

COIN HOARDS FROM THE LONDON AREA

AS EVIDENCE FOR THE PRE-EMINENCE OF LONDON IN THE LATER SAXON PERIOD

By R. H. M. DOLLEY, F.S.A.

Department of Coins and Medals, British Museum.

The purpose of this note is not to attempt a detailed appraisal of even a tithe of the numismatic evidence which will have to be taken into account by future students of Saxon London. Any such attempt would be as premature as presumptuous, and the progress that has undoubtedly been made during the last decade must serve as a warning of the extent to which hallowed beliefs can be shattered overnight when new minds come to grips on material the import of which has been dulled by sheer familiarity. A good example of this is afforded by the coinage which in the past has generally been associated with Halfdene's occupation of London in 871/872, an association for which the numismatists must take full responsibility but which has been accepted by historians and archaeologists of the calibre of Sir Thomas Kendrick, Sir Frank Stenton and Sir Mortimer Wheeler.¹ Recently, however, it has been demonstrated on purely numismatic grounds that the three coins concerned were struck for another Halfdene more than twenty years later and in quite another part of the country!² One day, doubtless, it may be possible for the still infant post-war school of Anglo-Saxon numismatists to demonstrate that at such and such a period there were in London so many moneymen, and that their average annual output was so many tons of silver, but it will be many years before we are within measurable distance of that goal, and for the present we must continue to muster the basic facts on which future theorizing must be based if it is to possess essential validity. Even for the extraction of these facts it has proved necessary to evolve—too often to improvise—new techniques, and there can be few fields of historical research today where the prizes to be won are so tangible but where progress is so positively retarded by a dearth of trained interpreters.

Immediacy has been given to the question of coin-hoards by the recent publication of Mr. Thompson's *Inventory of British Coin-Hoards*, cited hereinafter as the *Inventory*, a work that has to be consulted by every serious student of the mediaeval coinage of these islands but which

undoubtedly suffers from having been published at a time when the post-war school of Anglo-Saxon numismatists was still girding its loins.³ The submission of this note is that the position as regards coin-hoards from London and from the immediate neighbourhood of London is very different from that which appears in the *Inventory*, and that there is a very real danger that the importance of the coin-hoard evidence for Saxon London will be overlooked.

There are three principal classes of coin-hoard which may be distinguished in a paper of this kind, (a) hoards from within the presumptive Anglo-Saxon defences, i.e. for practical purposes from the modern "City", (b) those from the immediate vicinity of the Saxon *burh*, i.e. from those Metropolitan Boroughs which are contiguous with the "City", and (c) those from the remaining area which falls within a circle with a radius of twenty-five miles or thereabouts and with its centre at London Stone. For convenience, too, it is possible to divide up the coin-hoards according as they contain (a) less than thirty coins, (b) between thirty and one hundred and twenty coins, and (c) more than one hundred and twenty coins. These divisions, incidentally, are not quite arbitrary, and reflect traditional Anglo-Saxon units of reckoning. As it happens, too, long experience has taught that they possess considerable scientific validity.

To take first the hoards from within the Saxon defences, the *Inventory* lists no more than three of these deposited before the Norman Conquest, one from Fore Street, one from Gracechurch Street, and one from St. Martin's-le-Grand.⁴ The Fore Street "hoard", however, is one that can safely be left out of our calculations, the coins concerned being nineteenth-century forgeries which were "planted" to give them a hoard-provenance. As it happens, too, genuine coins of the issue concerned have never been found so far south, and the scholarly significance of the find is neither more nor less than that of the mythical "Byzantine" hoard from Carpenters' Hall.⁵ The Gracechurch Street find is dated by the *Inventory* "c.1015", a perpetuation of an obvious misprint in the original publication which is the more curious because all the coins listed are of Edward the Confessor!⁶ As far as can be judged today, the hoard numbered about sixty coins, and they had been struck at a number of mints over a period of some years. The date of deposit would seem to be c.1062/1063.⁷ For the student the hoard is of some interest because it affords welcome evidence of the way that money could move about the country. Almost every coin, incidentally, is from a mint accessible from

London by water, and this may be thought to suggest that the "barge" was already the London merchant's favoured means of transport.

The St. Martin's-le-Grand hoard has been the subject of recent re-appraisal, and has been shown to have been on a somewhat larger scale than was originally supposed.⁸ It must have consisted of sixty coins at least. All prove to be of the *Last Small Cross* type of Æthelræd II—the *Inventory* is in error when it suggests that they were all of *B.M.C.* type XI (the *Agnus Dei/Last Small Cross* mule known to me only from a unique cut halfpenny in the Stockholm Collection). The great bulk of the coins had been struck in London, and there is an interesting run of more than a score of coins struck from a single pair of dies, but a few of the coins are from mints as far afield as Chester and Barnstaple. The hoard is dated by the *Inventory* "Nov.1016", but almost certainly this is too late, and most numismatists will prefer to associate the non-recovery of the hoard with the slaughter which characterized Eadmund Ironside's battles against the Danes. Granted that many citizens of London may have had reason to fear that Cnut might not be able to keep in hand his soldiers the *frith* which in fact was established was of a kind calculated swiftly to bring back into the light of day such valuables as had been concealed.

The post-Conquest but largely Saxon St. Mary Hill "hoard" was discovered in the eighteenth century and there are many points concerning the original publication which await elucidation by the numismatist of today.⁹ Already, however, my colleague Mrs. J. S. Martin has made it clear that there were not two distinct hoards, a supposition which could have received support from the circumstance that there were on Dr. Griffith's own telling two containers.¹⁰ Incidentally the *Inventory* is in error when it states that the discovery was made in 1775—writing early in 1776 Griffith gives the date as June 24th 1774.¹¹ Together the coins seem to have numbered several hundred, and there is some reason to think that ten successive types were present, in each case in quantity. Certainly there were present 27 *Sovereign/Eagles* coins of Edward the Confessor, and on purely numismatic grounds I would date the concealment of the hoard c.1075.¹² Strictly speaking it lies outside the Saxon period, but for the purpose of this paper I propose to take into account all hoards which were deposited before the Domesday survey, a criterion which conveniently coincides with the date-bracket chosen for *The Oxford History of England*. As it happens there is an obvious occasion for the hoard, and I would suggest that it reflects the troubled state of

England in 1075 when the barely subjugated country was lacerated anew by the fratricidal turmoil which accompanied the abortive revolt of Roger and Waltheof.¹³ On this occasion, we may note in passing, England was also threatened with sea-borne invasion by the Danes. The *Inventory* suggests a dating "c.1070", but it seems impossible to date so early a find which spans four of the Conqueror's eight substantive issues, even if this solution were not open to objection on other grounds.

A second immediately post-Conquest "hoard" also is dated by the *Inventory* "c.1070" but unlike that from St. Mary Hill seems in fact to represent a conglomeration of two distinct parcels.¹⁴ In this case, however, the two elements are extremely disproportionate, and the circumstances of the discovery were such that it is by no means impossible that the places of concealment were quite distinct as well. The earlier of the two "hoards" seems to have numbered some six thousand Anglo-Saxon pennies, predominantly of Edward the Confessor. The *Inventory* summary is difficult to use because of its lay-out, and a further complication is the fact that at one point at least the coins are not of the *B.M.C.* types alleged.¹⁵ Moreover the assumption that all the Bailey coins in the Guildhall Museum are from this source is one that can be shown to be without warrant.¹⁶ The interpretation of the hoard is not easy, but the comparative paucity of coins of Edward's last (Michaelmas 1065) issue and the extreme rarity of coins of Harold II perhaps afford a clue. In the same way one cannot but be struck by the fact that the issues already obsolete at the time of the hoard's concealment had been struck on a very wide range of weight-standards so that "speculative" hoarding may seem to be precluded. On balance, therefore, I am inclined to believe that the treasure was an "official" one, part of the "bullion" reserve of one or more of the London moneyers, and that William entered London while it was still awaiting conversion into current coin.¹⁷ Further support for this theory may seem to be supplied by the circumstance that the hoard included three foreign coins, one Byzantine, one German and one Danish.¹⁸ Coins from abroad had been forbidden to circulate in England since the time of Æthelstan at least, and recent papers have underlined the extent to which the late Saxon kings were successful in enforcing specific legislation to this effect.¹⁹ The second of the two hoards appears to have comprised only a handful of coins, and like the much larger hoard from St. Mary Hill might possibly be associated with the revolt of Roger and Waltheof did not some private misfortune provide no less plausible an occasion.

The *Inventory*, then, has thrown up a total of five authentic hoards from within the Saxon defences of London which are to be dated before the Domesday survey, one c.1015, one c.1062, one c.1066 and two c.1075. One of the hoards ran into thousands of coins, one seems to have numbered more than 120, while two consisted of some 60 coins, and only one of less than 30. It will be noticed, however, that all seem to date from the eleventh century, and were one to judge from this total alone one might justifiably surmise that London did not begin to achieve its importance until the very end of the Anglo-Saxon period. It is precisely here that the hoards overlooked by the *Inventory* are so useful, and they may be thought to go a long way towards restoring the balance. Earliest in point of date is a hoard of at least sixty portrait pennies of Ælfred the Great from Bucklersbury Bargeyard which came to light in the nineteenth century.²⁰ As far as can be judged, the hoard was concealed a year or so after Ælfred had entered upon military occupation of London in 886. Only less significant is a small but quite unpublished find of pence of Æthelstan and of Eadmund of which a proportion at least is preserved in the London Museum.²¹ The coins came to light a number of years ago in Threadneedle Street, and must have been concealed c.945.²² Thirdly there is the little find of eight pennies of Æthelræd II found in 1837 in the course of building operations on the site of the old Honey Lane Market just to the north of the western end of Cheapside.²³ The date-bracket for this find is Michaelmas 997—Michaelmas 1003, and a recent note has argued that it may be one of a group which could conceivably be associated with the St. Brice's Massacre of November 1002.²⁴ By these three hoards the overall bracket of London finds is extended by a century and a half so as to run from c.885 until c.1075, while the total now stands at eight, an advance surely on the five—one bogus—which the *Inventory* had dated within the bracket c.1015-c.1070.

It must be stressed, though, that the above nine finds are all from points within the presumptive line of the Saxon defences. It is no quibble for the student of Anglo-Saxon London to seek to include three further hoards which had been concealed within sight if not bowshot of the walls. Two of the hoards appear in the *Inventory* under London, but the third is included under the heading "Unknown Site" though the fact that it is from London was revealed by Brooke as long ago as 1932.²⁵ In order of date of deposit the three finds are as follows. Firstly there is a silver sceatta hoard from the Thames which is to be dated to the second quarter of the eighth century—the *Inventory* dating "VIIIth

century" seems quite unnecessarily vague.²⁶ The exact find-spot is not known, but there is reason to associate it with the foreshore in the immediate vicinity of the City. The "Unknown Site" hoard in fact is from the Middle Temple, and was composed of more than 250 coins.²⁷ On purely numismatic grounds it is to be dated not more than a few years after the accession of Æthelwulf of Wessex, and it is difficult not to associate its non-recovery if not its concealment with the great slaughter of the Londoners—presumptively at the hands of the Vikings—which is recorded by the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as occurring in the year 842.²⁸ Our third hoard likewise would seem to be connected with Viking devastation, though there must be a little doubt about the exact find-spot. In the *Inventory* it is described as from "Waterloo Bridge," but the sale-catalogue which is our sole authority for the view that it contained at least one coin of Ælfred The Great as well as roughly a hundred coins of Burgred suggests that the provenance was "Waterloo Railway Bridge"—perhaps *Charing Cross Bridge (?)*.²⁹ However this may be, the hoard is to be dated c.870, and the presence of the odd coin of Ælfred would be consistent with the supposition that the hoard is in some way to be associated with the occupation of London by the Danish army in the winter of 871/872.³⁰

The importance of Anglo-Saxon London is further emphasized when we consider that there are a further eight hoards concealed at points lying within a radius of twenty-five miles of London Stone. Four of them are described in the *Inventory*—though in some respects the summaries stand in need of modification—but four have to be added. Earliest in point of date are a small find from Croydon Palace and a very large hoard from near Dorking.³¹ Both may well have been associated with the great Viking assault on southern England during Æthelbearht's reign which resulted in the sack of Winchester—an event not securely dated from English sources but perhaps to be assigned to 861 on the evidence of a Continental chronicle.³² One hastens to add that the Dorking hoard, which consisted of close on one thousand coins, has been dated by most authorities rather later.³³ Much hinges on the presence or absence of a coin of Burgred, and even more upon acceptance of Brooke's view that Burgred's coinage did not begin until 866, a view which many of us are coming to regard with some misgiving.³⁴ Two hoards ignored by the *Inventory* are from Barking and from the Thames at Wandsworth. Very little is known about the former which came to light in the eighteenth century, but it is known to have included

coins of Burgred, and so it is unlikely to have been deposited outside the decade c.865-c.875.³⁵ Indeed, the early demonetization of the joint issue of Burgred and of Æthelræd and Ælfred means that the latter date is to be considered a firm *terminus ante quem*. From the Wandsworth find of much more recent date four Burgred coins are in the London Museum.³⁶ They seem to span his earlier and later issues, and a date for the hoard c.870 must seem very plausible. Broadly comparable in date are two large hoards from Gravesend and from Croydon.³⁷ The former (published, incidentally, by Hawkins and not by Borrell) comprised some 540 coins, the latest a lone penny of Ælfred. The presumptive date of deposit is thus the winter of 871/872—*cf.* the hoard from Waterloo Bridge already mentioned. The Croydon hoard has recently been studied in great detail on the basis of a number of sources which the *Inventory* has overlooked, and the find-spot appears to be a point on the railway line a hundred yards or so south of Thornton Heath station.³⁸ It was about half the size of the hoard from Gravesend, but the presence of more than a score of pennies of Ælfred points to its having been concealed a year or two later.³⁹ It is the only coin-hoard from Southern England to have contained Kufic dirhams and the only one to include “*hacksilber*”.⁴⁰ There is reason to think, therefore, that the owner may have been a Viking raider and not an Englishman, and this would be consistent with the fact that it had been concealed in a cloth bag and not a pot. Incidentally it is worth remarking that the five “London” hoards deposited within the decade c.865-c.875 (Gravesend, Barking, Waterloo Bridge, Croydon and Wandsworth) comprise one end of a chain which runs up the Thames and then in a great arc back to the North Sea, the other links being finds from Reading (Berks.), Hook Norton (Oxon.), Leckhampton (Glos.), Beeston Tor (Staffs.), Dunsforth (Yorks.) and Gainford (Co. Durham).⁴¹ Together they account for eleven out of sixteen hoards from the period under review, the outliers being from Hitchin, Great Casterton, Southampton, Trewhiddle and Talnotrie.⁴²

A hoard passed over by the *Inventory* but recognized recently as being of the very greatest significance is a little find from Erith.⁴³ It is the probable source of almost all of the genuine English halfpennies bearing the name of Ælfred the Great, and like the Bucklersbury hoard already mentioned cannot have been concealed (or lost?) more than a very few years after Ælfred’s military occupation of London in 886. Finally there is the hoard from Isleworth which is dated by the *Inventory* “c.980” but which cannot have been concealed before Michaelmas 991,

and which probably dates from the winter of that year.⁴⁴ A ninth hoard which is described in the *Inventory* is a small find of late pence of Ælfred alleged to be from Ingatestone in Essex, but there are many suspicious features which incline me to the view that the provenance is bogus, and that the coins concerned were a parcel from a larger find from Leigh-on-Sea in Essex.⁴⁵ Accordingly it has been left out of the calculations on which is based this present study.

Coins found singly are not strictly relevant to the theme of this paper, but it is perhaps legitimate to draw attention to a few single-finds of coins of the very greatest rarity from London and the London area which point to a certain continuity of intensive use of coin throughout the period embraced by the coin-hoards proper. Pride of place should undoubtedly be given to the *Agnus Dei* penny of Æthelræd II which was found in Gracechurch Street. Fewer than a dozen coins of this issue survive today, and this is the only one to have an English provenance.⁴⁶ Much has been written about the issue, but it is only during the last few years that it has been possible to suggest its true date which seems to be the summer of 1009.⁴⁷ Another notable discovery from London itself was a unique halfpenny of Eadgar imitating a Winchester penny of Ælfred, but this unfortunately disintegrated in the nineteenth century.⁴⁸ Enormous importance also attaches to a rectangular piece of lead with rounded corners which was found in St. Paul's Churchyard.⁴⁸ It bears the imprint of the dies for Ælfred's second substantive issue, and I myself would regard it as a critical link in the chain of argument by which I seek to substantiate my still very controversial theory that London became the principal mint in England c.865.⁴⁹ From the remains of Croydon Palace has come the unique "Two Emperors" type penny of Ælfred, struck probably c.875, on which the West Saxon King assumes the title ANGLORUM, a title that he seems to have found it prudent almost immediately to drop until such time as the unification of a liberated England should be a reality.⁵⁰ In conclusion we may note the penny of Beorhtric of Wessex, Offa's son-in-law, found at Sunbury and now in the British Museum.⁵¹ Only four coins of this king are known, and only three can be traced today.⁵² Even though, then, the numismatist is inclined to grumble that single-finds of Anglo-Saxon coins from London today are few and far between, there can be no doubt that the metropolis has had its share and more, confirmation of the testimony of the coin-hoards to the importance of

Anglo-Saxon London as a *wic* as well as a *burh*, a place of commerce as well as a military stronghold.⁵³

In this paper, then, there have been listed no fewer than nineteen coin-hoards from London and the London area which span a period of some three and a half centuries. It now remains for me to justify my claim that London can fairly be described as enjoying "pre-eminence" during those years. For the same period and for the whole of the British Isles, the *Inventory* describes approximately 145 hoards, a total which is reduced to 132 by cases of duplication and of "non-hoards".⁵⁴ As we have seen, however, there are a number of hoards which have been overlooked by the *Inventory*—seven out of nineteen in the case of London—and a certain experience has taught me to accept as a useful working hypothesis the principle that the *Inventory* has brought together about two-thirds of the hoards known for any given period.⁵⁵ In other words we may reasonably postulate a grand total of approaching 200 hoards from the whole of the British Isles for the period c.600-1075 with which we are here concerned, and so the "London" hoards account in fact for one in ten of these finds. The proportion is large enough to be significant in its own right, but it is not perhaps unreasonable for us to leave out of our calculations hoards deposited in areas that never came under the continuous and effective rule of an English king. This is not the place to attempt to draw up a definite list of hoards strictly eligible to afford a basis of comparison, but for our present purpose it is sufficient to exclude all hoards from Wales, Scotland, Man and Ireland, and to accept only those from the soil of modern England.⁵⁶ Of the 133 *Inventory* finds, 58 come in the former category, and 75 in the latter. On this basis it is probable that there have been from England some 100 coin-hoards from the relevant period. It is unlikely, too, that current research will raise that figure to 120 without producing further additions to the London tally, and so one in six if not five of the pre-Domesday hoards from England will still prove to be from London or the London area, and this fact alone must surely justify the use of "pre-eminence" in the title of this paper.

This "pre-eminence" becomes all the more dramatic when the London figures are compared with those for the other major centres of coin-production in the Anglo-Saxon period. Taken in alphabetical order they are Canterbury, Chester, Exeter, Lincoln, Norwich, Stamford, Thetford, Winchester and York. Only Chester, Stamford and York appear at all in the *Inventory* in relation to hoards of the relevant period,

the figures being four, one and seven respectively. It is not without interest—and value—to analyse the figures for Chester and York as they stand, distinguishing hoards from within the Saxon defences and those from the immediate vicinity and contrasting the results with those obtained for London:—

			<i>Within the Defences</i>	<i>From the immediate Vicinity</i>
CHESTER	1	3
LONDON	8	3
YORK	5	2

As it happens, though, the *Inventory* figures for York stand peculiarly in need of drastic emendation on more than one count. For example an examination of contemporary newspapers shows that the “loose-finds” from Layerthorpe Bridge in no wise can be considered to constitute a hoard, while the alleged Norman hoard from York Minster in fact was composed of Plantagenet coins.⁵⁷ A special study of the York hoards on the lines of the present study of those from London is an urgent *desideratum*, and work on it already has reached a point when it is possible to indicate the broad outlines. Since, therefore, York is the only place in England which can challenge London on the score of its coin-hoards of the pre-Domesday period, I have thought to conclude this paper with a table summarizing the relevant finds from in and around both places in parallel columns. Bibliographical details are not given for those “York” finds not in the *Inventory* as the hoards concerned will be discussed in detail in a forthcoming paper, but the London reader may be assured that the evidence for these finds is at least as good as that adduced for the “London” hoards described above.⁵⁸

From this table (Appendix) it is clear that London and York stand on an entirely different plane from all other *burhs* in respect of coin-hoards from the period embraced by Sir Frank Stenton’s *Anglo-Saxon England*. It would be a pity, however, not to stress important points of distinction between the hoards characteristic of the two “capitals”. It is generally true that medieval coin-hoards reflect uncertainty, and especially is it likely that a majority of the hoards with which we are concerned were occasioned by threats to civic security. In this sense one might almost say that it is surprising that London after 886 has produced

so many hoards and York after 844 so few, though mathematically the two totals appear the same. Whereas London was not once taken by force of arms and only twice, in 1016 and 1066, had to sue for terms, York almost never knew substantial peace. This is not the place to catalogue all the occasions on which York either was stormed or hastened to open its gates to a new master, not to mention the violence of internal disputes often as in 1065 tantamount to insurrection, but it may be remarked that virtually every York hoard from within the Saxon defences can be linked with some major disaster directly touching the city itself. In contrast the coin-hoards from within London (a series which perhaps significantly does not begin until after Ælfred's refortification) reflect only indirectly national upheavals, while the capitulations of 1016 and 1066 seem to have occasioned no more than one hoard between them. There can be little doubt in fact that London already by the end of the ninth century enjoyed a position in the country which justifies the choice of the term "pre-eminence" in the title of this paper, and I look forward to setting out in subsequent essays some of the rest of the coin-evidence which is on a scale that has never perhaps been fully comprehended.

APPENDIX

- (a) Coin-hoard from within the Saxon defences. A Hoard of less than 30 coins.
- (b) Coin-hoard from the immediate vicinity. B Hoard of 30-119 coins.
- (c) Coin-hoard from within a 25-mile radius. C Hoard of 120 coins or more.

LONDON				YORK			
	(a)	(b)	(c)		(a)	(b)	(c)
"THAMES"	—	A	— 252	c.470			
				c.800?	—	—	B — "RAILWAY"
MIDDLE							
TEMPLE	—	C	— 366	c.842			
				c.850	—	—	C — EXHIBITION BUILDING
				c.850	—	C	— CONEY ST.
				c.850	391	C	— ST. LEONARD'S PLACE
				c.850	364	—	— C Ulleskelf
Croydon Palace	—	—	A 110	c.861			
Dorking	—	—	C 123	c.861			
Barking	—	—	B —	c.870			
Wandsworth	—	—	A —	c.870			
W'LOO BDGE	—	C	— 256	871/872			
Gravesend	—	—	C 176	871/872			
Croydon	—	—	C 111	c.874			

BUCKLERS- BURY	B	—	—	—	c.888						
Erith	—	—	A	—	c.888						
					c.890	—	B	—	—		CONEY ST.
					c.915	—	—	C	—		WALMGATE
					c.920	175	—	—	B		Goldsbrough
					c.927	162	—	—	C		Flaxton
THREAD- NEEDLE ST.	A	—	—	—	c.945						
Isleworth	—	—	B	203	991/992						
HONEY LANE ST. MARTIN'S	A	—	—	—	c.1000	—	—	A	—		MICKLEGATE
LE-GRAND GRACE- CHURCH ST.	B	—	—	249	c.1015						
	B	—	—	244	c.1063						
					1065	—	—	—	B		Harewood
					1065/1066	386	C	—	—		BISHOPHILL
WALBROOK	C	—	—	[255]*	1066						
					1068/1069	387	C	—	—		HIGH
					1068/1069	388	C	—	—		OUSEGATE
					1068/1069	—	C	—	—		JUBBERGATE
											BAILE HILL
ST. MARY HILL	C	—	—	250	c.1075						
WALBROOK	C	—	—	255	c.1075						
					c.1082	[390]†	—	B	—		MONKSGATE
					c.1086	—	—	A	—		JUBBERGATE

* Hoard not distinguished in *Inventory*

† Hoard wrongly associated by *Inventory* with York Minster.

Inventory

Inventory

REFERENCES

The following abbreviations are used throughout:—

<i>ASC</i>	=	<i>The Old English Chronicle</i>
<i>A-S Coins</i>	=	<i>Anglo-Saxon Coins</i> , ed. R. H. M. Dolley, London, 1960 (In the press)
<i>BMQ</i>	=	<i>British Museum Quarterly</i>
<i>BNJ</i>	=	<i>British Numismatic Journal</i>
<i>HB</i>	=	<i>Hamburger Beiträge für Numismatik</i>
<i>JMP</i>	=	<i>Jaarboek Voor Munt- en Penningkunde</i>
<i>NC</i>	=	<i>Numismatic Chronicle</i>
<i>NNA</i>	=	<i>Nordisk Numismatisk Årsskrift</i>
<i>NNUM</i>	=	<i>Nordisk Numismatisk Unions Medlemsblad</i>
<i>VCH</i>	=	<i>Victoria County History</i>

- 1 T. D. Kendrick, *A History of the Vikings*, 1930, p.x. F. M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 1946, p. 248. R. E. M. Wheeler, *London and the Vikings*, 1927, p. 11.
- 2 Cf. *NNA*, 1957-1958, p. 35 and forthcoming papers with C. E. Blunt in *A-S Coins* and 1959 *BNJ*.
- 3 J. D. A. Thompson, *An Inventory of British Coin Hoards A.D. 600-1500*, 1956.
- 4 *Inventory* nos. 243, 244 & 249.
- 5 *Inventory* no. 253, cf. forthcoming paper by P. D. Whitting in *A-S Coins*.
- 6 Cf. also R. E. M. Wheeler, *London and the Saxons*, 1935, p. 191 and *Guildhall Museum Catalogue* there cited.

- 7 Recent work in Sweden seems to establish beyond all reasonable doubt that after 973 there was a recoinage every sixth year (and later every third year). Consequently it is now possible to date late Saxon coin-hoards (and a number of single-finds) with a precision which even a decade ago would have seemed quite fantastic.
- 8 *Inventory* no. 249, cf. forthcoming paper with V. J. Butler in 1959 *BNJ*.
- 9 *Inventory* no. 250.
- 10 But Griffith fortunately was careful to stress that the crucible was found inverted *within* the larger vessel.
- 11 *Cf. Archaeologia* IV (1786), p. 356.
- 12 Unfortunately Griffith gives totals only for the three types which were of most interest to him, but we should be grateful that the three types more or less "straddle" the full run of the hoard. If it be assumed that the 74 coins which he lists are a fair sample, and that all ten of the consecutive types were present in roughly the same proportions, it would be a fair inference that Griffith saw some 250 coins. This figure would not conflict with his estimate that the hoard consisted of between three and four hundred coins. Many coins seem to have been destroyed, and originally the find may well have comprised five hundred coins.
- 13 Stenton, *op.cit.*, pp. 602-604.
- 14 It should not be forgotten that many months if not several years passed before the coins were seen by a reputable numismatist, while the workmen who "co-operated" with Bailey could not have distinguished even if asked "loose-finds" from the hoard proper.
- 15 e.g. on p. 95 the coins listed as of *B.M.C.* type XV in fact are of type XIII, and on p. 96 the *B.M.C.* type XVII coins prove to be of type XV.
- 16 For example a number of the St. Martin-le-Grand coins can be shown to figure in Mr. F. Elmore Jones' very provisional 1938 listing which in any case has been superseded by Mrs. Merrifield's 1950 register.
- 17 In this connection we should remember the presence of the crucible in the comparable though slightly later St. Mary Hill hoard. A crucible also figures in accounts of the slightly earlier Bishophill hoard from York, and I have the feeling that a number of late Saxon hoards embracing coins of a number of consecutive issues may prove to be identifiable as quasi-official bullion reserves rather than private speculations.
- 18 The second Danish coin described by the *Inventory* has proved to be a misread penny of the Wilton mint cf. *NNUM*, 1957, p. 47. The Byzantine coin is claimed by P. D. Whitting in his forthcoming paper in *A-S Coins*.
- 19 *Cf. NNUM*, 1957, pp. 253-256; *HB*, 1958/59, pp. 53-57 and (with G. van der Meer) *JMP*, 1957, pp. 54-56.
- 20 Marsham Sale, Sotheby 19: xi: 1888 lots 145 & 148: Webb Sale, Sotheby 25: vii: 1895 lots 7-12, cf. forthcoming papers cited *supra*, n.2.
- 21 I am grateful to Mr. S. E. Rigold for drawing my attention to the existence of relative material in the London Museum, and to the Director, Dr. D. B. Harden for permission to refer to it here.
- 22 Among the coins is what appears to be an unrecorded Brooke 5/1 mule of Æthelstan, though the dies appear to be unofficial.
- 23 C. Roach Smith, *Catalogue of the Museum of London Antiquities*, London, 1854, p. 108, cf. Wheeler, *London and the Saxons*, p. 191.
- 24 *NC* 1958, pp. 99-102.
- 25 G. C. Brooke, *English Coins*, 1932, p. 43 etc. For other and more precise indications of the find-spot see Wheeler, *London and the Saxons*, p. 191 (quoting *VCH* London, I (1909), p. 161) and *BNJ* XXVIII, i (1955), p. 31 etc.
- 26 *Inventory* no. 252—my own feeling would be to date the hoard c.740.
- 27 *Inventory* no. 366.
- 28 The point is developed in a forthcoming paper with K. Skaare in *A-S Coins*.
- 29 Carlyon-Britton Sale I, Sotheby 19:xi:1913 lot 337.
- 30 *Inventory* no. 256.
- 31 *Inventory* nos. 110 & 111.

- 32 Cf. forthcoming paper with K. Skaare cited *supra*, n.28.
 33 e.g. by Thompson (*op.cit.*, p. xx) c.865.
 34 The point is discussed in the forthcoming paper with K. Skaare cited *supra*, n.28, and a full-scale paper on Burgred's coinage is contemplated.
 35 *NC* 1958, p. 76.
 36 Again I am indebted to Mr. S. E. Rigold and to Dr. B. D. Harden for my knowledge of this most significant find.
 37 *Inventory* nos. 176 & 111.
 38 Cf. forthcoming paper with C. E. Blunt in 1959 *BNJ*.
 39 It is in fact the largest single source of coins of *B.M.C.* type I of Ælfred recorded to date.
 40 It is also easily the earliest coin-hoard from these islands which contains either Kufic dirhams or "*hacksilber*" (i.e. broken up silver ornaments in pieces suitable for melting down in a crucible) cf. forthcoming paper in the *North Munster Antiquarian Journal*.
 41 Beeston Tor, Dunsforth, Gainford, Leckhampton and Reading: *Inventory* nos. 40, 146, 167, 82 & 315 (but for the last see also *BNJ* XXVIII, ii (1956), pp. 394-399). Hook Norton: *BNJ* XXVIII, i (1955), pp. 39 & 46 and forthcoming paper with C. E. Blunt in 1959 *BNJ*.
 42 Hitchin, Southampton, Talnotrie and Trewiddle: *Inventory* nos. 190, 183 ("Hampshire"), 349 & 362. Great Casterton: in course of publication in excavation report.
 43 *BNJ*, XXVIII, iii (1957), p. 480.
 44 *Inventory* no. 203.
 45 Cf. forthcoming paper with C. E. Blunt in 1959 *BNJ*.
 46 Cf. *BMQ* XX, 3 (1956), pp. 69-70.
 47 C. Roach Smith, *Catalogue of the Museum of London Antiquities*, 1854, p. 108.
 48 *Ibid.*, p. 107.
 49 Briefly my view is that the principal resources of the Canterbury Mint were transferred to London as part of the accommodation reached when Mercia and Wessex decided to strike a common coinage—one of the earliest "monetary unions" in the middle ages.
 50 Cf. forthcoming paper with C. E. Blunt in *A-S Coins*.
 51 Cf. *BNJ*, XXVIII, i (1955), p. 41—the issue was at one time thought to be East Anglian.
 52 Cf. *Centennial Publication of American Numismatic Society*, 1958, pp. 130-131.
 53 Compare the forms "Lundenburh" (*ASC* s.a. 457), "Lundenceaster" (OE Bede), and "Lundenwic" (*ASC* s.a. 610) which bear witness to a dual concept of London as early as the end of the ninth century.
 54 For a "non-hoard" cf. *Inventory* no. 10; for a typical "duplication" cf. *Inventory* nos. 81 & 345.
 55 For example, in a forthcoming paper with J. Ingold in *A-S Coins* there are listed 50 Viking Age coin-hoards from Ireland of which no more than 33 appear in the *Inventory*.
 56 Strictly, of course, we should also exclude the not unimportant group of tenth- and eleventh-century hoards from England north of a line from the Mersey to Flamborough Head.
 57 *Inventory* nos. 389 & 390.
 58 For much information about York hoards I am indebted to Mr. G. F. Willmot, and even the list in *Archaeologia* XCVII (1959), pp. 60 & 69, must now be regarded as incomplete.