ON A PENNY OF THE ARMED-Figure TYPE WITH THE TITLE com IN THE REIGN OF STEPHEN.

By LORD GRANTLEY, F.S.A.

This rare penny was acquired by me from the Rev. S. Bourdillon, formerly Vicar of East Tytherley, Hampshire, and was found by a workman whilst excavating for the foundations of the bell-tower of East Tytherley Church in 1884, within four miles from the site of the Winterslow hoard of 1804, in which the only other known specimen, a variety of this although from the same obverse die, occurred. This latter is described in the "Catalogue of the British Museum," volume i, plate lxii, 14, under irregular issues of Stephen as an uncertain baronial coin.

Both pennies may be described as follows:—

ONE OF THE TWO SILVER PENNIES OF THE ARMED-Figure TYPE OF SALISBURY.

Obverse:— * . . . . . com. Bust to right in armour, wearing a helmet without nasal, holding in the right hand a sword in front of face; around, inscription divided by the bust with beaded outer circle; star behind the bust.

Reverse:— * & T [varied respectively] ON : & X. Cross fleury over quadrilateral with concave sides, fleurs de lys at each angle. Around, inscription between two beaded circles.
There is no mention of a star behind the bust in the description of the Museum coin,\textsuperscript{1} but it is very clear on this, whilst the \textbf{COM}, so plain on the former, has been omitted from the latter, as the die has evidently not been pressed evenly on the flan. On my penny the legend has on the obverse the remains of the lower part of a cross preceding the lower portion of several letters which, to my eyes, are not sufficiently certain for a decided opinion.

The reverse legend of my penny is not very clear, but the first letter is \textbf{S}, the second probably half a \textbf{T}, the third or fourth letter is certainly \textbf{A}, and the end reads \textbf{ON : u A}. For this Mr. Andrew has suggested \textbf{STANGUVN}, which is his reading of the name of the moneyer upon the coins of Stephen's first type at Salisbury, Hawkins 270; whereas he believes the name of the moneyer on the Museum coin similar to mine to be \textbf{STANNING}, that on Stephen's coins at Salisbury of his last type, Hawkins 268. If this be correct, and I think he is right, it follows that my coin is earlier in date than its fellow, and this would seem to be so, for, although both coins are struck from the same obverse die, mine suggests a sharper impression, as if from it in its first condition. Very likely Stanghun was father to Stanning.

The attribution of these two coins is still a very open question, because, whilst the most likely person would be Patric, Earl of Salisbury, as tentatively suggested by Mr. Andrew, he at the same time admitted the difficulty that Patric, so far as we know, was not created an earl before 1149, whereas the Winterslow hoard which contained the Museum coin was almost certainly deposited whilst Stephen's second regal issue, Hawkins type 269, was still being issued. But for this one would assume that no other person could have struck a coin which has \textbf{I}, a conical helmet instead of a crown; \textbf{2}, the word for \textit{Comes}; \textbf{3}, the mint \textit{SA} for Sarum or \textit{Sarisberie} on both the coins in review.

The \textbf{O} of \textbf{COM} only occurs in this uncial form with the characteristic rounded centre, and tail on the right, on one other type of

\textsuperscript{1} It is, however, visible, for Mr. Andrew called attention to it in the \textit{Numismatic Circular}, 1914.
Stephen's reign, Hawkins 284, attributed in the Museum Catalogue "to William of Gloucester between his father's death in 1147 and the arrival of Henry in 1149." But here, again, the same difficulty arises. These coins were present in the Winterslow hoard, and to accept his attribution would necessitate our extending the issue of Stephen's second type, Hawkins 269, to 1147, or 1148, an improbable supposition. I therefore prefer Mr. Andrew's attribution of this series bearing the name of William and the same general reverse designs as that of the coin which is the subject of this paper, to William de Mohun, who, according to Dr. Horace Round,\(^1\) was created Earl of Somerset and Dorset in or before 1141. I would go further and suggest the possibility even, for I will not put it stronger, that he was also the issuer of another coin in my collection, similar in type to the "William series," with an illegible name but the title CONES, for Comes, on the obverse, and \(\mathbf{\text{LL DE VIZAI}},\) for William of Devizes, as its reverse legend.

The Empress used only Stephen's first type on the reverse; which was doubtless what the public were accustomed to. Mr. Brooke,\(^2\) quoting the charter to Aubrey de Vere confirmed by Henry of Anjou, points out that Matilda probably abandoned her claims about 1142-3, and the Angevin party, as Henry of Anjou's first issue shows, placed his name instead of his mother's on the coins with, for continuity's sake, the same type as the latter's. It seems to me that Henry was desirous of effacing all traces of the usurper Stephen's types by coining for his second issue, with full face, his grandfather's last type—the fifteenth of Henry I—which Mr. Brooke ascribes to the years 1142-43. This with little variety and the voided cross style, formed the bulk of the rebel coins. The probable suspension of the Pyx trials owing to civil war caused Stephen's first type, including Matilda's, to form a long series in time and bulk, and it seems likely that many of the more obscure baronial and irregular issues\(^3\) followed this type, with

\(^1\) Geoffrey de Mandeville, pp. 271, 277.
\(^2\) "British Museum Catalogue," p. cxxvii.
surcharged and other variations. These may have been prior to 1142 if this is the date, as supposed by Mr. Brooke, when those representing the boy, Henry of Anjou, changed his reverse type.

The anomalous character of the coins of Bishop Henry de Blois seems to point to his having, on Stephen's captivity in 1142, assumed a quasi-regal supremacy over the royal party which his position as legate and King's brother would warrant his doing. William of Malmesbury\(^1\) quotes the legate as saying that by the condescension of the Pope he acted as his vice-regent in England. There is no territorial legend and they must by their reverses have emanated from York, where his power was strongest. This coinage and that of Robert de Stuteville, with those which the see of York had the prescriptive right of issuing, must have balanced those of the Angevin Earls in the west, and of Eustace Fitz-John commanding the Scottish-Angevin army in the north, for Mr. Lawrence has I think rightly argued that Eustace Fitz-Stephen could not have struck coins in his father's lifetime even if the latter was in captivity.

\(^1\) A.D. 1141, p. 518.