

# HISTORICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE REGIONAL PRODUCTION OF DIES UNDER ÆTHELRED II<sup>1</sup>

PAULINE STAFFORD

THE study of Anglo-Saxon numismatics has advanced considerably over the past two decades, and the picture which is emerging, although not yet definitive, must interest historians. An interim marriage between the historical and numismatic evidence, especially for the reign of Æthelred II, reveals the connections which existed between the coinage and political factors. Certain political developments during this reign had repercussions on the coinage, and the advancing study of regional die-production has sometimes made it possible to link specific changes in the circumstances of local rule with changes in the coinage.

England in the tenth and eleventh centuries was not a centralized state. The effectiveness of royal government depended on relations between the king and those who ruled in his name, the ealdormen, bishops, and reeves. In certain areas such as northern England the problems of government were almost always acute. The politics of late Anglo-Saxon England are dominated by such problems and relationships, and inevitably they varied with the position, power, and loyalty of individual nobles as well as with the king's own ability and situation. The heyday of King Edgar's power in the 970s, for example, differs significantly from the early stages of Æthelred's reign during the 980s, when a new and youthful king was establishing himself on the throne, and from the last years of that same reign when the English kingdom was facing sustained external attack of an unprecedented ferocity. It is not surprising to find that the coinage reflects such changes.

General links between the coinage and other areas of royal administration might be expected. The map of mints after Edgar's reform, for example,<sup>2</sup> shows that the area of controlled currency in eleventh-century England was similar to the area of royal authority represented by Domesday Book. York in each case was the most northerly extension. The concentration of mints in central Wessex, far more than necessary as Dr. Metcalf has pointed out,<sup>3</sup> may be partly because this is the area of greatest royal authority and activity where the royal demesne was concentrated.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This paper was delivered at a meeting on the B.N.S. and benefited from the comment and discussion of members of that Society. I owe an especial debt of gratitude to Mark Blackburn and Stewart Lyon who read the paper in draft, made many criticisms, and gave unstintingly of their own unpublished work and ideas. Above all, my thanks are due to Professor Dolley, who first interested me in numismatics, who has encouraged that interest with much help over the years, who suggested that I write this paper, and who has inspired it at every stage. My debt to him is even greater than the references

would suggest. Those mistakes which remain are entirely my own.

<sup>2</sup> R. H. M. Dolley and D. M. Metcalf, 'The Reform of the Coinage under Edgar', *Anglo-Saxon Coins*, ed. R. H. M. Dolley (London, 1961), p. 151.

<sup>3</sup> D. M. Metcalf, 'Geographical Patterns of Minting in Medieval England', *Seaby's Coin and Medal Bulletin*, 1977, pp. 314-17, 353-7, and 390-1 esp. p. 391.

<sup>4</sup> See my paper, 'The Reign of Æthelred II, A Study in the Limitations on Royal Policy and Action', in *Æthelred Millennium*, ed. D. Hill.

Many mints may have administrative as much as economic significance, as in the case of Winchcombe, a shire town and a mint, but with an output of coin so small as to suggest that it was never economically important.<sup>5</sup> Kings looked to the coinage for profit, and Anglo-Saxon administration was at its most sophisticated in enforcing and maximizing royal dues and rights.<sup>6</sup> The manipulation of the coinage was a regular and barely disguised tax on the use of money made possible and profitable by the king's establishment of a monopoly over minting. Recent work on metrology has revealed weight variations not only from issue to issue but within issues from area to area.<sup>7</sup> Metcalf correlates these variations with the functions of points of bullion entry.<sup>8</sup> The use of coin in administration and changing royal needs may also be important. In many issues, for example, Winchester, the West Saxon, and often the West Mercian mints strike heavy, whereas eastern and especially Danelaw mints strike light coin.<sup>9</sup> Winchester, in particular, and Wessex, in general, were centres for the payment of the bulk of royal dues to be taken perhaps in heavy coin. The lower reaches of the Severn and parts of the Welsh marches also had significant concentrations of royal land. One reason for the difference between heavy and light coin might be a variable minting fee, light coins representing a heavy tax on the use of coin.<sup>10</sup> If such a tax were a royal motive in the manipulation of the coinage its preponderance in the major trading centres of eastern England might be expected, and the consistently light weight of the coin from c. A.D. 1012 to c. A.D. 1051 may represent a particularly heavy tax to meet the heavy drain on royal finances in the shape of the heregeld.<sup>11</sup>

Royal interest in the coinage is not to be measured simply in terms of profit. The coinage contributed to royal prestige and propaganda.<sup>12</sup> Some of Alfred's issues had political purposes.<sup>13</sup> Athelstan's experiments with portrait issues and royal titles<sup>14</sup> have definite political overtones. Edgar's great reform of the coinage itself was part of a propaganda exercise in 973. Professor Dolley associates it with the second quasi-imperial consecration and the ritual rowing on the Dee—a carefully stage-managed

<sup>5</sup> On Winchcombe output see I. Stewart, 'Reflections on Some Wessex Mints and Their Moneyers', *NC* xv (1975), 219–29 esp. p. 228, and *Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles*, vol. 19, 'Bristol and Gloucester Museums', pp. 105–9.

<sup>6</sup> See J. Campbell, 'Some Observations on English Government from the Tenth- to the Twelfth-Century', *TRHS* xxv (1975), 39–54, and cf. S. Harvey, 'Royal Revenue and Domesday Terminology', *EcHR*, ser. 2, ii (1967), 221ff. and 'Domesday Book and its Predecessors', *EHR* lxxxvi (1971), 753–73.

<sup>7</sup> V. J. Butler, 'The Metrology of the Late Anglo-Saxon Penny, the Reigns of Æthelred II and Cnut', *Anglo-Saxon Coins*, pp. 195–214; C. S. S. Lyon, 'Variations in Currency in Late Anglo-Saxon England', *Mints, Dies and Currency*, Essays in Memory of Albert Baldwin, ed. R. A. G. Carson (London, 1971), pp. 101–20; K. Jonsson, 'An Example of Regional Weight Variation in the Coinage of Æthelred II', *NC* (1977), 177–80.

<sup>8</sup> D. M. Metcalf, 'The Ranking of Boroughs, Numismatic Evidence for the Reign of Æthelred II', *Æthelred Millennium*, ed. D. Hill.

<sup>9</sup> See the remarks of Butler, 'The Metrology . . .' on First Small Cross, Crux, Long Cross, and Helmet. Cf. H. B. A. Pettersson, *Anglo-Saxon Currency: King Edgar's Reform to the Norman Conquest* (Lund, 1969), pp. 146–54. Pettersson argued that weight variations arise as a result of averaging outputs, so that mints which struck throughout an issue and so struck more of the later and lighter coins, would record a lower average. Jonsson's evidence for the simultaneous striking of coin of different weight rebuts this argument.

<sup>10</sup> C. S. S. Lyon, 'Some Problems in Interpreting Anglo-Saxon Coinage', *Anglo-Saxon England*, v (Cambridge, 1976), 207.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Lyon's remarks in 'Variations . . .', pp. 114–15.

<sup>12</sup> Fully appreciated by Metcalf, *SCMB*, 1977, p. 315.

<sup>13</sup> R. H. M. Dolley and C. Blunt, 'The Coinage of Alfred', *Anglo-Saxon Coins*, pp. 77–95, and Lyon, 'Some Problems . . .', pp. 181–9.

<sup>14</sup> See C. Blunt, 'The Coinage of Athelstan, King of England 924–39', *BNJ* xlii 35–159, esp. pp. 46–59.

piece of political theatre.<sup>15</sup> The impresarios of these events were the ecclesiastical leaders of the monastic reform movement. English churchmen in the late tenth century were conversant with many aspects of the ninth-century Carolingian monarchy,<sup>16</sup> and Carolingian ideas influenced the events of 973. The use of the coinage by Carolingian rulers for prestigious purposes was probably not far from the minds of Edgar's ecclesiastical advisers.<sup>17</sup> These same churchmen were conscious of the achievements of the native dynasty,<sup>18</sup> and the reform of 973 may be a revival of ideas from the reigns of Athelstan, Alfred, and even Æthelwulf. The coinage is part of the image of kingship and the image which English churchmen of this date were fostering was that of the holy king.<sup>19</sup> For forty years after 973 the iconography of the English coinage was overwhelmingly religious. On the coin which represented the king's authority throughout England, the portrait of the ruler was associated with symbols of the divine.

At least as early as the reign of Athelstan, political factors affected not only the general but the detailed administration of the coinage. Athelstan's coinage responded to the changing circumstances of local rule. There were at least two significant experiments with the organization of the coinage under Athelstan: the Cross type with the title *Rex totius Britanniae* and regular mint-signatures which seems to have replaced the Two Line type in certain areas; and the Crowned Bust type, again with mint-signature but with a much narrower geographical spread than the Cross type. Crowned Bust is confined to the southern group of mints, to East Anglia, and perhaps very late in the reign to York.<sup>20</sup> Whatever Athelstan's intentions for this type, it only succeeded in the strongest areas of royal power, that is in the south of England and East Anglia. The East Anglian mints spring into life during Crowned Bust with a very high quality of workmanship, high weight, and rigidly enforced mint-signatures. Little is known of how East Anglia was controlled between Edward the Elder's conquest and the early years of Athelstan's reign. But in 932 Athelstan Half King, a West Saxon nobleman whose family had extensive lands in the south, was appointed as ealdorman.<sup>21</sup> His family was to control East Anglia loyally in the name of the kings of Wessex for the next sixty years. The West Saxon provenance of this family and its loyalty makes it likely that this appointment was the occasion from which the Norwich mint began to strike a rigidly controlled southern type, i.e. Crowned Bust, which ought therefore to date, as Blunt suggested on other grounds, from c. A.D. 932. Both the moneyers and the type continue at Norwich into the reign of Edmund, matching the continuity of the family itself. York presented a very different problem to the kings of Wessex, and Athelstan's York coinage suggests a recognition of the difficulties encountered in ruling this area.<sup>22</sup> The archiepiscopal

<sup>15</sup> Dolley and Metcalf, *op. cit.*, esp. pp. 136 and 152, and Dolley's forthcoming paper 'The Date of Edgar's Reform'.

<sup>16</sup> For general corroboration of this awareness see J. Campbell, 'Some Observations on English Government ...'.

<sup>17</sup> Professor Dolley informs me that he is about to publish a paper arguing for cyclical recoinages under Æthelwulf dating from that king's return from the Carolingian court. Cf. Lyon, 'Some Problems ...', pp. 193-4.

<sup>18</sup> See, e.g., Ælfric's remarks on Alfred and Athelstan in his translation of the Homily on Judges in the Old English Heptateuch. Dolley and Metcalf, *op. cit.*, p. 156, saw 973 as a deliberate harking back.

<sup>19</sup> See, e.g., R. Deshmann, 'Christus Rex et magi reges. Kingship and Christology in Ottonian and Anglo-Saxon Art', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, viii (1976), 367-405.

<sup>20</sup> Blunt, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

<sup>21</sup> C. Hart, 'The Family of Athelstan Half King', *Anglo-Saxon England*, ii (Cambridge, 1973), 115-44.

<sup>22</sup> Blunt, *op. cit.*, pp. 88-92.

minting privileges were allowed to continue, at first totally separate from the royal mint and later through the archbishop's participation in that mint. The loyalty of Archbishops of York, even as late as the mid tenth century, could not be taken for granted and the king would not lightly risk alienating their support. Under Athelstan the royal mint at York was controlled by a single moneyer, first Rægnald, and then Æthelferth who continued into the reign of Anlaf Guthfrithson; in each case a single monopolist who must have had many workmen under him. Such a powerful and presumably profitable monopoly may well have been the only way of ensuring royal control of the coinage in a city where the power of the West Saxon kings was much resented. Under Anlaf Sihtricson and Edmund York is once again a multi-moneyer mint. In East Anglia and at York under Athelstan the coinage and its organization responded to differing political pressures.

Detailed study of the tenth-century coinage has been concentrated on the reform of King Edgar and the immediately succeeding period where the evidence is particularly plentiful.<sup>23</sup> Edgar's reform involved cyclical recoinages, the setting-up or reopening of a large number of mints to facilitate these recoinages, and the addition of the name of the mint to that of the moneyer on the coin to aid in the detection of those who failed to comply. Three particular lines of inquiry in the post-reform period show how the coinage responded to political changes: the minting pattern, the movement of moneyers, and local die-cutting.

The great burgeoning of mints in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries went far beyond economic necessity, and in central Wessex far beyond the principle of a mint accessible to the whole population.<sup>24</sup> Edgar's reform could have worked with fewer mints. The exact minting pattern after 973 cannot be certainly drawn especially since finds of Reform-type pennies are still few, and the same vagaries of coin hoards make it difficult to be certain how that pattern changed over the next forty years or so. But it does seem, on present evidence, that many so-called mints functioned only intermittently and for specific purposes, and that the minting pattern continued to change for some time after 973. Many of the very small and ephemeral mints of Wessex appear only very briefly during Æthelred's reign: Warminster, Crewkerne, Axbridge, Bruton, Taunton, and Milborne Port appear in Long Cross, and only Warminster and Taunton strike any other Æthelred issue, Last Small Cross in each case. Some of these West Saxon mints do not function until even later, as in the case of Petherton, Bedwyn, and Berkeley. Many of these mints must have lain dormant for years.<sup>25</sup> In most of these cases when the mint did strike it tended to be with the help of a moneyer from some adjacent and larger mint.<sup>26</sup> Such a pattern of activity

<sup>23</sup> Dolley and Metcalf, 'The Reform . . .', is still the essential starting-point. Much work since this is surveyed by Lyon, 'Some Problems . . .',

<sup>24</sup> Metcalf, *SCMB* 1977.

<sup>25</sup> Lyon, 'Some Problems . . .', p. 210; Metcalf, *ut supra*; and cf. I. Stewart, 'Reflections on Some Wessex Mints . . .', *NC* xv. I am grateful to S. Lyon for additional information on this point.

<sup>26</sup> All information on moneyers unless otherwise stated is derived from O. von Feilitzen and C. Blunt, 'Personal Names on the Coinage of King Edgar', *England Before the Conquest*, ed. P. Clemoes and K. Hughes

(Cambridge, 1971), pp. 183-214; V. J. Smart, 'Moneyers of the Late Anglo-Saxon Coinage, 973-1016', *Commentationes de Nummis Saeculorum IX-XI in Suecica Repertis*, pt. II, ed. N. L. Rasmussen and B. Malmer (Stockholm, 1968), pp. 191-276. On Milborne Port see Dolley, *BNJ* xxix (1958-9), 61-4, its Long Cross moneyer Æthelric is a prolific Shaftesbury moneyer, and one of its Pointed Helmet moneyers Swetric is known at Winchester. Cf. F. Elmore-Jones, 'The Mint of Axbridge', *BNJ* xxx (1960-1), 61-9. For Berkeley see *SCBI* xix, 109-11.

has been remarked in certain south-western mints such as Castle Gotha.<sup>27</sup> Mints such as Aylesbury and Hertford rarely had a moneyer permanently attached to them, but were usually supplied as needed from a large mint, often London.<sup>28</sup> Such facts must raise the question of whether every place whose name appears on a coin was a permanent mint; whether many of them were economically unnecessary and opened only occasionally and for specific purposes.<sup>29</sup> A large number of such mints are concentrated in Wessex, and many are on great royal estates such as Petherton, Bedwyn, Milborne Port, Bruton, Berkeley. These estates were centres for the collection of royal dues and their renders may still normally have been taken in kind in the eleventh century.<sup>30</sup> At times of exceptional royal need for cash or of royal absence, these renders may have been made in cash, and fluctuating mint output may result in part from fluctuating royal need. The fluctuations in the activity of many mints and the creation and movement of mints demonstrate that the minting pattern of the 970s was subjected to unforeseen strains and demands which necessitated flexibility. This fact is clearest in the response of the coinage to the payment of gelds under Æthelred, which has been shown to have had a significant impact on minting.<sup>31</sup> The emergency measures resulting from Viking attack show similar flexibility, as when the new mint was opened at Salisbury in 1003 as a refuge for the moneyers of Wilton among others.<sup>32</sup> There may have been many other temporary factors, such as the presence of the royal court in an area, which could affect a minting pattern which in many of its details, if not its broad outlines, was not simply a product of the logic of economics.

Moneyers could be, and often were, moved from mint to mint. The most obvious examples are the movement of moneyers to the emergency mints such as Salisbury and Cissbury, and the interchange of moneyers between adjacent mints such as Southampton and Winchester,<sup>33</sup> London and Southwark.<sup>34</sup> Moneyers could move within a given area, often frequently, as the Exeter moneyers did in the south-west<sup>35</sup> and the Canterbury moneyers did in south-east England.<sup>36</sup> Lincoln moneyers

<sup>27</sup> Stewart, 'Reflections on Some Wessex Mints...', in Dolley and Elmore-Jones, *BNJ* xxviii (1955-7), 27 f.; Lyon, *BNJ* xxxi (1962), 51-2.

<sup>28</sup> Aylesbury only struck Crux, and its two moneyers, Ælfgar and Leofstan, were probably both London moneyers. On Hertford see C. Blunt, 'Origins of the Mints of Hertford and Maldon', *BNJ* xli (1972), 21-6, and Dolley, *BNJ* xxix (1958-9), 54-8, and I. Stewart, *NC* 1971, pp. 237-42. In its early history Hertford shared a moneyer with Maldon. It is extraordinarily active in Crux with six moneyers and is supplied from London like other mints in the Southwark/Hertford wedge.

<sup>29</sup> Suggested by Metcalf, *SCMB* 1977; Stewart, *NC* 1975, and cf. Stewart, 'The Early Coins of Æthelred's Crux Issue with Right-facing Bust', *NC* 1971, pp. 237-42.

<sup>30</sup> With the possible exception of Berkeley all these manors rendered the 'farm of one night' in 1066 and were central to royal provisioning, see my forthcoming paper 'The Farm of One Night and the Organisation of King Edward's Estates in Domesday', *EcHR* 1979/80.

<sup>31</sup> C. S. S. Lyon, 'Some Problems...', p. 197 n. 4, and *BNJ* xxxix (1970), 200.

<sup>32</sup> See, e.g. Dolley and Elmore-Jones, 'An Intermediate Small Cross Issue of Æthelred II and Some Late Varieties of the Crux Type', *BNJ* xxviii (1955-7), 84, and cf. Dolley, 'Three Late Anglo-Saxon Notes', *BNJ* xxviii, 99-103.

<sup>33</sup> Dolley, 'Further Southampton/Winchester Die-links in the Reign of Æthelred II', *BNJ* xxxv (1966), 25-33; Elmore-Jones, 'Southampton-Winchester Die-links in Cnut's Quatrefoil Type', *BNJ* xxxix (1970), 6-11.

<sup>34</sup> All traceable Southwark moneyers occur also at London. London had other less regular links, see Dolley and G. van der Meer, 'A Die-link between the Mints of Dover and London at the End of the Reign of Æthelred II', *BNJ* xxix (1958-9), 416-17, and Dolley, 'An Æthelred Die-link Between London and Hertford', *BNJ* xxix (1958-9).

<sup>35</sup> I. Stewart, 'The Exeter Mint and its Moneyers', *Glendinning's Sale Catalogue*, 28 Oct. 1970.

<sup>36</sup> See, e.g., the pattern of the south-east in Last Small Cross.

*Canterbury Moneyers*: Ælfrýd (previously at Hastings and London) Eadwold, also at London; Godman, also at Dover, Lewes, and London; Godric, also at London

are sometimes found operating in the small neighbouring mints,<sup>37</sup> and Norwich moneyers throughout East Anglia and some adjacent areas.<sup>38</sup> In some cases moneyers were sent out from large mints to open smaller ones.<sup>39</sup> Some individual moneyers such as Leofwine<sup>40</sup> and Hunewine<sup>41</sup> have been shown to have had very varied career patterns, and die-links have established moneyer connections, at first sight improbable, between mints as far apart as Wilton and Hertford.<sup>42</sup> Mints could be temporarily enforced with additional moneyers in particular circumstances: the mint of Bath for the consecration of King Edgar in 973,<sup>43</sup> and a whole series of eastern mints stretching from Thetford to Southwark which were reinforced by London moneyers during Crux. Such movements begin to appear normal rather than exceptional and seem to have occurred for a variety of reasons: for the establishment of new mints as at the Reform; to meet exceptional needs posed by the consecration or the gelds; to meet irregular needs at small mints; or simply to collect dies for a new type.

These movements are suggestive and problematic. If some mints were regularly supplied from other centres should they be regarded as mints or rather as places at which moneyers occasionally worked? Who controlled the moneyer movements and what is their significance for understanding die-cutting patterns? These questions still remain to be answered. But all such movements underline the flexible organization of the late Saxon coinage, and at the same time the predominance of the great minting centres of London, Winchester, Canterbury, Exeter, Norwich, Chester, Lincoln, and York. These were not only the main centres which supplied moneyers to other mints but also the most regular die-cutting centres.

In most issues after 973 some local die-cutting occurred. The desire to return to local die-cutting seems to have been strong, due probably to the economic and political issues involved in die supply. When dies were centrally cut throughout an issue, moneyers from all mints, including those such as York or Lincoln with long traditions of supplying their own dies, would be forced to purchase all their dies from

(previously many other connections); Godwine, also at Rochester, London, and Cissbury; Leofstan, also at Romney, Lewes, Colchester, and London; Leofnoth, also at Lewes and London; Wulfstan, also at London; Ulf.

*Dover Moneyers:* Brihtmær, also at London; Cynsig (previously at London); Eadsige, also at Hastings and London; Godman (above); Leofric, also at London (previously at Rochester, Canterbury, and Lymne); Manninc.

*Lewes moneyers:* Ælfweard, also at Hastings and London; Godwig; Leofa (previously Hastings); Leofnoth (above); Leofstan (above); Leofwine, also London (name previously occurs at many mints including Romney and Dover); Onlaf; Godeferrth; Godman (above); Wine.

*Rochester moneyers:* Ælfheah; Eadnoth (previously London and Chichester); Eadweard, also London (previously Lymne); Godwine (above).

*Romney moneyers:* Leofstan (above); Wulfnoth (previously name known at Thetford, Dorchester, Winchester, and Northampton).

These can only be tentative identifications, but do

suggest a degree of movement within the south-eastern mints.

<sup>37</sup> Leman who struck First Small Cross at Caistor was at Lincoln in Crux.

<sup>38</sup> See, e.g., the Norwich moneyers Lyfinge at Cambridge and Ipswich in 973; Brantine active also at Ipswich in First Hand; Folcard who appears at Thetford in Crux; Eadmund active also at Cambridge in Crux.

<sup>39</sup> See, e.g., G. van der Meer, 'A Second Anglo-Saxon Coin of Reading', *BNJ* xxxi (1962), 161, identifying the moneyer Corff who opened the Reading mint and was previously active at London.

<sup>40</sup> Lyon, 'Presidential Address', *BNJ* xxxix (1970), 200-3, 'Mint Organisation in Late Saxon England'.

<sup>41</sup> M. Blackburn, 'The Mint of Watchet', *BNJ* xlv (1974), 13-38, esp. pp. 19-22.

<sup>42</sup> Stewart, 'Early Coins of Æthelred's Crux Issue . . .', *NC* 1971.

<sup>43</sup> Dolley, 'The Eadgar Millenary—A Note on the Bath Mint', *SCMB* 1973, pp. 156-9, though S. Lyon has pointed out in personal correspondence that Wallingford is an equally exceptionally active mint in Circumscription Cross.

Winchester or London. At the same time, they would be deprived of income derived from their own sale of dies to mints in their own area. Centralization of die supply would thus be a financial burden and a loss of income, an income in which the ealdorman or reeve may once have shared. A share of the profits, one of which was presumably the manufacture and purchase of dies, may have gone to the local ruler both before and after Edgar's reform. During the 980s and 990s Edgar's reform was still a novelty. The remintings constituted a tax on trade and the use of money,<sup>44</sup> and judging from the heavy punishments found in Æthelred's third and fourth codes not a popular one.<sup>45</sup> The success of the reform may have been achieved in some circumstances by providing an incentive to the local ruler in the form of such profit. By the time of Domesday some certainly enjoyed such a share. In towns like Dover, the earl or count had a proportion, the third penny of the urban farm.<sup>46</sup> At Huntingdon, Leicester, and Chester<sup>47</sup> Domesday specifies that the earl or count took a third of the moneyers' payments. If profit arose from local die-cutting the ealdorman may well have shared it. From 975 onwards such local production of dies was often allowed. In some cases it may represent an inability to enforce centralization, and it is notable that York and Lincoln at the very edges of royal authority cut some of their own dies in every issue which they struck between 975 and 1016. But in other cases local die-cutting may represent the grant of a local privilege in specific political circumstances, and an examination of the changing patterns of local die-cutting in relation to political changes may be revealing.

More than forty mints have been shown to have been active during Edgar's Reform type.<sup>48</sup> Some are almost certainly new, such as Winchcombe, Cambridge, and Ilchester, others may have reopened after intermittent activity. This issue also saw the appointment of many new moneyers. This may be partly an illusion created by the possibility of identifying mints and moneyers after the reform, but it should be remarked that a large proportion of the moneyers who struck this issue at York, Lincoln, Stamford, Norwich, and Winchester have names hitherto unrecorded on Edgar's earlier coinage.<sup>49</sup> The smaller mints which were now opened or reinforced may often have acquired moneyers from elsewhere. On the basis of name identity alone it is possible, for example, that Chester supplied moneyers to Hereford and Stafford;<sup>50</sup> that Winchcombe received a moneyer from London;<sup>51</sup> that Shrewsbury gained one who had passed through Gloucester,<sup>52</sup> and that Gloucester itself acquired two moneyers who may have come from Winchester.<sup>53</sup> The movements of moneyers in these west midlands mints already suggests links both north and south, phenomena also observable in their later die supply.

The East Anglian mints present an interesting picture in this issue. Cambridge and

<sup>44</sup> IV Atr. 7 (printed F. Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen* (Halle, 1903-16), vol. 1) makes clear the trader's obligation to ensure that he is using money of the correct weight and type.

<sup>45</sup> III Atr. 8 and 16; IV Atr. 5.

<sup>46</sup> D.B., vol. 1, fol. 1.

<sup>47</sup> D.B., vol. 1, fols. 203, 230, 262<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>48</sup> For a list see Dolley and Metcalf, p. 145, to which may be added Barnstaple, K. Jonsson, 'Fyndet fran

Smis: Tingstade sn pa Gotland', *NVA* 1975-6, pp. 66-82. I am grateful to M. Blackburn for this reference.

<sup>49</sup> At York, for example, the following new moneyers appear in the Reform issue: Brentinc, Gunnulf, Iohan, Isulf, Osmund, Tumma, Unspac.

<sup>50</sup> Gyllis to Hereford, Ælfsige to Stafford.

<sup>51</sup> Ælfnoth to Winchcombe.

<sup>52</sup> Sigewald.

<sup>53</sup> Wynsige and Æthelstan.

Ipswich were opened or reopened in 973, apparently stimulated into life by a Norwich moneyer Lyfinge. With four known moneyers striking this type Norwich was the most important mint in East Anglia. There are few Old Norse names among the East Anglian moneyers, but there are a number of Old English names which are also common in Wessex, plus three Old German names.<sup>54</sup> Continental Germans were important at Winchester in the Reform issue.<sup>55</sup> The hand of ealdorman Æthelwine may be discernible here. Æthelwine, son of ealdorman Athelstan Half King, was very prominent at Edgar's court. Norfolk, Suffolk, and Cambridge, the areas supplied with moneyers from the Norwich centre, are also areas under Æthelwine's jurisdiction.<sup>56</sup> His links with the royal court could certainly have led to his import of three German moneyers into the East Anglian mints. Moneyers were also sent out from Winchester and London to other mints in the Reform type, and there is already evidence for the importance of Canterbury as a source of moneyer supply in the south-east<sup>57</sup> and of Exeter in the south-west.<sup>58</sup>

The Reform type was continued as the issue of the reign of Edward the martyr, but not unchanged.<sup>59</sup> During Edward's reign the absolute uniformity of die-cutting found in Edgar's Reform type gives way to local schools of die-cutting, similar though not identical to the old tenth-century pattern. Dies were cut locally at Lincoln, York, in Kent, and at a centre in East Anglia which supplied parts of East Mercia and Middle Anglia. The troubled accession of Edward led to a return to local die-cutting in some areas, and the explanation may well be political. At some date between 975 and 979 York made a gesture of virtual independence in the appointment of earl Thored.<sup>60</sup> Local die-cutting here would be a sign of the difficulty of central control. Lincoln too may simply represent a return to local die-cutting in political circumstances which made centralization difficult to enforce. Lincoln may have been in the control of Ælfhere of Mercia and the revival of the local cutting of dies might thus be a sign of his opposition to Edward.<sup>61</sup> East Anglia and Kent were also die-cutting areas in this issue. In these cases the privilege would be granted to favoured royal supporters. In the struggle for the throne after the death of Edgar, Æthelwine of East Anglia and Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury, were the most important supporters of

<sup>54</sup> Erconbold, Northberd, Albart: compare one possible Old Norse name, Oslac. Old English names, Lyfinge, Leofric, and Ælfgar.

<sup>55</sup> Regenold, Regenulf, Marscale, and compare Flodvin at Chichester.

<sup>56</sup> Liber Eliensis, ed. E. O. Blake, *Camden Society*, ser. 3, vol. xcii (1962), bk. 2, cap 11a, where he presides over the moots of East Anglia and Cambridge.

<sup>57</sup> Lynn, for example, had a moneyer Æthelstan from either Canterbury or London.

<sup>58</sup> See, e.g., Æthelferth active at Exeter in Edgar's third type and at Ilchester in the Reform issue.

<sup>59</sup> For this discussion of die-cutting patterns under Edward the Martyr I am grateful for personal information from Professor Dolley and for permission to use S. Lyon's unpublished paper 'The Hand Types of Æthelred II in the Context of Edgar's Reform'. The importance of the study of regional die-cutting after 975, pioneered by Dolley, is underlined in, for example, S. Lyon's 'Presidential Address', *BNJ* xxxix (1970), 200-3.

For die-cutting patterns earlier in the tenth century see Blunt, 'The Coinage of Athelstan', and Dolley, 'The Mint of Chester', *J. Chester and N. Wales Archaeological Society*, xlii (1955).

<sup>60</sup> For Thored, see D. Whitelock, 'Dealings of the English Kings with the North in the Tenth- and Eleventh-centuries', *Anglo-Saxons: Studies presented to B. Dickins*, ed. P. Clemoes (London, 1959), pp. 78-80. My forthcoming paper 'The Reign of Æthelred . . . ' contains a detailed study of the succession crisis after 975.

<sup>61</sup> Ælfhere was a supporter of Æthelred and related to his mother, see the bequests to her in his brother's will, P. H. Sawyer, *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Charters* (London, 1968), no. 1485; and the grant of land made to Ælfhere early in the reign, Sawyer 834. He was ealdorman of Mercia (below n. 68). Whether he controlled Lincoln is uncertain, but note his links with Godwin who may be the same man who was a local ruler here between the 990s and 1016 (below n. 111).

Edward.<sup>62</sup> Æthelwine's jurisdiction covered East Anglia and East Mercia.<sup>63</sup> Dunstan was probably also a local ruler. By the 990s the Archbishops of Canterbury fulfilled most of the functions of an ealdorman in Kent,<sup>64</sup> and it seems likely that Dunstan already filled such a position under Edgar and Edward the martyr. The support of these two men, crucial to Edward, would be consolidated by a grant of the right of local die-cutting. Thus the die-cutting pattern after 975 would reflect both political pressures and problems of control in the north.

This same pattern persists in the last two stages of the type during the first months of the young Æthelred's reign. But it begins to change during Æthelred's first full issue, First Hand. The die-cutting pattern of this type has been examined by Dolley and Talvio.<sup>65</sup> At the beginning of the issue in 979 a single centre which may have been Winchester or London was furnishing dies for the whole of southern England except the south-east. The supply of southern England as a unity is found in most issues from now on, and underlines the fact that this was the area in which the king had most freedom of action and found it least necessary to pander to local rulers. Here royal power was always strongest.<sup>66</sup> At the same time there were die-cutting centres at Canterbury, Chester possibly, Lincoln, York, and Norwich. Norwich provides dies for the East Anglian mints throughout the issue until 985. The power of Æthelwine was unquestioned, and the young king had quickly to come to terms with him. At the beginning of the issue Canterbury supplied dies to Rochester, Lewes, and Lymne, but it ceased to function as a die-cutting centre quite early in the type. Dunstan had been a supporter of Edward in the succession dispute, and one factor in that dispute had been the enmity between Dunstan and Æthelred's mother Ælfthryth.<sup>67</sup> Ælfthryth was a prominent figure during Æthelred's early years, and it is not surprising to find Dunstan's power and privileges trimmed. Chester, if it was a die-cutting centre at all in this type, disappears very early. The town was sacked by the Vikings in the winter of 979.<sup>68</sup> When the mint revived it received its dies from a midlands centre, the one which from the beginning of the issue had cut the Midlands A and B types, a centre which Dolley suggests should be identified as Lincoln. Midlands A and B dies are found at mints ranging from Lincoln through Derby to Worcester, an area which corresponds to much of what we know to have been Ælfhere of Mercia's ealdormanry.<sup>69</sup> Ælfhere was one of the most important men at Æthelred's court in these years, until his death in 983. Derby and Lincoln apparently received dies from York at the beginning of the issue, but this link was soon severed. The severance of the link between York and the north midlands is likely in view of the problems which the

<sup>62</sup> Dunstan's support of Edward is suggested by *Passio Sancti Edwardi*, ed. C. Fell (Leeds, 1971), II, 17-18, and Florence of Worcester, *Chronicon ex Chronicis*, ed. B. Thorpe (London, 1848-9), i, 145.

<sup>63</sup> Above n. 56, and Vita Oswaldi, *Historians of the Church of York and its Archbishops*, ed. J. Raine (Rolls Series, 1879), i, 444.

<sup>64</sup> See, e.g., II Atr. Preamble. For the early appearance of a shireman in Kent see Sawyer 1458, 1456, 1461. Archbishop Ælfric left a warship in his will c. A.D. 1006 to the men of Kent for their defence.

<sup>65</sup> Dolley and T. Talvio, 'Regional Styles in First Hand', *BNJ* xlvii (1977), 53-65.

<sup>66</sup> See the maps of royal demesne and royal itineraries in the *Æthelred Millennium*.

<sup>67</sup> For fuller details see my 'Reign of Æthelred II ...'.

<sup>68</sup> Dolley and E. Pirie, 'The Repercussions on Chester's Prosperity of the Viking Descent on Cheshire in 980', *BNJ* xxxiii (1964), 39-44.

<sup>69</sup> Ælfhere is the ealdorman who witnesses all Bishop Oswald's charters in Worcestershire, Gloucestershire, Warwickshire, and Oxfordshire. *Vita Oswaldi*, p. 443, calls him *princeps Merciorum gentis*, though it is clear from *ibid.*, p. 444, that his rule did not extend over the whole of East Mercia.

English kings experienced in the control of York, especially between the exile of Osloc in 975 and the appointment of Ælfhelm in 993.<sup>70</sup> It may also have provided an opportunity to enhance the power of Ælfhere. Lincoln became the major die-cutting centre for much of English Mercia after 979, replacing Chester. It is likely that Ælfhere would have retained control of this new centre. By the end of First Hand there were four die-cutting centres active, York, Lincoln, Norwich, and London/Winchester.

The succeeding issue, Second Hand, is one of the most contentious of all the types which followed Edgar's reform.<sup>71</sup> It exhibits great uniformity of style, nearly all the dies were cut at a single centre, and it is overwhelmingly a southern issue. Only one coin from the mints of York and Lincoln has so far been found. The presumption must be that the new type could not be enforced in the north. In 985 Æthelred exiled Ælfhere of Mercia's successor Ælfric.<sup>72</sup> York was still under the power of Thored, who seems to have been increasingly less amenable to royal control (below). After 985 Æthelred was reviving some of the policies of his father Edgar, and was trying to recover some of the ground lost during the political turmoil after 975. The spate of new ealdormen who had been appointed during, and as a direct result of, the political crisis were not replaced when they died during the 980s<sup>73</sup> reflecting a policy of Edgar's later years; Ælfric was exiled and not replaced, and attempts may have been made to trim the power of some of those who had directly profited from the succession dispute. A decision to supply dies centrally and to suppress the local die-cutting, which it has been argued may itself have arisen as a response to that dispute, would also mark a return to the policy of Edgar's reform issue. Such a decision may have proved unacceptable or unenforceable in the north. It is politically, if not economically, possible that York and Lincoln were suppressed during Second Hand because of the king's inability to pursue this policy here. There is a little evidence to support the view that York was suppressed and did not merely continue to strike First Hand. Thirty-seven moneyers are known to have struck Crux at York, the highest known number of moneyers at this mint in any of Æthelred's issues. The majority of these are not previously recorded as York moneyers, and the situation is similar if not so pronounced at Lincoln. This discontinuity of moneyers between the two issues, First Hand and Crux, is especially marked at these two mints, and it could be argued that they had been closed and were restaffed in a great reshuffle perhaps associated with the appointment of Ælfhelm to York in 993 (three of the new moneyers at York may have come from the Five Boroughs, his own area of provenance<sup>74</sup>). But the discontinuity may also be simply a sign of the recruitment of new moneyers to meet an apparently heavy output at York during Crux, and any suggestion that the north of England was coinless for a six-year period must be open to serious doubt.

At the end of Second Hand a short-lived experiment was made with a third variant of the Hand type, Benediction Hand. It appears that this motif was being considered

<sup>70</sup> See Whitelock, 'Dealings . . .',

<sup>71</sup> For some of the debate over Second Hand see Petersson, *op. cit.*, pp. 81-5; P. Grierson, 'Royal Numismatic Society Presidential Address', *NC* 1959, p. iv; Lyon, 'Some Problems . . .', pp. 200ff.

<sup>72</sup> A.S.C. MS. C s.a. 985.

<sup>73</sup> Æthelmar of Hampshire and Edwin of Sussex had died in 982, A.S.C. MS. C s.a.

<sup>74</sup> Osulf, at Leicester in First Hand, and at Leicester and/or Derby under Edgar; Oiga, possibly a Stamford moneyer under Edgar; Sumerleda, at Nottingham in First Hand.

as the distinctive reverse of the reign. Endless radical change posed die-cutting difficulties and might prove unacceptable in more conservative areas, and some pressure for continuity may have existed. *Benediction Hand*, though short-lived, shows the same pattern of central die-cutting as *Second Hand*, but seems to have been cut by a different workman.<sup>75</sup>

The new type eventually adopted was *Crux*. At the beginning of this issue dies were all centrally supplied. Later distinctive styles emerged from which it is already possible to distinguish a group of dies cut at York, and differences suggesting that dies may have been cut at both London and Winchester. Further work on the styles in *Crux* will probably reveal even more complexity. In the late, so-called *Small Crux* variety, for example, it has already been shown that dies were cut in the south-east (probably at Canterbury), at London, and possibly elsewhere.<sup>76</sup>

The 990s saw several important changes in the great ealdormanries. In 993/4 three new appointments were made, Ælfhelm to York, Leofwine to West Mercia, and Leofsige to Essex.<sup>77</sup> Thored had been ealdorman at York from the beginning of the reign until 992. Until 985 he was fairly regular in his attendance at the royal court<sup>78</sup> and it is probably to these years that the marriage of Æthelred to his daughter is to be dated. From 985 until c. 990 he appears at court only twice, in 988<sup>79</sup> and at a meeting in London in 988/90.<sup>80</sup> In the early 990s attempts seem to have been made to forge better relations, and in 992 he had joint command of a royal expedition against the Vikings.<sup>81</sup> The expedition proved unsuccessful, and perhaps for this as well as for other reasons Thored disappears in 992 to be replaced at York in 993 by Ælfhelm. The deaths of Æthelwine of East Anglia in 992 and Brihtnoth of Essex in 991 thus left England north of the Thames without an ealdorman by 992. Æthelred remedied this by a series of appointments made in 992/4 of Ælfhelm, Leofsige, and Leofwine.

These political developments are reflected in the coinage. Difficulties at the York mint between 985 and c. 990, followed by a reopening c. 990 with dies centrally supplied would fit what little we know of Thored's career. The appointment of Ælfhelm in 993 marked a determined attempt to consolidate rule in the north and it seems likely that Ælfhelm's loyalties would be cemented by permission to reopen the York die-cutting centre. It has already been remarked that some of the new moneyers at York may have accompanied Ælfhelm from the Midlands.<sup>82</sup> The return to more regional die-cutting observable generally in *Crux* would fit with a policy of new appointments to ealdormanries. It is possible, for example, that the south-east die-cutting centre is relevant to the appointment of Leofsige, if not to one of the two archbishops Sigeric or Ælfric.

In *Crux* it is clear for the first time that dies are being cut at both Winchester and London to supply southern England. This is just one of many indications of the

<sup>75</sup> I am grateful to Professor Dolley and S. Lyon for personal information on *Benediction Hand*.

<sup>76</sup> I am grateful to Mark Blackburn for personal information on the development of styles in *Crux*. On *Small Crux* styles see I. Stewart, 'The *Small Crux* Issue of Æthelred II', *BNJ* xxviii (1955-7), 509-17.

<sup>77</sup> Ælfhelm first appears as a charter witness in 993, Sawyer 876; Leofwine appears in 994, S. 880; and Leofsige in the same charter.

<sup>78</sup> S. 834, A.D. 979; S. 843, 844, 845, 848, and 851, A.D. 983; S. 855, A.D. 984; S. 856, 858, and 860, A.D. 985.

<sup>79</sup> S. 872.

<sup>80</sup> S. 877.

<sup>81</sup> A.S.C. MS. C s.a. 983.

<sup>82</sup> For details of Ælfhelm and his family see White-lock, 'Dealings . . .', pp. 80-1, and P. H. Sawyer, 'The Charters of Burton Abbey and the Unification of England', *Northern History*, x (1975), 28-39, and above n. 74.

growing importance of London to the West Saxon kings in the late tenth century. London and Winchester appear in other contexts as jointly important in the administration of the coinage and the connected weights and measures. Under Edgar, in his third law code cap 8, London and Winchester are cited as operating the standard of weights and measures which was to be generally used, and the same chapter enjoins a uniform coinage. This close connection between weights and the coinage is found again in Æthelred's fourth code, cap 9.2, where weights are to be standardized according to the weight at which the king's money is received.

Crux is the first issue in which a great upsurge of production occurs which can be associated with Danish raiding<sup>83</sup> and the first acute strains on the mint-pattern. Production was particularly heavy in certain areas. Many of the mints of eastern England from Southwark to Thetford were reinforced by London moneyers to meet an apparently extraordinary demand for coin. London may also have supplied additional moneyers to the Thames valley mints of Aylesbury and Wallingford and into the south-east,<sup>84</sup> and other centres such as Exeter seem to have done the same in their areas.<sup>85</sup> Many mints had particularly large numbers of moneyers active in this issue.<sup>86</sup> For the first time Crux raises questions of why such additional supply was required, how it was arranged, and how it relates to geld payment.

It cannot be assumed that all payments made to the Danes during Æthelred's reign have been entered into the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, nor that *all* the gels entered there were truly national payments. Many local gels were paid, and some of those which had the help and authorization of the king and found their way into the pages of the Chronicle were local. The first recorded payment of geld is in 991, 10,000 pounds following the harrying of East Anglia, Essex and the south-east.<sup>87</sup> The defence itself had been on a local scale, as witness the famous encounter of Brihtnoth at Maldon, and there is no reason to suppose that this geld was not itself local. In 994 a treaty, now surviving as the first part of the second code of Æthelred, was negotiated with the Viking host which had been ravaging southern England. Although the king was involved, this was again a local peace, negotiated and paid for by the rulers of England south of the Thames, Æthelweard of West Wessex, Ælfric of East Wessex, and Archbishop Sigeric.<sup>88</sup> Sigeric had to raise much of the money himself in an *ad hoc* fashion by the sale of land, and the Vikings threatened to burn

<sup>83</sup> For the upsurge of coining see Petersson's tables 12-20, which also illustrate the eastern bias of Crux. D. M. Metcalf, 'The Ranking of Boroughs . . .', quotes figures demonstrating the scale of this surge. The survival from about this date of large hoards from Scandinavia clearly affects these figures, and Metcalf's statistical caveats in the 'Ranking of Boroughs . . .', and 'How Large was the Anglo-Saxon Currency?', *ECHR*, 2nd ser. xviii (1965), 475-82, are pertinent.

<sup>84</sup> The following names connect London and Wallingford: Ælfweard, Ælfwig, Leofric; London and Oxford: Ælfwine, Æthelwine, Wulfwine; London and Aylesbury: Ælfgar, Leofstan. The following appear at London and one or other of the south-eastern mints of Dover, Lewes, Rochester, and Canterbury: Ælfgar, Ælnoth, Brihtmar, Goldwine, Leofric, Leofstan, Leofwine, Sidwine, Wulfstan.

On the basis of information in Smart, 'Moneyers of

the Late Saxon Coinage . . .', Colchester, Aylesbury, and Southwark opened in this issue.

<sup>85</sup> Exeter is linked with Totnes and Ilchester (Hunewine) and Ilchester (Leofric).

<sup>86</sup> The following mints had large numbers of moneyers active during Crux: York, Lincoln, Worcester, Cambridge, Thetford, Colchester, Hertford, Wallingford, Southwark, Sudbury, Winchester, Wilton, Wareham, Ilchester, Totnes.

<sup>87</sup> A.S.C. MS, C s.a. 991.

<sup>88</sup> II Atr. Preamble. The king is associated with the payment but the peace is bought by the southern English shires. S. 943, a grant of land to the Dane Toti who 'dedit mihi in adiutorium unius libre argenti appensionem de auro purissimo ad reddendum tributum' underlines the *ad hoc* fashion in which many of these payments were probably raised. For Archbishop Sigeric selling land at Risborough to Bishop Aescwig of Dorchester see

down his cathedral if he failed to pay quickly the money he had promised. The capture of Archbishop Ælfheah in 1012 was also designed to raise a payment locally, this time by way of ransom, which the Archbishop refused to allow. There are other indications that the gelds recorded in the Chronicle are not all nationally raised. In 1002 negotiations with the Danes prior to payment were undertaken by ealdorman Leofsige of Essex, and this may be because the threat to be bought off was largely to his area of jurisdiction in south-east England.<sup>89</sup> In 1004 a decision to buy peace is stated to have been made by the East Angles<sup>90</sup> and in 1009 the men of East Kent bought off the Danes with 3,000 pounds.<sup>91</sup> It is not until the geld of 1006/7, which took a long time to collect and is stated to have been paid *geond Angelcyn*, that we can be certain that we are dealing with payments which are not local. As the Chronicler himself laments, the English defence in general was fragmented and no area would help another.<sup>92</sup> There is no evidence that these gelds, as opposed to the later regular heregeld to pay mercenaries, were collected nationally on the basis of the hide.<sup>93</sup>

The Anglo Saxon Chronicle for Æthelred's reign is a partial and geographically and chronologically biased account of the reign.<sup>94</sup> The chronicled geld payments are not reflected in the rate of coin survival. For example, on any dating argument the geld of 1007 must have been paid during the Helmet issue, a sum of 30,000 pounds, the largest so far recorded in the Chronicle. But Helmet is the least well represented of Æthelred's later issues in Scandinavia.<sup>95</sup> Factors governing hoarding there must of course be taken into account, but it still seems likely that the quantities of coins surviving from Æthelred's issues such as Crux, Long Cross, and Last Small Cross reflect the payment of other unrecorded gelds. Future study of extraordinary outputs may actually eke out our knowledge of the areas and dates of Viking raiding. It may be, for instance, that the reinforcement of the western mints during Long Cross (below n. 108) is evidence of raids in this area unrecorded in the Chronicle, but the essential background to Æthelred's Irish sea campaign in A.D. 1000. These extraordinary outputs appear to signal the rapid raising of a local payment.<sup>96</sup> The eastern

S. 882, A.D. 995. Æsewig had given 'nonaginta libras meri argenti ducentasque purissimi auri manecas'. S. 1488, the will of Archbishop Ælfric forgiving debts owed him by the men of Kent, Middlesex, and Surrey, suggests the making of local payments by local rulers, since this is the most likely way in which such debts would have been incurred, and compare the will of King Eadred, S. 1515, leaving sums of money to various shires to be used to pay off the Danes, in each case entrusted to the keeping of the local bishop.

<sup>89</sup> A.S.C. MS. C s.a. 1002. For the area of Leofsige's jurisdiction see S. 891 where he is called ealdorman of Essex; *Liber Eliensis*, bk. 2, cap. 66, sees him witnessing a will in Cambridgeshire (a normal function of an ealdorman); S. 883, where he brings an accusation against the royal reeves of Oxford and Buckingham, which may mean that his jurisdiction extended here. His predecessor, Britnoth, had also had jurisdiction in Huntingdonshire, see *Liber Eliensis*, bk. 2, cap. 25.

<sup>90</sup> A.S.C. MS. C s.a. 1004.

<sup>91</sup> A.S.C. MS. C s.a. 1009 with 3,000 pounds. Com-

pare also the local payment demanded by Swegn in 1013 from St. Edmund's Bury. *Fl. Wig. bk. I s.a.*

<sup>92</sup> A.S.C. MS. C s.a. 1010.

<sup>93</sup> F. Harmer, *Anglo-Saxon Writs* (Manchester, 1952), pp. 513-14. The first geld which was widely collected seems to have been that of 1007, decided upon in 1006, though again there is no evidence that it was not collected in *ad hoc* ways.

<sup>94</sup> See C. Plummer, *Two Saxon Chronicles Parallel* (Oxford, 1899), vol. ii, pp. lxxiv n. 3; lxxxix and esp. cxvi where he attributes the account to Canterbury.

<sup>95</sup> See Petersson's tables (above n. 85).

<sup>96</sup> Tributes and gelds could call additional coin into circulation, see Heming, *Chartularium Ecclesiae Wigorniensis*, ed. T. Hearne (Oxford, 1723), i. 248. Worcester lost much as a result of the great tributes taken during Swegn's devastations, 'ob huius itaque tam gravis tributii exactionem omnia fere ornamenta huius ecclesie distracta sunt, tabule altaris, argento auro parate, spoliatae sunt textus exornati, calices confracti, crucis conflatae'.

bias of Crux, and the reinforcement of mints in the Southwark/Thetford wedge, could be the first efforts to pay off the Danes in eastern England. Crux was also an issue during which many mints in Wessex and the south-east were reinforced, perhaps in 994 or in the raiding which preceded that payment, and additional moneyers were also at work in the Severn Valley and the north. As the intensity of Viking raiding increases after 990 the coinage may well show strange patterns and bursts of activity as it responds to local pressures.

At the end of Crux there were a variety of experiments with the new type, and a return to the Small Cross motif of Edgar's reform was considered.<sup>97</sup> The experiments were carried out at Winchester which was clearly still a dominant die-cutting centre, though it is possible that Small Crux was a similar experiment at the London die-cutting centre.<sup>98</sup> Winchester and London both supplied the initial dies for the type eventually adopted, Long Cross, and London supplied a larger area than Winchester. Later a Lincoln die-cutting centre emerges, one possibly at Shrewsbury and then at Canterbury, York, Chester, and perhaps Stamford and Oxford.<sup>99</sup> There is as yet no political explanation of the appearance of Oxford and Stamford. Shrewsbury and/or Chester would mark the jurisdiction of ealdorman Leofwine who had control of the west midlands. The apparent disappearance of East Anglia as a die-cutting centre between 991 and 1009 is of some interest. The death of Æthelwine in 991 removed the control of his family in this area and no successor was appointed to the ealdormanry. By 1004 Ulfcytel was displaying many of the powers of an ealdorman here although he never received the title,<sup>100</sup> and he may well be one of the high reeves who begin to appear about this date. The eclipse of the East Anglian centre again suggests the importance of political factors in determining die-cutting patterns.

Work on the die-cutting patterns in Helmet is not yet sufficiently advanced to make attempt at political correlation profitable.

In 1009 at the end of Helmet there was another abortive experiment, this time with the so-called Agnus Dei type.<sup>101</sup> The penitential Lamb on the obverse must be associated with the law code VIII Æthelred issued in 1009, which was a purely penitential ordinance calling for prayer and fasting to counter Viking attacks. The Holy Spirit on the reverse brings the wisdom of God to the English. This iconography and the law code to which it relates so closely are both signs of the influence of Archbishop Wulfstan of York, by now a dominant figure at court. The type was never generally issued though the few examples which survive show that its die-cutting pattern would probably have been the same as that of Last Small Cross. Dolley has shown that it was cut at Winchester, London, and possibly at Chester or

<sup>97</sup> On these experiments see Lyon, 'Some Problems...', p. 200; Stewart, *BNJ* xxviii (1955-7); Dolley, 'Some Further Remarks on the Transitional Crux Issue of Æthelred II', *BNJ* xxix (1958-9), 259-64, all on Small Crux and Transitional Crux varieties. On Intermediate Small Cross see Jonsson, *NC* 1977, Dolley and Elmore-Jones, *BNJ* xxviii (1955-7), 75-88, and Stewart, 'Notes on the Intermediate Small Cross and Transitional Crux Types of Æthelred II', *BNJ* xxxvii (1968), 16-24.

<sup>98</sup> I am indebted to Mark Blackburn for personal information on the styles which probably developed in this type.

<sup>99</sup> The style so prevalent at Stamford is also found at Lincoln and the East Anglian mints and may be an earlier or later sub-style of the Lincoln die-cutting centre. Similarly the 'Oxford' style may be a mere variety of the Winchester style. I am grateful to Mark Blackburn for this information.

<sup>100</sup> For Ulfcytel as leader of the East Angles see A.S.C. MS. C s.a. 1004, 1010, 1016. *Fl. Wig.* s.a. 1016 calls him *dux*, but he never receives the title in any charter of the reign.

<sup>101</sup> I am indebted to Professor Dolley for allowing me to see his unpublished manuscript on this type.

in the Severn Valley.<sup>102</sup> He has suggested that the type was countermanded partly because the dies would have been difficult to cut, and if the decision to allow widespread die-cutting had already been taken this would have been an important consideration. The return in 1009 to the Small Cross motif not only provided a simple style to cut, but represented an evocation of King Edgar and the use of a reverse which had been popular and widely used during the tenth century. The adoption of this motif underlines the fact that from its very inception Last Small Cross was dominated by political factors.

Last Small Cross has the most complex die-cutting pattern so far discovered in any of Æthelred's issues.<sup>103</sup> Dolley first distinguished die-cutting centres operative at London, Winchester (SA and SB), York (NA and NB), in the west, south-west, south-east, and East Anglia. Lyon's latest work on the issue, as yet not fully published,<sup>104</sup> suggests further refinements. At the beginning of the issue the dies used to cut heavy coins were cut at Winchester (SB) which supplied central Wessex, East Mercia, and East Anglia; in the south-west, supplying mints in the south-west and some in eastern England; at a West Mercian centre which supplied not only Oxford/Wallingford but also London; at Lincoln (NB) and at York, which cut a distinctive variety of NA. As the type progressed the die-cutting pattern changed. London began to produce dies which supplied east and south-east England, subsequently giving rise to regional imitations at Canterbury and Norwich and local styles at Ipswich, Rochester, and possibly Lewes. Lincoln and York continued to cut their own dies. The south-west, West Mercia, and Winchester all continued to function as die-cutting centres, but now with a more comprehensible local distribution of the dies produced. The existence of anomalies of die supply in this issue was recognized by Dolley, and Lyon has now pin-pointed most of these geographical anomalies to the beginning of the issue and suggests that the cancellation of the Agnus Dei type and the pressure of Viking attacks may lie behind many of these anomalies. The eastern mints in particular were supplied with dies from a wide variety of centres. Last Small Cross was generally an issue of high production, but this is especially marked in eastern England. Abnormally large numbers of moneyers were active in eastern mints in this issue; Lincoln, for example, has so far recorded thirty-six moneyers of this type.<sup>105</sup>

Political circumstances, the pressures of external attack, and moneyer movement to meet the extraordinary demands for coin at a time of heavy geld payments will all help to explain the patterns observable in Last Small Cross. The movements of the London moneyer Leofwine during this issue have been verified through die-links.<sup>106</sup> He was connected with the mints of Gothaburh in the south-west, the emergency mint of Cissbury and Stamford as well as London. Although they relate to the subsequent issue, Quatrefoil, Blackburn's remarks on the moneyer Hunewine of Watchet and his movements are pertinent.<sup>107</sup> Hunewine was active at several mints during

<sup>102</sup> See M. Dolley, 'The Nummular Brooch from Sulgrave', *England before the Conquest*, ed. P. Clemons and K. Hughes (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 333-49.

<sup>103</sup> R. H. M. Dolley, 'Some Reflections on Hildebrand Type A of Æthelred II', *Antikvariskt Arkiv*, ix (Stockholm, 1958) on which all remarks on areas of die supply, etc. are based, unless otherwise stated.

<sup>104</sup> Lyon remarked on some of these regional centres in *BNJ* xxxv (1966), 35. In generous personal corre-

spondence he has amplified his remarks.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. the numbers of Lincoln moneyers for other Æthelred issues: First Hand, 11; Crux, 19; Long Cross, 16; Helmet, 22; Last Small Cross, 36.

<sup>106</sup> Lyon, 'Presidential Address . . .', *BNJ* xxxix, esp. p. 203.

<sup>107</sup> M. Blackburn, 'The Mint of Watchet', *BNJ* xliiv (1974), 13-38, esp. 19-22.

Quatrefoil, and used dies from several different sources. His activity was characterized by the use of dies from the *same* source at any one time, no matter at which mint he was striking. Such moneyer movements, coupled as they could be with die movements, help account for the die anomalies in Last Small Cross. These anomalies are most evident in the eastern mints which are the ones most likely to have been reinforced by moneyers from outside. Eastern England was by now the centre and theatre of royal defence, and may thus have borne the brunt of the additional demand for coin.<sup>108</sup>

The anomalies are concentrated in this area. Much of the pattern of die-supply in this issue makes geographical sense and can be interpreted in administrative and political terms. The Western centre represents the jurisdiction of Leofwine, by now well established as ealdorman of West Mercia. The south-east would be the area ruled by the archbishop and his royal reeve. Could the murder of Archbishop Ælfheah in 1012 and the subsequent gap at Canterbury until 1014 be reflected in the development of the two local die-cutting centres at Rochester and possibly Lewes? East Anglia was under the authority of Ulfcytel, and its re-emergence as a die-cutting centre would reflect the growing importance of this local military leader. Lindsey had its own ealdorman/high reeve in Godwine,<sup>109</sup> and York was controlled by the powerful Uhtred of Bamborough.<sup>110</sup> There was no ealdorman in the south-west from c. 1002 to 1014, though the men of this area recognized the authority of Æthelmær who led them to submit to Swegn in 1013.<sup>111</sup> A better understanding of how the south-west was ruled in these years might help explain the far-reaching distribution of dies from this area in eastern England at the beginning of Last Small Cross. During Last Small Cross Æthelred would thus have granted the rights of local die-cutting and the profits which went with them to most of the local rulers, and this is not surprising at a time when loyalty was at a premium during the last stages of the defence against the Danes. By this date many parts of England were controlled by high reeves,<sup>112</sup> and further research could well reveal yet more local styles based on their jurisdictions, producing a pattern in Last Small Cross akin to that of Quatrefoil.<sup>113</sup> The large number of die-cutting centres operative during Cnut's first issue, dating from 1017/18, suggests a conciliatory new king allowing the privilege and profit of die-cutting to a larger number of local rulers than ever before.<sup>114</sup>

<sup>108</sup> The importance of the output of the eastern mints is brought out by Petersson's tables. The following mints had particularly large numbers of moneyers active in this issue: Leicester, Stamford, Huntingdon, Thetford, Norwich, London, Canterbury, Lewes, Winchester, Chester. Compare the pattern of exceptional activity in Crux: York, Worcester, Cambridge, Thetford, Colchester, Hertford, Aylesbury, Buckingham, Wallingford, London, Southwark, Rochester, Canterbury, Winchester, Chichester, Wilton, Wareham, Ilchester, Exeter; and in Long Cross: Chester, Bath, Exeter, Stamford, Wallingford, Lewes, Shrewsbury, Hereford. The activity in the north-west marcher mints in this issue may be connected with raids in the Irish sea which led to the king's attack on Cumbria and the Isle of Man in A.D. 1000.

<sup>109</sup> A.S.C. MS. C s.a. 1016 for his death at Ashingdon and *ibid.* 993 for Fraena, Godwine, and Frithegist, leaders of the army which failed to repel the Vikings who landed on the Humber. Only in A.S.C. MS. C s.a. 1016 is

he called an ealdorman, no man of this name ever receives that title in the charters of the reign. The Chronicle of Evesham (Rolls Series), pp. 78–83, identifies a Godwin who fell at Ashingdon with a despoiler of Evesham who was connected with Ælfhere of Mercia.

<sup>110</sup> Whitelock, 'Dealings . . .', p. 82. His regular attendances at court date only from A.D. 1009, S. 921. He was appointed 1006 × 9.

<sup>111</sup> A.S.C. MS. C s.a.

<sup>112</sup> See my 'Reign of Æthelred . . .',

<sup>113</sup> For work on Quatrefoil see Dolley, 'Regional Distribution of Dies in the West Country, 1017–23', *Spinks' Numismatic Circular*, lxi (1956), 321–5 and 373–7.

<sup>114</sup> The chronological framework for the above arguments has been based on the dating of the issues of Æthelred proposed by Professor Dolley, a framework which accorded well at certain points with the historical evidence.

The coinage cannot be seen in isolation from other aspects of royal administration or from political factors. The problems of local separatism especially strong in the north, and the need to secure and keep the loyalty of the great magnates, were considerations which affected all aspects of royal government in the tenth and eleventh centuries. The development of local die-cutting after Edgar's reform seems to show particularly well how the coinage could respond to political pressures. Such local die-cutting may be a sign of reward for loyalty or support, as in the cases of Æthelwine and Dunstan under Edward the Martyr and Ælfhere early in Æthelred's reign. It may mark an attempt to woo loyalty, as at York under Ælfhelm after 993 and in the entire pattern of Last Small Cross. It may sometimes demonstrate the king's inability to exercise closer control, as may regularly be the case at York and Lincoln and more generally towards the end of the reign during the currency of Last Small Cross. Southern England was supplied for most of the time by the two royal centres of London and Winchester. This was in every sense the area of firmest royal control, where the royal demesne was concentrated, where the royally founded churches were situated, where the king was most frequently present. It is not surprising that it is here that royal control of the coinage is also firmest, although political factors have their part to play even here.

Study of die supply, moneyer movement, and changes in the mint pattern all demonstrate the flexibility of the organization of the Old English coinage, and in this and other ways advancing knowledge of the coinage has contributed much to an understanding of administration. Much still awaits discovery concerning the political geography of England at this date, and here in the future the coinage may have yet more to tell us. The system of which the coinage was a part was one operated by men in an age when ties of clientage and patronage at all levels of society were of paramount importance, an age in which the advantages derived from the manipulation of the coinage could not be ignored. The complicated political context in which the system was operated may never be fully understood, thanks to the enormous gaps in the sources, and it may never be possible to marry all the patterns discovered in the study of the coinage with political facts. But exploration of those patterns can only contribute to a more sophisticated understanding of the politics of the Old English kingdom.