ADDITIONAL MATERIAL ONLINE

The Moneyers of England, 973–1086

Labour organisation in Late Anglo-Saxon and Early Anglo-Norman English mints

Jeremy Piercy

BAR BRITISH SERIES 650 | 2019

BAR PUBLISHING

Published in 2019 by
BAR Publishing, Oxford

BAR British Series 650

The Moneyers of England, 973–1086

ISBN 978 1 4073 5374 6 paperback
ISBN 978 1 4073 5623 5 e-format

DOI https://doi.org/10.30861/9781407353746

© Jeremy Piercy 2019

COVER IMAGE *Moneyers working in a mint. Bern, Burgerbibliothek, Mss.h.h.I.16, p. 222 – Diebold Schilling,* Spiezer Chronik *(www.e-codices.ch).*

The Author's moral rights under the 1988 UK Copyright,
Designs and Patents Act are hereby expressly asserted.

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be copied, reproduced, stored, sold, distributed, scanned, saved in any form of digital format or transmitted in any form digitally, without the written permission of the Publisher.

BAR
PUBLISHING

BAR titles are available from:

BAR Publishing
122 Banbury Rd, Oxford, OX2 7BP, UK
EMAIL info@barpublishing.com
PHONE +44 (0)1865 310431
FAX +44 (0)1865 316916
www.barpublishing.com

Contents

List of Figures ix
List of Tables x
List of Maps xiii
Foreword xiv
List of Abbreviations xv
Glossary xvi
Abstract xvii

1. Introduction 1
Who were the Moneyers and what was their status? 1
Political and Economic Development in Anglo-Saxon England 6
Minting and Coinage in Anglo-Saxon England 16

2. Methodology 19
Problems with the Current Resources on the Moneyers 19
A Preparatory to a Prosopography 19
Die-Links 23
Charters 25
Uses of the Database in Historical Analysis 27
The Coverage of the Database 29
Data Entry 30
Moneyer Name 30
Mint 32
Range of Active Dates 32
The Organisation of the Database 35
The Moneyers of England Database, 973–1086 35

3. Onomastic Patterns in the Late Anglo-Saxon Moneyers 39
Introduction 39
Inheritance in Late Anglo-Saxon England 39
Moneyer Groups as Families 40
Onomastic Trends in the MED 44
Case Study 1: The [Brun-] Name Sequence 48
Case Study 2: The [Os-] Name Sequence 48
Case Study 3: The [Deor-] Name Sequence 49
Case Study 4: The [Eald-] Name Sequence 49
Case Study 5: The [Gold-] Name Sequence 49
Case Study 6: The [Theod-] Name Sequence 50
The Primary Name Sequences of London 50
Name Sequence Variation in the London and Southwark Mints 50
The [Ælf-] Name Sequence in London 52
The [Æthel-] Name Sequence in London 53
The [Beorht-] Name Sequence in London 54
The [Ead-] Name Sequence in London 55
The [God-] Name Sequence in London 57
The [Leof-] Name Sequence in London 58
The [Wulf-] Name Sequence in London 59
The Southwark Mint 61
Conclusion 61

4. The Moneyers and Mints of Late Anglo-Saxon England 63
Mint Classification and Name Sequence Organisation 63

5. Moneyer Grouping Patterns in Anglo-Saxon Mints 111
Moneyers Operating in Groups within the London Mint 111
The 'Stair-Step' Pattern of Moneyer Grouping 119

6. Organisational Structure of Late Anglo-Saxon Mints 127
Introduction 127
Moneyer Rotation Cycles 127
Theories and Possible Causes of this Rotation Cycle 132
Major Mints Summary 136
Minor Mints Summary 139

7. Conclusions, Limitations, and Future Implications 145
Introduction 145
Findings 145
Limitations of the Research 147
Future Implications 148
Final Thoughts 149

Bibliography 151
Primary Sources 151
Unpublished Material 151
Printed Material 151
Websites and Online Resources 151
Secondary Sources 152

Appendix 1 161

Supplementary data on moneyers and their coins, including Appendix 1 in graphical format, are available as an accompanying download.

Foreword

This is a weighty volume dealing with a weighty subject: the moneyers of later Anglo-Saxon England. Jeremy Piercy has written a rigorous account of this small yet influential segment of the population, visible primarily through the corpus of surviving silver pennies. His work is an important resource for all those interested in Anglo-Saxon society, and not just because of the scale of the numismatic corpus: Jeremy also interrogates the material in bold, imaginative ways, identifying possible families of moneyers who dominated mint-towns for generations.

What he offers here is nothing less than a glimpse of the urban elite of the tenth and eleventh centuries. That glimpse is tantalising in its implications, and like all good scholarship invites more questions. How, for instance, did moneyers generate custom? On what basis did the mass of the population – which would, of course, have been for the most part peasants in the countryside – interact with the makers and exchangers of new coin at their mint-place of choice? And who, indeed, made that choice? Familial or social blocs of moneyers might be part of the answer, in that they could constitute part of larger constellations of patronage, extending upwards and downwards, and indeed sideways via horizontal ties. The way forward may lurk in large-scale comparison of the coinage with figures recorded in late Anglo-Saxon documents from areas rich in charters (such as Kent or the west midlands), or in Domesday Book.

Jeremy Piercy's study equips scholars with a model for how to deal with a challenging part of that evidence: the coinage. The results of this study will be a core pillar of future research, using the coinage to reveal how late Anglo-Saxon England really worked. Its great strength is that it envisages a coinage embedded organisationally in the world around it – not as a free-floating entity abstracted from economic and social realities of the day. This is exactly the approach that serious scholarship on the coinage needs to adopt more widely.

Rory Naismith

Abstract

This book examines one labourer group within developing urban society in England during the tenth and eleventh centuries in order to address both its status and whether the internal workplace organisation of this group might reflect on the complexity of an Anglo-Saxon 'state'. In reviewing the minting operation of late Anglo-Saxon England, and the men in charge of those mints a better picture of the social history of pre-Conquest England is realised. These men, the moneyers responsible for producing the king's coinage, were likely part of the thegnly or burgess class and how they organised themselves might reflect broader trends in how those outside of the aristocracy acted in response to royal directives. In order to address this, a database combining information from multiple catalogues, coin cabinets, and online repositories was developed and is presented in the appendix as well as the downloadable supplemental materials. Titled the *Moneyers of England Database, 973–1086,* it consists of 3,646 periods of moneyer activity, derived from 28,576 individual coins produced at ninety-nine geographic locations.

Chapters three through six provide potential uses for the database through two different types of study. Chapters three and four argue that the mints were primarily controlled and operated by families. Pointing to the repetition of the protothemes amongst the moneyers on a large scale across nearly all the mint locations known from the 970s to 1086, the text argues that the mints were dominated by a few select families that maintained authority through wars and conquests. Chapters five and six present two new theories on late Anglo-Saxon mint organisation. The first theory is that groups of moneyers would begin and end activity within the mints together, most often within family units, but regularly in conjunction with other minting families in the same location. The second theory is that these groups would operate in rotation. The moneyers would operate for a set period of time, then withdraw in favour of another member of their dynastic group, before returning to activity at a later date. The book concludes that this was potentially, if not likely, in response to royal imposition on the mints restricting the number of coinages that a moneyer could be responsible for, and take profit on, consecutively.

The book is structured with a brief introduction and literature review, inclusive of discussion on the status of the moneyers and the concept of an Anglo-Saxon 'state', followed by a methodological section that outlines the creation of the *Moneyers of England Database, 973–1086*, as well as the limitations in the source material. This is followed by two analysis sections and the conclusion. The database is presented in the appendix along with nine maps and general information about the corpus. There are also four supplemental material downloads available with the book. The first is an organisation of the coinage record supporting the identification of the moneyers by mint. The second is the raw database information in a manipulatable format for independent research. A large format diagram of all 425 moneyers in operation in London between 973 and 1086 is the third supplement and the tabular and graphical results of the analyses found in the latter sections of the book are presented in full in the fourth.

1

Introduction

Who were the Moneyers and what was their status?

> *Godwinus Socche fuit tempore Regis Edwardi magister monetarius, et tenuit unam domum de feudo Episcopi Winton.*[1]

Claiming that a single mention of a 'master-moneyer' from one line of the Winton Domesday, itself compiled a generation after the Norman Conquest, provides support for an extraordinary level of organisation within the mints of late Anglo-Saxon England is admittedly a difficult proposition. And yet, the line does exist. There must be a reason that of the nearly 20 moneyers noted in the *c*.1110 survey, only Godwine Socche, or possibly Godwine Ceoc, is labelled a 'master' moneyer.[2] Was this a true indicator of Godwine's status *TRE*, as noted within the survey, or had his status changed post-Conquest to include a differentiation from his fellow minters? Is this just a step in the long process of moneyers first appearing on coins in the time of Offa to their eventual disappearance from the coinage after the final consolidation of minting into the predecessor of the Royal Mint in 1278?[3] Who were the moneyers and how did they structure their mints at the end of the Anglo-Saxon era? In order to address these questions, a means of studying the moneyers as a collective group must first be established. But, before that, just what is already known about the moneyers?

This study aims to address some aspects of the status of the moneyers and how they structured their minting practice through the creation of a central point of reference and analysis of that material. Moneyers appear in miracle stories which occasionally provide a view of their life not readily apparent from the other extant sources. For example, a story in *Translatio et Miracula S. Swithuni* written by Lantfred after the saint's translation to Winchester in 971, describes a moneyer with great wealth, servants, treasure, and a large house.[4] The miracle story of Deorman of London in *De Miraculis Sancti Ædmundi* outlines that this man, whom Simon Yarrow equates to Deorman the moneyer, was a man of great wealth, 'who stood out among other businessmen, for the costly silk and splendid robes he wore'.[5] Another story, from Goscelin's *Miracles of St Augustine*, describes a group of men, a father and two sons, all moneyers, moving from Canterbury to Bath looking for work in the mints.[6] Two moneyers of similar name to those mentioned in the story, Æthelred and Sired, are documented on the coinages in Canterbury around this same time.[7] While it is not clear that these were the same individuals as those mentioned by Goscelin, the implication that families of moneyers existed is clear.

There are also several moneyer-related items from Domesday that shed light on who these men were in relation to the society around them. Certainly, they were not common workmen, but it is equally certain that they were not part of the aristocracy, at least not generally, because of the lack of written records of their lives.[8] In short, the moneyers were the men in control of the mints that produced the king's coinage and beyond the characterisations below, not a lot is known about them, the social circles that they moved in, or how they operated. They have always been something of a special case, in being neither peasant nor noble, they represent a junction between those two large social bodies.[9] Some of the

[1] H. Ellis, 1816, *Libri censualis vocati Domesday Book, additamenta ex codic antiquiss: Exon Domesday, Inquisitio Eliensis, Liber Winton, Boldon Book*, London, 533; M. Biddle, 1976, *Winchester in the Early Middle Ages, an edition and discussion of the Winton Domesday*, Oxford, translation at 36, discussion at 421–22.

[2] M. Biddle, 2012, *Winchester Studies 8: The Winchester Mint and Coins and Related Finds from the Excavations of 1961–71*, Oxford, 581–2, n. 2.

[3] G. C. Brooke, 1931, 'The Medieval Moneyers', *BNJ* 21, 59–66 at 66.

[4] Lantfred, Translatio Miracula S. Swithuni, in M. Lapidge, ed., 2003, *Winchester Studies 4: The Cult of St Swithun*, Oxford, 267–75.

[5] Abbot Samson, De Miraculis Sancti Ædmundi, in T. Arnold, ed., 2012, *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, Volume 1, London, 107–208 at 183. *Inter quos quidam praedives a urbis Londonie, Deormannus, affuit, qui prae ceteris negotiatoribus in caris speciebus et sericis et cycladibus splendidus et egregius mercator effulsit*. S. Yarrow, 2006, *Saints and their Communities: Miracle Stories in Twelfth-Century England*, Oxford, 58. Yarrow utilises Samson's *De Miraculis S. Ædmundi*, which was likely compiled at the end of the twelfth century. This makes provenance for the Deorman miracle story difficult, as the Deorman family was influential in London and beyond during the late 1100s. The contemporary local politics could have influenced the creation of this story. See also R. Pinner, 2015, *The Cult of St Edmund in Medieval East Anglia*, Woodbridge, 60.

[6] *Acta Sanctorum*, May, vi, 402. *Novit Cantuaria tres cives suos, quorum duo videntur germani, Wilfronius et Ælredus, tertius Ælredi silius Siredus, qui pari solertia et arte vitam alebant, et de inopia ad divitem sufficientiam excreverant.... In tali negotio venientes ad oppidum, quod a balneis calidis ibidem scaturientibus, Bathan Anglice nuncupatur, emptasque ex more copiosas arsuras, quas dicunt scopaturas, ad proximum flumen ferebant diluendas*. For discussion of the miracle story in detail see H. Tsurushima, 2012, 'The Moneyers of Kent in the Long Eleventh Century', in D. Roffe, ed., *The English and Their Legacy, 900–1200: Essays in Honour of Ann Williams*, Woodbridge, 33–59 at 37.

[7] Tsurushima, 2012, 37.

[8] While the 'special status' of moneyers is not in dispute, and is elaborated upon below, the lack of written records associated with their office and practice indicates that they likely moved in different social circles to ecclesiastic officials, royal agents, and the large land holding aristocracy, making their classification difficult, even if they shared some common privileges attributed to those other important groups. See: R. Naismith, 2017a, *Medieval European Coinage, Vol. 8: Britain and Ireland c. 400–1066*, Cambridge, 10–11.

[9] R. Ruding, 1840, *Annals of the Coinage of Britain and its Dependencies: from the earliest period of authentic history to the reign of Victoria*, Volume I, Third Edition, London, 48. See also R. Naismith, 2013b, 'London and its mint *c*. 880–1066: a preliminary survey', *BNJ* 83, 44–74 at 53–4.

earliest studies on the coinage of Anglo-Saxon England attempted to outline the unique position of the moneyer. In 1840, Ruding outlined the points in Domesday that framed the possible uniqueness of the moneyer office:[10]

- Some moneyers had tax-free housing.
- A moneyer may have been required to march with the sheriff or could pay a fee instead. It is not clear if military service was expected or if this was so that the sheriff had ready access to coin as needed.
- A moneyer was obligated to hammer coinage for the king upon his arrival at a mint, utilising the king's silver.
- Moneyers had sac and soc.
- When a moneyer died without a will their property devolved to the king.
- Moneyers paid rent to the king.
- Moneyers paid a fee at coinage renewals for the new dies from London. This fee was occasionally paid after the dies were received.

So, this states that moneyers were men of some authority within their local communities but were not by and large as important or as powerful as the local sheriff or reeve. According to Ruding, they were too numerous to be noble but could not be peasants or simple workmen because of the enormous responsibility they had and the trust that their name on the coinage was meant to instill into those taking the silver pennies from them.[11] Ruding's contemporary, Edward Hawkins, compiled a detailed list of the moneyers and descriptions of the different coinages produced in England in 1841, utilising Ruding's findings as a starting point in his own interpretation of the coinages.[12] Hawkins refers to Ruding's work as the history of the coinage, while his own work is the history of the coins themselves, making notes on hoard discoveries and coin types.[13] Perhaps, due to the marked increase in hoard discovery during industrialization, later historians and numismatists disputed some aspects of the certainty provided in the reasoning of Ruding.[14] In 1885, J. Drummond Robertson referred to Ruding's descriptions as too vague and sought to solidify the standing of later moneyers through the use of the Pipe Rolls, noting that several moneyers were also Bailiffs in Gloucester in the thirteenth century.[15] Drummond Robertson also noted that in the Registers of the Abbey of Gloucester these moneyers acted as witnesses in 'almost every document' and in a few occurred as principals.[16] Drummond Robertson speculated that the status of the moneyers may have been influenced by the French. He refers to Ernst Dumas' writing from 1868 that in 864 it was recorded that 'no one could be a master moneyer unless he were descended from the old coiners, who were men of gentle blood, and privileged to dine at the king's table'.[17] Dumas goes further in the lines following to state that this measure of control (from progenitor to descendant) in the position of moneyer is what allowed the moneyers of Rouen to maintain control of their craft and keep others out for nine centuries, with few exceptions.[18] Drummond Roberston's final characterisation of the moneyers disputes Ruding's findings, noting that Henry II, in utilising a French artist in his reorganisation of the coinage in 1180, established a 'superior rank of men holding the office' than would have existed at the time of Domesday.[19] If one takes Dumas' characterization of the Rouen moneyers at face value, however, it would seem that at the very least the Normans would have had knowledge of this sort of process when they reached English shores. Taking this reasoning a step further, it is also evident that Normans were present in London, with special privileges, during the latter years of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom and could have transferred minting knowledge in this period as well, long before Henry II's 1180 reform.[20] Another criticism of Ruding's outline of the moneyers is in the realisation that not all moneyers would have needed to travel to London in order to purchase a new die. Several studies suggest that the dies utilised in the hammering of coins were made regionally, thus making frequent travel to London unnecessary. For example, Peake suggested as early as 1893 that an original die was produced in London and that copies were made regionally.[21] Further discussion of the regional die hypothesis is in the section on die-links below. Other points of contention with regards to the utilisation of Ruding's classifications on the status of the moneyers have developed into debates within the numismatic field.

[10] Ruding, 1840, 49. While not explicitly stated, it would appear Ruding was using Ellis's 1816 *Boldon Book* for some of his research into Domesday as he references it specifically on page 1 in reference to the use of *pecunia* in the text.

[11] Ruding, 1840, 48.

[12] E. Hawkins, 1841, *The Silver Coins of England Arranged and Described with Remarks on British Money, Previous to the Saxon Dynasties*, London.

[13] Hawkins, 1841, 2.

[14] E. Hawkins, 1887, *The Silver Coins of England Arranged and Described with Remarks on British Money, Previous to the Saxon Dynasties,* Second Edition, London, iii–vi. The second edition of this book, published by the author's grandson, still lists it as the predominant 'handbook' on English silver coinage but acknowledges that a great deal of additional information had been uncovered through 'numerous disturbances of the soil caused by building and other operations'. This publication followed Hildebrand's, which, being published in Swedish, is acknowledged but noted as unhelpful for the current study.

[15] J. Drummond Robertson, 1885, 'The Status of the Anglo-Norman Moneyer', *NC* 5 (Third Series), 209–12 at 210.

[16] Drummond Robertson, 1885, 210.

[17] Drummond Robertson, 1885, 212.

[18] E. Dumas, 1868, *Notes sur l'émission en France des monnaies décimales de bronze (1852-1865)*, Paris, 39 n.1. Dumas does not provide a source for this information. Dès 861, les monnayeurs possédaient cet exorbitant privilége, que nul ne pouvait être reçu maître s'il ne descendait de la race des anciens monnayeurs, gentilshommes commensaux de la table du roi. C'est ce qui explique comment les monnayeurs de Rouen conservèrent cet état dans leurs familles, exclusivement à toutes autres, pendant plus de neuf siècles. Cette loi ne souffrit que des exceptions rares et dans des circonstances particulières. Full text available at the Hathi Trust Digital Library, https://babel.hathitrust.org, Accessed 11 October 2017.

[19] Drummond Robertson, 1885, 212.

[20] J. Green, 2017, *Forging the Kingdom: Power in English Society, 973–1189*, Cambridge, 200. Green notes that there were Normans in London with special legal privileges during the reign of Æthelred II. This, perhaps not coincidentally, is the period in which the coinage reforms of Edgar from the mid-970s solidified into periodic type changes, which would, more than anything else, make the late Anglo-Saxon coinage distinct.

[21] A. E. Packe, 1893, 'The Coinage of the Norman Kings', *NC* 13, 129–45 at 130; P. W. P. Carlyon-Britton, 1905a, 'A Numismatic History of the Reigns of William I and II (1066–1100)', *BNJ* 2, 87–184 at 91.

For example, taking Ruding's work a step further in 1901, Walter Andrew published a monumental article, 502 pages in length and taking up an entire volume of the *Numismatic Chronicle*, in which he outlined, using evidence from Domesday, two theories for mint operation.[22] His first theory was that the mints were allocated by the king for his direct service or farmed to a local lord.[23] His second theory, which proved to be the more controversial, was that those mints farmed to local lords could only be active when the lord was physically present in the relevant mint-place.[24] He developed these theories in light of the sporadic reporting of mint dues within Domesday and the then limited supply of Anglo-Saxon coinage finds for certain locales. His theories received harsh criticism, especially and most prominently in the form of a five-page rebuttal article published the following year in which C. G. Crump and C. Johnson state that Andrew's work contained no concrete historical evidence and was in effect 'bad history'.[25] The article concludes with an acknowledgement that Andrew was attempting to readdress Ruding's work in a modern context but that such work would be better served by being undertaken by a numismatist with 'a knowledge of history' instead.[26] The fallout of this harsh response to his work would cause an irreparable rift in the Royal Numismatic Society. Andrew resigned and within months the society had split into two distinct groups: the Royal Numismatic Society and the British Numismatic Society.[27] The details of this split stem most directly from the publication of Crump and Johnson's rebuttal to Andrew.[28] Carlyon-Britton and Lawrence, both prominent members of the Society, protested the editors' decision to publish the letter on the grounds that the paper had not been delivered to the Society at a regular meeting, that the writers were not members of the Society, and that they clearly stated that they had no knowledge of numismatics.[29] This was followed by several months of infighting over procedure and editorial misconduct. The editors also refused a rebuttal from Andrew to the Crump article. Following these incidences and some problems with Societal Council elections, Carlyon-Britton, Lawrence, and others established the British Numismatic Society in November 1903, electing Carlyon-Britton as its first President.[30]

Several decades later, D. M. Metcalf would outline Andrew's work as still the only firm attempt at solving the historical questions the coinage of Henry I raises about the moneyers (outside a two-page summary provided by Adolphus Ballard in 1904).[31] He also stated that Crump and Johnson failed to actually disprove the hypotheses Andrew put forth, but that subsequent research and coin finds over the intermittent 80 years had provided ample examples to dispute the theories put forth in 1901.[32] So, this intervening period saw the development of several theories on the status of the moneyer without any real movement beyond the original list developed from Domesday in 1840 by Ruding. A notable exception to this, and one stated by Mark Blackburn to have 'stultified further research for more than sixty years' was George Brooke's introduction to the British Museum Catalogue of the Norman kings' coins.[33] In Brooke's work he outlines the continuation of Anglo-Saxon minting practices after the Norman Conquest and goes into some detail on what was at the time known about the role of the moneyer.[34] The listing provided by Brooke is effectively Ruding's list with more detail, thus perpetuating the same characteristics outlined in the first half of the nineteenth century.[35] This acknowledgement of the continuation of Anglo-Saxon minting practices as continuing virtually unchanged through the Norman Conquest and the reigns of the first Norman kings is reiterated in recent scholarship. In the modern era, Ruding's list of moneyer characteristics has seen continued support generally, with the exceptions regarding its rigidity noted above, but with very little elucidation beyond the initial list. The idea of the moneyers as being part of a special, thegnly class, for example, has been espoused by several historians. As early as 1981, Loyn noted that the names found in coin epigraphy parallel name patterns associated with thegns.[36] In 1982, Pamela Nightingale produced a lineage of a twelfth century London moneyer, Deorman, and his family, highlighting the high social status he and his descendants held within the city.[37] Scholarship has continued to acknowledge the special status of the moneyers with some studies seeking to correlate the names on the coins with the written records of the time, thus providing further evidence of their status. In 1988, Ian Stewart set out to connect a moneyer to a

[22] W. J. Andrew, 1901, 'A Numismatic History of the Reign of Henry I. (1100–1135)', *NC* 1 (Fourth Series), 1901, 1–502.
[23] Andrew, 1901, 12, 16, 22, 27, and 29.
[24] Andrew, 1901, 230, 254 and 262.
[25] C. G. Crump and C. Johnson, 1902, 'Notes on "A Numismatic History of the Reign of Henry I" by W. J. Andrew', *NC* 2 (Fourth Series), 372–77 at 373.
[26] Crump, 1902, 376.
[27] R. A. G. Carson, 1976, 'A history of the Royal Numismatic Society', *NC* 16 (Seventh Series), xii–xv.
[28] Carson, 1976, xiii.
[29] Carson, 1976, xiii.
[30] Carson, 1976, xiv.

[31] D. M. Metcalf, 'The taxation of moneyers under Edward the Confessor and in 1086', in *Domesday Studies: Papers read at the Novocentenary Conference of the Royal Historical Society and the Institute of British Geographers, Winchester, Woodbridge, 1986*, 279–93 at 279–80.
[32] Metcalf, 1986, 281.
[33] M. A. S. Blackburn, 1990, 'Coinage and Currency Under Henry I: A Review', in M. Chibnall, ed., *Anglo-Norman Studies XIII. Proceedings of the Battle Conference*, 49–82 at 49.
[34] C. E. Brooke, 1916, *A Catalogue of English Coins in the British Museum: the Norman Kings*, 2 vols., London, xii.
[35] Brooke, 1916, cxli–cxlii. Brooke pointed out the specific instances of moneyers having the privileges in Domesday that Ruding outlined earlier. While Ruding noted that the moneyer at Oxford had a free house, Brooke also includes moneyers from Wallingford and York. Brooke also notes that the translation of *liber* by Ruding as 'free' may not be so clearcut and that this may simply indicate certain privileges associated with the house and not the house itself. Considering that the house at Wallingford was provided to the moneyer for as long as he worked at the mint, it would appear that the provision of a house 'free' was implicit.
[36] H. R. Loyn, 1991, *Anglo-Saxon England and the Norman Conquest*, Second Edition, London, 125.
[37] P. Nightingale, 1982, 'Some London Moneyers and Reflections on the Organization of English Mints in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', *NC* 142, 34–50.

recorded thegn from a corresponding charter.[38] In his work, for the late Anglo-Saxon era he focused upon the moneyer Hunewine, a moneyer of Totnes, who had a long career and, according to Stewart, at some point was appointed a thegn, or *minister*, by Æthelred II.[39] David Roffe, in 2007, noted that the classifications given within Domesday, those outlined nearly two centuries before by Ruding, indicated that the moneyers held thegnly status.[40] Roffe does not refer to Ruding directly but does address the same points from Domesday, that some moneyers had sake and soke, were exempt from certain taxes, and in some instances were provided housing – all measures of thegnly status.[41] Roffe also notes that land owned by the moneyers of Nottingham was held in a separate fee by the crown and is evident in the annual Pipe Rolls in the late twelfth century, implying that this landholding status was already in place before the Pipe Rolls were recorded.[42] Biddle also pointed out that the Norman moneyers held burgess status and landholder rights, and that this status could have predated the Conquest.[43] In 2012, Martin Allen compiled a list of those moneyers that could be identified as aldermen or burgesses in the twelfth century, utilising Domesday, the Pipe Rolls, and the works of other scholars.[44]

We also know that the moneyers' forges were typically grouped and on the high street or in the commercial district close to the goldsmiths.[45] This seems reasonable in that there are some studies that suggest moneyers and goldsmiths were closely linked, and that some individuals potentially held both offices.[46] Moneyers, goldsmiths, and metal workers were also linked for more practical reasons, such as the need for centralized smelting facilities, which made access to fuel easier. Moneyers were also exchangers, taking in foreign currency and changing it for the king's silver, a practice that was regulated in 1103 by Henry I to restrict them from operating exchanges outside of their county, implying that the practice was widespread during the eleventh century.[47] Moneyers certainly maintained other offices after the Conquest.[48] From at least the early reign of Æthelred II the moneyers had workers operating under their supervision, thereby giving some credence to Godwine Ceoc's possible status as a 'master-moneyer'.[49] Moneyers seemed to operate their own mint-places as independent establishments.[50] This seems to have been regulated to some extent, even though the legislation supporting such regulation has not survived, because in the 1160s the moneyers of Winchester were fined for 'shared premises'.[51] Moneyers were also specialists in their craft. The moneyers were expert metallurgists and capable of manipulating the silver content of their coinages to exact detail. For example, in their study of debasement in the purity of silver coinage for the period 1009 to 1052, D. M. Metcalf and J. P. Northover found that moneyers were capable of maintaining specific percentages of silver content within the coinage alloys.[52] Metcalf and Northover stated that moneyers were able to bring a previously unexpected level of sophistication to the minting practice that goes beyond the skill of the sporadic individual because this expertise was evident in every mint across late Anglo-Saxon England.[53] The implication that the

[38] B. H. I. H. Stewart, 1988, '*Ministri* and *Monetarii*', in *Revue numismatique, 6e série - Tome 30, année*, 166–75.

[39] Stewart, 1988, 167. Stewart states that the unusual moneyer name Hunewine coincides with charters listing an individual of the same name at the same location in generally the same period of time. He makes the assumption that these two individuals are one and the same based on this information.

[40] D. Roffe, 2007, *Decoding Domesday*, Woodbridge, 121–22. Also: D. Roffe, 2012, 'Hidden Lives: English Lords in post-Conquest Lincolnshire and Beyond', in D. Roffe, ed., *The English and their Legacy, 900–1200: Essays in Honour of Ann Williams*, Woodbridge, 205–28 at 217–8. Roffe states that the moneyers may have served also as 'lawmen' or had similar status.

[41] Sake and soke refers to the right of the possessor to administer justice within a specific jurisdiction, most probably the relevant hundred. Sake and soke was common amongst the king's thegns and the moneyers having similar rights indicates similar status. For discussion on this and further definition see: J. Hudson, 2012, *The Oxford History of the Laws of England*, Volume 2, Oxford, 59–62.

[42] Roffe, 2007, 121 n. 66. Also: Nightingale, 1982, 38–9. Nightingale notes that Deorman held land as tenant-in-chief in Domesday.

[43] Biddle, 1976, 402, 421, 443–4.

[44] M. Allen, 2012a, *Mints and Money in Medieval England*, Cambridge, 5–8.

[45] Biddle, 1976, 400–5; Nightingale, 1982, 46.

[46] For discussion on the connections between moneyers and goldsmiths see D. J. Symons, 2006, 'The Moneyers of the Worcester Mint, 1066–1158: Some Thoughts and Comments', in B. Cook, ed., *Coinage and History in the North Sea World, c. AD 500–1250*, Leiden, 545–88 at 546–7.

[47] Symons, 2006, 547.

[48] Allen, 2012a, 8–9.

[49] IV Æthelred 9.1, in Felix Liebermann, 1883, 1905 (Reprint), *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen. Herausgegeben im Auftrage der Savigny-Stiftung*, Volume 1, Halle, 234–6. *Et illi habeant suboperarios suos in suo crimine, quod purum faciant et recti ponderis, per eandem witam quam prediximus*. 'And they shall be responsible for the production by their employees of pure money of the proper weight, under pain of incurring the same fine as we have fixed above.' Translation from R. S. Kinsey, 1960, 'Anglo-Saxon Law and Practice Relating to Mints and Moneyers', BNJ 29, 12–50 at 20. The idea that Godwine Socche and Godwine Ceoc are one and the same is also stated in H. Ellis, 1837, 'Note on Ruding's Annals', *Transactions of the Numismatic Society, The Numismatic Journal,* Vol. 2, 252–5 at 253 in which he states that Godwine and Ceoca from Ruding's work were the same individual. Ruding had labelled Godwine and Ceoca as two separate moneyers of Edward the Confessor, whereas Ellis noted that they were likely one moneyer named either Godwine Socche or Godwine Ceoca. See also: H. Ellis, 1836, 'Letter from Sir H. Ellis', in *Proceedings of the Numismatic Society*, 1837–8, London, 97–9 and R. Ruding, 1817, *Annals of the Coinage of Britain and its Dependencies: from the earliest period of authentic history to the reign of Victoria*, Volume I, First Edition, 398.

[50] P. W. P. Carlyon-Britton, 1909, 'A Numismatic History of the Reigns of William I and II (1066–1100)', Part II, *BNJ* 6, 147–76 at 163–4. This position, that moneyers likely operated in their own establishment with workers operating for them has been reiterated in J. D. Brand, 1984, *Periodic Change of Type in the Anglo-Saxon and Norman Periods,* Rochester, 45–50; D. M. Metcalf, 1987, 'A penny life will give you all the facts', *NC* 147, 184–8 at 187–8; B. H. I. H. Stewart, 1992, 'The English and Norman mints, c.600–1158', in C. E. Challis, ed., *A new history of the Royal Mint*, Cambridge, 1–82 at 59; Allen, 2012a, 1; Naismith, 2017a, 11 and 240.

[51] M. Allen, 2012b, 'The mints and moneyers of England and Wales, 1066–1158', *BNJ* 82, 54–120 at 56–7.

[52] D. M. Metcalf and J. P. Northover, 2002, 'Sporadic debasement in the English coinage, c.1009–1052', *NC* 162, 217–36.

[53] Metcalf, 2002, 220–4. Metcalf and Northover hypothesize that some of the differentiation in purity found between the east and west mints in England were the result of political events and were planned. The invasion by King Swein of Denmark in 1013 and his recognition as king by most of the west and then Oxford and Winchester provide the backdrop for a largescale debasement of coinage from those areas. Metcalf and Northover provide several different explanations but conclude that the most likely result was either a command from Swein to debase the coins

moneyers, who were probably of a class at least similar, if not equivalent, to thegns, were also experts at their craft and that every instance of minting in the period exhibited this implies a comprehensive level of training and skill. Also, the manipulation of the silver content in the coins was widespread, with regional differentiation possibly impacted by political events, implying communication and organisation.

In the centuries to come the organisation of the moneyers would cement itself into a far-reaching, centralised conglomeration that would regulate the coinage for the entire country.[54] The governing regulations of the mint were not particularly clear even into the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but the idea that they had built upon a longstanding tradition of internal rules and regulations is clear. The moneyers created a self-sustaining structure that Grierson would label as an 'international corporation', although he was unable to precisely label the mechanics of that incorporation.[55] But, aside from the knowledge that the moneyers organised into some kind of collective enterprise that was evident in later centuries, and that some moneyers would also be in other prominent government roles during subsequent monarchies, how do we get from the vague 'international corporation' to the Royal Mint?[56] What we are left with, then, is the list compiled by Ruding in the first half of the nineteenth century being more or less the same set of characteristics we have of the moneyers in the present. While the specific aspects of those characteristics have been questioned and debated, sometimes with wide-ranging implications for the field of numismatics as a whole, the underlying points remain the same. Moneyers were of a certain class that included privileges and rights normally associated with the thegnly or burgess class, but because of a lack of documentation in the written record, the implication is that they were of a different sort of *minister* than the typical thegn.[57] Scholarly pursuits of the minting practice of the late Anglo-Saxon system continue to describe the moneyers in generally the same way: these men were important, they had some rights and privileges, they may have been thegns or royal agents of some sort, they operated alone, or at least individually controlled a mint-place, they may have operated within the confines of a family structure, and we know they existed because we find their names on the coinages that they produced. That is how they have been described to a greater or lesser degree in most work on the coinage for nearly two centuries.[58] Obviously, this is not an indication of poor scholarship, if anything, the level of clarity that has been achieved from so little documentary evidence is astounding, but the lack of source material is a limiting factor.[59] If a central point of reference for all of the known moneyers operating from Edgar's Reform to the Domesday survey were available, would the picture of late Anglo-Saxon minting, and the status of the moneyers, become clearer?

As noted earlier, this study aims to address some aspects of the status of the moneyers and how they structured their minting practice through the creation of a central point of reference. The database itself is presented as part of the download package accompanying this book. Chapters five and six outline how the database can be used to determine the structure that the moneyers of late Anglo-Saxon England created. This structure was likely in response to royal authority which sought to impose more direct control upon the minters' monopoly of the hammering of the king's coinage. This resulted in groups of minters operating together before allowing another member of their dynasty, in conjunction with other minting groups, to take over and carry forward for a set period of time. This temporary replacement resulted in a pattern of rotation through which the individual, within the realms of feasibility with regard to extant material evidence, can be witnessed to act as moneyer, withdraw from the role, and then take up the role again at a future time, generally for an additional one or two coinage issues.

The cultural and political interaction of Anglo-Saxon and early Anglo-Norman moneyers with the crown, with their respective communities, and with society at large illustrates the depth of the minting endeavour in the British Isles. The mint structure, being complex in and of itself provides an example of the level of sophistication the Anglo-Saxon state had achieved by the end of the tenth century and prior to the Norman Conquest of 1066. But, in order to establish the mints as an indicator for the advanced status of the Anglo-Saxon state, the development of that state, and how the coinage produced within the mints facilitated that development, must be addressed. In outlining the historiography of the centralization of authority within pre-Norman England and highlighting the importance of the mints as a symbol of this centralization, a better picture

in the mints under his control, even though the coins themselves were still minted in Æthelred II's name using old dies. The problem with this conclusion is that it is not clear who benefitted from the debasement. Another option is that the breakdown in royal authority following the invasion led to moneyers acting independently in the debasement. While not stated in the article, it is conceivable that had this occurred, the moneyers would have benefitted most directly in that they would have been able to take in a larger amount of silver than they were returning in exchange and conceivably keep the excess themselves.

[54] C. E. Challis, 1978, *The Tudor coinage*, Manchester, 20.

[55] P. Grierson, 1975, *Numismatics*, Oxford, 100.

[56] Challis, 1978, 4–5.

[57] Naismith, 2017a, 242.

[58] This type of description, at least in its purest form, can be found recently in Naismith, 2017a, 240–3. Naismith outlines the moneyers as being of a special class, likely not in the same circles as other high-ranking officials. He utilises Biddle's survey of the Winton Domesday, Nightingale's account of Deorman of London, and the laws of the late Anglo-Saxon kings to outline the general status of the moneyers. Naismith also highlights the importance of die-links as potential uses for expanding our knowledge of the moneyers but acknowledges the limits of this source. Discussion of die-linking can be found below. The use of moneyer names as a point of onomastic study is a significant exception to this general line of discourse. Moneyer names have become an important source for personal and place-name studies. The use of moneyer names as a point of linguistic extrapolation for the possible inhabitants of Anglo-Saxon towns is discussed in chapter one.

[59] Moneyer name studies have been used to great effect in determining when certain coin types were produced and the order of types generally. The use of moneyer names as a source for the ordering of coinage types is discussed in detail in below.

of the significance of the mints, and the men in charge of them, can be developed.

Political and Economic Development in Anglo-Saxon England

The progression of urban development in Anglo-Saxon England and the resultant royal administrative structures have been the subject of much debate, as detailed below. Through study of the mint structure and the moneyers, perhaps a clearer picture of the complexity of the Anglo-Saxon state, and the models that were incorporated into the Danish and Norman administrations can be developed. The idea of an 'Anglo-Saxon state' is the subject of several different viewpoints on the development of pre-Norman English government and society. Was the level of governance in late Anglo-Saxon England exceptional? Did the economic reforms of Edgar and Æthelred II lead to a system that points to a royal authority that constituted something beyond the idea of normative monarchial power for the period? Or is the mint system indicative of an even more complex system that incorporated ideas of nationhood and ideology beyond simply the economic structures? In order to address these questions, the concept of the 'state' in Anglo-Saxon England, and how it has developed in scholarship, needs to be reviewed.

The concept of an Anglo-Saxon 'state' is supported most predominantly by the development of the coinage system in England from the period of Edgar's reform in the early 970s. Sawyer saw the coinage as the opportunity for a greater understanding of Anglo-Saxon England as a whole.[60] In his groundbreaking work he noted that coin evidence complements the information found in Domesday and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.[61] Decades later, Sawyer points to the ongoing studies of the coinage as realisation of that opportunity, giving elucidation on many aspects of late Anglo-Saxon administration.[62] Spufford, in 1988, argued that the influx of silver from Germany through trade led directly to the increase in urban development and the accompanying minting activity[63] This supported Sawyer's earlier assertions that native silver could not have supported the increase in minting and coinage in the late tenth century.[64] These conclusions also support recent work that argues for a 'customer driven' increase in minting for the period rather than purely political motivations.[65] The movement of silver from the Continent to England precipitated expansion of urban communities and the facilitation of money within those communities acted as a means of advancing the visible authority of the crown. The minting system and coinage of late Anglo-Saxon England provide evidence of a sophisticated administrative mechanism. Molyneaux recently combined work on the ideological, administrative, and economic strengths of Anglo-Saxon England and argued that these led to the formation of a cohesive kingdom of England in the late Anglo-Saxon period that has essentially remained intact to the present day.[66] But, alternative viewpoints on whether this was a deliberate effort, or a result of circumstance, are evident. As the mints are a focal point of this debate, and indeed the primary point of evidence in support of the concept of the Anglo-Saxon 'state', it is important to frame how the concept of that 'state' has developed in relation to minting in the tenth and eleventh centuries.

The idea of the Anglo-Saxon 'state' is most predominant in the work of James Campbell with several later historians supporting or disputing his assertions. Through a combination of ideological, administrative, and economic strengths, late Anglo-Saxon society developed a cohesive and complex political state according to Campbell.[67] Campbell based his conclusions on several different factors. First, he pointed to the hidage system outlined in Domesday as evidence of a sophisticated governmental structure.[68] This conclusion was based in part on the work of W. J. Corbett, who in 1900 made correlations between the number of hundreds in the ninth or tenth century County Hidage and Domesday.[69] Other support for Campbell's position that there was a sophisticated and complex government in late Anglo-Saxon England comes from his conclusion that large-scale projects such as Offa's Dyke could not have been constructed without the means of organizing and supplying 'many thousands of diggers'.[70] The concept of a national identity is also important to Campbell's position. Drawing on Reynolds and Wormald, Campbell points out that the inhabitants of England identified themselves as 'English' rather than 'Anglo-Saxon' or 'Saxon'.[71] Campbell also points to contemporary post-Conquest historians for support of the idea of a national identity, noting that the English were seen as inhabiting a distinct and defined *patria* in historical

[60] P. H. Sawyer, 1965, 'The wealth of England in the eleventh century', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (Fifth Series) 15, 145–64 at 148.
[61] Sawyer, 1965, 148–53.
[62] P. H. Sawyer, 1998, 214; idem, 2013, *The Wealth of Anglo-Saxon England*, Oxford.
[63] P. Spufford, 1988, *Money and its Use in Medieval Europe*, Cambridge, 74–9.
[64] Sawyer, 1965, 159.
[65] Naismith, 2017a, 13.

[66] G. Molyneaux, 2015, The Formation of the English Kingdom in the Tenth Century, Oxford, 1–9.
[67] J. Campbell, 1986, *Essays in Anglo-Saxon History*, London, 155–89; idem, 1987, 'Some agents and agencies of the late Anglo-Saxon state', in J. C. Holt, ed., *Domesday Studies: Papers Read at the Novocentenary Conference of the Royal Historical Society and the Institute of British Geographers, Winchester, 1986*, Woodbridge, 201–18.
[68] J. Campbell, 1995, 'The Late Anglo-Saxon State: A Maximal View', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 87, 39–65 at 40.
[69] Campbell, 1995, 41; W. J. Corbett, 1900, 'The Tribal Hidage', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 14, 187–230. Campbell points to some problems in Corbett's work, notably the latter's attempt to correlate the Tribal Hidage of the seventh or eighth century with the County Hidage of the ninth or tenth with tenuous connections. Campbell states that this, along with the implication that acceptance of the work would mean acceptance of 'large scale royal action', is why Corbett's work has been largely left out of contemporary scholarship on late Anglo-Saxon England.
[70] Campbell, 1995, 44.
[71] S. Reynolds, 1984, *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe*, Oxford, 266; eadem, 1985, 'What do we mean by "Anglo-Saxon" and "Anglo-Saxons"?', *Journal of British Studies* 24, 395–414 at 398; P. Wormald, 1994, 'Engla Lond: The Making of an Allegiance', *Journal of Historical Sociology* 7, 1–24.

BAR BRITISH SERIES 650

'This is an original piece of work which takes the study of late Anglo-Saxon moneyers to a new level.'

Prof. J.L. Bolton, Queen Mary University of London

'There are many discussions of moneyers and their part in the coinage, but this is by far the most sustained and important treatment of the topic in over thirty years, since E. A. Freeman's study of moneyers under Edward the Confessor in the 1980s.'

Dr. Rory Naismith, King's College London

'To my knowledge there are no existing works that catalogue and examine the moneyers of late Anglo-Saxon England as a group. This work not only furthers our understanding of late Anglo-Saxon mints and the activities of the moneyers, but it will also prepare the ground for future studies on moneyers, coinage and the economy. … This work will be of interest to historians and numismatists working on late Anglo-Saxon England as well as other parts of the early medieval world. In particular, it makes information about moneyers and mints accessible to those outside the field of numismatics.'

Dr Chelsea Shields-Más, SUNY

The book examines the moneyers, those men responsible for minting the king's coinage, within developing urban society in England during the tenth and eleventh centuries to address both their status and whether the internal workplace organisation of the mints might reflect the complexity of an Anglo-Saxon 'state'. In reviewing the minting operation of late Anglo-Saxon England, and the men in charge of those mints, a better picture of the social history of pre-Conquest England is realised. These men were likely part of the thegnly or burgess class and how they organised themselves might reflect broader trends in how those outside of the aristocracy acted in response to royal directives. The book outlines a new and innovative method of analysing the organisation of labour in Medieval England. These new techniques and methodologies provide support for a previously unknown level of complexity in English minting.

Accompanying the book are several digital downloads, including the *Moneyers of England Database, 973–1086*, consisting of information on 3,646 periods of moneyer activity derived from 28,576 individual coins produced at ninety-nine geographic locations.

Jeremy Piercy completed his PhD in History at the University of Edinburgh in 2018. His research is in medieval social and economic history with concentrations in Anglo-Saxon and Viking cultures. His work addresses the intersection of history, linguistics, numismatics, and material culture.

Printed in England

ISBN 978-1407-35374-6

9 781407 353746

www.barpublishing.com

BAR PUBLISHING