

MONETA AND MOT ON ANGLO-SAXON COINS

B. H. I. H. STEWART

THE occasional occurrence on Anglo-Saxon coins of moneyers' names in the Latin or English genitive case has, from time to time, evoked discussion both of these forms, which are rare, and of the significance of the word *Moneta*, which is very common.¹ The main purpose of this paper² is to re-examine the problem by comparing Anglo-Saxon coin inscriptions not only with each other but also with those of other periods and countries.

Unequivocal Latin genitives are found in the early ninth and mid-tenth centuries. *Heremodi*,³ *Sigeberhti*,⁴ and *Werheardi Moneta*⁵ occur on the closely related series of coins in the names of Cuthred of Kent and Coenwulf of Mercia. English genitives in -es occur in the reigns of Eadmund, Eadred, Eadwig, and Eadgar on the abundant non-portrait coins with the moneyer's name on the reverse in two or three lines, divided by crosses, rosettes, &c.⁶ and less frequently on those with a circular inscription surrounding a small central ornament, normally a cross.⁷

Roman coinage was originally struck in the temple of Juno Moneta,⁸ Mother of the Muses. From this association, the word *Moneta* acquired in classical times the meanings of 'mint', 'money', and 'die', and retained at least the last two in the Middle Ages. During the ninth century, and the tenth until the regular introduction of a mint-name necessitated a contraction of the inscription, *Moneta*, or a shorter form, is the almost invariable accompaniment to the moneyer's name on the reverse of English pennies. If, as is often implied by the best English numismatists,⁹ it stands as an abbreviation of *Monetarius*, there are a number of extraordinary phenomena to be explained. The full form *Moneta* is never followed by a mark of suspension or abbreviation, nor are longer

¹ C. F. Keary, 1893, in *Catalogue of English Coins in the British Museum, Anglo-Saxon Series* (ref. throughout as *BMC*), vol. ii, p. cv; A. Anscombe and W. J. Andrew in separate papers read to the British Numismatic Society in 1929 (23 Jan. and 27 Mar.), summarized by W. C. Wells in 'The Northampton and Southampton Mints', *BNJ* xxi (1931-3), pp. 23-28; H. Holst, "'Moneta" in Old English, Mót (Peningr) in Old Norwegian Coin-Inscriptions', in *Transactions of the International Numismatic Congress*, 1938, p. 315 (ref. Holst).

² I have had much valuable help in the preparation of this paper from Mr. P. Grierson with whom I have been making a general study of coin inscriptions in another context; from Professor Dorothy Whitelock and Dr. R. I. Page, who have commented respectively on Old English and Old Norse usage; and from Mr. C. E. Blunt and Mr. R. H. M. Dolley who have guided me in the numismatics of a period in which they are experts, and without whose encouragement and assistance the sections on tenth-century Mercian coins would have been much less accurate and less complete.

³ Cuthred, *BMC* 7.

⁴ Cuthred, *BMC* 8; Coenwulf, *BMC* 78 (*Seberhti*).

⁵ Cuthred, *BMC* 9, 10; Coenwulf, *BMC* 85, 86, 88.

⁶ Eadmund, *BMC* types i, ii, and iii; Eadred, types i and iv; Eadwig, types i and iii; Eadgar, type i a-g.

⁷ Eadmund, *BMC* type iv; Eadred, type iii; Eadwig, type v; Eadgar, types iii and iv.

⁸ *OCD* suggests that the name is connected 'with the root of *monere* ("mindful", "reminder") and hence is used occasionally . . . to translate *Mnemosyne*. There is no indication, however, that any cult of a goddess so named, independent of Juno, ever existed.' Unless it could be proved that the title was used for Juno before her temple became the Roman mint, the possibility must exist that the word was connected with coining and transferred to Juno, rather than vice versa.

⁹ e.g. recently for the tenth century by R. H. M. Dolley, *The Mint of Chester* (Part 1), *Chester Archaeological Society's Journal*, xlii, p. 9 (of offprint): ' . . . the contraction for "monetarius" that follows the moneyer's name.' This is a fundamental paper for the period Edward the Elder to Eadgar, not only for the Chester mint (ref. hereafter, MC).

forms ever found although in plenty of issues there are moneyers' names of unequal length with the identical form *Moneta*. For example, on coins of Coenwulf, *Dun Moneta*¹ and *Tidbearht Moneta*² occur in circular inscriptions. Unless *Moneta* was a full and deliberate form, one would have expected, perhaps, *Dun Monetarius* or *Tidbearht Mon*; as it is, Dun's inscription is spread out to fill the space, whilst Tidbearht's is crowded, and makes use of ligature in both words to save space.

It is odd that he should not have used *Mon* or *Monet*, since these would be natural abbreviations. A form ending in a vowel, and thus in the middle of a syllable, might occur in a case such as *Mone* with N and E in monogram, but *Moneta* should, as an abbreviation of *Monetarius*, occur rarely, perhaps not more than once in ten or twenty times when the space available on the coin just suited it. Instead, it is not only preserved when die-cutting considerations would naturally favour a longer or shorter form, but one type at least—that with the cruciform reverse inscription introduced by Æthelwulf³—is designed specifically to accommodate this exact form. The moneyer's name followed by *Mo* is arranged in the form of a cross, with the last four letters, N, E, T, and A, in the angles. As Keary says, 'it is obvious that this word "Moneta" is no necessary contraction, the exact number of the letters in the inscription being carefully arranged beforehand.'⁴

There is, I believe, another reverse type, too, which was originally conceived on the basis of the word *Moneta* being a complete form. Coins by the moneyer Sigestef of Coenwulf⁵ and Ceolwulf⁶ have the inscription *Sigestef Monet* around a central A. Another group of coins of Ceolwulf, by the moneyers Ealhstan,⁷ Eanwulf,⁸ and Ethelmod⁹ have this A type, and whereas coins of other types by these moneyers have the full form *Moneta* in the circumscription, these have *Monet* only. That the A is intended to be read in continuation is rendered almost certain by a coin of Ceolwulf reading *Ealhstan Mone*¹⁰ with a monogram of TA as the central type and by coins of Ecgbearht of the moneyer Redmudh which read *Redmudh Mone* with T and A in the centre,¹¹ or *Monet* with A alone.¹² A central A on other Anglo-Saxon coins, when a completion of *Monet* is not needed, may be explained in two ways. Either it stands as an initial (e.g. of *Anglorum*) or a symbol (e.g. Alpha, with or without Omega) in its own right, or else it may be uncomprehending imitation of the A on *Monet* coins.¹³ The practice of making a circumscription and a central epigraphic type continuous in sense is common on Anglo-Saxon, as on other medieval, coins. That a final letter should be accorded such prominence need not be considered improbable in view of the well-known north Italian coin, the *bolognino*; the central type, an A, was the last letter of the city's name, continuing the circumscription—*Bononi/A*, but the type was copied elsewhere, e.g. at Gubbio and Parma, whose coins of this type were consequently known as *bolognini*.

It will help to put the problem of *Moneta* in perspective if we consider the origins of coin inscriptions and some of their functions in the Middle Ages.¹⁴

¹ BMC 70.

² BMC 82.

³ BMC type xvii; used also by Æthelbearht, BMC type i, and by Archbishop Ceolnoth, BMC i, pl. xii. 10 and pl. xiii. 2.

⁴ BMC i, p. cv.

⁵ BMC 79 and pl. viii. 13.

⁶ BMA 79; Ryan 633.

⁸ BMA 108.

¹⁰ Lockett 380.

⁷ BMC 106.

⁹ BMA 110.

¹¹ Fitzwilliam Sylloge, 524.

¹² C. E. Blunt, *The Coinage of Ecgbearht, King of Wessex, 802–39*, BNJ xxviii (1958), p. 473.

¹³ Perhaps even at the same time as the *Monet/A* Coins—e.g. Ceolwulf BMC 107, Eanwulf *Moneta* around an A and crescents.

¹⁴ There is a very good general survey in G. Macdonald, *The Evolution of Coinage* (Cambridge 1916), chap. 6.

Greek coin inscriptions often refer to the coin itself, or to the design on it. What is possibly the earliest known, *Φαννος ἐμὶ σέμα*—‘I am the badge of Phannes’¹—is a striking example of the latter. On Cretan coins of the fifth century, *Γόρτυνος τὸ παῖμα*² and *Φαιστίων τὸ παῖμα*³ are generally understood⁴ as meaning ‘the thing struck’—that is to say, ‘the coin’—‘of Gortyn’ and ‘of the Phaestians’, and Phaestos provides an example too of a plain adjectival inscription⁵—*Παιστικόν*, ‘the Phaestian (coin)’. It could, however, equally be ‘the Phaestian (stamp)’, and another clear case, in the first century B.C., referring to the design is *Κότυος χαρακτή(ρ)*, ‘the device of Cotys’.⁶ Late fifth-century Thracian pieces of Seuthes I proclaim themselves as *Σεύθα ἀργύριον ἢ κόμμα*—‘Seuthes’ silver (coin)’ or ‘struck piece’.⁷

Such inscriptions are somewhat exceptional. On many Greek coins, however, there are implicit references to the coin or the type. Syracusan coins mostly read *Συρακοσίων*, ‘of the Syracusans’.⁸ What noun is understood is a matter of taste. Sometimes there is a strong suggestion in favour of reference to type: *Ἀκράγαντος*, ‘of Acragas’, beside the Eagle, which was the badge of the City, looks like a caption.⁹ But Macedonian coins have *Ἀλεξάνδρου*, not by the king’s head, but on the reverse, and this presumably means ‘Alexander’s (coin)’.¹⁰

Most of these usages are paralleled in the Middle Ages,¹¹ though Roman practice had a lasting and dominant influence. One remarkable case of the plain genitive, without a noun, is that of early pennies of Archbishop Wulfred of Canterbury which read *Wulfredi Archiepiscopi/Doroverniae Civitatis*.¹² Two series of coins struck in the English Danelaw in the ninth century, the Lincoln coins of St. Martin—*Sci Marti*—and the York coins of St. Peter—*Sci Petri Mo*—have inscriptions which can only be interpreted as *Sancti Martini*, or *Petri, Moneta*, that is, ‘the money of St. Martin’ or ‘of St. Peter’.¹³ Examples from the British Isles are, however, uncommon. But the word *Moneta* occurs on two Scottish issues. *Moneta Regis David Scottorum*, on some rare early half-pence and farthings of David II,¹⁴ and *Moneta Pauperum* on copper farthings of the fifteenth century.¹⁵

The latter is an interesting example of a coin being described in terms of its users—‘money of the poor’. The former follows a formula familiar on the Continent. The phrase *Moneta Nova* is regular on coins of the Low Countries and the Rhineland in the

¹ *Guide to the Principal Coins of the Greeks*, British Museum (London 1959), pl. i. 9; the obverse type is a stag, and on p. 3 it is suggested that the word *φαννος* might be regarded as a genitive of a name for Artemis, to whom the stag was sacred, and the whole translated, ‘I am the sign of the Bright One’.

² B. V. Head, *Historia Numorum*, 3rd ed., Oxford, 1911, pp. 465–6 (ref. Head).

³ Head, p. 472.

⁴ C. T. Seltman, *Greek Coins*, 2nd ed., London, 1955, p. 169, and pl. xxxvi nos. 9 and 11 for illustrations of the coins (ref. Seltman).

⁵ Head, p. 473.

⁶ Head, p. 285.

⁷ Head, p. 282.

⁸ e.g. Seltman, pl. xlv, many examples.

⁹ e.g. Seltman, pl. viii. 12.

¹⁰ e.g. Seltman, pl. xlviii, many examples.

¹¹ A most instructive analysis of medieval coin inscriptions occurs in Engel and Serrure, *Traité de*

numismatique du moyen âge (3 vols., Paris 1891–1905), vol. i, pp. lv ff.

¹² e.g. BMA 196; Ryan Sale lot 595; *BNJ* xxvi, p. 343. Mr. Lyon gives me the following reference: ‘I presume, as it is put in the genitive case, VVlfredi, the word *moneta* or *nummus*, is understood’—Samuel Pegge, *An Assemblage of Coins Fabricated by the Authority of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, 1772, p. 6.

¹³ A third Danelaw Series, those of St. Eadmund, has no genitives, but some unequivocal vocatives: *See Eadmunde* occurs on some of the best dies (*BMC* 245–8, 318, 321, 328–9, 335–40, 599, 620), and though this form is scarce, *See Eadmund* and *Sc Eadmunde* are common enough to ensure that the vocative is deliberate. They can only be read as an invocation, ‘o St. Eadmund the King’, the invocative *o* being omitted as in the Litany.

¹⁴ Stewart, *The Scottish Coinage*, London, 1955, pl. iii. 43.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pl. vii. 100 and 101.

later fourteenth and in the fifteenth century, with the name either of a ruler or of a place. The epithet *nova* really had little meaning, not necessarily implying a new type or variety.

Coins of Lorraine in the fourteenth century give examples of the regular use of *Moneta* and a place-name (e.g. Nancy and Sierck) in the genitive or ablative, with or without a preposition—*Moneta de Nancei*, *Moneta F(a)c(t)a in Nancey* or *Nancei(o)*, *Moneta in Cier*, *Moneta Sierk*, &c.¹ An adjectival usage is also common—*Moneta Nova Leodiensis*, 'the new money of Liège', for John of Bavaria, 1389–1418, for instance.² The adjectival use,³ with *Moneta* understood, frequently occurs on continental imitations of Edwardian sterlings (e.g. *Melbodiensis*)⁴ though in the original series, from which they were derived, only on the earliest farthings, which read *Londoniensis*.⁵

A very few medieval coins refer to themselves more personally. The magnificent sovereign of Hans of Denmark, struck in 1496, announces, not without a touch of pride, that *Ioh's Dei gra(cia) rex Danor(um) iussit me fieri an(no) 1496*, 'Hans, by the grace of God king of Denmark, ordered me to be made',⁶ a comparable inscription to that on the Alfred jewel.⁷ *Odulf me fecit*⁸ seems to represent the coin as an example of the moneyer's art. *Ici a munai*, 'here is money',⁹ *Denarius Aureliani* 'the penny of Aurelianus',¹⁰ and *Cruzatus Alfonsi Quinti Regi(s)*, 'The Cruzado of King Alfonso V',¹¹ are others.

These cases add weight to the view that *Moneta* generally means 'coin' and not 'die'. All the *Moneta nova* examples and sometimes the variant *Moneta facta*, would be hard to interpret as 'the new die . . .' and 'the die made . . .'; and *Moneta Duplex* means 'double coin' in the sense of a double denomination.¹²

Yet it seems as if there was some doubt on occasions as to whether the die or the coin was meant; the double meaning of *moneta* is an ambiguity of the sort which made *coin* mean a die in French and a piece of money in English. The Norwegians of the eleventh century also seem to have been particularly inexact in their distinctions, and their Runic coin-inscriptions throw interesting light on the meaning of legends containing a moneyer's name.¹³

The basic formula is: *Lofrikr á mót petta*—'Lofrik has this die'.¹⁴ The *á* may be omitted—*Gunnarr mót pessi*—'Gunnar—these dies'; so may *petta*—LEOFRICR MOT—'Leofric — — die'. The moneyer Gunnar also has *Gunnars mót pessi*—'These (are) Gunnar's dies'; and this formula also is shortened: LEFRICS MOT—'(This is) Leofric's

¹ *Catalogue de la Collection de Monnaies de feu Christian Jurgensen Thomsen* (3 vols., Copenhagen 1873–6), i, pp. 289–90 (ref. Thomsen).

² Thomsen, 6279.

³ An adjective on the reverse may, however, be a continuation of an obverse inscription: e.g. *Iohannes Epc/Leodiensis* on a sterling of John d'Enghien, Bishop of Liège, of which the mint, Huy, is indicated by the letters *hovi* in the angles of the cross (Thomsen 6272).

⁴ Maubeuge; Thomsen 3875.

⁵ Or *Londriensis*: H. B. Earle Fox and Shirley Fox, 'Numismatic History of the reigns of Edward I, II and III', *BNJ* vii (1911), pp. 101–4 and pl. 11, 12–14.

⁶ Engel and Serrure, iii, p. 1335.

⁷ Inscribed *Aelfred Mec Heht Gewyrcan*, 'Alfred ordered me to be made'.

⁸ Memorial coinage to St. Eadmund (E. Anglia,

and elsewhere?), *BMC* i, pp. 122, 471; also other moneyers in the same series, and Elda and Simun under Alfred.

⁹ Amiens, twelfth century, Engel and Serrure, p. lix.

¹⁰ i.e. of Orleans; on a Merovingian coin, A. de Belfort, *Description générale des Monnaies mérovingiennes* (5 vols., Paris 1892–5), no. 542.

¹¹ Thomsen, i, p. 238, no. 2880. Alfonso V of Portugal's cruzado was the first European coin made of gold from the New World.

¹² The French *double paris* of the fourteenth century.

¹³ The examples quoted are taken from Holst, loc. cit.; Roman capitals as on the coins, italics represent runic inscriptions.

¹⁴ This is Holst's translation of *mót*; see below, p. 39.

die'. The Old Norse word *peningr*, which normally means 'money', 'coin', being the same root as the Germanic *pen(d)ing*, ancestor of our *penny*, is apparently found in the sense of a 'die' on the coins, as a synonym for *mót*: *Áskell á pening pen(na)*—'Askell has this die'. A contemporary Danish inscription in Runic, *Thordr á mi(k)*—'Thord has me' is of the same order.

This last example gives cause to wonder whether the *me fecit* inscriptions do not also refer to the die: after all, the moneyer's name by 900 almost certainly does not represent a man who actually made (= struck) the coin, though he may perhaps have cut the die.¹

What, then, of the ubiquitous *Moneta* on Anglo-Saxon pennies? The answer seems to emerge from the above examples, which show that medieval inscriptions quite frequently refer either to the coin itself or to the die(s), and that when a noun is present, it is *Moneta*. Quite possibly Anglo-Saxon die-cutters, like modern numismatists, at times tacitly assumed that this word, ceaselessly found with a moneyer's name, was in fact in apposition to that name, and stood for *Monetarius*, or even as it stood meant 'moneyer'.

But originally, if not always, it was understood as a noun, and the tenth-century examples with the genitive of the moneyer's name show that the true nature of the word had been rediscovered, if not remembered.

Anscombe,² though understanding *Moneta* to be a noun, thought that it was used in the sense of 'mint', was in the ablative case, and that *de* was omitted for reasons of space, so that, e.g. *Durandi Moneta* meant 'from Durand's mint'. On the grounds that there were three moneyers of Eadgar—Durand, Fastolf and Herolf—who used both *Moneta* with a Latin genitive,³ and a vernacular form, e.g. *Durandes Mot*, he thought *mot*, the English word for a meeting(-place), meant the place where moneyers and artificers met, i.e. the mint.

The objections to this theory are overwhelming. Why should *de* be consistently omitted? If the unlikely meaning of 'mint' is given to *moneta*, how can the place be described as the *moneyer's* mint? The Old English for 'meeting' is not *mot* but *gemot*;⁴ and the process of thought whereby *mot* is explained as a synonym of *Moneta* is wildly hypothetical.

Even Andrew, himself not unsusceptible to imaginative theories in fields such as philology where he was no expert, could not accept it. Yet his own solution was, if anything, even more fanciful.⁵ Reverting to the idea that *Moneta* was an abbreviation of *Monetarius* he explained the occasional genitives as being used to denote the use of a dead moneyer's die by an administrator. Andrew's contribution confused the issue, but he did make one useful point—that on York coins of Anlaf Guthfrithsson an inscription such as *Athelferd Minetr*⁶ contained a form of the English word for moneyer—

¹ In the Merovingian period, moneyers no doubt often cut their dies; in later periods, e.g. English coins from Offa onwards, individual die-cutting styles are associated with the names of several moneyers; possibly one cut his own, and others', dies or they may have been cut by a workman who was not a moneyer at all. The Northumbrian moneyer Leofthegn in the 840's is, perhaps, an example of a moneyer cutting his own dies. Some of his stycas are of distinctive style, and have many more varied and ambitious types than those of his colleagues.

² See *BNJ* xxi, p. 26.

³ Unfortunately, the so-called genitives are in fact

uninflected English roots followed by elaborate ornamental marks, in the form ! or similar, as indeed they are correctly printed in *BMC* (e.g. Eadgar, type III, nos. 174–5, 189).

⁴ The loss of *ge-* does not apparently occur before Middle English times; but in compounds, *mothus*, *motern*, it does occasionally occur without *ge-* (*motern* in the Lindisfarne Gospels, late tenth century).

⁵ See *BNJ* xxi, p. 27.

⁶ R. H. M. Dolley, 'The Post-Brunanburh Viking Coinage of York', *Nordisk Numismatisk Årsskrift*, 1957–8, pp. 13–88; see pp. 45 and 68, and fig. 1 (ref. *VCY*).

mynetere.¹ It is thus easier to believe that *moneta* may sometimes have been thought of, and accidentally perpetuated, as representing the word for moneyer; though Andrew was surely wrong to suppose that 'in early times Latin was usually contracted, and as *moneta* was the form which was adopted on our earliest standardized coinage, it remained the stereotyped form throughout'.

It is not necessary to look further than the lists of inscriptions on coins of Eadmund to Eadgar in the British Museum and the Chester hoard, in order to observe the close coincidence of English genitives and of the form *mot*. Sometimes the genitive is incorrectly formed—*-es* is tacked on to nominatives in the vowel *a*, e.g. *Boigaes* instead of *Boigan*; but it is, if not invariable, at least the regular form when *mót* occurs, and vice versa. Exceptions exist both ways, but they are unusual.

Table I plots the occurrence of genitive forms of moneyers' names in the English *-es*, and of the word *mot*. It also includes other coins in the names of any moneyer who qualifies for the list by *-es* or *mot* usage, so that it gives some idea of the exclusiveness of the usage by these moneyers. It is based on the material listed in the *British Museum Catalogue*, the *Sylloges* of the Fitzwilliam and the Hunter and Coats collections, and the reports of the Iona and Chester hoards.² I do not pretend that it is complete, nor do I think it needs to be to demonstrate the consistency of the *-es/mot* usage. Probably its omissions consist mostly of non-*es* and non-*mot* coins by moneyers included in the list, which would slightly lower the proportion of consistent usage, though not materially.

The total number of coins in the table under each category are as follows:

(a) <i>mot</i> + <i>-es</i>	81
(b) <i>mot</i> + other forms	8
(c) Other forms + <i>-es</i>	18
(d) Neither <i>mot</i> nor <i>-es</i>	20
	<hr/> 127

These figures do not overstate the case. The two irregular categories, *b* and *c*, might be reduced if, for example, MT was reckoned as MOT (which it almost certainly represents), or if *-a* (not *-an*) was counted as a genitive (two coins read *Maneca Mot*) which it could be in the North of England.³ A number of moneyers are only here recorded with *mot* and *-es*—notably Æthelwulf, Regther, and Wulfgar in three reigns each, and Agtard and

¹ A form of the English word is perhaps contained in the obverse inscription of the *aureus* by Offa's moneyer Pendred (exhibited and discussed by Mr. Blunt and Mr. Dolley, Royal Numismatic Society, 28 Mar. 1962), which reads PAENDRAED MV (or Y) NITA RE. If RE is part of the second word *Mynitare* could be a form of *mynetere*, the middle vowels being influenced by *Munitarius*, a common Merovingian form of the Latin *Monetarius*. However, if the second letter is *v*, not *y*, *Munita* could represent the word *Moneta*.

² Refs.: BMC; C = C. E. Blunt and R. H. M. Dolley, 'The Chester (1950) Hoard', *BNJ* xxviii, pp. 125–60; I = R. B. K. Stevenson, 'The Iona Hoard of Anglo-Saxon Coins', *NC*, 6th ser., vol. xi (1951),

pp. 68–90; F and HC = *Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles* (Brit. Acad.), Fitzwilliam Museum Cambridge, part I (1958) by P. Grierson, and *Hunterian and Coats Collections, University of Glasgow, part I* (1961) by A. S. Robertson.

³ The southern boundary of the loss of *-n* in the weak genitive singular is not known. Dr. Page writes that it certainly extended as far south as south Yorks., perhaps farther, including, e.g. Cheshire. Coins of Boia (see below, pp. 34 and 41) suggest it may have reached Derby. Conversely Mr. Dolley warns that in some cases *-an* may not be a genitive, but can betray an Irish name, e.g. at York the moneyers Beolan (Æthelred II) and Crucan (Cnut).

TABLE I

Usage of the English Genitive of Moneyers' Names and of the Form Mot on English Coins of Eadmund to Eadgar with Horizontal Reverse Inscriptions

Moneyer's name	MOT	Other forms	Eadmund		Eadred		Eadwig		Eadgar	
			Genitive -es	Other forms	Genitive -es	Other forms	Genitive -es	Other forms	Genitive -es	Other forms
Ælfred		MON			BMC 36	C 122	BMC 15		C 379	
Æthelwulf	x				C 129		C 308		C 383	
Agtard	x				C 131-4, I 67		F 599, C 309			
Amund	x		BMC 17							
"		MT	C 117							
"		MO	C 116							
Boiga	x				C 135-6		C 313-14			
"					C 148-152					
"					BMC 22-3					
"		MYNET				C 152 (-i)				
"		MONETA		BMC 32(-i)			BMC 18			
"		MON							C 386	
"		MO								
Demenece	x		BMC 31			BMC 26				
"			C 75							
"		MON	BMC 39, 40					C 322	C 389,	
"								F 600	BMC 140,	
"									I 226	
"		MO	BMC 41							
Dudeman		MOV (?)			I 70, 70a					
Dunn	x				I 71		I 105-6			
"		MON					BMC 21			
Durand	x		BMC 49							
"		MO								BMC 84
Frethic	x				C 163-7		BMC 24		C 399	
"					BMC 42,				BMC 141	
"					HC 651					
"		MO							C 398	
Godsere	x						F 601			
Grim	x				C 179, 181				C 402-4	
"					BMC 49,					
"					HC 653					
"		MONE				C 180		C 402-4		
Inguc	x				BMC 62					
"					I 72					
Maneca	x					BMC 66				
"						HC 655				
Mann	x				C 202, 246				BMC 145	
"		MONE	BMC 147				C 346-7			
"							BMC 31			
"		MON			C 245					
Oswald	x								HC 695	
"									F 615	
"									BMC 146	
"		MON								HC 696
Othelric	x		C 100-1		C 210-3					
Paul		MO	I 22							
"			BMC 119-20							
Redwine	x					C 215				
Regther	x		BMC 124		C 216-18		C 350			
"					HC 656		I 109			
"					BMC 75					
Rodbert	x				I 73, 74					
Sigar	x		BMC 128		C 223-4	C 221				
"					BMC 78					
"		MO				C 222			C 432	
"		MON								
Sigwold	x		C 107							
Wulfgar	x		C 113		I 77, 78		I 110			
"			BMC 139		C 236-9,					
"					BMC 89					

Othelric¹ in two. Some moneyers invariably have *-es*, but not always *mot*: Frethic, otherwise consistent with *mot* + *-es*, has *mo* once, and Amund has *mo* and *mt*, though either of these could stand for *mot*. A certain exception is *Dunnes mon*.² No moneyers, of whom a number of coins are listed, use *mot* consistently without a genitive, though the only recorded specimen of Redwine is in this category.

Grim is a good example (and perhaps Durand too, if he is the same moneyer operating for Eadmund and Eadgar) of a moneyer whose coins are consistent in having both *mot* and *-es* combined, or neither, but never singly. Other moneyers mix their usage, e.g. Mann and Siger. Ælfred always has *mon*, normally with *-es*, but once not. Demenec uses *mot* and *-es* forms separately and rarely.

A few other genitives and *mot* forms exist, and listed below are a number of examples which are or may be relevant but which are not included in Table I. They consist of coins with types other than the horizontal inscription, or with inexplicit spelling; of isolated examples; and of specimens not contained in the five sources of Table I. They do not include coins with the letter M in the obverse field, of Eadred to Eadgar, which are listed in Table II.

ATHELSTAN

BMC type v (small cross pattée and circular inscription each side).

Chester: PAVLES MO LEIGC HC 632 (REX TO B)

Derby: BOIGA MOT ET DEORAIVI BMC 2
BOIGA MOT ET DEORABVI HC 623 } *Obs.* both read RE SAXORVM

IOIA MOT L DERVBVI (*obv.* reads +EÐISTANREX TOT BRIT neatly retrograde). Moneyer Iola or Boi(g)a. C. E. B.

GARIARDES MOT IN DEORABVI (*obv.* reads +EÐELSAN RE+ TO BRIT, with H in field at 5.30 o'clock). Moneyer? Derby Museum.

MAEGENREDES MO IN DEORABVI HC 625 (RE SAXORVM).

EDEL (?) MOT IN REORABVI—Some letters reversed. *u* in *obv.* field. BMC 3.

Wardborough (?): BYRHTEL MOT PEARI Taffs collection.

No mint name: (?) PEDVRARDES MOTE. M in *obv.* field. ? Moneyer Durand. Bibl. Nat. Paris (292A).

BMC type i (small cross pattée/horizontal inscription).

DOMENCES MO BMC 102.

PAVLVS MON BMC 122 (might be for PAVLVS, cf. BMC 136).

EADMUND TO EADGAR

Horizontal inscription types

Eadmund: DREGL MOT	BMC i, no. 45.
ELFSTANES M	BMC iii, C 115.
ERICIL NOT	BMC i, BM ex RCL 579 and Evans.
WERLAF MOT	BMC iii, C. E. B. ex Ryan 770.
Eadred: AELFRICES MO	BMC i, C 123.
DUDEMANES MOT	„ C. E. B.
GILLEQS MOT	„ C 174.
GISLEMER OT	„ C 177–8.

¹ The recognition of Othelric's *mot* usage suggests that C 114, catalogued as blundered, is of this moneyer; the inscription is ODIHRIEIIHOT (some letters

reversed). If II represents EL and III represents SM or (S)M, the inscription reads normally for a coin of this group. ² BMC 21, Eadwig.

	GISLEMES M	<i>BMC</i> i, <i>BMC</i> 47.
	HUNRED MOT	„ <i>BMC</i> 55.
	OSBERN MOT	„ Seaby Oct. 1951, no. 5670.
Eadwig:	CNAPEES	<i>BMC</i> iii, no. 35.
Eadgar:	IOLES MONET	<i>BMC</i> i, c no. 143.
	LEVIC MOT	<i>BMC</i> i, I 204.
	VINEES VO	<i>BMC</i> i, f no. 165.
	WINEMES MON	F. Baldwin.

Eadgar: circular inscription type (BMC iii unless stated).

DEORVLVES MOT IN	<i>HC</i> 706.
DVRANDES MOT	<i>BMC</i> 168, I 264–5.
DVRANDIES MONETA	<i>BMC</i> 169, I 263.
FASTOLFES MOT	<i>BMC</i> 178–9 I 279–83.
„ MO	„ 180, I 284.
HEROLFES MOT	„ 192–3.
IGOLFERTHES MOT	<i>BMC</i> 194, I 295.
LEOFINCES MOT I	„ 196.
WILSIG MOT	„ 202 (type iv)

The moneyers of coins listed above and in Table I, so far as they can be connected with specific mints, seem mostly to belong to Derby and Chester. Paul is at Chester under Athelstan, and Boiga at Derby. Boiga was not a rare name, and moneyers of that name struck for Eadwig at Bedford¹ and for Eadgar in his last type at Canterbury;² but it occurs at Derby again in two types of Eadgar,³ and the coins of Boiga in Table I probably belong to this mint. An obverse reading *Eadred Rex Dorbe*⁴ shows Ælfric to have struck there also, and coins of Eadgar, *BMC* type iv, by the moneyers Othelric⁵ and Iole⁶ include the Derby mint name in their reverse inscriptions. Sigar and Sigwold at one time worked for Anlaf Guthfrithsson at Derby.⁷ Other Table I moneyers may be represented by coins of Eadgar's last type—Dun⁸ and Manna⁹ at York, Frethric at Derby¹⁰ and Wulfgar at Stamford.¹¹ Cnapa coined at Stamford in the same type.¹² Grim worked at Bedford for Eadwig¹³ and Eadgar.¹⁴ Gillys is the Chester moneyer of the Howell Dda coin.

In his study of the Iona hoard, Mr. Stevenson suggested that die-cutting schools could be identified, which might have a regional significance.¹⁵ One feature in particular has struck me which may be useful in differentiating the products of one of these various die-cutting schools, viz. the occurrence of the letter m in the obverse field. In working through the *mot/-es* group of moneyers it was impossible not to notice how closely they corresponded with the m-in-field group. The relationship can be seen from Table II.¹⁶

¹ *BMC* 2.

² *BMC* 5.

³ *BMC* type ii, Ryan 787; type iv, C 443.

⁴ C 122.

⁵ C 450.

⁶ C 444.

⁷ *VCY*, pp. 50–51 and 73.

⁸ *BMC* 10.

⁹ *BMC* 12.

¹⁰ *BMC* 7.

¹¹ *BMC* 44.

¹² *BMC* 42.

¹³ *BMC* 4 (type ii).

¹⁴ *BMC* 4 (type vi).

¹⁵ *NC* 6th ser., xi (1951), pp. 69–71; endorsed by Blunt and Dolley, *BNJ* xxvii (1954), p. 133, n. 2.

¹⁶ Two coins from the Chester hoard are included, which are catalogued as reading *Eadwimig* (C 328) and *Emadgar* (C 443). The latter is illustrated, and shows that the m has slipped into the circumscription by a compositor's error; I presume that the same is true of the unillustrated C 328.

TABLE II

Coins of Eadred, Eadwig, and Eadgar, of Horizontal Inscription type, with M in Field

<i>Moneyer</i>	<i>Reign</i>	<i>Inscription</i>	<i>Reference</i>
ÆLFRED	Eadwig	Ælfredes Mon	BMC 15
	Eadgar	"	C 379
ÆTHELNATH	Eadred	Æthelnath	F. Baldwin
ÆTHELWULF	Eadwig	Æthelwulfes Mot	C 308
	Eadgar	Ethelulfes Mot	C 383
ÆTHERED	Eadgar	Æthered Mo	F 614
AGTARD	Eadred	Agtardes Mot	BMC 9
	Eadwig	"	C 309, F 599
ARNULF	Eadred	Arnulf Mont	BMC 11
BERNARD	Eadred	Bernard Mo	I 68
	Eadwig	"	I 104
	Eadgar	Berenard Mo	Argyll
BO:GA	Eadred	Boigaes Mot	BMC 23
	Eadgar	Boigaes Mon	C 386
DEME NEC	Eadwig	Demence Mon	C 322, F 600
	Eadgar	"	BMC 140, C 389, I 226
DUNN	Eadred	Dunnes Mot	I 71
	Eadwig	" Mon	BMC 21
	"	" Mot	I 105-6
ELFSTAN	Eadgar	Elfstan Mon	HC 692
FRETHIC	Eadred	Ferthices Mot	HC 651
	Eadwig	Frethices Mot	C 328
	Eadgar	"	BMC 141, C 399
	"	Frethices Mo	C 398
GODSERE	Eadwig	Godseres Mot	F 601
GRIMTER (?)	Eadgar	Grimter Mo	CEB
INGELRIC	Eadgar	Ingelries Mon	CEB
INGUC	Eadwig	Inguces Mot	F. Baldwin 1953
LEFINC	Eadgar	Lefinces Mon	BMC 144
LEOFSTAN	Eadgar	Leofstan Mon	C 427
MANN	Eadgar	Mannees Mot	BMC 145
" (?)	"	Manin	RCL 615
OSFERTH	Eadgar	Osferth Mo	I 228
OSWARD	Eadgar	Oswardes Mot	BMC 146, F 615, HC 696
	"	Oswardds Mon	HC 695
OSWULF	Eadgar	Oswulfes Mot	CEB
OTHELRIC	Eadred	Othelrices Mot	C 210
	Eadgar	"	PWCB 448
REGTHER	Eadred	Rethgeres Mot	C 216
	Eadwig	Regtheres Mot	I 109
RODBERT	Eadred	Rodbertes Mot	I 73-74
SIGAR	Eadgar	Sigares Mon	C 432
WINEMAN	Eadgar	Winemes Mon	F. Baldwin
WULFGAR	Eadred	Wulfgares Mot	I 77
	Eadwig	"	RCL 3705
	Eadgar	"	I 229-30

Of the moneyers listed in Tables I and II, sixteen are common to both, which is remarkable since the M-in-field coins are distinctly uncommon and many of the names¹

¹ The moneyer Arnulf struck for Anlaf Sihtricsson, apparently at York (*VCY*, p. 54, fig. 19) during 943-4. Before this he worked for Æthelstan, and after for Eadmund and Eadred (*ibid.*, p. 81). Elfstan of Table II, though not qualifying for Table I, has affinities

with the group. Of his four coins in the Chester hoard, two of Eadgar (C 469, 470—*Eadgar Rex To Bi*) read *Elfstan Moneta*, and one of Eadwig (C 304; *wynn* in king's name) *Elfstan Mo*. His Eadmund penny (C 115) is of the very rare variety BMC type iii, with rosettes

in Table II are represented there by a single specimen. There probably exist other coins elsewhere by moneyers of Table I not recorded here with the M. There are eight such moneyers, but of these Dudeman, Maneca, Redwine and Sigwold are in any case represented in Table I by only six coins in all.

Coins of the moneyers in Tables I and II tend to be engraved with fine, neat letters. A is generally plain and unbarred:¹ only three of the M-in-field coins have a barred A.² Of the twelve coins of Eadwig with the M, only one has vv for w in the king's name,³ the others all having *wynn*, which is otherwise (apart from coins by the moneyer Heriger) rather rare.

The form of M on the reverse of these coins is often elaborately composed of five separate parts—two main uprights, joined by two crescents (or by two small straight dashes disposed v-wise) with a wedge serif or vertical dash in the middle. The small M on the obverse is sometimes of this form also, or else written as an H.

What is the significance of the M in the field? Mr. Dolley suggested that the Mercian privy-mark was originally this curious five-stroke M, which was replaced (though with an overlap) by the rosette as an ornament.⁴ It is noticeable that the M does not occur in the field under Eadmund, perhaps because the king's name contained the letter. The M-in-field also occurs on coins of Anlaf Guthfrithsson which Mr. Dolley attributes to Derby.⁵ The letter perhaps stands for *Mercia*, indicating the province where the die was made or issued or used; it probably does not represent the ethnic⁶ as a continuation of the obverse inscription.⁷ In one instance it is replaced by E on a coin of Anlaf of characteristically Mercian workmanship.⁸ An M (which could perhaps be read as an E) also occurs (on the Anlaf side) on a coin struck from two obverse dies in the names of Æthelstan

between, above, and below the reverse inscription. Besides the rosettes, Blunt and Dolley remark that the five-stroke M 'suggests that the issue was local and confined to the NW'. In addition, I read the penultimate letter on the reverse as s, making *Elfs(t)anes M* (the M upside down), a reading consistent with the foregoing remarks about the occurrence of genitives in this area.

¹ Since writing the above, I find that Mr. Dolley has remarked on this feature and on the curious M described in the next paragraph (*MC*, p. 6), which go back to Edward the Elder. The following paragraphs have been rewritten after profitable discussion with Mr. Dolley, but all the features mentioned, including characteristics of style, occurred to us independently, which is some argument for their objective existence.

² *BMC* 144, Eadgar; *F* 614; *C* 389.

³ *C* 308.

⁴ *MC*, p. 7.

⁵ *VCY*, pp. 50–51, figs. 12–14. The presence of M on Anlaf's coins could be excused as mere imitation. But the dies of Sigar's coin (fig. 12) are expertly engraved, exactly in the official Mercian style of the same moneyer's coins struck for Æthelstan and Eadmund. They were certainly not blindly copied by an ignorant die-cutter.

⁶ One of the Anlaf coins (*VCY*, fig. 14) apparently includes a different ethnic (EI . . R, retrograde) in the circumscription. This presumably means *Anlaf King*

of (the Kingdom of) York, since it is a Derby coin. The same applies to his flower-type coins of the moneyer Ingelgar (*VCY*, p. 52, fig. 16) which read *Rex Ebr*, as do a few of Eadmund after he recaptured York in 944. Mr. Dolley interprets *REXTOD* on flower coins of Anlaf by Rathulf as *Rex To D, King at Derby*. He quotes (*VCY*, p. 75) a coin reading *MO TO LI* (*money(-er) at Leicester*) and *Rex an Situn* on Swedish coins to support the use of *To* in this sense and the use of a place-name after the Latin title. For the latter, there are also coins reading *Cnut R Eofe* (Hildebrand, 614–15). If *TOD* = *To D*, Anlaf is excused of the 'swaggering gesture' (G. C. Brooke, *English Coins*, 3rd edn. (London, 1950), p. 37) of imitating Æthelstan's *Tot(ius) Brit(anniae)*; but presumably coins of Eadgar with *TOD* (*BMC* 200 and 203) would have to be interpreted similarly, which is possible in their case, but less likely for very similar coins (*BMC* 198–9) which have to only, extremely weak by itself meaning *at*, but less so if imitating the old *Tot Brit* formula.

⁷ That the M was considered separate from the obverse inscription is suggested by the fact that it occurs on the reverse of the Anlaf coins, even on that of Sigar (*Sigares Mot*, *VCY*, fig. 12; Brooke, pl. x. 2) who has it on the obverse of his coin of Eadgar (*C* 432—*Sigares Mon*).

⁸ *VCY*, pp. 50 (fig. 11) and 73; also *BNJ* v (1909), p. 89.

and Anlaf.¹ The so-called s which occasionally occurs in the field is probably not a letter at all.²

The demonstrable connexions, on other grounds, between the moneyers of Tables I and II with the mints of Chester and Derby do strongly support the idea that both the *mot/-es* forms and the m-in-field are Mercian in origin. Shrewsbury, Oxford, and Tamworth probably came within Mercia, but Chester and Derby were the pre-eminent mints. It is not suggested that either feature was invariable, but they may be found useful in further breaking down the regional die-cutting schools. Like Mr. Stevenson, I present some observations on the material in the hope that others more expert than myself in the coinage of this period may find it profitable to pursue their detailed numismatic significance.

We return to the word *Mot*. It occurs on a limited number of mid-tenth-century coins, which on other considerations are attributable to Mercia, particularly to the mints of Chester and Derby. In a very high proportion of its appearances it is accompanied by an English genitive. Under Eadgar a deliberate distinction seems to be made, on coins in the name of the same moneyer, between inscriptions with *Moneta* and those with *Mot*—e.g. *Fastolf Moneta*³ and *Fastolfes Mot*.⁴ The same distinction between languages⁵ is broadly found on coins by many Table I moneyers, Grim being the best example.

I am sure that *Mot* is not an abbreviation or contraction of a longer word. It never appears with the superscript line of contraction or suspension which is so common over M, MO, MON, and MONE. Two very similar coins of Eadgar, both with m in the obverse field, by the moneyer Oswald, illustrate the distinction conveniently:⁶ one reads MŌN, with the line, the other MOT without. *Mot* is clearly a word in its own right, and all the evidence suggests that it was thought of as a synonym of the Latin *Moneta*. It has been argued above that the latter is itself not an abbreviation, but a deliberate form, in which case it can only be the Latin noun for 'die' or 'coin'.

The moneyer Boiga has some especially interesting forms germane to the interpretation of these words. His normal usage is *Boigaes Mot*, with an incorrectly formed English genitive; and in the same way that *-es* was added mechanically to the root, so apparently was *-i* for the Latin form, which is again grammatically incorrect for the first declension.

¹ VCY, pp. 52 (fig. 15) and 75.

² Eadred, BMC 69 (Osferth) and 71 (Oswald); both are m-in-field moneyers (if Oswald = Oswald). s might stand as an ethnic for *Saxoniorum*: *Rex S* in this sense, though less common than *Rex A(n)glorum*, does occur under Eadgar on coins especially of the *Mot/-es* moneyers Fastolf (BMC 173, 180) and Boiga (jointly with Fastolf—BMC 182). But apart from the arguments (see above, p. 37, nn. 6 and 7) against m in this position being the ethnic, which equally apply, the s seems in fact to be merely two linked crescents, an ordinary privy-mark in the series.

³ BMC 75.

⁴ BMC 178–9.

⁵ Such apparent mixtures of languages as do occur need not surprise (see above, p. 37, n. 6). A possible example is the unique silver penny of Eanred. Mr. Blunt (D. M. Wilson and C. E. Blunt, 'The Trewhiddle Hoard', *Archaeologia*, xcvi, pp. 75–122, esp. pp. 113–

16) who argues convincingly against this piece belonging to the time of Eanred of Northumbria, quotes Mr. Dolley's suggestion that its reverse inscription *Des Moneta* means *Money of that (king)*, referring to the royal name on the obverse. This certainly seems a possibility. The theme *thes* is unrecorded for a proper name, and is preferably read as the genitive of *se*, 'that'. There are other examples of an obverse inscription containing name and titles in the nominative combined with a reverse referring to the coin as being the money of the ruler in question: e.g. *Phs' Dux Burg' et Comes Flandrie/Moneta Comit' Flandrie* (Flanders, Philip the Good, 1419–67, double gros of Bruges). The Eanred penny has an unexplained ornament (? letter, like an uncial m inverted) after *Moneta*, which may not have any significance at all; if it was purely decorative, to fill space, it further argues for *Moneta* being a complete word.

⁶ HC 695 and 696.

For this seems to be the case with two otherwise unparalleled forms, *Boigai Moneta*,¹ and *Boigai Mynet*.² The latter, though with a misformed Latin genitive,³ contains the regular English word for 'coin', and adds weight to the idea that all three words, *Mynet*, *Mot*, and *Moneta* (or its abbreviation), mean 'coin' in this context.

There is abundant evidence that *Moneta* was used to mean 'coin' and 'die' equally, both in classical and medieval Latin.⁴ In the light of other medieval coin inscriptions discussed above, the chances are that it was more generally understood to mean 'money' or 'coin'. The occurrence of *Mynet* supports this. Whether *Moneta*, or any other word in this context, actually means 'die' or 'coin' does not matter too much; and it must be remembered that, in translating it into a language such as our own which has different words for the two meanings, we are seeking to make a definition which the original engraver of the die need never have done.

This is important for the meaning of *Mot*. In Old Nordic,⁵ it is glossed as 'stamp' or 'mark'. The inscriptions on early Norwegian coins suggest that it acquired the technical sense of 'coin-die', a not improbable meaning in view of those given for the verb *móta*, 'to stamp', 'to coin'.

Once *Mót* had been used with this meaning, the transference of meaning from the die to the thing struck from it appears (on analogy at least) to have been natural. Whether it occurred in Norway is doubtful; the form of the inscriptions on Norwegian coins containing the word *Mót*, and the similar usage of the word *peningr* (never glossed other than as 'coin', or in the plural 'money'), suggest that the latter is as likely to have been used with the sense of 'die' as *mót* with the sense of 'coin'. Again, however, there can be no certainty and the distinction is not of fundamental importance.

English tenth-century coin inscriptions certainly suggest that *Mót* was used as an alternative for *Moneta*, probably with the meaning of *Mynet*, in areas where Old Nordic was familiar.⁶ At Chester and Derby at least it seems that *Mót* rather than *Mynet* was the normal word. A gloss of *nomisma* as *mynitt re vel mót* in the Lindisfarne Gospels⁷ makes the two words synonymous, and is in fact the only textual occurrence of *Mot* in England at this period.⁸ Nevertheless the numismatic evidence is so strong and consistent

¹ Eadmund, *BMC* 32.

² *C* 152.

³ *Gotae Mone* (Eadmund, *BMC* 74) is apparently an example of the first declension Latin genitive correctly formed.

⁴ Holst collates examples.

⁵ Dr. Page writes 'The term Old Norse is ambiguous. Some (myself included) use it to mean Old Nordic (i.e. ancestor of Danish and Swedish as well as Norwegian). Others (e.g. the English Place Name Society) use it to mean old Norwegian. . . . Certain Danish dictionaries give an Old Danish cognate to *ON mót*.' Since we are dealing not only with the North of England, under Norwegian influence, but also the Danelaw, I use Old Nordic here to avoid ambiguity and to include the wider linguistic grouping.

⁶ The inscription *AVRAMONITRE* occurs on coins attributed by Mr. Dolley to Anlaf Sihtricsson (*VCY*, p. 47, fig. 6) and Regnald Guthfrithsson (*VCY*, p. 49, fig. 10; also *HC* 523-4). Sir Charles Oman (*The Coinage of England*, Oxford 1931, p. 60) made the interesting suggestion, not followed by Mr. Dolley, that *Aura* was not a moneyer's name but the ON. word for money

or treasure (cf. modern *öre*). *Monit Re* could thus be *Moneta Regis*, though *Aura* and *Moneta* together is curious. However, forms such as *Minetr*, *Monetra*, *Monetr* in this Viking series do look convincingly like the English (*Mynetere*) or Latin (*Monetarius*) words for moneyer, and *Monitre* is comparable. The last letter is enigmatical: if it is really *G*, *Reg(is)* looks probable. But I wonder whether it is an integral part of the inscription at all—it occurs frequently at the end of both obverse and reverse inscriptions in this series and might almost be a die-cutter's mark (e.g. *Anlaf Cunun F | Aura Monitre F*, *VCY*, fig. 6; *Anlaf Cununc F*, *VCY*, fig. 7; *Rathulf Mōnet F*, *VCY*, fig. 9; *Anlaf Cununc F | Faman Moneta F*, *HC* 522).

⁷ Matth. xxii. 19. Professor Whitelock writes, 'One would expect *mynitt vel mót*. I do not know what *re* is. If meant as part of *mynittre* it would of course mean moneyer.' But this makes no sense here.

⁸ Professor Whitelock writes, 'If *mot* was a regular term for "coin" in the Scandinavianised parts of England, it is odd that it is only recorded once. Still, we have not many texts from this area, and I think

that it seems reasonable to look upon *Mot* as a regular word for 'coin' in parts of England where the speech of Norsemen and Danes was familiar.

Finally, a word about the grammar of Anglo-Saxon coin inscriptions and the various forms which appeared in the late tenth century when mint names were added as a regular feature.

It is quite clear that many die-cutters did not understand what they were engraving; and, moreover, that they often used one die as a model for the next. In the same way that a textual critic can reconstruct a stemma for the copying of manuscripts from one or more originals, so the numismatist can often point to errors in copying which prove the one die must have been directly copied from another, or from an existing coin. Relatively few of the coins of David I of Scotland read DAVIT REX, and of Archbishop Philip I of Heinsberg, PHIL(ippus) ARC(hiepiscopus). The normal forms¹ are AVIT REX and HITARC, which occur on the large majority of dies. The chances against these mistakes having been made independently over and over again are enormous; each error was made once, and then blindly reproduced. A very remarkable case of individual copying occurs on the Thetford coins of type II of William the Conqueror. On three reverse dies of the moneyer Cinric, the initial cross has been omitted apparently because the Ð was cut in error on the first die as +I and thought to include the cross: CINRIC ON+IEOTNE. Two dies derive from this one, each reading CINRIC OND+IEOTNE, where an attempt has apparently been made to cut a coherent inscription, though the +I remains.²

This makes it less surprising that most ninth- and tenth-century Anglo-Saxon coins with a moneyer's name have a form, e.g. *Heremod Moneta*, which does not explain the relationship between the two nouns and no doubt led to *Moneta* being thought of as meaning *Moneta(rius)*. We have seen how Norwegian inscriptions in Runic passed from 'Leofric has this die' to 'Leofric . . . die'. There are also one or two inscriptions in that series with Roman letters which show *Mót* with the moneyer's name either in the nominative (-r) or genitive (-s): IEOFRICR MOT and LEFRICS MOT. These are more explicit than the English, since the nominative is not an uninflected root.

Portuguese coins of the later fifteenth century contain some arresting examples of muddled grammar at a time when coin inscriptions had become much more elaborate and sophisticated. On coins of Alfonso V (1438–81) there occur *Dominus Alf. Regis Portugal*,³ *Alfonsus Quinti Regis*,⁴ and on the two sides of the same coin, a grosso of Castille,⁵ *Alfonsus Dei Gracia Rex Castele*/*Alfonsus Dei Gracia Regis Castele*.

It seems as if the die-cutters of the Anglo-Saxon coinage did not understand the exact

nomisma and *moneta* are rare in the Gospels, so the gloss is not required. I do not think it survived into Middle English.'

¹ Both have caused misattributions. AV . . . on poor specimens led Lindsay, *View of the Coinage of Scotland*, Cork, 1845, p. 5 and pl. i, nos. 6–8, to describe them under Alexander I. Until HIT was realized to be a corruption of PHIL, other attributions were sought—e.g. Archbp. Hildebroed (Thomsen, ii, p. 104).

² G. C. Brooke, *Catalogue of English Coins in the British Museum, Norman Kings* (London, 1916), vol. i, p. cxxvi. Brooke writes 'on the supposition that the mistaken letter represented H, the letter Ð is inserted

before it'. Since, however, there is no initial cross on any of the three dies, it seems possible that the inscription was not understood at all and thought to end —ON+, i.e. without a mint name. As a result Ð (for Ð) was inserted. This seems to be supported by the fact that in these inscriptions the + occurs opposite the end of one of the limbs of the cross-design, whereas the first letter of Cinric does not: this is not, however, conclusive since on a number of reverse dies of the type inscriptions start at irregular points.

³ Thomsen 2881.

⁴ Thomsen 2884.

⁵ Thomsen 2888.

grammatical forms of the inscriptions or of the words they contained. A coin of Eadmund¹ with the remarkable reverse reading *Clac Mone Mone Mon* suggests that the engraver knew the abbreviation MONE to have a general sense connected with moneyers and minting, but was ignorant of the full form of the word.

From the mid-tenth century the use of mint names became more general and in the major recoinage at the end of Eadgar's reign, when minting was systematically decentralized, the reverse inscription was more or less standardized to contain the name of moneyer and mint. Table III shows some of the many experimental forms and the way in which they led to the formulae eventually adopted throughout. Only a selection of forms is given.

TABLE III

Forms of Inscriptions on tenth-century Anglo-Saxon Coins containing the Name of Moneyer and Mint

No.	Reign	Type	Mint	Inscription	Refs.
1	Athelstan	BMC v	Bath	Biorhtulf Mon Bat Civitate	BMC 1
2	"	"	Hereford	Hunlaf Mo Heref	BMC 21
3	"	"	Chester	Abba Mo in Lege Cf	BMC 22
4	"	"	London	Ere Moneta Lund Civiet (EFE = ELE?)	BMC 59
5	Eadwig	BMC ii	Bedford	Baldwine Beda	BMC 1
6	"	"	"	Boiga Moneta Beda	BMC 2
7	Eadgar	BMC iv	Derby	Frethic in Deorby	BMC 7
8	"	"	"	Manes Mot in Doi	C 447
9	"	BMC iii	"	Boia Mot in Debi	C 443
10	"	"	Oxford	Wulfstan Mō Oxna Urbis	C 455

It is not to be insisted that the engraver worked out the grammatical construction in every case; but the apparent meanings of the inscriptions are worth considering. No. 1 could be 'Biorhtulf Moneyer at the City of Bath'; equally, 'The die—or coin—(of) Biorhtulf in the City of Bath'. No. 3 is similar, with the preposition *in* added.² No. 4, with *Moneta* in full, perhaps suggests that 'die', or 'coin', not 'moneyer' was meant. No. 5, a straight statement of the necessary information—'Baldwine, Bedford'—might have become more widely used, one would have thought. Nos. 8 and 9 use *Mot* still, Man making his genitive but Boia being a form which could stand as genitive without inflection.³ No. 9 can be compared with the coins of Athelstan, listed above on p. 34, which have essentially the same inscription, but with *et* (*aet* = at) instead of *in*. No. 10 might mean 'Wulfstan moneyer of the City of Oxford' or 'the die—or coin—(of) Wulfstan of the City of Oxford'.

No. 2, spasmodically used from Æthelstan onwards, was to become the regular form once the coinage settled down after Eadgar's reform. To start with, the word *Moneta* in full sometimes appeared between the names of moneyer and mint *Baldic Moneta Beda*⁴ or *Wilmund Moneta Grant*.⁵ But it settled down to Mō, sometimes MON. This in

¹ BMC 151; and cf. Eadmund type VI, *Cygel Mone Mone* (Bibl. Nat., Paris, no. 293) perhaps by the same moneyer as BMC 155.

² Cf. = *C(i)v*, *f* being often used for its phonetic equivalent *v*; cf. *Cifitatis* on a coin of Archbp. Wulfred

(BNJ xxvi, p. 343).

³ See above, p. 32, n. 3.

⁴ Edward the Martyr, BMC 3.

⁵ Æthelred II, *1st hand* type. HC 785 (Cambridge).

turn gave way to ON¹ during Æthelred II's reign though MO persisted in north-east England until well into the reign of Cnut. Thereafter any contracted form of *Moneta* or *Monetarius* drops out, though if a die-cutter had space to fill, he might reintroduce it at the end—e.g. *Carla on Eaxcestre Mo*.²

¹ The use of *on* rather than *in* has sometimes puzzled numismatists, on the grounds that *on* implied motion towards. Professor Whitelock comments that in the greater part of the Anglo-Saxon period, there is no difference in meaning between *on* and *in*, but in West Saxon *in* is displaced by *on*. Motion towards is shown by the case governed, i.e. accusative. The form *an* (cf. *Anlaf/Onlof*) occurs in a comparable context to the English M⁻ON on the Swedish coin of Svend Tveskjaeg (P. Hauberg, *Myntforhold og Udmyntninger i Danmark indtil 1146*, Copenhagen, 1900, pl. i) which reads

Godwine M⁻an Daner. An example of this coin was in the Näs hoard, which contained no English coin later than Long Cross. Since M⁻AN must mean *M(. . .) an*, Mr. Dolley asks whether M⁻ON, and M⁻O too, may not represent *M—on*, i.e. 'moneyer at', rather than *Mon—*, i.e. 'moneyer'. The form M⁻ON is generally post-1010, being transitional between M⁻O and ON.

² Hildebrand, Æthelred II, 496; supported by Hild. 117, *God on Cadanbyri M*.

Postscript

1. Mr. Lyon has drawn my attention to a coin of Æthelred II, *Last Small Cross* type (F 743) reading *Edwine Mtr on Lunden*. This lends support to the suggestion (n. 1 above) that M⁻ON meant 'moneyer at' (*mynetere on*) at the time when English was replacing Latin in reverse inscriptions. I still find it difficult, however, to understand M⁻O, in the earlier period of Latin inscriptions, as having the same connotation, rather than being merely an abbreviation of a Latin word, *Moneta*, or perhaps *Monetarius*.

2. The inscription *Grossi Pragenses* in the plural (Bohemia, John the Blind, 1309–46) suggests that *Moneta* on a fourteenth-century coin could be understood to mean the money in general of which it was a part, rather than the particular coin itself (see above, p. 30).