding 1840 Pl. 15 Alfred no. 1.*

Dies A/a
Drapery with signs of hooping in outer panels. Inscription 3.

Dies B/b

PL. 1, 36


Dies A/a

PL. 1, 28

AfL2.11. Lincolnshire Museums Collections. Lunettes B. 0.90 g. Diameter not known. Obv. IVA, double-banded diadem. Drapery in Wessex style. Inscription 2. Rev. CIALVLF/ETA Ex Walmsgate, Lincoln hoard (1985). For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies A/a

AfL2.12. EMC 1997.0126. Lunettes D. 0.95 g. Diameter not known. Obv. IIB, bold facial features and bonnet. Drapery with signs of hooping in outer panels. Inscription 3. Rev. FMO/CIALVLF/ETA Ex Tyssen (1802), perhaps via Miles (1820). Illustrated Ruding 1840, Pl. 15. Alfred no. 4. For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies B/b

AfL2.13. BMC 177. Lunettes D. 1.21 g. 20 mm. Obv. IVB, bold bust with double-banded diadem. Hair ends pelleted. Central panel of drapery comprise one horizontal and one vertical bar. Inscription 3. Rev. FMO/CIALVLF/ETA Ex Tyssen (1802), perhaps via Miles (1820). Illustrated Ruding 1840, Pl. 15. Alfred no. 4. For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies C/c

---

Cuthwulf


Dies A/a
AfL2.15. N/Circ Oct 1988, 6309* (offered at £950). Lunettes D. 0.90 g, chipped. 19 mm. IVB, although major chip at 5 o’clock removes detail of any pellet design at end of king’s name. Double-banded diadem and pelleted hair. Central panel of tunic has two horizontal bars surmounting two vertical. Inscription 2. Rev: FMON/CV/BVLF/ETA *: *: *: *: *: Ex Gravesend hoard (1838). (Pl. 1, 33)

Dies B/b

Dealinc


Dies A/a

Dies D/b

Denewald


Dies A/a

Dies B/b

Dudd

There is also a coin weight recorded with the same reverse die as AfL 2.22 and 2.23. See also irregular coins of Dudda.


Dies A/a
AfL2.21 Goldberg Auctions May 2008 212* (sold for $5250). Lunettes A. 1.17 g. diameter not known. Obv: IVB, double-banded diadem, pelleted hair. Central panel of drapery has two horizontal over two vertical bars. Inscription 4. Rev: similar to AfL 2.20. Overall coin very similar in appearance to AfL 2.20. Ex Davissons Auction 3 (3 May 1994) 156 where noted, ‘A small group of these appeared on the market last year. This piece is one of the best.’ Possible coins are identified in the hoards section (Table 1A) under the Barkby Thorpe hoard (1887). 1152 (bought Daniels £3). Illustrated Ruding 1840 Pl. H, 43.* It is not clear from Ruding 1840 who is the owner of the coin, although Mr Cuff and Colonel Durrant are both acknowledged in the preface for the plate on which the coin appears. 1152 (bought Daniels £3). Illustrated Ruding 1840 Pl. H, 43.* It is not clear from Ruding 1840 who is the owner of the coin, although Mr Cuff and Colonel Durrant are both acknowledged in the preface for the plate on which the coin appears.

Dies C/c

Dies C/c
Dudin (c)
Dies A/a

Dudwine
See also Irregular coin.

Duinc (possibly Dunninc)
AfL2.26. BMC 178. Lunettes D. 1.02 g. 21 mm. Obv. IIIB, single-banded diadem. Two verticals in central drapery panel. Inscription 2. Inscription 2. Rev: MON/ DVINC/ ETA. Provenance not known. BMC catalogue omits initial cross in second line of inscription. For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C. (Pl. 1, 23) Dies A/a

Dunn
See also Wessex-style coins.
AfL2.27. NCirc Jul. 1992 item 4164.* (offered at £800). Lunettes A. 1.25 g. 18 mm. Obv. IVB, double-banded diadem and pelleted hair. Wessex pattern drapery but straight shoulders and second vertical in central inscription. For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.
Dies A/a

Ealhere
See also Wessex-style coin.
AfL2.28. Verulamium Museum, St Albans (SCBI 42, no. 737).* Lunettes A. 0.64 g, chipped. 18 mm. Obv. IVB, double-banded diadem, bust reminiscent of Group 1 variant IIIB coins. Drapery not visible. Sub-variant B crude style. Inscription 4. Rev: MON/ EALHERE/ ETA. Ex Abbey Orchard, St Albans hoard (1968).
Dies A/a

Ealmeit
AfL2.29. NCirc Oct. 1995, 5515* (Very fine, offered at £600). Lunettes C. 1.21 g. 19 mm. Obv. IVB, double-banded diadem bent towards top distorting profile. Central panel of drapery two vertical bars surmounted by two horizontal bars, right panel two bars, left panel blank. Sub variant B crude style. Inscription 22. Rev: MON/ EALMET/ ETA For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.
Dies A/a

Elelaf
Dies A/a

Ealmund
AfL2.31. Ebay 4 Sep. 2006 seller Hidden History. Lunettes D. wnr, coin chipped. Diameter not known. Obv: IVD, distinctive Wessex features in bust cut to a similar pattern as a variant I but somewhat coarser, with no bonnet and a double-banded diadem. Wessex pattern drapery. Inscription 24. Rev: NDMO/ EALM in East Anglian style V/NETA Too distinctive to be a forgery, use of East Anglian M on rev. may indicate east Mercian mint location. This moneyer, transcribed Ealhmund, also known for an irregular Lunettes D of Æthelred I (Lyons and MacKay 2007 Corpus Ae3.13). Stated by seller to be found Norfolk c.2006.
Dies A/a

Ethelcah
See also Wessex-style coins.
AfL2.32. British Museum, T.G. Barnett bequest 1935. Lunettes C. 1.34 g. 20 mm. Obv. IIIA, single banded diadem. Wessex style drapery but with single horizontal bar in central panel. Inscription 2. Rev: HMO/ EBELEA/ ETA Almost certainly NCirc Mar. 1919 item 70755 offered at £5 ‘in perfect preservation and one of a series of coins from important collections’ Thorburn (1918), 52 and Montagu (1895), 547. For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.
Dies A/a
Ethelgar
AFL.2.33. Lyons Lunettes D 0.55 g, only 50% of coin extant. 20 mm (coin is on same size flan as the Luhinc AFL.2.43). *Obv. IVD, thin bust with pelleted hair, no bonnet and a double-banded diadem. Central panel of drapery has one vertical bar with single horizontal bars top and bottom. Inscription 11. *Rev. RO(\text{Moneta})/E\text{DEL}/GA/N\text{ETA} Ex Suffolk find 2008. (Pl. 2, 40)

Dies A/a

Ethelhere
AFL.2.34. BMA 459. Lunettes A. 1.57 g. 19 mm. *Obv. IVB, double-banded diadem, pelleted hair. Central panel of drapery two vertical bars below two horizontal bars. Sub-variant B crude style. Inscription 3. *Rev. MO\text{N}/E\text{DEL}/\text{ETA} Ex Beeston Tor hoard (1924): Brooke 1924: no. 34. (Pl. 2, 37)

Dies: A/a

AFL.2.35. BMA 460. Lunettes C. 1.11 g. 19.5 mm. *Obv. V, loosely drawn face but essentially ‘vertical’ bust, single-banded diadem. Central drapery panel an inverted V not quite closed at the top, hooped bars in side panel. Inscription 7. *Rev. MO\text{N}/E\text{DEL}/\text{ETA} Ex Beeston Tor hoard (1924): Brooke 1924: no. 47. For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies: B/b

Ethelstan

Rev. MO\text{N}/E\text{DEL}/\text{STA}/\text{ETA} For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies A/a

AFL.2.37. Rose (1974), 80* (sold for £400). Lunettes D. wnr. coin a little chipped. 18 mm. *Obv. IIIC, double-banded diadem. Drapery in Wessex style but panel dividers between central and outer panels hooped inwards. Inscription 2. *Rev. MO\text{N} above O/E\text{DEL}/VLF/\text{ETA} The Rose auction catalogue hints that the reverse is die-linked to a coin of this moneyer in the name of Burgred in the same sale (lot 67). Unfortunately the Burgred coin is not illustrated. For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies A/a

AFL.2.38. Duddington hoard (1994–5). Lunettes D. wnr. 20 mm. *Obv. IVC, head in ‘Wessex’ style, double-banded diadem surmounted by small crescent, tuft of hair before. Hair in two rows of dots and hoops. Wessex style drapery. Inscription 24. *Rev. MO\text{N}/E\text{DEL}/\text{LF} For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies: B/b

Ethered
See also Wessex-style coins.
AFL.2.39. Somerset County Museum, Taunton (*SCBI 24, no. 383).* Lunettes B. 1.06 g. 18.5 mm. *Obv. IIIC, double-banded diadem. Drapery in Wessex style but panel dividers between central and outer panels hooped inwards. Inscription 2. *Rev. MO\text{N}/E\text{DEL}/\text{ETA} Somerset County Museum first catalogued in 1962, provenance uncertain. Interestingly the only other Alfred Lunettes coin in the Somerset County Museum (Cialbred, *SCBI 24, no. 382) is a different interpretation of the double-banded diadem variant IIIC in similar state of preservation. Pagan proposes that this coin forms part of a small hoard that was possibly deposited c. 875.136 For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies A/a

AFL.2.40. Coats Collection, University of Glasgow (*SCBI 2, no. 562).* Lunettes D. 1.09 g. 18 mm. *Obv. IIIC, double-banded diadem. Although in Wessex pattern, drapery dividers between central and outer panels curve inwards. Inscription 3. *Rev. MO\text{N}/E\text{DEL}/E\text{TA} Coats collection, bought in 1870s. For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies: B/b

Heafreth
See also Wessex-style coin.

Dies A/a

Healf?
Croydon No. 2 hoard (1862) bought Allen. ‘This coin (reading HEALF MONETA) has unluckily crumbled to pieces; Mr Allen still retains the fragments.’138 Listed as Hea(wu)lf in Blunt and Dolley 1959, 229 no. 160.

---

137 Corbet Anderson 1877, 144.
Herebald
See also Wessex-style coins.
AFL2.42. Herriot (2004) 16* sold for £360. Lunettes B. 0.96 g, chipped. 18 mm. Obv. IIIc, double-banded diadem with colander shaped helmet. Wessex style drapery. Inscription 4. Rev. **LDMO/HEREB(A?)/NETA** Chipped and extensively corroded. ‘Recent find Thames Exchange’, offered at £275. Ex NCirc May 1989, 2501.* For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies A/A

**Gainford, Durham hoard (1864). Lunettes D. Obv:** ?/9 Rev: **DMO/REBALD/NETA** coin damaged. Noted Pagan 1967 and 1987 as Lunettes C. Thompson 1956 suggests this coin is Lunettes A but he is consistently wrong on identifying the reverses of this hoard. To cause further confusion NC iv (1864) 225 states coin is similar to Ruding 1840 pl. XV no. 4, a Lunettes D (the coin illustrated in Ruding is AFL2.13/BMC 177 of Cialulf above). In view of the fact that a coin of Sigeric, undoubtedly from Gainford, is identified by reverse type from Ruding 1840, we favour Lunettes D. Noted in NC iv (1864) as in possession of Revd Edelston, vicar of Gainford.

Luinhic
See also Wessex-style coins.
AFL2.43. Lyons. Lunettes D. 1.02 g. 20 mm. Obv. IVD, thin bust, pelleted hair, no bonnet and a double-banded diadem. Central panel of drapery contains a rectangle with a vertical pellet inside. Inscription 24. Rev. **MON/LVHINC/ETA:** Ex DNW (20 Jun. 2007) 858* sold for £1300; ex NCirc May 1994, 3201* offered at £495. *(Pl. 2, 39)*

Dies A/A

**Manninc**
See also Wessex-style coins.
AFL2.44. BMC 176. Lunettes C but not indented at top right. 0.99 g, small chip at 6 o’clock. 19 mm. Obv. IIIB, single-banded diadem. Central panel of drapery with single vertical bar and single horizontal bar, outer panels three horizontal bars. Inscription 2. Rev. **MO** four pellets around **MANNINC/ETA** Reverse only illustrated in Keary and Greuber (1887) Pl. VI no. 4*. Ex Hook Norton hoard (1848). Metcalf and Northover 1985 note this coin is 18.50% ‘silver’, an alloy of predominantly silver mixed with very small quantities of gold and lead. Coin is also illustrated at Pl. 27, no. 99.* For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C. *(Pl. 1, 24)*

Dies A/A

**Osgeard**
See also Wessex-style coin.
AFL2.45. Duddington hoard (1994–5). Lunettes D. wnr. 19.5 mm. Obv. IVC, head in ‘Wessex’ style, double-banded diadem surmounted by crescent. Hair in two rows of dots and hoops. Wessex-style drapery. Inscription 2. Rev. **DMON** pellet over **OSGEAR/ETA** For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies A/A

**Sigeric**

The editor of *Archeologia Aeliana*, Longstaffe, who looked at the coins recorded two pellets instead of a trefoil which is unmistakeable on this coin.138 Although Longstaffe was a careful observer and noted numismatist it must be noted that a two-pellet formation is not encountered on Lunettes coins and may just be a mis-transcription. Interestingly there are parallel problems with the description of the coin of Hildefrith from the hoard that is currently not located (see note above AFL1.90).

Spink sale catalogue notes that the coin is of uneven coppery tone reflecting original surface enrichment. For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies A/A

**Sigestef**
See also Wessex-style coins.
AFL2.47. BMC 168. Lunettes A. 1.01 g. 19 mm. Obv. IIIA, single-banded diadem one tuft of hair in front. Central drapery panel one horizontal over two vertical bars, outer panels two hooped bars. Inscription 10. Rev. **FMOIZE2/ETE/NETA***. Ex Hook Norton hoard (1848). *(Pl. 1, 20)*

Dies A/A

---

AfL2.48. Clonterbrook Trust (1974), 30*. Lunettes B. 1.19 g (wt derived from Clonterbrook), 19 mm. Obv. IIIA, single-banded diadem, two tufts of hair in front. Wessex style drapery but only one horizontal bar in central panel. Inscription 2. Rev. MONSIESTE/ETA Ex Lockett (1960), 3630*; Grantley (1944), 998 (sold for £11 10s.); Montagu (1895), 546 (‘very fine and extremely rare’); Archdeacon Pownall (1887) 38. Possibly Bank of England (1877) 30 and Austen (died 1797). Pagan 1887 queries that this coin might be a cast but if so it cannot be taken from AfL2.49/BMC 175. Although this comment may have been as a consequence of this coin being somewhat coarser in appearance than AfL2.49/BMC 175 this is almost certainly due to the fact that this coin is struck from dies that are more worn. Key differences are that the damage to the inner rings of the obverse is completely different and the Lockett obverse is double struck at 4 o’clock (AfL2.49/BMC 175 is not). For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies B/b
AfL2.49. BMC 175. Lunettes B. 1.37 g. 19 mm. Same dies as AfL2.48/Lockett (1960) 3630. Ex Tyssen (1802); Southgate (1795). Illustrated Ruding (1840) Pl. 15, Alfred no. 5.* Metcalf and Northover 1895 note this coin is 15.90% ‘silver’, an alloy of predominantly silver mixed with very small quantities of gold and lead. Coin is also illustrated at pl. 27, no. 100.* For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

(T1, 21)

Dies B/b
Tata139
AfL2.50. BMC 172 (obverse illustrated Greuber and Keary 1887 Pl. VI, 2*). Lunettes A. 1.23 g, 19 mm. Obv. V, ‘vertical’ bust with single banded diadem, hair represented by two rows of hoops. Central panel of drapery has one vertical bar leaning right, outer panels each two hooped bars. Inscription 19. Rev. MON/TATA IIIA. The whole in very thick block lettering. Higgins (1830) 124. Illustrated in Hawkins 1841, pl. XXIII no. 171.*

Dies A/a
AfL2.51. Verulanium Museum, St Albans (SCBI 42, no. 748).* Lunettes A. 0.73 g, chipped. 18 mm. Obv. V, ‘vertical’ bust with single banded diadem, hair represented by single row of curls. Drapery design difficult to assess but central panel seems to comprise two verticals only. Inscription 13. Rev. similar to AfL2.50/BMC 172 and again rendered in thick block lettering. Ex Abbey Orchard, St Albans hoard (1968).

Dies B/b
AfL2.52. NCirc Nov. 1990, 6820.* Lunettes B. wnr, but chipped. 18.5 mm. Obv. IIC, double-banded diadem. Drapery has some reference to Wessex pattern but central panel of two horizontal and one vertical bars merged together, outer panels each two bars. Inscription 2. Rev. MON/TATA IIIA. For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies C/c
AfL2.53. MacKay (collection reference 0802). Lunettes C. 1.17 g. 18 mm. Obv. IIIA, single-banded diadem. Wessex-style drapery. Inscription 27. Rev. MON/TATA IIIA. Ex CNG, 14 May 2008, 2136, $2750; ex CNG (8 Dec 1993), 662* (good very fine, estimated at $1250). For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

(T1, 22)

Dies D/d
Tilfein
Greuber and Keary 1887 also suggest Tilevine, but this is probably Tilewine, a moneyer for the London Monogram type.

139 There are also five forgeries (see Blunt and Thompson 1958 and Pagan 1972) that seem to have been inspired by AfL2.50/BMC 172. All use the same dies based on a crude interpretation of the ‘Vertical’ bust Variant V with Lunettes A reverse. All have inscription 28 and a complex reverse reading of: MON/TATA IIIA... The obverse is linked to additional forgeries in the names of moneyers Lide, Ocumer and Ozric (further details in Pagan 1972).

1. Fitzwilliam Museum (SCBI 1, no. 992 and MEC 1496)* 1.15 g. 19 mm. Ex Henderson (1933), possibly NCirc Nov. 22 item 11968 (FDC offered at £6 10s.). Murdoch (1903) 83 bought Rollin £8, Montagu (1895) 548 ‘extremely fine and rare with this title of king’, Shepherd (1885) 69 (bought Rollin £14 10s.). The Shepherd catalogue presumed that the M-X represented the epithet maximus. This coin also illustrated in Blunt and Thompson (1958) at Pl. 1, 9*.

2. SCBI 2, no. 1237* Bought through Burns (1879), ex Yorke Moore (1879) 70.

3. Grantley (1944) 996* sold for £12 10s. stating the same Murdoch and Montagu provenance as SCBI 1, no. 992. Subsequently NCirc Aug.–Sep. 1947 item 51738 offered at £15 15s.

4. Drabble (1943) 837* (1.16 g weight derived from NCirc) This coin was auctioned after Grantley’s death. It seems to be an identical coin and claims the same Murdoch and Montagu provenance as the coins above. Subsequently NCirc Dec. 1947 extremely fine/FDC* offered at £16 10s.

5. Lockett (withdrawn and not in Lockett sales) whose manuscript notes records a provenance Watters (1917) 47 (obverse illustrated*) 49, Murdoch (1903) 84 (bought Watters £5), Richardson (1895) 33 (sold for £4 15s.), Marsham-Townsend (1888) 144 (sold for £8 15s.).

Finally there is a coin in NCirc May 1920 (Crompton Roberts. FDC and offered at £7 10s.) £1341, giving an unlikely provenance of Cotton (1889), Brice, Montagu (1895) and Nunn (1896). This coin could be either 3 or 4.
Inscription 20.


Dies A/a

Tirwald
See also Wessex-style coins.
AFL2.55. Verulamium Museum, St Albans (SCBI 42, no. 749).* Lunettes A. 0.96 g, chipped. *Obv. IVB, double-banded diadem, pelleted hair. Drapery would appear to be a separate central panel with one vertical bar below to horizontal drapery, outer panels two bars. Sub-variant B crude style. Inscription 7. Rev. DMO/TIRVAL/ETA. ex Abbey Orchard, St Albans hoard (1968).

Dies A/a


Dies B/b

Tirwulf
See also Wessex-style coin.
AFL2.57. Verulamium Museum, St Albans (SCBI 42, no. 751)* Lunettes A. 0.78 g, extensively chipped. 18 mm. *Obv. IVB, big bust with double-banded diadem, drapery clearly anomalous but difficult to identify from SCBI. Sub-variant B crude style. Inscription 4. Rev. MON/TIRVLF/ETA inverted cone of six pellets. ex Abbey Orchard, St Albans hoard (1968).

Dies A/a

AFL2.58 Barratt (c.1820s) Lunettes D. wnr. Diameter not known. *Obv. IVA, central panel of drapery one horizontal above two vertical bars. Inscription 25. Rev. MON/TIRVLF/ETA. Mr. Barratt’s copy of Ruding owned by Dr Lyon has a handrawn, but self-evidently accurate, illustration of this coin on an inserted sheet headed ‘Specimens in the collection of Joseph Barratt.’

(Pl. 1, 29)

Dies B/b

Winberht
AFL2.59. Verulamium Museum, St Albans (SCBI 42, no. 752).* Lunettes A. 0.88 g, extensively chipped. 18.5 mm. *Obv. IVB, big bust with double-banded diadem, drapery central panel has two horizontals and two verticals. Sub-variant B crude style. Inscription 4. Rev. *MON/VINBERT/ETA*. *Ex Abbey Orchard, St Albans hoard (1968).

Dies A/a

Wine
See also Wessex-style coins.
AFL2.60. BMA 473. Lunettes A. 1.28 g, 20 mm. *Obv. IVB, double-banded diadem, hair without pellets. Double vertical pellets in central panel of drapery. Inscription 5. Ovb. as BMA 434. Rev. MON/VVHE/ETA; * Ex Beeston Tor hoard (1924), Brooke 1924, no. 43.

(Pl. 1, 30)

Dies A (also links to Biarnred AFL2.6/BMA 454)/a

AFL2.61. Duddington hoard (1994–5). Lunettes B. wnr. 18 mm. Obv. IIIIC, double-banded diadem surmounted by very small crescent. Central panel two horizontal and two vertical bars, outer panels two hoops. Inscription 2. Rev. MON/VVINE; ETA. For further analysis of Lunettes B to D reverses, including this coin, see Appendix 2, Table 2C.

Dies B/b

Wulfheard
See also Wessex-style and Irregular coins.
AFL2.62. BMC 171. Lunettes A. 1.12 g, broken. 19 mm. *Obv. IVB, double-banded diadem with straight pelleted hair, one tuft of hair in front of diadem. Two horizontal surmounting two vertical lines in central panel of drapery. Inscription 4. Rev. MON/VVLFARDY; ETA; * Ex Tyssen (1802). Illustrated Ruding Pl. 15, Alfred 3.* Pl. 2, 38.

Dies A/a

AFL2.63. Verulamium Museum, St Albans (SCBI 42, no. 753).* Lunettes A. 0.82 g, broken in two pieces with substantial sections missing. Diameter cannot be ascertained. *Obv. IVB, double-banded diadem. Drapery central panel three (?) vertical lines, outer panel (only one remains) two horizontals. Sub-variant B crude style. Inscription 22. Rev. similar to BMC 171 but single pellet in place of trefoil at end of first line. Ex Abbey Orchard, St Albans hoard (1968).

Dies B/b

AFL2.64. Blunt collection, Fitzwilliam Museum (Blunt 345).* Lunettes A. wnr. extensively chipped, so much so that original size of coin difficult to ascertain. Diameter is small in 17 mm range. *Obv. V, ‘vertical’ bust, single-banded diadem, two tufts of hair. A vertical bar in central panel of drapery. Side panels have hooped bars. Inscription 20. Rev. DMON/VVLFER; ETA; *. Ex Grantley (1944) 999c, sold with Group 1 coins of Dariel and
Hebeca, also to Blunt, for £4; Briggs (1893) 195; almost certainly Lindsay (1867), 45 bought Lincoln and described as 'fractured'.

Dies C/c

Dies D/d

Irregular coins

**Denemund**
Afl.Ir1. National Museum of Wales. Lunettes B. wnr. 18.5 mm. *Obv.* Group 2, irregular (c). Very small head and overlarge drapery. Outer panels of drapery have a distinctive three hoops pattern. Inscription 2. *Rev.* ND*MON*/DENEM*/ETA Ex Drabble (1939), 383 coin stated to be chipped; ex Ready (1920) 82. Could possibly be Sotheby (23 May 1849) 101 ‘From the Oxford *trovaille* of 1848, very rare and well preserved’ and thus Hook Norton hoard (1848). Could also possibly be Sotheby (19 Oct. 1878) 457 ‘edge chipped but very fine, dark toned.’ Metcalf and Northover 1985 note this coin is 10.70% ‘silver’, an alloy of predominantly silver mixed with very small quantities of gold and lead. Coin is also illustrated at Pl. 27, no. 101*.

Dies A/a

**Diara**

See also Wessex-style coin.
Afl.Ir2. EMc 1998.0092.* Lunettes D. wnr. Diameter not known. *Obv.* Group 1, irregular (b). The lettering is distinctive, for example the A of AELBRED is not standard, and the bust, notably the eye, which on most Wessex coins is circled, is rendered as a dot and there is only a point for the mouth rather than two lips. Inscription 2. *Rev.* MON/DIARA*/ETA Although cut in an approximation of Wessex style this coin is considered a Mercian-produced coin almost certainly produced outside London. Found Ribi, Lincs. with a coin of Elbere (EMc 1998.0093). 

Dies A/a

**Diarelm**

See also Wessex-style coins of Diara.
Afl.Ir3. Repton no. 2 (1985) (illustrated Pagan 1987, 34, no. 5*). Lunettes D. 0.59 g, chipped and broken in two. 19 mm. *Obv.* Group 2, irregular (f), very distorted bust reminiscent of Burgred types with the large ‘fish eyes’. Double-banded diadem, short hair at right angles to diadem. Very large eye and mouth pointing downwards. Tunic central panel has two horizontal bars with vertical between, outer panels two hooped bars. Inscription 18. *Rev.* MM*ON*/DIAREL*/ETA Ex Repton excavations 1985, found grave 529 with Afl.2.8 and Afl.Ir5. 

(Pl. 2, 46)

Dies A/a

**Dudda**

See also Mercian-style coins of Dudd.
Afl.Ir4. Fitzwilliam Museum (*SCBI* 1, no. 542)* Lunettes C. 0.87 g, chipped. 17 mm. *Obv.* Group 1, irregular (a), a very barbarous bust. Single diadem, spiky hair. No mouth. Wessex drapery in coarse style. Inscription 15. *Rev.* M*ON*/DDVD*/A*/ ETA Bought from Sadd (Cambridge dealer), date not known. *MEC* notes this coin as, ‘Barbarous work, contemporary imitation?’. 

Dies A/a

Afl.Ir5. Repton no. 2 (1985) (illustrated Pagan 1987, 34, no. 4*). Lunettes C. 0.48 g, chipped. 17 mm. Group 1, irregular (a). Same dies Afl.Ir4/*SCBI* 1, no. 542. Ex Repton excavations 1985, found grave 529 with Afl.2.8 and Afl.Ir3. 

(Pl. 2, 51)

Dies A/a

**Dudwine**

See also Mercian-style coin.
Afl.Ir6. Repton no. 1 (1982) 3381 (illustrated in Blackburn 1986, 115 no. 5*). Lunettes D. 0.71 g, chipped and obverse corroded. 20 mm. *Obv.* Group 2, irregular (e), ‘vertical’ bust with single banded diadem. Hair indistinct. Central panel of tunic is highly irregular, a St Andrew’s cross with pellets in each angle surmounted by a horizontal line of three pellets. Outer panels two hooped bars. Inscription 26. *Rev.* N*EMON*, horizontal line of three pellets over MO and a crescent(?) over the M (but this may just be poor die-cutting or a die occlusion)/D*DVI*/./ ETA (assumed .*, as chip obscures). Trefoil of pellets pointing upwards between T and A. Metcalf and Northover 1985 note this coin is 18.42% ‘silver’, an alloy of predominantly silver mixed with very small quantities of gold and lead. Coin is also illustrated at Pl. 27, no. 103*. Ex Repton mass-burial site. 

(Pl. 2, 48)

Dies A/a

---

140 This coin is an addition to the list in Blunt and Dolley 1959; see Biddle *et al.* 1987, 26 n.39.
Duni
AfLIr7. CNG Mail Bid 69 (8 June 2005), 2107* (sold for $1000). Lunettes A. 1.24 g, slightly ragged flan. Diameter not known. Obv. Group 2, irregular (d), single-banded diadem. Drapery has three horizontal bars in central panel, two hooped bars in outer panels. Very thick cut letters. Inscription 11. Rev. MÓN/DVNI inverted/ETA in very thick cut letters. (Pl. 2, 47)
Dies A/a

Eadred
AfLIr8. EMC 2000.0317.* Lunettes C. 0.90 g, corroded and cracked. 18 mm. Obv. Group 2, irregular (g). Highly irregular, very coarse thick cut style. Over-large nose and spiky hair. Wessex-pattern drapery. Inscription 17. Rev. MON/EADRE/ETA Found Southwell, Notts. Also recorded BNJ Coin Register 2003, no.153*. (Pl. 2, 50)
Dies A/a

Herewulf
See also Wessex-style coins.
AfLIr9. Ashmolean Museum (SCBI 9, no. 246).* Lunettes A. 0.93 g, chipped and creased. 18 mm. Obv. Group I, irregular (a). SCBI image seems to lack any bonnet. However illustration in Metcalf and Northover clearly shows a bonnet. Inscription 2. Rev. MO line of three pellets above HERELVI/ETA Gift of Dr East, 1948, found Princethorpe, Warwickshire (no date given). Also recorded BNJ Coin Register 2003, no.164*. (Pl. 2, 54)
Dies A/a

Wulfheard
See also Mercian and Wessex-style coins.
AfLIr10. Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg (SCBI 50, no. 194).* Lunettes A. 0.91 g, with very small chip. 17.5 mm. Obv. Group 1, irregular (a), single-banded diadem. Wessex-pattern drapery but with only one horizontal in central panel. Inscription 2, bold lettering. Rev. DMON/VVLEAR/ETA Looks to be base metal, also coin is unusually worn. Ex Reichel (1858), coin is a manuscript addition in 1843 catalogue. (Pl. 2, 50)
Dies A/a

Unidentified or Uncertain Moneyers
AfLU1. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (MEC 1351).* Lunettes A. 0.36 g, coin in two parts possibly of two coins. Diameter not known. Obv. III/5. Rev. POW[N] E[TA] Ex Lewis (1891), bought Tunbridge Wells 2 Jul. 1872. Croydon No. 2 hoard (1862). The drapery of the neck of the bust has two vertical bars and there is evidence of a bonnet. This points to a coin of Variant III, Sub-variant C.
AfLU2. Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Cambridge (MEC 1350A).* Lunettes D. 0.40 g, coin less than 50% complete. Diameter not known. Obv. Head missing. III?/nk. The obverse has the characteristic layout of a Variant III coin, see Bureel (SCBI 20, no. 727) for similar. Rev. DM/NN/ME/ETA?; Could quite plausibly be Denemund who is known for Variant III or possibly Deigmund, Ealmund or less likely Ethelmund who is only known for Wessex-style coins. From excavations at Great Shelford, Camb. 1980, now Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.
AfLU3. Lincolnshire Archaeological Trust (SCBI 27, no. 1945).* Lunettes A. 0.40 g, fragment. Diameter not known. Obv. I or II/inscription appears to be of Group I standard. Rev. [-][-]RC or EE[-]. This could be Bureel or an unknown moneyer Bureel. Although listed as a coin of Æthelred I the single-banded diadem which is clearly visible indicates it must be a coin of Alfred. Excavated at St Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln, 1975.
Lockdales (19 Nov 2006) 433 unknown moneyer.
EMC 2000.0264 unknown moneyer, unknown finds spot.
EMC 2000.1151 unknown moneyer, Torksey.
Bower 1998 unknown moneyer, Flixborough, Lincs.

Coin Weights

Berried
AfL. W1. DNW (19 Jun. 2002), 131 (sold for £820) with coin weight Lunettes? Total weight 44.51 g. Coin secured reverse side up. Found Northern Ireland c.1987. This moneyer not known for Lunettes coinage but on grounds that he is known for Alfred’s Third Coinage assumed to be a coin of Alfred.

Biarnwulf
AfL. W2. British Museum. Lunettes D. Total weight 71.44 g. Coin missing but rev. impression remains. Obv. not known. Rev. FM/OBIARNVI/ETA Found Kingston, Isle of Purbeck, Dorset. For further details see Williams 1999, Item 20, not confirmed as Alfred but moneyer only known for this king.
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**Dudd**

**Eadwulf**
See AFL.1.26.  

(Pl. 2, 53)

**AUCTIONS AND OTHER REFERENCES**

For auctions, only 'named' sales are included; general sales at Glendining, Sotheby etc. are referred to by date in the corpus and elsewhere.

Addington (1883): collection bought *en bloc* by Montagu 1883
Airlie (1897): Sotheby 30 Jun 1897
Allen (1898): Sotheby 14 Mar 1898
Austen (1797): Collection obtained by act of Parliament for Bank of England
Bagnall (1964): Portion of collection bought by Spink 1964
Bank of England (1877): Sotheby 13 Jul 1877
Barclay (1831): Sotheby 21 Mar 1831
Baron (1854): Donation to Yorkshire Philosophical Society now in Leeds Museum
Barratt: Collector c.1820s, his personal illustrations of his collection are in the possession of Dr Lyon (q.v.)
Bearman (1922): Collection purchased Baldwin c.1922
Bennington: J. Bennington of Croydon, one of the initial purchasers of the Croydon No. 2 hoard (1862)
Bergne (1873): Sotheby 20 May 1873
Bliss (1916): Sotheby 22 Mar 1916
Blunt: Blunt Collection of British Medieval Coins in the Fitzwilliam Museum
Boyd (2005): Baldwin 26 Sep 2005
Boyne (1896): Sotheby 21 Jan 1896
Brand: series of Sotheby sales 1983-4
Brice: various sales from 1853 but bulk of collection purchased *en bloc* by Montagu in 1887
Briggs (1893): Sotheby 22 Mar 1893
Brown (1868): Sotheby 26 Jul 1869
Brushfield (1929): Glendining 2 May 1929
Burns (1879): agent for Thomas Coats, whose collection now forms part of the University of Glasgow collections
Bursted (1912): Sotheby 6 Nov 1912
Carlyon Britton (1913): Sotheby 17 Nov 1913, first portion.
Carlyon Britton (1916): Sotheby 20 Nov 1916, second portion
Carlyon Britton (1918): Sotheby 11 Nov 1918, third portion
Chaffers (1857): Sotheby 9 Feb 1857
Christmas (1864): Dowell 27 Apr 1864
Clark (1898): Sotheby 23 May 1898
Cooper: Dr Cooper, one of the initial purchasers of the Croydon No. 2 hoard (1862)
Cotton (1889): Sotheby 27 May 1889
Crompton Roberts (1920): collection sold to Spink with part appearing in *NCirc* May 1920
Cuff (1854): Sotheby 8 Jun 1854
Devonshire: Christie 18 Mar 1844
Dimsdale (1824): Sotheby 6 Jul 1824
Doulton (1888): Christie 17 Jun 1888
Drabble (1939): Glendining 4 Jul 1939
Drabble (1943): Glendining 13 Dec 1943
Duncanson (1930): Bequest to Fitzwilliam 1930
Durrant (1847): Sotheby 19 Apr 1847
Dymock (1858): Sotheby 1 Jun 1858
Evans (1908): Purchased *en bloc* by Spink c.1908 and much purchased by Morgan (1915)
Fitch (1918): collection purchased by Spink c.1918
Grantley (1944): Glendining 22 Mar 1944
Higgs (1830): Sotheby 29 Apr 1830
Hill (1879): Christie 8 Apr 1879
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Henderson (1818): Sotheby 24 Jun 1818
Henderson (1933): bequest to the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge
Hodsoll (1794): Collection purchased en bloc by Tyssen
Lewin-Sheppard (1861): Sotheby 14 Jan 1861
Lewis (1891): Rev Lewis, bequest to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge 1891
Lindsay (1867): Sotheby 14 Aug 1867
Linzalone (1994): Stack 7 Dec 1994 (see also Wolfshead Gallery)
Lockett (1960): Glendining 26 Apr 1960, English Part IV
Longbottom (1934): Sotheby 14 May 1934
Loscombe (1855): Sotheby 30 Mar 1855
Lyon: Dr Lyon, current collector, collection held at the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge
Lyon: current collector
Mack (1975): Glendining 18 Nov 1975
MacKay: current collector
Maish (1918): Sotheby 25 Mar 1918
Mann (1917): Sotheby 29 Oct 1917
Martin (1859): Sotheby 23 May 1859
Miles (1820): Sotheby 14 Mar 1820
Miller (1920): Elder Coin and Curio Company, New York 26 May 1920
Montagu (1888): Sotheby 7 May 1888
Montagu (1895): Sotheby 18 Nov 1895
Morgan (1915): dispersed to British Museum and others, including Lockett, c. 1915
Murawski: current dealer
Murchison (1866): Sotheby 28 May 1866
Murdock (1903): Sotheby 15 March 1903
Napier (1916): Sotheby 3 Aug 1916
Neligan (1881): Sotheby 10 Nov 1881
Norweb (1886): Spink 19 Nov 1886
Nott (1842): Sotheby 30 May 1842
Nunn (1896): Sotheby 20 Nov 1896
O'Hagan (1907): Sotheby 16 Dec 1907
Parsons (1929): Sotheby 28 Oct 1929
Parsons (1953): Glendining 11 May 1954
Peace (1894): Sotheby 18 Jun 1894
Peckover (1920): Sotheby 12 Jul 1920
Pownall (1887): Sotheby 20 Jun 1887
Rashleigh (1909): Sotheby 21 Jun 1909
Ready (1920): Sotheby 15 Nov 1920
Reichel (1858): collection bought en bloc by Hermitage Museum 1858.
Reynolds (1954): Glendining 6 Apr 1954
Richardson (1895): Sotheby 22 May 1895
Ryan (1952): Glendining 22 Jan 1952
Shand (1949): Glendining 8 Mar 1949
Shepherd (1885): Sotheby 22 Jul 1885
Shottt: Collector and curator, bequest to Ashmolean c.1976
Smith (1895): Samuel Smith, Sotheby 11 Jul 1895
Southgate (1795): Collection bought en bloc by Tyssen before intended Sotheby sale of 1 Jul 1795
Stack (1999): Sotheby 22 Apr 1999
Stewartby: Lord Stewartby current collector
Thane (1819): Sotheby 1 Dec 1819
Thorburn (1918): Sotheby 27 Nov 1918
Tyssen (1802): Sotheby 12 Apr and 6 Dec 1802
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