In addition to the above the author describes all the known varieties and, so far as the types of the reign are concerned, his monograph is complete. The paper is well illustrated with autotype reproductions of thirty-three coins representing the types, mules and principal varieties.

A Find of Coins of Stephen and Henry II. at Awbridge, near Romsey, by H. A. Grueber, F.S.A.

A careful record of a find of early coins is always a valuable contribution to our knowledge and, as I have before remarked, except that he usually ignores the importance of giving any weights of the coins, and this instance is no exception to his rule, Mr. Grueber's descriptions are excellent.

He tells us that "about three years ago a farm-house garden was being enlarged in the parish of Awbridge near Romsey, Hampshire, and in the removal of a laurel-hedge there were discovered, about two and a half feet below the surface, all close together as if they had been in a bag which had rotted, some silver coins, about 180 in number. The finder thought little of his discovery, and from time to time disposed of about 50 of the coins to his friends." Of the approximate total, 138, viz., 34 of Stephen and 104 of Henry II., were examined by Mr. Grueber, who describes them as "mostly in poor condition, partly from oxidation and partly from wear, so much so that there was scarcely a well-preserved specimen amongst the pieces of Stephen."

The types comprised:—Stephen, Hawkins 270, three coins, but all of the variety with reverse "double cross moline, with annulet at each end and in centre" reading *SANSON ON ANT* attributed to Southampton with a query; Hawkins 268, thirty coins and one variety which Mr. Grueber describes as:—

HUNTINGDON (?)

Obverse.— . ST ... EX. Head facing, crowned; sceptre on his left.

---

1 Mr. Grueber reads it "O HANT," but the old form H was then obsolete and the letter is clearly N.
Reverse.—**HiM . . . O**n·bvn: Double cross pommée, with annulet in centre; within quatrefoil fleured internally.

Henry II., one hundred and thirty-eight coins, all of Hawkins 285, but these, as the writer says, do not appear to call for any special remarks, although in this small hoard sixteen mints were represented.

Several of Mr. Grueber’s paragraphs are well worthy of repetition in full:

The three coins attributed to Southampton of the type given as Hawkins, No. 270 var. are similar to one described in the Linton find.¹ The Linton coin was said to have been disposed of in the Montagu sale, and was purchased for the National Collection; but this attribution would seem to be uncertain, if the coin itself is compared with the illustration in the Numismatic Chronicle. Whether the attribution of these coins to Southampton is correct, I am not at the present moment prepared to say, since **ANT** could as well be an abbreviation of **SANT** (St. Edmundsbury) as for **HANT** (Southampton). There is a coin of Henry II. in this hoard with the moneyer’s name **ZAN2VN**, who may be the same as the moneyer, supposed to be of Southampton, but unfortunately the mint-name is entirely obliterated.

Mr. Walters, who has seen the coin,² suggests that **ANT** is an abbreviation for **TANT** (Taunton), the A and T being combined. He also draws attention to the fact that Hawkins 270 is the only published type of Stephen known of Taunton.

It may interest Mr. Walters to know that there is documentary evidence to prove that Sansun, the moneyer, was a tenant of the Bishop of Winchester, who, of course, was closely connected with the town of Taunton.

The coin which I have ventured to give to Huntingdon is an interesting variety of Hawkins, No. 268, in having on the obverse the head only of the King, with the sceptre on his left instead of on his right, as in the case of the usual type. It is unfortunate that this interesting coin is so rubbed and clipped as to make the legends scarcely decipherable, and the mint-name somewhat doubtful, but the letters **H** and **N** are fairly clear, whilst the base of the **V** can just be traced. The moneyer’s name begins with the letters **IM**, but I am unable to suggest its completion.

¹ Numismatic Chronicle, 1883, p. 114.
² Sic. There were three.
Reviews.

The lettering on the obverse is still more indistinct than that on the reverse, but one seems to see traces of the letters STI on the right of the head, and EX on the left. . . . Besides having the sceptre on the King's left, the coin is of rude work, and the mint-mark on the reverse is not the usual cross pattée, but a cross pommée fitchée. It is unfortunate that the coin is not better preserved, as otherwise it might have supplied some important data both numismatic and historical.

One would have thought that this "rude work," coupled with the fact that the die has evidently been copied from a coin without reversal, supported my remark in Henry I. that the mint of Huntingdon ceased to exist coincidentally with the death of Henry, Prince of Scotland and Earl of Huntingdon, for it suggests the hand of a Scottish die-sinker, but Mr. Grueber evidently thinks otherwise as appears in his next paragraph. A very similar coin was issued at Carlisle during Earl Henry's tenure of that earldom.

Surely we all have had enough of Henry I.? I thought Mr. Grueber had, and I am sure I have. If only critics like Mr. Grueber would point out some of its many defects it would be interesting, but I am tired of correcting arm-chair criticism which the writer is too lazy to verify by reference to even ordinary authorities. Perhaps, if I now contrast what Mr. Grueber says with what he ought to have known, it may again point my previous remark that contributors to the Numismatic Chronicle would fain teach others what they know not themselves, and it may save a repetition of careless criticism. This is what he says, but the italics are mine:—

Mr. Andrew tells us that the mint of Huntingdon was in operation towards the end of the reign of Henry I. (1128-1131), during a portion of which time David King of Scotland, who was Earl of Huntingdon, was there, and held an inquiry touching the alleged treason of Geoffrey de Clinton, the King's justiciary for that county. Mr. Andrew further remarks that the mint was closed after the departure of David, in 1130, but was reopened in Stephen's time, probably by David's son, Prince Henry, Earl of Huntingdon, and ceased to exist coincidentally with his death. It would be very interesting to be able to connect these coins with Henry, Earl of Huntingdon, but that seems scarcely possible, if Mr. Andrew's theory holds good, that the mint was only in operation

1 Referring to the variety of Hawkins 268 previously described, and to an ordinary specimen of the same type and of the Huntingdon mint in the National collection.
when the lord of the manor was resident there, for the date at which I
would fix this issue, viz., during the last years of Stephen, would be
after the Earl's death or only shortly before, when he was certainly not
in this country. Henry, Earl of Huntingdon, was born in 1114, and
died in 1152. He was confirmed in his title as Earl by Stephen at
Carlisle, in 1136, and was in England during the years 1138–1140.
It was in this last year that he married Ada, daughter of Earl de
Warenne, and there is no record, so far as I am aware, of his ever
having again visited England.

In other words, my theory is to stand or fall on an incidental remark
of my own, that the mint of Huntingdon was opened and closed
coincidently with the advent and death of Earl Henry. Mr. Grueber
assigns the issue of the type in question to "the last years of Stephen,"
but so that he may close in his argument, defines these "years" to
"after the Earl's death or shortly before"; yet there was but an interval
of one year four months and thirteen days between the death of the
Earl and that of the King. Agreeing that Hawkins 268 was the last
type of Stephen's reign, we may safely assume that it was being issued
for at least two or three years prior to Earl Henry's decease, as the
usual period of issue of types had been extended to four or five years at
the close of the reign of Henry I., and although Stephen's decease was
an unforeseen circumstance, the extent of the issue of the type proves
that it had been in circulation for several years.

What I mean by arm-chair criticism is, that what Mr. Grueber
probably did was to refer to that excellent work, the Dictionary of
National Biography, as the method of least trouble. Now, the
Dictionary is content to record the life of Earl Henry until about the
year 1140, and then, owing no doubt to exigencies of space, cuts the
story short with a mere reference to his death. Mr. Grueber therefore
cuts his story short, and, because he is told no more, jumps to the con-
clusion that the Earl suddenly disappeared beyond our ken to Scotland.

In 1136 at Durham, not Carlisle as Mr. Grueber states, Henry
was invested with the earldoms of Carlisle, Huntingdon, Doncaster
(Norgate) and Northampton (Sir A.C. Lawrie).

In 1139 at the treaty of Durham, he received the earldom of
Northumberland, excepting Newcastle and Bamborough (Norgate,
Richard of Hexham, etc.). From this date the earldoms of Huntingdon
and Northampton were also claimed by his half-brother St. Liz, whilst
Henry was also a claimant to the honour of Bedford. In 1139, not
1140 as Mr. Grueber states, he married Ada de Warrenne (Lawrie).

Henry was English on his mother's side and inherited his earldoms
through her. So far from leaving this country for Scotland, he was the
most influential potentate in the North of England, residing usually at
his palace at Corbridge in Northumberland, but sometimes at Hunting-
don and Carlisle. With the exception of occasional visits to his father's
court, there is no record, so far as I am aware, of his ever having left
his earldoms; and the contemporary chronicler Ordericus tells us that
after his marriage "his close connection with the Normans and English
became permanent." We will now see what his record1 was when,
according to Mr. Grueber, "he was certainly not in this country."

1140. Earl Henry, accompanied by his countess, visits Stephen's
court. (Hexham.)

, At Newcastle executes a charter to the Church of Durham.
(Lawrie.)

1141. Executes a grant of lands to the Church of Durham.
(Lawrie.)

, Assists William Cumyn, who seized the Castle of Durham
and held the bishopric by force of arms. (Simeon; Lawrie.)

, Grants a charter of protection to the Church of Durham.
(Lawrie.)

, At Durham Castle grants several charters. (Lawrie.)

1142. Is concerned throughout the year in the troubles at Durham.
(Simeon; Lawrie.)

, Executes a charter at Berwick. (Lawrie.)

1143. Still concerned in the troubles of the Palatinate. (Simeon;
Lawrie.)

1144. Raises an army in Northumberland, ostensibly on behalf
of the elected bishop, and seizes Thornelaw Castle, but
is alleged to have secretly favoured Cumyn and refused
to surrender it to the Bishop. (Hexham; Simeon.)

1 There are many more similar records, but the following are sufficient for my present
purpose.