OR a detailed account of this mint we refer our readers to a paper by the present writer which is contained in vol. iv of this Journal, pp. 17–31.

The derivation of the name of Berkeley, its status as a royal market-town at the time of Domesday and before, the grant by Henry II. to Robert Fitzharding of Berkeley with all appurtenances as fully as they were held in the time of King Henry I. coupled with the specific mention of a market and a mint with its own moneyer (et monetam cum proprio monetario suo) are therein fully dealt with, and the few coins now existing which were struck at this mint are there specified.

It will therefore be sufficient to here mention that the only Anglo-Saxon coins of Berkeley now known to us consist of three specimens struck there under Edward the Confessor.

The coinage of Berkeley under our Norman Kings is even more poorly represented, as the only specimen that has come to our knowledge is a penny of Type VIII of William I. of the variety Hawkins 242.

It reads:—

* PILLELM REX.*

* LIPINE ON BAREI. * Plate XIII, Fig. 1.
This ancient city and sea-port is situate on the Lower Avon and its tributary the Frome, and although since the time of Edward III. a county of itself, it is as to the older portion of it geographically within Gloucestershire and the old kingdom of Mercia, at the extreme south-western corner, only divided from Somerset, and consequently from Wessex, by the river Avon. The river was spanned in even Saxon times by a bridge, a circumstance which, as will be seen, was the origin of the name of the city. At an early date the town had spread considerably on the Wessex side.

Antiquaries from the time of Camden have identified the site with the Caer Brito, or Cair Britoc, of Nennius, an eighth century scribe, and the antiquity and importance of the city are much insisted upon by its historian, William Barrett, F.S.A., who completed his work in 1789. The ancient camps at Clifton and Rownham Hill, on the heights on either side of the gorge of the Avon, testify to a very early occupation of the immediate neighbourhood, as also do many finds of Roman coins, but we are unable to see any connexion between the designation Caer Brito and the present place-name of Bristol.

Our earliest coins of this town are of Æthelraed II., and pieces struck there under all of his Saxon, Danish and Norman successors are in evidence in our cabinets of to-day. The mint-name indicated by all of them from Æthelraed II. to Harold II. inclusive, is clearly Bristow or Brigstow, which can only denote, A.-S., Brig, a bridge, and stow, a place, dwelling-place, habitation.

Under William I. an alternative form Bristol is introduced, which would appear to indicate, A.-S., bricg, a bridge, and stol, a stool, seat or throne. Both forms are in evidence on coins of Edward IV. struck at Bristol, whereon Villa Bristow and Villa Brystoll appear. Although the later form is that by which the city is now generally known, the writer has heard it called by the country-folk of the neighbourhood Brister, which seems to point to the preservation of the earlier name Bristow, i.e., Brigstow.

Bristol, whatever its earlier history, would therefore seem to have come into prominence in the time of Æthelraed II., a time when its port
and its ships would be of particular value in connexion with the measures taken to repel the invasions of the Danes. Owing to its situation the town was of the first importance from the military and trading points of view, connected as it is by the Avon with the Severn and Bristol Channel. As we might expect, it had, at an early date, a trade with Ireland, one of the imports, as in the case of Chester, being the skins of the marten, then abundant in that country. During the troubles that arose in 1051 between Earl Godwine and his sons on the one hand and Edward the Confessor on the other, Earl Harold, afterwards the second king of that name, withdrew to Bristol and thence to Ireland and later, in 1067, one of his sons came thither from Ireland with a naval force. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle narrates:

"They then went to Bristol, and would storm the town, but the townsmen fought stoutly against them; and when they could gather nothing from the town, they went to the ships with the plunder they had taken; and so they went to Somersetshire, and there landed. And Eadnoth the Stallere fought against them, and was there slain, and many good men on each side; and those that were left went away thence."

The entries in Domesday as to Bristol are not so full as we would wish. It does not share with Gloucester and Winchcombe the honour of a separate account at the head of the survey, but under the heading Terra Regis we have an entry, of which the following is a translation:

"In Bertune (Barton Regis) at Bristou (Bristol) there were six hides. In the demesne three ploughs and twenty-two villeins and twenty-five bordarii with twenty-five ploughs. There are nine serfs and eighteen coliberti having fourteen ploughs. There are two mills of twenty-seven shillings. When Roger received this manor from the king he found there two hides and two ploughs in demesne and seventeen villeins and twenty-four bordarii with twenty-one ploughs. There are four serfs and thirteen coliberti with three ploughs. In one member of this manor, Manegodesfelle (Mangotsfield) there are six oxen in demesne. Of this land the church of Bristou (Bristol) holds three hides and has one plough there. One Radchenistre holds one hide and has one plough and four bordarii with one plough. This manor and Bristou (Bristol) render to the king one hundred and ten marks of silver. The burgesses say what bishop G. (Geoffrey de Mowbray, Bishop of Coutances) has, (namely) thirty-three marks of silver and one mark of gold on account of the king's firma."
This entry so far as it concerns Bristol appears to contain only indirect information: we must assume that the account of Bristol itself, as a borough, is omitted from the survey, in the same manner as are omitted the accounts of Hastings, Hythe, London, Romney, Tamworth and Winchester.

But the payment to Bishop Geoffrey shows that he received the third penny of the borough, as would the earl of a county, and that the remaining two-thirds of the firma were received by the king.

As the entire firma paid by the burgesses was 110 marks of silver, and the part taken by Bishop Geoffrey was 33 marks of silver and one mark of gold, we infer that a mark of gold was equal to $3\frac{3}{8}$ marks of silver, in other figures about £2 8s. 10d.

We may, we think, also assume that the minting rights were vested in the burgesses and that the firma shared by the King and the Bishop included the payment by the burgesses therefor.

In 1088 Bishop Geoffrey, and his kinsman Robert de Mowbray, were supporters of Bishop Odo in his rebellion against William II. in favour of Robert, Duke of Normandy.

The plot was formed in Lent, and put into active execution at Easter, when in the words of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle:

“... They went and ravaged, and burned, and laid waste the king’s farm-vills, and laid waste the lands of all the men who remained faithful to the king. And each of them went to his castle, and manned it, and provisioned it as best he could; and Bishop Geoffrey and Robert de Mowbray went to Bristol, and harried, and brought the booty to the castle. And afterwards they went out from the castle and ravaged Bath and all the land thereabout, and all the district of Berkeley they laid waste...”

After the suppression of this rebellion, Robert Fitzhamon, a strong supporter of Rufus, was in or about the year 1090 granted the city of Gloucester and the lordship of Bristol, where he was placed in the position which Bishop Geoffrey had held.

These events did not interrupt the coinage at Bristol, as Types 1 and 2 of William II. are in evidence.

We think, therefore, that the minting rights of the burgesses were not affected, and that a continuous coinage at Bristol under William I.
THE BERKELEY MINT.

WILLIAM I. FIGURES 2 TO 18.
WILLIAM II. FIGURES 19 TO 25.
and II. was in operation. The specimens we have noted confirm this
deduction, as Type II of William I. is the only issue of which no
example from this mint has come to our notice, but there is no reason,
in our opinion, why this gap in the series should not one day be
supplied.

**William I.**

Type I:—

* * LEORL ON BRIESTOL, Plate XIII, Fig. 2.
  * LEORL ON BRIESTOL, Plate XIII, Fig. 3.
  * LIFPINE ON BRIESTOL, Montagu, 1896, Lot 181.

Type II:—

No example hitherto noted.

Type III:—

† * LEORL ON BRVELES, from Murdoch sale, Lot 179.
  Illustrated, vol. ii, Plate II,
  Fig. 23, and Plate XIII,
  Fig. 4.

* " " " BRVELES, W. Sharp Ogden, from the
  Whitchurch Common Find.
  * LIFPINE ON BRIG.

Type IV:—

* LIFPINE ON BRI, Murdoch sale, Lot 182.
  " " " BRI,
  " " " BRIG, Plate XIII, Fig. 5.

Type V:—

† * LAREL ON BRIE, from L. A. Lawrence sale, Lot 55,
  Plate XIII, Fig. 6.

* LIFPINE ON BRILST, W. C. Wells, var., pellet in the 1st
  quarter of the quadrilateral orna-
  ment. Illustrated, vol. ii, Plate II,
  Fig. 38.

† * HPATEMAN ON BRI, Plate XIII, Fig. 7.

* LIFPINE ON BRIES.

† * LIFPINE ON BRIE, another, Lieut.-Col. H. W. Morrieson.
  Plate XIII, Fig. 8.

Type VI:—

* BRIHTPORD ON BRIE, Cuff, Lot 712.
  * LIFPINE ON BRIE.
  * " " " BRIELSI, Plate XIII, Fig. 9.
Type VII:—

* BRIHTPORD ON BR, sale at Sotheby’s, Jan., 1857, Lot 6.

Type VIII:—

† * BRIHTPORD ON BRIE, Beaworth, 23; Tamworth, 1, †Plate XIII, Fig. 10.

† * OMBRIE, Beaworth, 20, †Plate XIII, Fig. 11.

† * BRIHTPORD ON BRIE, Beaworth, 2.

† * BRPODE ON BRIE II, Beaworth, 12, †Plate XIII, Fig. 12.

† * BRIHTPORD ON BRIE,

* BRENSTAN ON BR

* OMBR

* ON BRI

† ON BRI

† BRIEST, Beaworth, 15, †Plate XIII, Fig. 13.

* BRIE, Beaworth, 5.

† BRIE, Beaworth, 32.

* BRIE, Beaworth, 9.

* BRIEII.

† BRIEII, Beaworth, 30, †Plate XIII, Fig. 14.

† OMBRII, another, W. C. Wells.

† EDPOLD ON BR SOP.

† LIPFINE ON BRIEII, Beaworth, 3, †Plate XIII, Fig. 15.

* BRIST, Beaworth, 3.

† SPECN ON BRIESTO, Beaworth, 21, †Plate XIII, Figs. 16 and 17 (different dies).

* SPEIN ON BRIE, Allen, Lot 302.

† SPEIN ON BRIEII, Beaworth, 18, †Plate XIII, Fig. 18.

WILLIAM II.

Type 1:—

* BRIHTPORD ON BRIE, Tamworth Find, Plate XIII, Fig. 19.


Type 2:—

* BRIHTPORD ON BRIE, Tamworth Find.

† BRIEST, Plate XIII, Fig. 21.

* SP[GN ON [BRIE]T, Tamworth Find.
The Bristol Mint.

Type 3:—

* ÆVRELT ON BRICIS, H. M. Reynolds. Illustrated, vol. ii, page 175, Fig. 5, and Plate XIII, Fig. 22.

Type 4:—

* BIHTPORD ON BRI, the late Sir John Evans.
* SMIPU ON BRICIS, Lieut.-Col. H. W. Morrieson. Illustrated, vol. ii, Plate IV, Fig. 78, and Plate XIII, Fig. 23.

Type 5:—

† * LIPPIE ON BRI, Illustrated, vol. ii, Plate IV, Fig. 85, and Plate XIII, Fig. 24.
† * SINOT ON BRIE, from Rashleigh, Lot 398, Plate XIII Fig. 25.

Gloucester:—D.B. Glosecestre.

This, the ancient county town of the shire to which it gives its name, is without doubt the Cair Gloui of Nennius. In the Itinerary of Antoninus it is called Glevum Colonia. The derivation is therefore Celtic, and signifies "the fair city," the Anglo-Saxon ceaster having been substituted for the British cair, after its capture by the Saxons in A.D. 577.

As regards its numismatic history, this city has a record extending back to the time of Ælfred the Great, upon some very rare coins of whom the words AT HEAPP for "[struck] at Gloucester" appear.¹

The mint-name occurs on coins of Æthelstan, and upon those of Eadgar and of all his Saxon, Danish, and Norman successors.

Indeed it is probable that the issue was uninterrupted from the time of Ælfred, but few of the coins of Eadweard the Elder, Eadmund, Eadred, and Eadwig disclose their place of mintage, and this can only be inferred by comparison of the names of the moneyers appearing upon them with those coins of other kings, whereon the same names appear in conjunction with the name of a mint.

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records that Æthelflaed, Lady of the

¹ See British Museum Catalogue, vol. ii, Plate IV, Fig. 13. This specimen was long regarded as unique, but the author has a second example, presented to him by Mr. L. A. Lawrence.
Mercians, and daughter of Ælfred the Great, was buried in the east porch of St. Peter's Church at Gloucester, and that Æthelstan died there on the 27th October, 940 (really 939).

In 1058 Bishop Ealdred of Worcester hallowed the monastery at Gloucester, which he himself had raised to the glory of God and St. Peter, and on Sunday, the 15th July, 1100, the church which Abbot Serlo had built from the foundations at Gloucester was consecrated by the Bishops of Worcester, Rochester, Hereford, and Bangor.

From the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle we learn that William I. held his Christmas Court at Gloucester in the year 1085. The proceedings occupied five days, and afterwards the Archbishop and clergy had a synod which occupied three days. It was after this sitting of the Witan at Gloucester that the King held the Great Council at which the Domesday Survey was determined upon. From the same source we learn that William II., at Lent in 1093, was taken so ill at Gloucester that he was everywhere reported dead. After his recovery it was at Gloucester that Rufus summoned King Malcolm of Scotland. This summons was obeyed, but the monarchs parted in great hostility, and King Malcolm returned home to Scotland, only soon afterwards to be slain by Robert, Earl of Northumberland. William II. also held his Court at Christmas, 1094, at Gloucester, and it was here that he received messengers sent by his brother Robert, Duke of Normandy, to complain of the breach by the King of the terms of the agreement that had before been made and sworn to between them.

In the year 1099, Rufus again held his Court at Christmas in Gloucester. These events show us that Gloucester occupied a very important position under our Saxon and Norman sovereigns.

On turning to Domesday, we find the account of Gloucester inserted at the head of the survey before the list of tenants in chief and the schedule of the King's own possessions.

The following is a translation of an extract from the entry sufficient for our purpose:—

"In the time of King ÆEdward the city of Glowceestre (Gloucester) rendered thirty-six pounds by number and twelve sextaries of honey
by measure of the same burgh and thirty-six 'dickers of iron and one hundred iron rods capable of being hammered out thin for the nails of the King's ships and certain other small customs in the court and chamber of the King.

"Now the actual city renders to the King sixty pounds of twenty (pence) in the ora and from the mint the King has twenty pounds.

* * * * *

"There were sixteen houses where the castle is situate which now are wanting and in the borough of the city there are fourteen houses lying waste."

From this entry it is clear that at the time of Domesday the mint at Gloucester was in the King's hands, as he received a payment of £20 a year in respect of it.

Of the coinage of William I. at Gloucester, Type IV (1074–1077) and Types VI and VII (1080–1086) have not hitherto been noted.

Type VII of William I. should certainly be forthcoming, as we know that the King was actually at Gloucester during its time of issue, but this is the type of this King's money of which the smallest number of specimens has been preserved to us. The same remarks apply in their entirety to Type 5 of Rufus.

As regards his Type 1, which also is wanting, as we have the mule of that and the next type, it may be safely assumed that specimens of it will one day be discovered. Type 5, the last, of William II., is also absent. We, however, incline to the opinion that the coinage at Gloucester was continuous.

**WILLIAM I.**

Type I:—

* * ORDRIL ON GLEPELE, Plate XIV, Fig. 1.

Type II:—

* * ORDRIL ON GLEPELEI, pierced, York Find, 1845 (2).

Plate XIV, Fig. 2.

* SILAE ON GLEPELE, J. B. S. MacIlwaine, from Montagu, 1896, Lot 190.

† * PVLECEAT ON GLE, Illustrated, vol. ii, page 138, Fig. 6, and Plate XIV, Fig. 3.

1 a dicker = ton bars.
Type III:—

* • LIOFPINE ON CLEPEI, Plate XIV, Fig. 4.
* • PVLFQEAT ON CLEPEL, Plate XIV, Fig. 5.

Type IV:—

No example hitherto noted.

Type V:—

* • LIPINE ON CLEP, another, the late Sir John Evans
  * Plate XIV, Fig. 6.
* • SILEPEE ON CEPIL, a Gentleman, Nov. 1857, Lot 80.
† * • SILEPINE ON CLE, Plate XIV, Fig. 7.
* • PVLFQET ON CLEI.

Types VI and VII:—

No examples hitherto noted.

Type VIII:—

* • BRIHTNO© ON CLE, Beaworth, 5.
* " " " " GLP, Beaworth, 10.
† " " " " var., no ornament on the King's left shoulder. Illustrated, vol. ii, Plate III, Fig. 62 and Plate XIV, Fig. 8.

* • BRIHTNO© ON CLEPE, Beaworth, 4.
† " " " " var., annulet on the King's left shoulder, Plate XIV, Fig. 9.

* • SILE© ON CLEPEEL, Beaworth 1.
* " " " " CLEPE, Beaworth, 3.
† " " " " var., annulet on the King's left shoulder. Plate XIV, Fig. 10.
* " " " " CPLPEL, Beaworth, 2.
† * • SILEEPINE ON CEP, Beaworth, 8; Tamworth, 1. † Plate XIV, Fig. 11.

* • SILEEPINE ON CLE, Beaworth, 18.
† * " " " " var., no ornament on either shoulder of the King. † Plate XIV, Fig. 12.

* • VFCIET ON CLEPE, Beaworth, 4.
† * " " " " CLEPEI, Beaworth, 17, Plate XIV, Fig. 13.
* " " " " CLEPEIE, Beaworth, 1.
* " " " " CLEPIE, H. Symonds.
The Winchcombe Mint.

William II.

Type 1:—

No example hitherto noted.

Mule, obv., Type 1, rev., Type 2.

* * BRHTNOD ON CP(?), Tamworth Find, Plate XIV, Fig. 14.

Type 2:—

[* BRIHTOD ON CLEP, Tamworth Find.
  * EDPOLD ON CLEPE.
  * SEPOLD ON CLEPE, Plate XIV, Fig. 15.

Type 3:—

† * COPINE ON CLEPE, from the late Sir John Evans's collection, Plate XIV, Fig. 16.

Type 4:—

* EDPOLD ON CLEPI, Allen sale, Lot 353.
  * SEPINE ON CLEP, H. M. Reynolds.
  * SEPOLD ON CLEPE, Plate XIV, Fig. 17.

Type 5:—

No example hitherto noted.


For a full account of this mint we refer our readers to a paper by the present writer, pp. 49-54 of this Volume.

The derivation of the name, its status as a borough and place of mintage in Anglo-Saxon and Norman times, its superior claims in these respects to those of Winchelsea, whereto some Winchcombe coins have hitherto been assigned, are there dealt with at length, and it will, therefore, be sufficient for the purposes of this present paper to repeat that there are coins of Eadgar, Æthelræd II., Cnut, Harthacnut and Edward the Confessor struck at Winchcombe.

As no mention is made of the mint or of moneyers in the Domesday account of the borough of Winchcombe, it is inferred that the mint was at that time rented or farmed to the burgesses with the town.

It follows that we should expect the coinage to be of a continuous character, but in fact Types V and VIII of William I. are the only
issues of his money at Winchcombe which have yet come to our notice, whilst the money of Rufus of this mint is at present entirely unrepresented.

Judging from the small number of coins of prior reigns struck at this mint, which are preserved to us to-day, we may reasonably infer that the issue therefrom was never very copious.

Furthermore it is not unlikely that some coins struck at Winchcombe under William I. and II. may exist in our cabinets with an attribution of them to Winchester, as all those in the British Museum are so assigned, and we are not without hope that this and the before-mentioned account of the Winchcombe Mint may result in the discovery of some of such pieces.

**WILLIAM I.**

Types I, II, III and IV:—
No examples hitherto noted.

Type V:—

* ✳ **GOLDPINE ON PILL,** Beaworth Find, Plate XIV, Fig. 18.

" " " **PIN,** Durrant, Lot 177.

Types VI and VII:—
No examples hitherto noted.

Type VIII:—

† ✳ **GOLDPINE ON PIN,** Beaworth, 8, var., pellet above the King’s forearm. Plate XIV, Fig. 19.

* ✳ **GOLDPINE ON PINL,** Beaworth, 3, Plate XIV, Fig. 20.

**WILLIAM II.**

Types 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5:—
No examples hitherto noted.

**HAMPSTEAD:** D.B. Hantescire.

**SOUTHAMPTON:** D.B. Hantone, Hantune.

Southampton was in early times not only the port of Winchester, the capital of the West Saxon Kingdom, but thence in Norman and later days sailed many an expedition on foreign conquest bent. Thence,
too, but a decade since, embarked our troops for our last most costly war.

Its antiquity is great, for near by, at Bittern, stood Clausentum, a famous Roman town. The name Hantune has been conjectured to have been derived from Ant, the British designation of one of the rivers flowing into Southampton Water, to which was added the Saxon suffix tun, our town. But we cannot credit this derivation, for the Anglo-Saxon forms Hean-tun and Ham-tun clearly have no connexion with Ant. If the correct word be hean, that signifies high; whilst ham, denotes home. But Hean, Hana, and Hama are all well-known Anglo-Saxon personal names, and we are of opinion that Hean-tun or Ham-tune denotes the town founded by Hean or Hama. Hean, who lived about A.D. 690, was founder of Abingdon monastery and nephew of Cissa, regulus of Wilts.

A charter of Æthelwulf, A.D. 840 (Kemble, cxxlvi, Tom. II, 9), is expressed to have been written "in villa regali quae appelatur Hamtun" and subsequent charters contain many references to the place.

Its situation on the sea rendered it liable to attack from the Danes, and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle narrates that in 980 it was ravaged by a naval force, and most of the town-folk slain or captured. Again, in 994, the Danes took winter quarters at Southampton, "and there they were fed from all the realm of the West Saxons, and they were paid sixteen thousand pounds of money."

To Hamtune were assigned two moneyers under the laws of Æthelstan enacted at Greatly, and coins issued there under that king are in evidence to-day, as are some of Eadwig and of all his Saxon Danish, and Norman successors.

In Domesday, Southampton is styled Burgus ae Hantone, and the account of it is placed, as would become it as a county borough, at the head of that portion of the survey of Hampshire which is separately devoted to the Isle of Wight.

The entry contains nothing of numismatic interest, but the circumstance that neither mint nor moneyers are referred to would lead us to infer that the privilege of coining had become vested in the burgesses. No specimens of Types I, V, VI, and VII of the
numismatic history of william i. and ii.

coinage of william i. emanating from this mint have hitherto been noted, and types 3, 4, and 5 of william ii. are similarly absent. we, however, see no reason why these lacunae should not be supplied by the discoveries of the future.

wiliam i.

type i:

no example hitherto noted.

type ii:

* godrill on hamti, york find, 1845.
* hamtv, york find, 1845.
* tvn, york museum.
* godpine on ant, w. c. wells.
* sapine on hamt, york museum.
* * siepine on hat, from the o'hagan sale, 18.12.1907.
lot 403, plate xv, fig. 1.
* * spelman on amt, york find, 1845 (2), plate xv fig. 2.
* * spelman on hmt, york museum.

type iii:

* pvlpi on ham, l. a. lawrence.

type iv:

* * siepi on hamtvne, plate xv, fig. 3
* * siepine on amtv, plate xv, fig. 4.

types v, vi, and vii:

no examples hitherto noted.

type viii:

* * sepine on hamt, beaworth, 12.
* * hamtv, beaworth, 19. illustrated, vol. ii, plate iii, fig. 57, and plate xv, fig. 5.
* overstruck on a coin of type vii. illustrated, vol. ii, plate iii, fig. 56, and plate xv, fig. 6.
* * hamtvn, beaworth, 5.
* * hamt, var., no ornament on either shoulder of the king.

wiliam ii.

type i:

* sepine on hmtvi. illustrated, vol. ii, plate iv, fig. 67, and plate xv, fig. 7.
**SEPINE ON HAMTV**, Tamworth Find.
**SEPI ON HAMTVN**, Murdoch sale, Lot 201.

Type 2:—
* SEPINE ON HAMTV, Tamworth Find, Plate XV, Fig. 8.
* " " " MTVN, Tamworth Find, Plate XV, Fig. 9.
* " " " HAII, sub “London.”
* SEPINE ON HAMTVI, Tamworth Find, Plate XV, Fig. 10.

Types 3, 4, and 5:—
No examples hitherto noted.

N.B.—The coins of Type 4, of the variety Hks. 249, without the stars on either side of the king’s face, heretofore wrongly read and attributed to Southampton and Hythe, are all from the same dies and were struck at Hastings by the moneyer **DIRMAN = Deorman**, whose name has also been wrongly rendered as Didman and Dilman.

**TWYNHAM, otherwise CHRISTCHURCH:**

*D.B. Thuinam, Tuinam.*

This ancient borough, market town, and seaport is first mentioned in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* under Annal 901, where it is recorded that Æthelwald Ætheling, son of Æthelred I., forcibly entered the vill at Tweoxenam against the will of King Eadweard the Elder and his witan. He was a claimant for the throne of England, but was not strong enough to withstand Eadweard. He was, however, received as King in Northumbria, and as such struck coins which, though very rare, are still in evidence to-day. The town of Twynham is situate between the rivers Avon and Stour, the circumstance to which it owes its name—*Tweon = between, eo = rivers.* Twynham, *eo nomine,* is mentioned in a charter of Æthelstan dated April 23rd, 939 (Kemble, No. 1119).

The following is a translation of the entry in Domesday concerning it:

“The King holds Thuinam (Twynham) in demesne. It was of the farm of King Edward. Then and now there is one virgate of land. Land there is for thirteen ploughs. In demesne are two ploughs and twenty-one villeins and five bordarii with twelve ploughs. There are one serf and three coliberti and four Radechenistri with two plough-teams and a half, and one mill worth five shillings, and sixty-one acres of
mound. Wood there is in the forest of the King, where were five villeins with three ploughs. In the borough of Thuinam thirty-one messuages render sixteen pence for rent (de gablo).

"In the time of King Edward and after, it was worth nineteen pounds by number; now ten pounds of twenty (pence) in the ora, and yet it renders twelve pounds and ten shillings.

"What is in the forest has increased in value."

The alternative name Christchurch is derived from its church and priory, founded prior to the Conquest for a dean and twenty-four secular canons, and dedicated to the Holy Trinity. Domesday records that the canons of the Holy Trinity of Twynham held five hides and one virgate in the town itself, and one hide in the Isle of Wight.

This church was rebuilt in the reign of William II. by Ranulph Flambard, Bishop of Durham, who had obtained a grant of the town and priory of Twynham, and the same, greatly increased in size, was dedicated to our Saviour Christ.

The manor was granted by Henry I. to Richard de Redvers, who strengthened the town and castle. Of the latter the mound with a portion of the stone keep erected thereon remains to the north of the priory. The house adjoining, probably the residence of the Constable, is one of the best preserved examples of quasi-domestic Norman architecture now existing.

As regards its numismatic history under William I. and II. there is only one coin known. It is of Type VII (A.D. 1083–1086) of William I.

This coin, which is in the national collection, was in 1902, and for the first time, attributed by the present writer to Twynham, to which mint he also attributed the penny of Henry I., Hks. 254, described by Mr. Andrew in a Numismatic History of the Reign of Henry I., p. 420, in his account of the Tamworth mint.

It may be added that the writer has specimens of the coinage of Henry I. of the type of Hks. 262 struck at Twynham, whereon the mint name is very convincingly written TVEMHAM.

To return to the coinage of William I. of this mint, we are unable to say whether it is likely or not that specimens of other types will yet be discovered.
As the borough was the property of the King he probably caused money to be struck there only when it was particularly required. Such an occasion may have been that when in 1085 or 1086 the Conqueror, after the great gathering of the witan and all landholders of account at Salisbury, went thence to the Isle of Wight on his way to Normandy.

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle shows us that there was some delay in the journey, as it states that the King "first did after his wont obtain a very great treasure from his subjects, where he could have any accusation, either with justice or otherwise."

It is not perhaps unreasonable to suggest that William stayed at Twynham after his journey from Salisbury and crossed thence to the Isle of Wight, and that the Twynham penny of Type VII, the then current type, was, with others not preserved to us, struck on that occasion.

We will add, in conclusion, that coins of Twynham, of William II., struck during the time of the rebuilding of the church by Ranulph Flambard, should be confidently looked for, and that we will not intrude on Mr. Andrew's period by further discussing the coinage at Twynham, or Christchurch, during the reigns of Henry I. and Stephen.

**WILLIAM I.**

Types I, II, III, IV, V, and VI:—

No examples noted.

Type VII:—

* * EOLEMAN ON TPIN, Pembroke, Lot 56 (the same coin), Plate XV, Fig. 11.

Type VIII:—

No example noted.

**WILLIAM II.**

Types 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5:—

No examples noted.

**WINCHESTER : D.B. Wincestre, Wintonia, Wintonia Civitas.**

Winchester is identified with the Cair Guent of Nennius, and with the Venta Belgarum of the Romans. It has been the see of a
Bishop since A.D. 662, and was the capital of Wessex. As the power of the Kings of Wessex became extended over that of the other Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, so did the importance of Winchester increase. The Royal Treasury was situate within the walls of Winchester Castle in Anglo-Saxon and Norman times, and was there continued until as late a date as A.D. 1188.¹

From the numismatic point of view, Winchester was, therefore, a place of the highest importance. Indeed certain gold sceattas or trientes have been attributed to this city, and it seems reasonable to suppose that those coins of Æcgberht which have his title of “Rex Saxonum” and “Rex Saxoniorm,” and those of Æthelwulf whereon he is similarly styled, or is described as “Rex Saxoniorm Occidentalis,” were struck at Winchester, the capital of the West-Saxon kingdom. It is, however, certain that there was a continuous coinage at this royal mint from the time of Ælfgred the Great until the reign of Henry III.

The account of the City of Winchester is, like that of London and of some other cities and boroughs, absent from Domesday Book, although there are many incidental references to the place. The first twelve folios of the Liber Wintoniae contain a record of what King Edward the Confessor possessed in Winchester in demesne. This record is the result of an inquest held there by order of Henry I. by 86 of the superior burgesses in the presence of William the bishop, Herbert the chamberlain, Ralph Basset, Geoffrey Ridel, and William de Pont de l'Arche. William Giffard was consecrated Bishop of Winchester on the 11th August, 1107, and he died on the 25th January, 1129, so it is sufficient for our purpose to know that the date of the record is somewhere between 1107 and 1129. The information afforded by this survey is of considerable interest and value, and some entries throw a direct light upon the numismatic history of the city. Under the laws of Æthelstan, Winchester was accorded six moneyers, and it appears to have retained that number until the reign of Henry I., for one record contains the statement, “and in the market-place were five mints, which were destroyed by order of the King.” It will,

¹ Round’s Feudal England, pp. 144–145.
perhaps, be objected that the word used is *monete* = mints, and not *monetarii* = moneyers, but the mention of the destruction of five mints seems to imply that each moneyer worked at a separate establishment, and that the object in view was the reduction of the number of these, and consequently of the number of the moneyers.

On the other hand, the passage may infer that Henry did not regard the market-place as a suitable or safe site for his mints, and that he therefore arranged that all coining should take place within a fastness such as was afforded by the walls of his royal castle. The record contains names similar to a large percentage of those of the moneyers disclosed upon the Winchester coins of Edward the Confessor and those of his three successors, but as most of these names occur more than once, and in the case of common names frequently, in the same record in reference to the owners of different properties in different parts of the city, it is not possible to identify individuals unless some reference to the office of *monetarius* be disclosed by the entry in conjunction with the mere name. For example, the name Godwine so often occurs that a description, or surname, is generally added for the purposes of identification: we find on folio 2 alone, *Godwinus Elmeressone, Godwinus Socche, Godwinus Chem.* In regard to Godwine Socche the record narrates that in the time of King Edward he was master of the moneyers and held one house of the fee of the Bishop of Winchester. We are tempted to think that *Socche* is the rendering given by a Norman scribe of the name *Ceoca*, and that Godwinus Socche is identical with the Godwine Ceoca of certain Winchester coins of Edward the Confessor, the second, or surname, being added on these coins to distinguish the moneyer from Godwine Widia, another Winchester moneyer of the same period, but we cannot say which, or, indeed, whether either of these, was identical with the Godwine whose name appears upon the coins of William I. and II. struck here.

As regards other names appearing in the survey, we think that "Alwinus Aitardessone," who is there described as having been a moneyer in the time of King Edward, and who then held one house which pertained to Basingstoke, may be identified with the Ælfwine
whose name is present upon the coins of that King, and upon those of Harold II. and William I. and II.

The same remarks apply equally to Andrebode, mentioned on folio 3 as a moneyer and householder under King Edward, whereas Andrebode Gangeor, who paid rent in respect of property in "Tannerestrete," was obviously a different person.

Again, Alestan, who was a moneyer in the time of King Edward, and had certain land in Winchester, is doubtless the Æthestan, Ægstan, and Æstan of the coins of Edward the Confessor, William I., and William II. Incidentally we see that the forms Æthestan, Ægstan (including Ægelstan), Æstan, and Ælestan are all of them variants of the name Æthelstan. Finally, the wife of "Wimund the moneyer" is mentioned on folio 2b; the Wimund referred to having coined at Winchester under both the Conqueror and Rufus.

As has already been remarked, the mint at Winchester was the property of the King, and from it there was a continuous issue of the coinage. All the types of the money of William I., and all, save the last, of those of William II., of the Winchester mint are represented in our cabinets to-day. The pennies of Type 5 of Rufus are the rarest of that King's coins, and we attribute the absence of any example of it in our Winchester list to the mere accident of non-discovery.

**WILLIAM I.**

Type I:—

* * IEFPINE ON PINI
  " " " PINIE, Murdoch, Lot 172.
† * * IEFPIN ON PNIE
  * ANDERBOED ON PE
  " " " I
  * ANDERBOED ON PI
  " " " PIN; Plate XV, Fig. 12.
  * ANDERBOED ON PE, and the late F. G. Hilton Price.
  * ANDERBONPA ON P
  * ANDERB ON PAONE, Allen, Lot 348.
  * ANDERBOD OF OON
  * LEOPFOLD ON PINE
  " " " PINI
  " " " PINN, B. Roth, from Montagu, Part 5, Lot 61.
THE WINCHESTER MINT, continued.

WILLIAM I. FIGURES 1 TO 19.
WILLIAM II. FIGURES 20 TO 24.
The Winchester Mint.

Type II:—

* **LEOFPOLD ON PINT.**

**PIE.**

PI, Chaffers, 1857, Lot 130.

* **LEOFPOLD ON PIN.** 2 specimens.

* **LEOFPOLD ON PINE.**

* **LIVINE ON PINE.**

† **LIVINE ON PNE,** Illustrated, Vol. II, Plate I, Fig. 6, and Plate XV, Fig. 13.

**LIFINE ON PINLE,** Montagu, Lot 186.

Type III:—

* **IELFPINE ON PIN,** L. A. Lawrence, Lot 43.

* **IELEFPINE ON PIN,** W. C. Wells.

* **GODNOE ON PILE,** Ruding, Plate I, Fig. 2.

* **LIFINE ON PIN.LEI,** York Museum.

† **LIFINE ON PIN.LEI,** and York Museum.

**LIFINE ON PINLES,** Plate XV, Fig. 14.

* **LIOFINOE ON PINEN,** B. Roth, from W. S. Lincoln and Son.

Type IV:—

† **ANDERBODA ON PN.**

* **GODPINE ON PINES,** Spink and Son.

* **LEOFPOLD ON PIN.**

**PINE.**

* **LIFNE ON PINEESR,** Plate XVI, Fig. 1.

* **SEPARD ON PINLE,** Christmas, Lot 220.

† **SIPARD ON PINLEI,** Plate XVI, Fig. 2.
Type V:—

* * ANDRBD ON PIN, Beaworth Find, Plate XVI, Fig. 3.
* [ANDIRBOD ON PIN, Beaworth Find.
* ANDRBOO ON LST, Montagu, Part 5, Lot 76.
* GODPINE ON PELI, Beaworth Find.
* " " " PIN.
* " " " PINE, Beaworth Find.
* " " " PNESI, Beaworth Find.
* GODPNE ON PNLEI.
* LIOFPOLD ON PIN, Miss Helen Farquhar.

† " " " Overstruck on a coin of Type IV, Plate XVI, Fig. 4.

* LEEPOLD ON PIN, Cuff, Lot 675.
* LFOLD ON PINLESI, L. A. Lawrence, Lot 59; Liverpool Museum.
* LFNE ON PINLESR, Beaworth Find.
* LIFIE ON PINESI.
* SIPAORD ON PNLE, Beaworth Find.
* SIPORD ON PIN, Hoare, May 1857, Lot 38.
* PIMVND ON PIN, Simpson sale.

Type VI:—

* IESTIEN ON PNEST, Beaworth Find.
* IESTAN ON PIN, Beaworth Find, Plate XVI, Fig. 5.
* ANDERBOD, ON PNE, Beaworth Find, Plate XVI, Fig. 6.
* ANDRBOD ON PEC, Beaworth Find.
* GODPINE ON PIN, Beaworth Find.
* " " " PINEI, Beaworth Find.
† " " " PNES. Illustrated, Vol. II, p. 155, Fig. K, and Plate XVI, Fig. 7.

* LEOFPOLD ON PI, Cuff, Lot 719; the late Sir John Evans.
  " " " PI, the Rev. C. K. Henderson.
* " " " PINI, Beaworth Find.
* LIFINE ON PINESI, Beaworth Find.
† SIPORD ON PIN, Cuff, Lot 715, Plate XVI, Fig. 8.
  " " " PINI, H. M. Reynolds.

Type VII:—

* IEGSTAN ON PIN, Beaworth Find, Plate XVI, Fig. 9.
* IESTAN ON PINI, B. Roth, from Montagu, Lot 223.
  " " " PINE, Durrant, Lot 116.
† BRVNIE ON PINI, Beaworth Find, Plate XVI, Fig. 10.
† * GODPINE ON PINE, Plate XVI, Fig. 11.
* LIOFPOLD ON PINE, Beaworth Find.
* SIPIORD ON PINE, var., annulet on the King's right shoulder. Illustrated, Vol. II, Plate III, Fig. 51.

Mule, VII–VIII:

† * IESTAN ON PINE. Illustrated, Vol. II, Plate III, Fig. 53, and Plate XVI, Fig. 12.
* " " " PINE, Beaworth Find.
† * LEFPOLD ON PINE. Illustrated, Vol. II, Plate III, Fig. 52, p. 162, Fig. M, Plate XVI, Fig. 13.
* LIFPOLD ON PINE, Beaworth Find.
* SIPORD ON PINE.

Type VIII:

† * IESTAN ON PINE, Beaworth, 67.
* " " " PIN, var., 2 pellets on the left shoulder of the King, W. C. Wells.
† " " " PIN, Beaworth, 64.
* " " " PIN, Beaworth, 46.
† " " " PINE, Beaworth, 64; same rev. die as Mule of Types VII–VIII supra, Plate XVI, Fig. 14.
* " " " PIN, Beaworth, 22.
* BRVNIE ON PINE, Beaworth, 10.
* GODPINE ON PIN, Beaworth, 44.
* " " " PIN, Beaworth, 16.
† " " " PIN, Beaworth, 94, Plate XVI, Fig. 15.
* " " " PIN, Beaworth, 7.
* " " " PNL, Beaworth, 4.
* " " " OM PNE.
* GODPNE ON PINE, Beaworth, 12.
* GODPINE ON PINE, Beaworth, 12.
* LIOFPOLD ON PINE, Beaworth, 68.
† " " " PIN, Beaworth, 68.
* LIOFPOLD ON PINE, Beaworth, 59.
† * LIFPOLD ON PINE, Beaworth, 191.
* " " " PIN, Beaworth, 17
* " " " PIN, Beaworth, 20.
Type 1:—

* IESTIEN ON PINCE, Spink and Son.
* IESTAN ON PINCE.
* EDRIE ON PINPE, Tamworth Find. Probably misread.
* EDPINE ON PINCE, Allen, Lot 348; Miss Helen Farquhar.
* GODPINE ON PINCE.
  " " " " PINCEI, Wm. Ransom, found at Shillington
* LIFPOLD ON PINCE, Tamworth Find.
† " " " " PINCE, Plate XVI, Fig. 20.

Mule, Types 1–2:—

* GODPINE ON PINCE, H. M. Reynolds. Illustrated, Vol. II, Plate IV, Fig. 68.

Type 2:—

* IESTAN ON PINT, Tamworth Find.
† * EDPINE ON PIN, Tamworth Find. Plate XVI, Fig. 21.
* GODPINE ON PIN, Tamworth Find; B.M. sub "Worcester," Plate XVI, Fig. 22.
* PIMVND ON PIN, a Gentleman, January, 1860, Lot 111; Tamworth Find.

* PULFPINE ON PINE.
Type 3:

* EDPINE ON PIN
* GODPINE ON PIN, Ruding, Wm. I. and II. Plate, Fig. 15.

† * PIMVND ON PI, Plate XVI, Fig. 23.

Type 4:

* IELFPINE ON PIN, Allen, Lot 364.
* EDPINE ON PIN

† * GODPINE ON PIN, Plate XVI, Fig. 24.

Type 5:

No example hitherto noted.

Herefordshire:—D.B. Herefordseire.

Hereford:—D.B. Hereford Civitas.

Hereford as the see of a Bishop, and consequently as a city, dates from about A.D. 669.

The earliest coins known to us whereon the name of this mint occurs were struck there under Æthelstan, and these disclose the names of Ecgberht and Hunlaf as moneyers upon coins of the same issue.

The mint-name again occurs upon the coinage of Eadgar and upon that of all his Saxon and Norman successors, except Eadweard the Martyr, of whose coinage at Hereford we have no note. It is, however, probable that coins were issued there during his reign, and also under Eadmund, Eadred, and Eadwig, but the coins of the first-named king are very uncommon, and those of the three last named rarely disclose their place of mintage.

In Domesday the account of the city of Hereford stands at the head of the survey. From this we learn that in the time of King Edward the Confessor there were seven moneyers here. One of these was the moneyer of the Bishop. When the money was renewed, each of them had to pay eighteen shillings for the dies received, and at the expiration of one month from the day on which they came back each of them had to pay to the king twenty shillings, and in like manner the Bishop had from his moneyer twenty shillings. When the king came into the city, these moneyers were wont to make as many pennies as
he desired—of course of the king's silver. And these seven had their sac and soc. On the death of any moneyer of the king, the king had twenty shillings for a relief. If any died without having distributed his property the king had the whole. If the sheriff went into Wales with the army these men went with him. If anyone liable to go did not go, he made amend to the king by payment of forty shillings.

From this city the reeve rendered twelve pounds to King Edward and six pounds to Earl Harold. At the time of Domesday the king had the city of Hereford in demesne, and English burgesses there remaining had their former customs.

This city rendered to the king (William) sixty pounds by number of bright (i.e. new) pennies.

From these entries it will be seen that in the time of King Edward, Earl Harold held what amounted to the tertius denarius of the city, but that the king was the direct lord of his six moneyers, as was the Bishop of his single moneyer. It follows that the Earl had no rights in the coinage in respect of his ownership of the tertius denarius, or otherwise. In the time of Domesday, William I. held the city in demesne, and he, therefore, retained the control of his six moneyers, or of any larger or smaller number that he cared to appoint. On the other hand, it is not unlikely that the rights of coinage were farmed to the burgesses and included in the firma of £60 rendered by the city to King William. No examples of Types VI and VII of William I., both uncommon types in our cabinets of to-day, have been noted, nor has any specimen of Type 3 of William II., struck at this mint, come to our notice. We are, however, of opinion that these three types were struck at Hereford in common with the remaining types of the coinage of the two reigns, and that there is no reason why examples of them should not one day come to light.

**William I.**

Type I:—

† *ÆGELRÆ ON HER*, var., no sceptre. From the Bergne, Brice and Montagu, Lot 187, collections.

Illustrated, vol. ii, Plate I, Fig. 4, and Plate XVII, Fig. 1.
THE HEREFORD MINT.
WILLIAM I. FIGURES 1 TO 12.
WILLIAM II. FIGURES 13 TO 18.

THE HERTFORD MINT.
WILLIAM I. FIGURES 19 & 20.
WILLIAM II. FIGURES 21 TO 23.
Type II:—

* * ** BRIHTRIE ON HERE; **, another, York Museum. York Find, 1845 (2), Plate XVII, Fig. 2.

* ** EDPI ON HEREFORI, W. Sharp Ogden; overstruck on Type I.

Illustrated, vol. ii, Plate I, Fig. 12, and Plate XVII, Fig. 3.

Type III:—

* ** ÆCELRIE ON HÆRE
* ** PVLFPINE ON HR, Plate XVII, Fig. 4.

Type IV:—

* ** IELPI ON HEREFOR
* ** IESTAN ON HEREFOR, Plate XVII, Fig. 5.
* ** BRIHTRIE ON HERI, Plate XVII, Fig. 6.
* ** EADRI ON HEREFOR

Mule, obv., Type IV, rev., Type V:—

† * ** IEGLPINE ON HERI, from the Howard, Brice and Montagu, Lot 212, collections.

Illustrated, vol. ii, Plate II, Fig. 35, at p. 150, Fig. H, and Plate XVII, Fig. 7.

Type V:—

* ** HEDEPI ON HREF, Plate XVII, Fig. 8.

Types VI and VII:—

No examples hitherto noted.

Type VIII:—

† * * ** IEGLPINE ON HRF, Beaworth, 20; Tamworth, 1.

† * * ** IEJFPNI ON HREFRD, Beaworth, 5, Plate XVII, Fig. 10.

* * ** LIFSTAN ON HRF, Beaworth, 13.

† * * ** HRFI, Beaworth, 8.

† * * ** ORDPI ON HREFRI, Beaworth, 7.

† * * ** HRFRD, Beaworth, 6, Plate XVII, Fig. 12.

WILLIAM II.

Type I:—

* ** IEJFPNI ON HRFERI, Tamworth Find, Plate XVII, Fig. 13.

Type 2:—

* ** IEGLPINE ON HRI, Tamworth Find, Plate XVII, Fig. 14.
Type 3:—
No example hitherto noted.

Type 4:—

Type 5:—

Illustrated, vol. ii, p. 181, Fig. W, and Plate XVII, Fig. 18.

Hertfordshire: D.B. Herfordscire.

Hertford: D.B. Burgus Hertforde.

The ancient borough of Hertford gives its name to the county of which it is the chief town. Bede, in his Ecclesiastical History, records that a synod, presided over by Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, was held here in A.D. 673, and the same event is noted in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Hertford is there designated Heorotford, so the true meaning of the name would appear to be Hart-ford, or the ford of the hart or stag.

Hertford is situate on the river Lea, in Anglo-Saxon Lygea, so that Lygeanburh, referred to in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle under annal 571, as one of the four towns captured by Cutha from the Brito-Welsh, after his victory at Bedford, may indeed refer to Hertford, and not to Lenbury, or Lenborough, in Buckinghamshire, as has hitherto been supposed.

The same authority narrates that in April 913, Eadweard the Elder commanded the north burgh to be built at Hertford between the Maran, the Bean and the Lea. In the summer of the same year some of his force wrought the burgh at Hertford on the south side of the Lea.

The earliest coins which bear the name of this mint were struck there under Æthelstan, by the moneyer Abonel. His name is very
distinctive and it is therefore not unlikely that the coins of Ælfred the Great, by the moneyer Abenel, were struck at Hertford. We have no note of this moneyer's name as occurring upon coins of Eadweard the Elder, but it recurs upon some of Eadmund and Eadwig. In the case of the last-named king the compilers of the British Museum Catalogue (vol. ii, p. 156) assign the name, with a query, to Hereford, but we may safely surmise that Hertford might have been written without the note of enquiry. We have records of coins of Æthelræd II., Cnut, Harold I., and Edward the Confessor struck here, but, to judge from the number of specimens now preserved to us, the monetary issue from this mint must always have been small.

The account of the Borough of Hertford stands at the head of the Domesday survey of Hertfordshire. From this we learn that in the time of King Edward there were there 146 burgesses in his soke.

The details of the ownership of certain honors follow and the account concludes with the statement that:

"This township (suburbium) renders twenty pounds burnt and weighed and three mills render ten pounds by number. When Peter the Sheriff received it, it rendered 15 pounds by number; in the time of King Edward seven pounds and ten shillings by number.

From this we gather that in the time of Edward the Confessor Hertford remained a Royal Borough, but that sometime prior to the compilation of Domesday the Conqueror had farmed the same to Peter de Valognes, and that the borough then rendered double the firma which it had paid in the time of the Confessor.

We have unverified records of two coins of Type V of William I., but the first type, however, which certainly exists, is his Type VIII. Types 1, 2 and 4 of William II. are also known, but Types 3 and 5 are absent.

The coins of this mint of both Saxon and Norman times are so rare, that we do not attach any significance to the absence to-day of the other types of the coinage of the two reigns now under consideration.

It is probable that the issue, though small, was continuous in each successive type from the reign of Æthelstan until the close of that of William II.
WILLIAM I.

Types I, II, III, and IV:—
No examples hitherto noted.
Type V:—
* IELFRIE ON HIOTF
* -- -- RIE ON HTFRD

Types VI and VII:—
No examples hitherto noted.
Type VIII:—
* * SEMIER ON HRTFR, Beaworth, 1, Plate XVII, Fig. 19.
† * DIDRIE ON HRTFI, Beaworth, 7, Plate XVII, Fig. 20.

WILLIAM II.

Type 1:—
* DIDRIE ON HRTFRDE, Allen, Lot 312; the late Sir John Evans.

Type 2:—
† * IELGAR ON HRTF, Tamworth find, Plate XVII, Fig. 21.
† * DIDRIE ON HRTFR, Allen, Lot 311 (1), 312 (1), and 313 (3); the late Sir John Evans. †Plate XVII, Fig. 22.

Type 3:—
No example hitherto noted.

Type 4:—
† * IELGAR ON HRTF, Plate XVII, Fig. 23.
* EDRIE ON HRT, a Gentleman, January, 1860, Lot 114; the late Sir John Evans.

Type 5:—
No example hitherto noted.
PORTRAIT OF STEPHEN ENGRAVED FROM HIS COINS BY G. VERTUE, CIRCA 1740. REDUCED.