A NUMISMATIC HISTORY OF THE REIGNS OF
WILLIAM I. AND II. (1066-1100).

By P. W. P. Carlyon-Britton, F.S.A., President.


HUNTINGDONSHIRE:—D.B. Huntedunscire.
Huntingdon:—D.B. Huntedun, Huntedone.

The county borough of Huntingdon gives its name to the
shire of which it is the chief town. It is situate on a
gentle acclivity on the northern bank of the River Ouse;
Godmanchester, the site of a Roman station, lies on the
southern side of the stream. Huntingdon, anciently Huntandun,
Huntedun, signifies in Anglo-Saxon "the hill of hunters," a
derivation ascribed to it by Henry of Huntingdon, who wrote in
or about the year 1135. From the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle we learn
that in the summer of A.D. 921 the army, i.e., the Danes, from
Huntingdon and from the East Angles, went and wrought the work
at Tempsford, and inhabited it, and built and forsook the other at
Huntingdon. This authority also narrates that in the autumn of the
same year the troops of King Eadweard reduced the burgh at
Huntingdon and repaired and renovated it, where it was before in a
state of ruin; and that all the folk that were left there of the
peasantry submitted to King Eadweard, and sought his peace and his
protection.

The earliest coins we have which bear the name of this mint are
a few specimens struck there under Eadwig. The writer has an
unpublished example by the moneyer Hildulf, a name which also occurs upon a coin of Eadred, so it is not unlikely that coins were issued at Huntingdon at a date anterior to the reign of Eadwig. But, be this as it may, coinage at Huntingdon was continued under all Eadwig's Anglo-Saxon and Danish successors, with the sole exception that of Eadweard the Martyr no coin of this mint has yet been recorded.

Huntingdon was within the territory of Siward, Earl of Northumberland and of Huntingdon, and on his death in 1055 it passed to his son Waltheof, who married Judith, a niece of William I. Earl Waltheof was one of those notable persons whom William took with him to Normandy in the Lent of 1067. Orderic, Book iv, Chap. IV, records that in 1068 the Conqueror erected a castle at Huntingdon and placed in it a garrison composed of his bravest soldiers. Domesday informs us that twenty houses had been destroyed to make room for this castle. The mount, of large size, is still in evidence in the grounds of Castle Hill House. There are two passages in the Domesday record of Huntingdon that are of exceptional interest in relation to its direct numismatic history. The first states that "Huntedun Borough was answerable to the king's geld for a fourth part of Hyrstingestan hundred for fifty hides, but now it is not so taxed in that hundred, since King William imposed the tax of the mint upon the borough." The second records that "In this borough there were three moneyers rendering forty shillings between the king and the earl, but now they are not." These statements together afford the information that formerly the mint of Huntingdon was a royal mint and that its payments were receivable, presumably, as to two-thirds, by the king, and, as to the remaining third, by the earl, as owner of the tertius denarius of the county and borough. That at some time prior to the compilation of Domesday, possibly upon the death of Waltheof in 1075, the king had taken the borough into his own hands and had farmed the mint to the burgesses. As our existing coins of Huntingdon show that the mint was in operation at the time when Domesday records that the "moneyers are not," the statement can only mean that as officers accounting to the crown the moneyers were no longer existent for the purpose of this fiscal record.
A reference to our appended list of the recorded specimens of coins struck at Huntingdon under William I. and II. discloses that Type III of the former and Type 5 of the latter king are the only absentee. Both are uncommon types, and there would seem to be no reason for their absence other than the accident of non-discovery or non-disclosure. Whether as a royal mint, in which the earl had only a third share, or as a mint rented by the burgesses, the coinage emanating from it would, we may reasonably assume, have been of a continuous character. In conclusion, we would add that certain coins by the moneyer Sæwine formerly attributed to Huntingdon have proved upon investigation to belong to Southampton, and that the mysterious moneyer "Gypat" is a cataloguer's disguise of the perfectly good Anglo-Saxon name *Siwate.*

**William I.**

Type I:—

† *GODRIE ON HVNT*, from O'Hagan sale, 1907, Lot 402, Plate XVIII, Fig. 1.

Mule: obverse Type I, reverse Type II:—

* *GODRIE ON HVTED*, Plate XVIII, Fig. 2.

Type II:—

† *GODRIE ON HVTED*, struck over a coin of Harold II.; new obverse over old reverse, and *vice versa*. From Wigan and L. A. Lawrence, Lot 39, collections. Illustrated, vol. ii, Plate I, Fig. 13, and Plate XVIII, Fig. 3.

*GODRIE ON HVNT*

````
```` " " HVNT
```` " " HVNTEN
```` " " " HVNTI, York Find, 1845 (2).
```` *GODPINE ON HVN*, York Museum.

Type III:—

No example hitherto noted.

Type IV:—

† *GODRIE ON HVNTEN*, Plate XVIII, Fig. 4.

```` " " " HVNT, Lloyd, 1857, Lot 45.
Type V:—
* GODPINE ON HVT

Type VI:—
† * GODPINE ON HVTD, another, Lieut.-Colonel H. W. Morrieson, †Plate XVIII, Fig. 5.

Type VII:—
* IELFPNE ON H, Cuff, Lot 682.

Type VIII:—
* IEGLPINE ON HV, (HV ligulate).
  † " " " HVN (VN ligulate), reading retrograde.
* IELFPINE ON HVN
  * " " " HVT, Beaworth, 5.
  † " " " " Allen, Lot 314, Plate XVIII, Fig. 6.

**WILLIAM II.**

Type 1:—
† * SIPATE ON HNTED, Plate XVIII, Fig. 7.

Type 2:—
† * SIPAT ON HVTD (or HNTD), from Allen, Lot 314, Plate XVIII, Fig. 8.

Type 3:—
* GODPINE ON HVTD, Spicer MS.
* SIPATE ON HVT, FitzWilliam Museum, Cambridge. Reverse only, Plate XVIII, Fig. 9.

Type 4:—
* IELFPINE ON HVN, Spicer MS.

Type 5:—
No example hitherto noted.

**KENT:—D.B. Chenth.**

**CANTERBURY:—D.B. Civitas Cantuariae.**

This ancient city, capital of the former kingdom of Kent and the chief episcopal see of Britain, has a numismatic history surpassed by that of no other place within these realms. It is not improbable that ancient British coins were issued here, as well as some of the early
gold coins of the weight of the Roman *triens* or *tremissis*, that are from time to time found in Kent, and certain of the early Anglo-Saxon *sceattas* which preceded the issue of the silver pennies. It is outside the scope of our present work to do more than refer to the several series of silver pennies of the kings of Kent, and of the Archbishops of Canterbury, which had their origin here. Particulars of these and of the Canterbury coins of all our Anglo-Saxon and Danish kings from Ecgberht to Harold II. are to be found within the covers of our standard numismatic works. Upon these the ancient name of Canterbury, *Dorobernia* or some kindred form of designation, appears until and during the reign of Æthelstan, while the form *Caentwaraburh* had become usual under Eadgar.

It may here be remarked that the penny of Æthelstan read by Signor de Rossi, in his instructive account of *A Treasure of Anglo-Saxon Money found in the House of the Vestals, Rome*, 1884, *Eadeild mo antvn vrB*, and ascribed by him to Canterbury, cannot in reality be of that city, as the inferior designation *urbs* would not have been used in the case of a place entitled to the superior rank of *civitas*. The coin perhaps reads *Eadeild mon antvn vrB*, and in that case belongs to Southampton, or it may read *Eadeild mo tantvn vrB*, and thus supply the earliest known coin of Taunton.

The hoard in question contained no fewer than twenty coins of Æthelstan struck at Canterbury. These disclose the name of five moneyers and have some abbreviation of *Dorobernia Civitas* to indicate the mint-place, the most complete being *Dör Livít*, but they are, in error, assigned to Dorchester.

Under the laws of Æthelstan, so often already alluded to in this work, seven moneyers are allotted to Canterbury, four of the king, two of the bishop, and one of the abbot. Here the archbishop and the abbot of St. Augustine's are the dignitaries referred to as “bishop” and “abbot.”

Domesday contains no reference to mint or moneyers at Canterbury, so we must conclude that at the time of its compilation there were no moneyers directly responsible to the king.
It will be seen from the appended list of coins that specimens of all the types of William I. and II. of this mint are preserved to us. The number of names of distinctly different moneyers does not exceed four upon any type, except upon Type VIII of William I., whereon eight separate names occur, namely, Ælfric, Brihtwold, Burnoth, Godric, Simær, Winedi, Wilbold and Wulfriç. These perhaps represent only the full number of seven moneyers allotted under the laws of Æthelstan, as one at least of the seven may have been replaced by another during the issue of Type VIII. The apparent increase in number may be due only to the circumstance that we have preserved to us a larger number of specimens of Type VIII than we have of any other type of the coinages of the two Williams. The coins do not enable us to distinguish between those issued by the moneyers of the king, the archbishop and the abbot. The names of the moneyers afforded a sufficient distinguishment at the time, and we can only regret that we have no records of this period which preserve the information for us.

**William I.**

Type I:—

* * EADPEARD ON £A, another, the late F. G. Hilton Price.
* MANNA ON £ATPI

† * " " " £AT, †from the Wilcox sale, Glendining's, January, 1908, Plate XVIII, Fig. 10.

* " " " (£)AI, variety without sceptre; refer to Exeter. Both coins are probably of Canterbury.

† * * PVLFRED ON £ATPAI
* PVIFRED ON £ANT
* PVFRED ON £ANT

Type II:—

* MANNA ON (£)AN, York Museum, from York Find, 1845.

Type III:—

* MANN ON £ANPAI, St. Mary Hill Church Find, Plate XVIII, Fig. 11.

† [* - - -]PINE ON £ANTO, from sale at Sotheby's, April 30th, 1904.

* PVLPI NE ON £ANPA, St. Mary Hill Church Find.
The Canterbury Mint.

Type IV:—

* EADPINE ON LNT, the late Sir John Evans.
* MAN ON LANTVELBI, Plate XVIII, Fig. 12.
* SIEGELPINE ON LANT
* PVLFRIC ON LANT, Montagu, 1897, Lot 69; also O’Hagan, 1907, Lot 409.

Type V:—

* IELFRED ON ENTL, Beaworth Find.
* IELFRD ON ENTLIE
* MAN ON LANTVL, Plate XVIII, Fig. 13.
* MANN ON LANTAB
* MANNA ON ENTLB, a Gentleman, January, 1860, Lot 116.
* MMNAD ON ENTLB, the late Sir John Evans.
* PVLFRIC ON LANT
* " " " LAI
* " " " LNT, Lieut.-Colonel H. W. Morrieson.

Type VI:—

* ÆLFRED ON LANPAR, Beaworth Find, Plate XVIII, Fig. 14.
* PVLFPINE ON ENTL, Ruding, Plate I, Fig. 13.

Type VII:—

† GODRIL ON ENTL, illustrated, vol. ii, p. 159, Fig. L, and Plate XVIII, Fig. 15.

† PVL[LFRIE ON EN]TLE, a fragment.

Type VIII:—

* IELFRED ON LNT, Beaworth, 13.
* " " " ENTL, Beaworth, 4.
* " " " ENTLII, Beaworth, 1.
* " " " ENTLII, Beaworth, 8.
* " " " ENTL, var., no ornament on either shoulder of the king. Beaworth,
* " " " ENTLI
† IELREI ON ENTLIEBI, 2.
* IELFRID ON LNT, Beaworth, 18.
* BRIHTPOLD ON EN, Beaworth, 6.
* " " " EN, Beaworth, 7.
† " " " ENTL, Beaworth, 4.
† " " " ENTLI No ornament on either shoulder.
† " " " EN † Illustrated, vol. ii, Plate III, Fig. 63, and Plate XVIII, Fig. 16.
* BRIHTPOD ON EN { Beaworth, 2.
† " " " No ornament on either shoulder.
William II.

Type 1:

* * IEGRLRLE ON ENTLI, Tamworth Find.
* * BRIHT - - - ON EN, Tamworth Find.
* SEGRIM ON ENTB, ? a misreading.
* * PINEDI ON ENTL, Beaworth, 2.

Type 2:

* IELFRIEND ON EN, the late Sir John Evans.
† * BRIHTPOD ON EM, Plate XVIII, Fig. 19.
* PINDEI ON ENTL

† * PINEDI ON ENTL,
* PINDIE ON LANTLEI

† * PINEDI ON ENTL,
* PINDIE ON LANTLEI
Type 3:—

* ALGOD ON ENTLLE, Plate XVIII, Fig. 20.
* BRIHPPOD ON ENT, FitzWilliam Museum, Cambridge.
* EDPINE ON ENTLLE, Trinity College, Cambridge.
* [PI]NEDI ON ENTL[E]
* PVLFPINE ON ETL
* [ ] ONTL

Type 4:—

* ALFRIED ON ENTL, from Cuff, Lot 678, and Murchison sales, Lot 20.
* ALFRIID ON EN, Lewin Sheppard sale, July, 1860, Lot 132.
† AELDRED ON ENT
* IELFPORD ON ENTB, Christmas sale, Lot 225.
* BRIHPPOLD ON ENT, from a sale at Christie's, March 2nd, 1911, Plate XVIII, Fig. 21.
* SIMIER ON ENTL, Trinity College, Cambridge.
* " " " ENTLI, ditto and Montagu, 1896, Lot 265.
* PVLBOLD ON ENT

Type 5:—

* IELDRIED ON ENT
* EDPINE ON ENTLI, Plate XVIII, Fig. 22.
* PINEDI ON ENTLI, pierced.

DOVER:—D.B. Dover.

Although this ancient seaport and borough has an origin extending to a period prior to the first visit of Julius Cæsar to these islands, its numismatic history commences at a comparatively late period of our Anglo-Saxon monarchy.

Dover was one of those places which subsequently received the collective name of the Cinque Ports, and its earliest coins are those struck under Æthelræd II. We shall see, in the subsequent accounts of the Kentish mints, that coinage at Romney began at the same period as that at Dover, whilst the mints at the remaining Kentish Cinque Ports, Hythe and Sandwich, were not instituted until the reign of Edward the Confessor. Coins struck at Dover under all of the Anglo-Saxon and Danish successors of Æthelræd II. are in
evidence in our cabinets of to-day. The account of Dover occupies
the premier place in the entire Domesday survey, but it contains no
reference to mint or moneyers. We give the following extract:—

“Dover in the time of King Edward rendered £18 of which
pennies King Edward had two parts and Earl Godwine the third.
Against this the canons of St. Martin had the other middle part. The
burgesses gave 20 ships to the king for one occasion in the year to the
extent of 15 days, and in each of these ships there were 21 men.
This they did for him because he had remitted to them their sac
and soc.”

Orderic, Book iii, Chap. XIV, narrates that after the battle of
Hastings the Conqueror marched to Romney, and, after taking it by
assault, continued his march to Dover. The garrison were preparing
to surrender, when some Norman squires, greedy for spoil, set the
place on fire, and the devouring flames spreading around, many parts
were ruined and burnt. Domesday tells the same story by recording
that when King William first arrived in England the town was burnt,
and for that reason it was not possible to compute how much it was
worth when the Bishop of Bayeux, the Conqueror’s half-brother Odo,
received it. This, according to Orderic, was in A.D. 1067. Odo’s
arrest, as Earl of Kent, and fall from power occurred in A.D. 1082.
The coinage at Dover does not, however, appear to have been
influenced by these events. The probability is that in consideration
of its ship-service, the particulars of which, as given in Domesday, are
set out above, Dover received full borough rights from Æthelraed II.,
and that the dues from the mint were included in the payments made
to the king and earl. Domesday states, “Now it is worth £40 and
yet the provost renders thence £54, to the king £24 which are 20
[pennies] in the ounce, to the earl £30 by tale.”

Types II, III, and VI of William I. are at present unknown to
us, but as our evidence of Types I, IV and V is confined to a single
example of each type, there is reason to hope that these apparent gaps
may be supplied. All the types of William II. are in evidence, except
Type 5, the type of which the smallest number of examples has
hitherto been discovered.
The Dover Mint.

WILLIAM I.

Type I:—

* MANPINE ON DOVO, from Montagu, 1896, Lot 182, Plate XIX, Fig. 1.

Types II and III:—
No examples hitherto noted.

Type IV:—

† * MANPINE ON DOVO, from L. A. Lawrence sale, Lot 50, Plate XIX, Fig. 2.

Type V:—

* MANPINE ON DOF, Ruding, Plate I, Fig. 10.

Type VI:—
No example hitherto noted.

Type VII:—

* EINSTAN ON DOFI, Plate XIX, Fig. 3.
† * LIFPINE ON DOFR, from the late F. G. Hilton Price's collection, Plate XIX, Fig. 4.

Type VIII:—

† * EDPORD ON DOFRE, Beaworth, Fig. 3, †Plate XIX, Fig. 5.
† * GODPINE ON DOF, Beaworth, 3.
* GODPINE ON DOF, Tamworth, 1.
* " " " DOFI, Beaworth, 1.
* " " " DOFR, Beaworth, 7.
* " " " DOFRE, Cuff, Lot 694.
† * GOLDPIE ON DOF, Beaworth, 5, Plate XIX, Fig. 6.
* GOLDPIE ON DOFRE, Beaworth, 8.
* GOLPIE ON DOFRE
† * LIFPINE ON DOER, Beaworth, 21.
* " " " DOF, Beaworth, 4.
* " " " DOFI, Beaworth, 1.
* " " " DOFRE, Beaworth, 5.
* " " " DOFRI, Beaworth, 7.
* " " " DOFRRI, Beaworth, 3.
* LUVFRIE ON DOFRI, Beaworth, 2.
† * LVLFRIE ON DOFR, Beaworth, 18.
* " " " DOFRI, Beaworth, 7.
WILLIAM II.

Type 1:—

* * LIFPINE ON DOFRI, pierced, Plate XIX, Fig. 7.

Mule: obverse, Type 1, reverse, Type 2:—

† * LVFRIL ON DOFR, illustrated, vol. ii, p. 173, Fig. Q, and Plate XIX, Fig. 8.

* " " " DOFRE

Type 2:—

† * GODPINE ON DOF, var., large pellet to left of the king’s face. †Illustrated, vol. ii, Plate IV, Fig. 70, and Plate XIX, Fig. 9.

* * LIFPINE ON DOFR, another, R. Cyril Lockett, var., a crescent or segment of a circle, in the upper and lower curves of the quatrefoil on the reverse, Plate XIX, Fig. 10.

* " " " ODORFR

* LVFRIL ON DOFR

Type 3:—

† * MANPIN ONDOF, Plate XIX, Fig. 11.

* [ ] ONDOF

Type 4:—

* * LIFPINE ON DFR, var., Hks. 249; another, H. M. Reynolds, from Cuff and Rostron collections. Illustrated, vol. ii, p. 178, Fig. T. The B.M. specimen, Plate XIX, Fig. 12.

Type 5:—

No example hitherto noted.

Hythe:—D.B. Hede, Burgus Hedæ.

This borough and seaport derives its name from the Anglo-Saxon ᵁyne, signifying coast, port, haven. Our numismatic evidence shows that the place rose into importance in the time of Edward the Confessor, during whose reign coinage here was first instituted. The penny of Cnut attributed to Hythe by Mr. Grueber, British Museum Catalogue, vol. ii, p. 274, No. 253, and read by him * SÆPINE OL

HYÐA, in fact reads * SÆPINE O LHÝDA, as a reference to the
THE DOVER MINT.
WILLIAM I. FIGURES 1 TO 6.
WILLIAM II. FIGURES 7 TO 12.

THE HYTHE MINT.
WILLIAM I. FIGURES 13 TO 18.
WILLIAM II. FIGURES 19 TO 21.

PLATE XIX.
The Hythe Mint.

illustration, Plate XVIII, 10, of the same work discloses. A similar coin is correctly ascribed by Hildebrand to Lydford, in company with four other varying specimens by the same moneyer (Nos. 2862–2866, Cnut, in Hildebrand). In like manner, and also on the authority of Mr. Grueber, we find a penny of Harold I. attributed to Hythe. The reading given is *EDRIC ON HDE, and the description states "extremely rare, an unpublished mint of this reign" (see Montagu Sale Catalogue, 2nd portion, No. 73). The coin was acquired by Messrs. Spink in May, 1896, and through their courtesy the writer has recently inspected this misdescribed piece, which remains in their hands. It reads *EDRIC ONN DE, and is similar to No. 947 of Hildebrand, who correctly ascribes it, with four other coins by the same moneyer, to Thetford. Upon these the forms DE, DEO, DEOD and DEODF occur, so no doubt can remain as to the intention to indicate Thetford and not Hythe.

There are, however, undoubted coins of the Hythe mint issued under Edward the Confessor, but we do not know of any specimens of Harold II.'s coinage struck there.

It would seem that Hythe rose as Lymne declined, and that the mint at the former took the place of that which had continuously existed at Lymne from the reign of Eadgar. Both places were under the lordship of the Archbishop of Canterbury, so the transfer of the mint from the decayed and silted-up port of Lymne to the nearly adjoining and comparatively new haven at Hythe would be a reasonable change easy of accomplishment.

Hythe is only twice incidentally mentioned in Domesday. At folio 4a it is recorded that six burgesses in Hythe (Hede) pertain to Lyminge (Leminges), held by the archbishop in demesne, and at folio 46 it is stated that Hugh de Montfort holds Saltwood (Salteode) of the Archbishop, and that to this manor belong two hundred and twenty-five burgesses in the borough of Hythe (in Burgo hedæ).

The charter granted by King John to Hythe in June, 1205, refers to that port's charter from Henry II., and the privileges are to be enjoyed as in the times of Edward, William I., William II., and Henry I.
Domesday is silent as to the mint at Hythe, and equally so as to its moneyers, but as there is no specific account of the borough this cannot occasion surprise.

Our coins and the charter of King John show that Hythe was one of a group of towns performing special ship-service, in return for which, we assume, that it had special privileges, including the right to a mint from the time of Edward the Confessor.

As already mentioned we are at present unaware of the existence of any coin of Harold II. struck at Hythe, and the same remark applies equally to Types I to VII, inclusive, of William I. Type VIII is represented by under twenty coins, all by the same moneyer, Edred or Edraed, whose name also occurs upon coins of Hythe of William II. of Types 1, 2 and 4. These are all of great rarity, and we may reasonably consider that, as Hythe only employed the services of one moneyer, the output there was never very large. The name of Edraed as a moneyer does not occur elsewhere in either reign. Whether coins of Harold II. and of the first seven types of the Conqueror struck at this mint will one day come to light we do not venture to predict, but we are confident that Types 3 and 5 of Rufus should be forthcoming. Any specimens of these types, whereon the name of Edraed or Edred is discernible should be carefully looked for.

**WILLIAM I.**

Types I to VII:—

No examples hitherto noted.

Type VIII:—

* * **EDRED ON HIDE**, Beaworth, 12, Plate XIX, Fig. 13.

† " " " from Allen sale, Lot 316, Plate XIX, Fig. 14.

* " " " **HIDEN**, Beaworth, 2, Plate XIX, Fig. 15. **no ornament on either shoulder.**

† * " " **HIIDNI**, Beaworth, 1, Plate XIX, Fig. 16* and Fig. 17. †

* " " **HIIDDI**, Beaworth, 1, Plate XIX, Fig. 18.
The Rochester Mint.

WILLIAM II.

Type 1:—

* EDRED ON HIDE

" " " HIDN, Allen, Lot 315.

Type 2:—

* * EDRIED ON HIDE, Plate XIX, Fig. 19.
* " " " HDE, Plate XIX, Fig. 20.

Type 3:—

No examples hitherto noted.

Type 4:—

† * EDRIED ON IDE, illustrated, vol. ii, Plate IV, Fig. 82, and Plate XIX, Fig. 21.

Type 5:—

No example hitherto noted.

ROCHESTER:—D.B. Civitas Rovecestre.

Rochester as an episcopal see, and consequently as a city, dates from the lifetime of St. Augustine, and its numismatic history extends to the reign of Ecgbeorht and before.

Under the laws of Æthelstan three moneyers were assigned to Rochester, two of these being of the king and one of the bishop. Only a single specimen of the coinage of that king struck here has survived to us. It is of the variety with the bust of the king and reads on the reverse * HVNEAR MO ROF LIVIT (see Lindsay’s Coinage of the Heptarchy, Plate IV, 108).1 There are four pellets in the field, around the central cross, a distinction from the normal type which suggests that the coin was issued by the moneyer of the bishop. The name of this mint does not again appear upon our coins until the reign of Eadgar, but from that date until the time of Harold II., the only reign unrepresented by coins of Rochester is that of Eadweard the Martyr.

Apart from incidental notices the account of Rochester in Domesday (folio 2a) is limited to two lines, of which the following is a translation:—

1 This unique coin is now in the collection of Mr. Thomas Bliss.
“The City of Rochester in the time of King Edward was worth 100 shillings. When the bishop received it the like. Now it is worth £20, yet he who holds it renders £40.”

We infer that “the bishop” here means Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, who, doubtless, received the king’s interest therein, as in the case of Dover, on his being made Earl of Kent in A.D. 1067. On the fall from power and imprisonment of the Earl of Kent in 1082, we suppose that Rochester reverted to the king, and that at the time of Domesday it was farmed, probably to the sheriff, at a rent of £40, or double its nominal value.

The coins of this mint struck under William I. and II. have not been preserved to us in large numbers and, so far, no examples of Types I, III, V, VI and VII of the former king have come to our notice, but all the types of William II., except the last, are represented.

The known coins do not disclose the names of more than two moneyers in any one type. There would seem to be no reason why the successive bishops of Rochester under the two kings should not have continuously exercised the right of coinage, and we are disposed to think that the same may be said in regard to the two moneyers originally of the king.

If the right to these passed to Odo in 1067 it reverted to the king in 1082, and it seems to be reasonable to conjecture, in the absence of exact knowledge, that the person who had the city at farm at the rent of £40, double its legal value at the date of Domesday, would have included in his holding the privilege to employ the two moneyers formerly of the king.

It is unlikely that the right of the bishop would have been extended so as to include more than one moneyer, but in Types IV and VIII of William I. we have the names of two moneyers, and in Type 4 of William II. the like number, so that, unless we concede a change of moneyer of the bishop during the time of issue of each of three separate types, we must conclude either that the bishop did not ever exercise his right of coinage or that one at least of the two
THE ROCHESTER MINT.
WILLIAM I. FIGURES 1 TO 4.
WILLIAM II. FIGURES 5 TO 8.

THE ROMNEY MINT.
WILLIAM I. FIGURES 9 TO 13.
WILLIAM II. FIGURES 14 TO 18.

PLATE XX.
originally royal moneyers was at work during the issue of the three types referred to.

Our knowledge of the existence of a type at Rochester depends in several cases upon the preservation of a single coin, so we feel it to be safer to assume that if a larger number of specimens were discovered we should find that there was a continuous coinage throughout the two reigns, both on the part of the king, or his grantee, and on that of the bishop.

**WILLIAM I.**

Type I:—

No example hitherto noted.

Type II:—

* LIFTAN ON ROFEES, York Museum, Plate XX, Fig. 1.

Type III:—

No example hitherto noted.

Type IV:—

* GODFRIED ON ROF, Spicer MS. ? a misreading of GODRIED.

† * LIFSTAN O ROFSLEI, from L. A. Lawrence, Plate XX, Fig. 2.

Types V, VI and VII:—

No examples hitherto noted.

Type VIII:—

† * LIFSTAN ON ROFI, Beaworth, 3, plus one attributed to Dover. †Plate XX, Fig. 3.

* " " " ROFEIS, Beaworth, 1.

* LIPINE HORN ORRO, Beaworth, 5, Plate XX, Fig. 4.

**WILLIAM II.**

Type 1:—

* GODRED ON ROFEI, Tamworth Find, corrected from GIFTRED, Plate XX, Fig. 5.

Type 2:—

† * GODRIED ON ROFI, B.M. specimen from the Tamworth Find, †Plate XX Fig. 6.
Type 3:—

† * PVLFPINE ON ROF, overstruck on a coin of Type 2, the reverse design of which is distinctly visible through that of the new obverse. Illustrated, vol. ii, Plate IV, Fig. 74, and Plate XX, Fig. 7.

Type 4:—

* * IELSTAN ONIOFE, Plate XX, Fig. 8.
* * GVBOUND ONROFI

Type 5:—

No example hitherto noted.

**Romney** :—D.B. Romenel.

The numismatic history of Romney is very similar to that of Dover. Both places were of the confederation subsequently known as the Cinque Ports, and coinage began at each in the reign of Æthelraed II. It is probable that coins were continuously issued at Romney, as at Dover, under all of his Saxon and Danish successors, but the writer has no record of any coin of Harthacnut struck at this mint.

No substantive account of the borough of Romney is contained in Domesday Book, but the incidental references show that the burgesses enjoyed certain privileges and immunities on account of their sea or ship service.

Coins of the Romney mint are of considerable rarity, with the exception of those of Type I of William I. The presence of the numerous examples of this issue in our cabinets to-day is probably due to the accident of local discovery, as it is mentioned by the Rev. Dr. Guyon Griffith in Archeologia, vol. iv, p. 358, that in June, 1739, there was found at Dymchurch, in Romney Marsh, an earthen vessel containing about 200 pennies of Edward the Confessor, Harold II. and William the Conqueror. He adds that there were many exact halves and quarters intermixed with the whole pennies.

Examples struck here of Types III, IV and VII of William I.
are at present unrecorded, but Type 3 is now the only absentee from
our list of Romney coins of William II.

In our opinion the right of coinage was vested in the burgesses
and was, consequently, of a continuous character, and we therefore
think that there is reason to hope that the existing lacunae may
be supplied. It has been the good fortune of the present writer
to acquire the first Romney examples of Types 1 and 4 of Rufus
to be placed on record. Coinage was continued here under Henry I.

**William I.**

Type I:—

† * PVLFMÆR ON RV, Plate XX, Fig. 9.

† -- FLMÆR OF -- -, cut halfpenny, illustrated, vol. ii,
Plate I, Fig. 9, and Plate XX, Fig. 10.

Type II:—

* GONDINR ON RVNI, Spicer MS., probably a misreading.

Types III and IV:—

No examples hitherto noted.

Type V:—

* IELMIER ON RVME, Plate XX, Fig. 11.

Type VI:—

* IELMIER ON RVM, Christie’s, December 2nd, 1899.

Type VII:—

No example hitherto noted.

Type VIII:—

† * PINDEI ON RVMN, var., PAXO instead of PAXS,
Plate XX, Fig. 12.

* " " " RVME, Beaworth, 5.

* " " " RVME, Beaworth, 7.

* * PINDEI ON RVME, Beaworth, 1.

* * PVLMIER ON RIM, Beaworth, 7.

* " " " RVI, Beaworth, 1.

† * " " " RVM, Beaworth, 9, Plate XX, Fig. 13.

* " " " RVMME

**William II.**

Type I:—

† * EOE ON RVMNE, Plate XX, Fig. 14.
Type 2:—

* EILNRIED ON ROM, sale, May 27th, 1850, Lot 31; probably a misreading.

† * PINEDI ON RVM, from L. A. Lawrence sale, Lot 80, Plate XX, Fig. 15.

* * PV[LMIER] ORV, Plate XX, Fig. 16.

Type 3:—

No example hitherto noted.

Type 4:—

† * PVLMIER OR, large "annulet" on each shoulder of the king, Plate XX, Fig. 17.

Type 5:—

* G[OLD] ON RVMNE, B. Roth, from L. A. Lawrence sale, Lot 81, Plate XX, Fig. 18.

* PINEDI ON RVN, inspected at Messrs. Rollin and Feuardent’s in February, 1911.

Sandwich:—D.B. Sandwic, Sandwice, Sanwic.

Although the general history of this ancient port and borough would warrant a longer numismatic record than its coins disclose to us, it would seem that, in common with Hythe, coinage in fact began here under Edward the Confessor. It is true that Ruding gives the mint-readings SAN and SANDVVI under Cnut, but as the same list includes the name of the moneyer GODWINE CAS as a mint name and it is queried to "Godmancester," this is not very reliable; nor have we any greater confidence in Mr. Grueber’s attribution of a coin of Æthelræd II. to Sandwich. It is read * SPARTEAR M'O SAN* (see Brit. Mus. Cat., vol. ii, p. 233, coin No. 309). A reference to Hildebrand, coins Nos. 3541–3544, 3548–3554 and 3556–3560 of Æthelræd II., affords sufficient evidence that the British Museum coin is of the Stamford mint. If confirmation be wanted it is found in the circumstance that no coins struck at Sandwich of Cnut, Harold I. or Harthacnut are known to us.

Sandwich coins of Edward the Confessor are by no means common, but most of the types of his money were struck there and are represented in our collections of to-day. They are all by a moneyer
The Sandwich Mint.

named Leofwine, if we transfer to Stamford a moneyer whose name
is read FAREHIR, Brit. Mus. Cat., vol. ii, p. 424, coin No. 1151, who
is probably the FÆRGRIN (Færgrim) of coin No. 1233 op. cit.

Of the short reign of Harold II. no coin struck at Sandwich has
yet been recorded.

In Domesday, the account of Sandwich is included in that of the
lands of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The following translation
of the entry is of some interest:—

“Sandwich (Sandwice) lies in its own Hundred. The Archbishop
holds this borough and it is for the clothing of the monks, and it
renders the like service to our king as Dover, and the men here testify
concerning this borough that before King Edward had given it to the
Holy Trinity it used to render to the king £15. At the time of the
death of King Edward it was not at a rent. When the Archbishop
received it it rendered £40 for rent and 40,000 herrings for the
sustenance of the monks. In the year in which this survey is made
Sandwich (Sanuuic) renders £50 for rent, and herrings as before. In
the time of King Edward there were in that place 307 ‘hospited’
(hospitatae) houses, now there are 76 more, that is together 383.”

From this account it would seem that until granted by Edward
the Confessor to the Holy Trinity, in effect to the Archbishop of
Canterbury, this was a royal borough farmed to the burgesses, but that
at the time of Edward’s death, 5th January, 1066, Stigand, then
Archbishop of Canterbury, held the borough in demesne, but that
when the archbishop of Domesday’s time, Lanfranc, received it, it was
farmed to the burgesses at a rent of £40. Stigand was deposed on
the 11th April, 1070, and Lanfranc was appointed on the 29th August,
1070. He continued until the 24th May, 1089. His successor,
Anselm, was not appointed until 4th December, 1093, and he held the
see until 21st April, 1109.

Our existing coins of Sandwich struck in the time of William I.
are few in number. Types I, III, V and VII are unrepresented, while
Types II, IV and VI depend upon one example of each. Type VIII,
however, thanks to the Beaworth hoard, is well in evidence and
supplies the names of three moneyers. On the other hand, every type
of William II. of this mint is known to us. It is not improbable that Stigand did not institute a coinage at Sandwich and that Type I of William I. may have never been issued here.

As soon, however, as the borough had been farmed to the burgesses, viz., about 1070, we should expect each subsequent type to appear and so may anticipate that specimens of Types III, V and VII will one day become known. That coinage here was not dependent upon there being an archbishop of Canterbury in esse is shown by the existence to-day of all the types of William II. of this mint. The burgesses probably continued to have the control of the mint, and whether they paid their rent to the archbishop or to the Crown it mattered not as regards the exercise of a privilege, payment for which, we assume, was included in that rent. Coinage was continued here under Henry I.

**William I.**

**Type I:**

No example hitherto noted.

**Type II:**

*ÆBE -- NE ON SAN*, H. W. Monckton.

**Type III:**

No example hitherto noted.

**Type IV:**

*IELFGED ON SAN*, Liverpool Museum, Plate XXI, Fig. 1.

**Type V:**

No example hitherto noted.

**Type VI:**

*IELFGET ON SAND*, Cuf, Lot 714.

**Type VII:**

No example hitherto noted.

**Type VIII:**

† *IELFEH ON SANDP*, Beaworth, 4, †Plate XXI, Fig. 2.

† *IELFOTE ON SAND*, Beaworth, 13, †Plate XXI, Fig. 3.

† *GODPINE ON SAN*, Beaworth, 17, †Plate XXI, Fig. 4.

*" " " SAN*, Beaworth, 5.
THE SANDWICH MINT.
WILLIAM I. FIGURES I TO 4.
WILLIAM II. FIGURES 5 TO 9.

THE LEICESTER MINT.
WILLIAM I. FIGURES 10 TO 15.
WILLIAM II. FIGURE 16.

PLATE XXI.
The Leicester Mint.

WILLIAM II.

Type 1:—
* IELF\[^{\text{IET}}\] ON SAND, Allen, Lot 331.
* IELF\[^{\text{H}}\]E ON SAND, Tamworth Find, Plate XXI, Fig. 5.

Type 2:—
* IELFIET ON SAND, Plate XXI, Fig. 6.

Type 3:—
* ALFG\[^{\text{AD}}\] ON SAND, Plate XXI, Fig. 7.

Type 4:—
† IELDRIED ON SAN, Plate XXI, Fig. 8.

Type 5:—
* PVLF\[^{\text{POR}}\] ON SAN, Plate XXI, Fig. 9.

LEICESTERSHIRE:—D.B. Ledecestrescire.

LEICESTER:—D.B. Civitas de Ledecestre.

The county borough of Leicester, which gives its name to the shire, was the see of a bishop from A.D. 679 to some date between the years 869 and 888, when it was transferred to Dorchester in Oxfordshire. It is due to this circumstance that in Domesday it is denoted civitas, instead of burgus or urbs. The site has been identified with the ancient British Cair Lerion of Nennius and with Ratae of the Roman occupation of Britain. Although obscured in the Domesday appellation Ledecestre, other documentary and also our numismatic evidence make it clear that the usual forms of designation in Anglo-Saxon and Norman times were Ligoraceaster, Lygeraceaster, Legraceaster, Leherceaster, Lihraceaster and Leireceaster. The above are the principal forms, but many variants could be added.

Leicester was one of the Five Boroughs of the Danish Settlement, and although at Lincoln there was a coinage in the reign of Ælfred, and at Derby and Nottingham in that of Æthelstan, the earliest coins as yet correctly assigned to the remaining two of the five boroughs, viz., Leicester and Stamford, were struck under Eadgar.

The writer, however, possesses a unique round halfpenny of the type of Ælfred's best known coinage, which has around the obverse, in
lìeu of the name and title of the king, the inscription *LICIRA CIVI*,
the usual small cross surrounded by an inner circle occupying the
central position of the coin. The reverse has the inscription *RICO
F ME:*
for *Ricof me (fecit)*. This we may safely regard as an autonomous
piece struck by the Danes at Leicester in the latter part of the reign
of Ælfr̄ed. The next in our series of coins which undoubtedly bear
the name of Leicester are those of Eadgar, from whose reign a regal
coinage there was probably continuous until, and including, the reign
of Harold II., although there has not yet been noted a coin of
Eadweard the Martyr of this place.

In Domesday the account of the city of Leicester is placed at the
head of the survey of Leicestershire. The entry is somewhat lengthy,
but the following translation of the first portion of it supplies all that
is material for our present purpose:—

"In the time of King Edward the City of Leicester rendered yearly
to the king £30 by tale of 20 [pennies] to the ounce and 15 sestars
of honey. When the king went with his army by land 12 burgesses
went with him from this borough. If, however, he went against
an enemy by sea, they sent him four horses from the same borough to
London to carry weapons or other things of which there might be
need. King William now has £42 10s. by weight for all the rents of the
same city and shire. For a hawk £10 by tale. For a sumpter horse
20s. From the moneyers £20 yearly of 20 [pennies] to the ounce. Of
this £20 Hugh de Grentemaisnil has the third penny."

From this account it appears that Leicester remained a royal mint
at the time of Domesday and it probably so continued throughout the
reigns of William I. and II. notwithstanding the grant to Hugh de
Grentemaisnil by William I. of the third penny of the £20 paid yearly
by the moneyers.

We have, at present, no record of any example of Types I
and VI of William I. struck here, nor of Types 3, 4 and 5 of
William II.
The Leicester Mint.

WILLIAM I.

Type I:—

No example hitherto noted.

Type II:—

* GODRIE ON LECEI

* LIERIE ON LERELE, York Find, 1845, Plate XXI, Fig. 10.

Type III:—

* IEGELPINE ON LEQ, Plate XXI, Fig. 11.

Type IV:—

* IEGELPINE ON LECRI, Plate XXI, Fig. 12.

Type V:—

* IEGELPINE ON LEQI, Plate XXI, Fig. 13.

Type VI:—

No example hitherto noted.

Type VII:—

* IEGELPINE ON LEH, Beaworth Find, Plate XXI, Fig. 14.

Type VIII:—

* IEGELPINE ON LEH

* GODRIE ON LEHRE, Beaworth, 19; Tamworth, 1.

† * " " " var., Hks. 242, † Plate XXI, Fig. 15.

WILLIAM II.

Type 1:—

* GODRIE ON LEHRE, Tamworth Find.

Mule: obverse, Type 1, reverse, Type 2:—

* GODRIE ON LEHRE, Tamworth Find; the late Sir John Evans.

* * GODRIE ON LEHST, sub Chester, is probably a mis-reading from this coin.

Type 2:—

* GODRIE ON LEHRE, Tamworth Find, 2, Plate XXI, Fig. 16.

" " " LEH, Tamworth Find, 2.

" " " LHRE, " "

Types 3, 4 and 5:—

No examples hitherto noted.

1 In the absence of inspection of this coin it is impossible to attribute it with certainty to this mint, as its reading will equally apply to Chester, under which heading it was therefore also inserted.