SOME 'NORTHERN' VARIANTS ETC. OF THE *CRUX* ISSUE OF AETHELRAED II

SOME MISREAD MONEYERS OF LONDON IN THE REIGN OF ÆTHELRÆD II

By V. J. BUTLER

THE mint of London under Æthelræd II accounted for perhaps almost a quarter of the total English coinage. Hildebrand picked out and recorded for what is now the Systematic Collection in Stockholm over a thousand coins from the mint, no two of which he considered identical. In all, between the years 978 and 1016, according to Hildebrand, 106 moneyers were active at London, and there is evidence for as many as 61 moneyers engaged in the minting of Æthelræd's last type alone; figures, incidentally, which contrast strangely with the decree attributed to Æthelræd that moneyers should number 'in every principal town three, and in every other, one'.

It is not surprising therefore, if we consider the vastness of the material at Hildebrand's disposal when he came to catalogue the London coins of this reign, that the occasional misreading can be found. Here and there a duplicate has slipped in, where a coin, chipped, worn, or 'pecked' has seemed to bear a variant of the legend of its true duplicate. In the work now in progress to produce a definitive publication both of the Swedish hoard-coins and of the Systematic Collection, the modern method has been to compare coin with coin for die-identity much more closely than was the practice in medieval numismatics in Hildebrand's day. Two other factors have helped in the work of correction. One is a realization that die-cutting could not have been entrusted to careless illiterates. The majority of Æthelræd's coins bear regular legends in which both the mints' and moneyers' names correspond to their manuscript counterparts, or present few deviations in spelling that are not philologically explicable. Thus a coin comes in for special scrutiny if it bears a strange spelling, or exhibits a moneyer's name that seems not to conform to the elements and usage of Anglo-Saxon name-giving. The other factor is a suspicion, which has proved well justified, of 'one-coin' moneyers. It is, of course, quite possible that the only evidence for the activity of a certain moneyer in a mint may be one single coin—such is the accident of survival—but, nevertheless, such a coin merits close attention to make sure that it is as unique as it seems.

In this way, two names given by Hildebrand as moneyers of London can now be shown to owe their existence only to misreading, and a number of variant forms of authenticated moneyers' names can likewise be eliminated.

On page 111 of the 1881 edition of *Anglosachsiska Mynt* the name ᴅODERD appears. Only one coin bears this name, and it might be thought that the name is a die-cutter's error for ᴅODERE, who strikes a number of coins in the same type, Crux, and in others. Or else, explaining the legend as it stands, one might see it as a form of a name *Godheard (cf. Eadweard > Edwerd on coins of the Confessor). Apart from certain phonological difficulties in the way of this explanation,[1] it is not easy to find evidence for the name Godheard in Old

[1] See O. von Feilitzen, *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names of Domesday Book*, Uppsala, 1937, pp. 57–58.

English sources, though the two elements from which it is made up are in themselves well attested. In Searle's *Onomasticon Anglosaxonicum* only three examples of the name are cited, two of which refer undoubtedly to persons of continental Germanic origin, whilst the third is by no means certainly Old

a *b*

FIG. 1.

English.[1] Reaney derived the modern surname Goddard from Old French or Old German.[2] But as it happens, there is no need to search so far for an explanation of the name on this coin. The reverse of Hild. 2542 (Fig. 1*a*), on which ꝺODERD is said to appear, is from the same die as Hild. 2469 (Fig. 1*b*) which clearly reads EDꝼERD. In the light of the letter-forms used on the coinage of this reign, it is easy to see how such a misreading arose.

There are, on the surface, no such difficulties attending the acceptability of the name Eadgar, recorded as the moneyer of Hild. 2319 (Fig. 2*a*). Yet here again we have a mythical moneyer; this single coin is the only evidence we have for the name at London, and it proves to be a reverse die-duplicate of Hild. 2440 (Fig. 2*b*). It should be read as EALDꝺAR, a moneyer known at London from at least three different reverses.

Two London coins hitherto classified under other names must be reattributed to the moneyer Edwi. The irregular form EDRI of Hild. 2458 (Fig. 3) which corresponds to no known Anglo-Saxon name-formation, is seen on closer scrutiny to read EDꝼI. I have not been able, as in the instances above, to find an undefaced reverse-duplicate of this coin, but the additional line on the ꝼ which caused Hildebrand to read it as R is without any doubt one of the trial-pecks so often found on coins from Scandinavian hoards. Hild. 2499 (Fig. 4*a*) was read in error as +EDꝼINE O LVNDENE. The letter O standing alone would be a highly unusual form of a copulative; in fact the

[1] Searle, *Onomasticon Anglosaxonicum*, p. 261.
[2] *Dictionary of English Surnames*, p. 137.

a *b*

FIG. 2.

FIG. 3.

a *b*

FIG. 4.

legend reads +EDPI M:O LVNDENE and is from the same die as Hild. 2474 (Fig. 4*b*).

Another irregular form which can be eliminated by a comparison of dies is that of Hild. 2451 (Fig. 5*a*), recorded as EAPINNE. In searching for a less worn coin from the same reverse die, for the purpose of such a comparison, I found that in the Systematic Collection there are three, but that the legend of the four coins has been rendered by Hildebrand in three different ways. Hild. 2396 (Fig. 5*b*) is recorded as bearing the normal regular form EADPINE,

a *b* *c* *d*

FIG. 5.

whilst Hild. 2408 (Fig. 5*c*) and 2409 (Fig. 5*d*) are supposed to omit a letter and appear as EADPNE (cf. Hild. 2640–4 ÐODPNE and 2774–5 LEOFPNE). Whilst it is quite certain that all four coins are from the same die, because of the distinctive spacing and formation of the letters, the true reading is somewhat difficult to determine. The *wyn* symbol and the letter next to it are cramped together, and although the regular form EADPINE was perhaps intended, the space between I and N is provided with a diagonal line, as well as the two verticals of the N. Thus the reverse legend of these four coins should be read as EADPNNE.

The rest of the corrections I have been able to make to the Hildebrand listing of London coins consist mainly of small details, mostly turning on the difficulty of determining whether a letter is an E or Æ. On coins of this reign the A of the digraph is usually represented by the merest stroke on the E, i.e. Æ. With the spreading serifs of the E, the presence of surface pecks, and the effects of wear, it requires the most careful comparison of other features of the die to ascertain when two coins are duplicates. The decision of reading E or Æ is further complicated on coins of the London style of Æthelræd's Last Small Cross type by the appearance of Æ where E would normally be expected. This usage must be completely indiscriminate. On some coins of

this style and type every E is turned into Æ by the addition of a stroke. The first coin of the London mint in Hildebrand's catalogue, no. 2019, for example, has the moneyer's name written ÆADMVND, and even more significant, the obverse legend reads + ÆÐ ÆLR ÆDR ÆXANC, where probably for the second Æ and certainly for the fourth there can be no phonological explanation.[1]

a *b*

FIG. 6.

Another detail that requires close attention is the die-cutter's practice when short of space at the end of a legend of using the arm of the incipient cross as the second vertical of an N. This is the explanation of several legends which seem to end in LVNDEI; if the diagonal should be worn away, the letter runs the risk of being read as I or even of being missed altogether in mistake for a stop or a colon. A good example illustrating both the above points is afforded by Hild. 2455 (Fig. 6*a*) recorded as +EÐELRIC MꝊON LVNDE but in fact from the same die as Hild. 2154 (Fig. 6*b*) read correctly as +ÆÐELRIC MꝊON LVNDEN.

The proper place for the recording of all such minutiæ must be the publication of the whole Stockholm collection, but I have appended here a list of further instances where duplicates, and coins from the same reverse die, have been transcribed by Hildebrand as different examples.

Obverse and Reverse Die-duplicates

Hild. 2026 ÆLEᖴIN, 2111 ÆLFᖴIN. Both coins appear to read ÆLEᖴIN.

„ 2113, 2504. The obverse is c 4 ir 55, the reverse +ELFᖴINE (not +ÆLFᖴINE) MO LVᶦNᶦ.

„ 2181, 2508. a 3 ir. 55. The true reading is +EÐELRINE MꝊO LV.

„ 2234, 2308. Both read DRHᖴOLD. This in turn may be a die-cutter's error for BRHᖴOLD (cf. 2246–51) or perhaps represents the name Drihtwold.

[1] This phenomenon occurs even more frequently than Hildebrand's transcriptions suggest.

Hild. 2358, 2386. The two irregular numbers amount to the same reading, viz. EÐELRÆDRDEX ΛNᑕL. The reverse reads EADRERD in both cases.

„ 2818, 2838. a 5 reads +LVOFᖷINE M ON LVNDEN.

Reverse Die-duplicates

Hild. 2019, 2322.

„ 2155, 2183.

It only remains for me to thank Dr. Nils Ludvig Rasmusson and the authorities of the Royal Coin Cabinet at Stockholm for the excellent direct photographs from which have been made the blocks illustrating this paper.