

## MISCELLANEA

### *A Find of Coins of Eadred, Eadwig, and Eadgar at Chester*

By the courtesy of Prof. Robert Newstead, the Hon. Curator of the Grosvenor Museum, Chester, we are able to publish this account of a find of forty-three silver pennies of Eadred, Eadwig, and Eadgar, at a barber's premises at 97 Eastgate Row, Chester, on 5 June 1857. They were presented to the Grosvenor Museum by the Rev. F. A. Potts, 3 April 1941.

The find is composed as follows:

Eadred, type 1. Chester moneyers . . . . .	3
Eadwig, type 1. York . . . . .	1
Eadgar, B.M.C. Id, Brooke 1. Chester moneyers . . . . .	31
Other moneyers . . . . .	7
„ B.M.C. IV, Brooke 4. Chester moneyer . . . . .	1
	43

The Eadwig penny of York is the only one with a mint-name, but of the remaining forty-two coins thirty-five can be assigned with some certainty to the Chester mint. The coins are all, except No. 39 of Eadgar, similar in type, with small cross pattée on the obverse, and moneyer's name in two lines on the reverse, divided by a cross and two annulets. As a "complement" to this find consult the *Numismatic Chronicle*, Fourth Series, vol. xx (1920), pp. 141 ff., which gives an account of a hoard of 122 coins of Eadgar, Eadweard II, and Aethelred II found in Chester in August 1914, described by G. F. Hill. In this find, in contrast to the one under review, the majority of the coins were of the type with bust on obverse and small cross pattée on reverse. It is not intended to discuss the matter here, but it seems that there may be something to be learnt from the segregation in these two finds of portrait and non-portrait types, which may add fresh suggestions for the vexed controversy over the sequence or concurrence of portrait and non-portrait types. See *Num. Chron.*, loc. cit.; Brooke's *English Coins*, p. 66, &c.

#### *Notes on individual coins:*

- Eadred, No. 3. This moneyer is no doubt identical with Sigeferth (Athelstan).
- Eadwig, No. 1. Moneyer not in Brooke.
- Eadgar, No. 2. This is probably the Chester Aelfsige.
- No. 18. Deorulf probably = Deorlaf.
- Nos. 24 and 25. Identical with Frothric; No. 30 provides the link.
- No. 31. This is the Chester moneyer who struck the famous Howel Dda penny.

Nos. 33, 36, and 38. Moneyers not assignable to any mint.  
No. 37. Unpublished moneyer, but perhaps blundered.

T. M. TURNER

*Note:* In the following list all coins except the one of Eadwig and No. 39 of Eadgar have the moneyer's name in two lines, divided by a middle line O+O which does not vary.

# LIST OF THE COINS

EADRED, 946-55

*B.M.C. I, Brooke I.*

1. EADRED REX    ÐVMO/DNON    Thurmod (Chester moneyer under Eadgar).
2.    (*As I.*)    ÐVM/ODM̄O    "
3.    (*As I.*)    ZIEE/RDM̄O    Siefereth (worked at Chester under Athelstan).

EADWIG, 955-9

*B.M.C. I, Br. I.*

1. EADVIG REX    

❖  
EDELZ  
OM+EO  
TAN M  
❖

*clay*  
York: Athelstan (not in Brooke).

EADGAR, 959-75

*B.M.C. Id, Brooke I.* (All with two annulets and one cross dividing moneyer's name.)

1. EADGAR RE • I    ÆLFR/EDH    Ælfred (? Thetford).
2. EADGAR[-]    ÆLFZ/IGMO    Ælfsige (Chester moneyer, and other towns).
3. (*Same dies as 2.*)
4. EADGARRE    ALDEF/INEM̄    Aldewine (Chester moneyer).
5. EADGARRE    ALDE/FINE    "
6. EADGARRE+    ALDE/VVI    "
7. EADGARRE    ALHM/VND    Alhmund.
8. (*Similar.*)    ALH/MVND    "
9. EADGARE    EOR/OÐM    Eoroth (broken and repaired, Chester).
10. (*Same dies as 9.*)    "    "
11. (*Obv. similar to 9.*)    EOR/OÐHO    Eoroth.
12. (*Obv. similar. Rev. same die as 11.*)    "
13. (*Obv. similar.*)    EORO/ÐMO    "
14. (*Same dies as 13.*)
15. EADGARRE+    EALFS/IGEH    Aelfsige (Chester and other mints).
16. EADGARRE    EADM/VNDM    Eadmund (Chester).
17. EAD[G]ARE+    EAD/HVND    "
18. EADGARRE    DEOR/VLF    Deorulf (no doubt identical with Deorlaf, Chester moneyer).
19. EADGARE+    DEOR/VLFH    "    "    "
20. EADGARRE    ÐVRM/ODM̄O    Thurmod (Chester moneyer).
21. (*Obv. as 20.*)    ÐVR/MODM    "
22. (*Similar.*)    ÐVR/MOD    "
23. (*Similar to 22.*)    "    "

24. ( <i>Obv. similar.</i> )	FREÐ/RICM	Frothric (?) (Chester moneyer).
25. ( <i>Similar.</i> )	FRE/ÐRIC	"
26. ( <i>Similar.</i> )	FROÐ/RICMŌ	Frothric (Chester moneyer).
27. ( <i>Similar.</i> )	CROÐ/RICM	"
28. ( <i>Similar.</i> )	FROÐ/RICM	"
29. EADĠARE+	FROÐ/RICM	"
30. EADĠARRE+	FREO/RICH	"
31. ( <i>Obv. similar.</i> )	GILV/Z MŌ	Gillys (Chester moneyer).
32. ( <i>Same dies as 31.</i> )		
33. ( <i>Obv. similar.</i> )	HRO/ÐVLF	Hrothulf.
34. EADĠARRE	MER/TINM	Martin (Chester moneyer under Athelstan).
35. ( <i>Obv. similar.</i> )	MER/TIN	" "
36. ( <i>Similar.</i> )	FERZ/TAN	Werstan.
37. EADĠARE+E+ [ <i>sic</i> ]	TEOÐ/VCMO	Teothuc?
38. EADĠARR	VVER/ZTAN	Werstan.
<i>B.M.C. IV, Brooke 4</i> (Rosette each side).		
39. EADĠARREXTOD	ÐVRMODMONET	Thurmod (Chester moneyer).

### *A Hoard of Aethelred II Coins, 1940*

By A. H. BALDWIN

The object of this short note is to record the particulars of a small hoard of pennies of the time of Aethelred II, the king whose reign of thirty-eight years lasted, except for one short break, from A.D. 978 to A.D. 1016. Unfortunately very little is known of the place or time of the actual finding, for they were discovered among certain property left by an inhabitant of Shaftesbury. This man had put a note with them stating that they had been found on a building site near the town, and it also mentioned that a skeleton had been found on the same site some months before the coins were unearthed. No date was given and inquiry has failed to throw any more light on the matter.

The coins, 65 in number, are all of B.M.C. Type 4a, Hildebrand Type D, i.e. *obv.* Bust to left dividing the legend; *Rev.* Long voided cross with a pellet in the centre. That they are all of one type is in itself interesting as it is an uncommon event for this period. It would appear, however, that Type 4a has been represented in several previous hoards, mostly of Scandinavian origin.

There are 18 mints represented out of a possible 30 known for the type, and below is a list of them with the moneyers that are included:

<i>Mint.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Moneyers.</i>
1. Bath	2	ÆLFRIC
2. Canterbury	2	ÆLFRYD, EADPOLD
3. Chester	2	ELFSTAN, OÐVLF
4. Exeter	1	PVLFSIGE
5. Gloucester	4	LEOFSIGE, PIHTSIGE

6. Lincoln	8	EÐELNOÐ, COLGRIM, DRENG, GRIMM, VNBEIN, PVLFRIC
7. London	11	ÆÐELPERD, BRIHTLAF, BRVNSTAN, GODPINE, LEOFRED, LEOFRYD, LEOFRIC, LEOPINE, LYFING, SÆPINE, PVLFPINE
8. Lydford	1	GODA
9. Norwich	1	SPERTINC
10. Shaftesbury	1	GODA
11. Shrewsbury	1	PYNSIGE
12. Stamford	1	SPERTGAR
13. Wareham	1	PVLFRIC
14. Warwick	1	AEÐESTAN
15. Winchcombe	1	AELFGAR
16. Winchester	2	AELFSIGE, BRYHTPOLD
17. Worcester	4	AEÐELMAER, DVRANT, PVLFRIC
	(one forgery)	
18. York	21	EADRIC, FROSTVLF, HVNDVLF, LEOFSTAN, STEORCER, SVMERLID, SVNVLf, SPERT, ÐVRSTAN, PENGOS

Total  $\overline{65}$

Mr. Derek Allen has seen the hoard, and he has recorded the full reading for each coin. All the moneyers, as he points out, are known for the type and with few exceptions they are represented in the National Collection. They are all described in Hildebrand with the exception of the Winchcombe coin which, incidentally, is by far the rarest in the find. Mr. Allen also mentions that a few of the dies are not of regular workmanship and were probably locally made. Under this heading are the coins of Bath, Chester, and three of the Lincoln pieces. The late Dr. G. C. Brooke considered the Chester coin of OÐVLF to be of Danish origin.

It is obviously out of the question to explain how the hoard came to be buried. It has been suggested that whoever buried it must recently have received a payment from York. There are so many die duplicates among the York minted coins that they cannot have passed through many hands before reaching the man who put them in the ground. But this does not explain how coins of the same type of widely separated mints came to be accumulated in Shaftesbury, and no argument that I have heard would seem to answer the problem conclusively.

#### *Notes on Two Baronial Coins*

##### *I. Matilda defaced to read Stephen*

*Obv.* Similar to the type illustrated in B.M.C., Pl. LXI, No. 2.

+SATPNEREO recut on an original inscription of +MATILDICO

*Rev.* Similar to the type illustrated in B.M.C., Pl. LXI, No. 2.

+EVERARD : ON : WAR

In this coin we find an ironical retort to the extensive series of Stephen's coins defaced by partisans of the Empress. Actually it was probably expediency rather than irony that prompted this recutting of Matilda's dies.



Obv. I

Obv. II

As to details, the obverse legend speaks for itself. The reverse legend I take as the basis for attributing this coin to Wareham, following Brooke (B.M.C. i, p. cxx) with some misgivings, in spite of the facts that there is no Everard otherwise known to have been associated with this mint, and that we do know an Everard of the period at Warwick, and that furthermore the Warwick Everard used the same form of W (W).

A basis for dating this coin is furnished by the history of Wareham during the anarchy (if one accepts the mint attribution). Wareham was a stronghold of Robert of Gloucester until he surrendered it to Stephen in 1138. Recaptured by Baldwin de Redvers next year, it remained in Angevin hands until June 1142, when William of Gloucester gave it up to Stephen. It was retaken by Robert of Gloucester in the same year, and a subsequent attempt of Stephen to recapture it failed. My inference from the above facts is that the original dies were made some time previous to June of 1142. It seems more than likely that Stephen would take advantage of the opportunity afforded by his recapture of the town to recut Matilda's dies as a temporary expedient while awaiting the preparation or arrival of dies for striking his regular coinage, a project never realized because of the loss of Wareham in November.

## II. *Temp. Stephen*

*Obv.* Similar to type illustrated in B.M.C., Pl. LXI, No. 3.

ΓΙϞΙΕΤ+

*Rev.* Similar to type illustrated in B.M.C., Pl. LXI, No. 3.

VVITLSE

This coin presents a fascinating but rather discouraging problem. In stylistic character, both obverse and reverse, it is remarkably close to the Bristol coinage of Matilda, and especially to that specimen from the Roth collection described and illustrated in the B.M.C.

(I, p. cxviii, No. 3, and Pl. LXI, No. 3). The lettering of the legends, both obverse and reverse, is extremely crude and obviously hand-engraved, and in the style of the engraving I find another striking similarity to the Matilda coin just mentioned. All in all I am convinced that the coin under consideration should be assigned to Bristol.



Rev. I

Rev. II

Following this assumption we are confronted with two chief objections. The name of the moneyer is one with which we are not familiar, either at Bristol or elsewhere, but the form of the letters is so crude as to put the true reading in doubt. The name of the mint is largely off the edge of the flan, and this part of the coin is in any case so lightly struck as to offer no hint of the form even of the bottoms of the letters used. To all this I reply simply that the stylistic character of the coin suggests a Bristol origin so strongly in every detail that it must be taken as conclusive in the absence of strong evidence to the contrary.

But having got so far, we are still faced with the problem of how a coin with such an obverse legend, suggesting as it does a blundered version of **STEPHEN** if indeed it suggests anything, came to be struck in a city that was the principal Angevin stronghold throughout the anarchy. Oman has pointed out, in his *Coinage of England*, that we might expect to find specimens of the later regular types of Stephen showing the mint-name of Bristol, although none were known at the time he wrote. It is possible that the specimen in question may represent a makeshift set of dies used at a time when the official control of the central mint remained tenuous and communications were still difficult. Such a period existed between 1148 and 1154, after the Angevin cause in England had been substantially abandoned, and previous to the signing of the Treaty of Wallingford.

On the other hand, it may be argued that, somewhat as in the case of the **PERERIC** series, this coin was struck by a moneyer who, even though he felt it best to adhere to the Stephen party, still thought it wise to hedge against a possible sudden revival of Angevin power. This view is supported by the fact that the obverse legend, while strongly suggestive of the name and title **STIE RE**, is still, and quite possibly intentionally, so obscure as to be capable of interpretations more acceptable to the opposing faction. The final letter



of this legend looks most like a T, and a strong stretch of the imagination gives the third letter the appearance of E. While this cannot possibly be accepted as the basis for an alternative attribution to Robert of Gloucester, it might yet serve in a pinch as an alibi for a frightened moneyer. Did this moneyer perhaps use an entirely fictitious name, made up of letters most easily cut, with a view to disclaiming all responsibility should the need arise?

Whatever the true solution may be, I feel confident in assigning this coin to Bristol, and in dating it within the period intervening between the departure of the Empress from England and the signing of the Treaty of Wallingford.

L. CABOT BRIGGS

### *A Note on the Fox Classification of Edward I's Pence*

In discussing the Boyton Find of Edwardian pence in the *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1936, p. 117, Mr. D. F. Allen called attention to the slight confusion presented by the Fox classification of Class III. He suggested that the Fox division of this group is not categorical, and that owing to the merging of certain sub-groups of this class one with another the "exact apportionment into classes is ultimately a matter of taste and eye". In this connexion it seems worth while pointing out that a slight discrepancy exists between the original classification by Messrs. Fox in vol. vii of the *British Numismatic Journal*, and Mr. Shirley-Fox's summary of the classes in the *Numismatic Chronicle* in 1917. On p. 120 of vol. vii of the *British Numismatic Journal* (reprint, p. 32) it is stated that the type called Class III*d* occurs only at mints situated in the north of England "at which it seems to occupy that place in the series which is filled in the South by III*e*". In the *Numismatic Chronicle* of 1917, p. 282 (reprint, p. 4), Mr. Shirley-Fox, presumably owing to a slip, says precisely the opposite, and that coins of Class III*d* were struck at London, Bristol, Lincoln, and Bury St. Edmunds, and that Class III*e* is represented by a "sub-type peculiar to the mints in the North of England, and contemporaneous with III*d*", the northern mints concerned being Durham, Newcastle, and York, both royal and ecclesiastical. In the circumstances it seems better not to attempt too minute a subdivision, and to regard Classes III*d* and III*e*, since, moreover, they were contemporaneous, as forming one and the same group. We may suppose that Brooke was aware of the difficulties here outlined, and that his modification of Class III into *a*, *b*, and *c* (*English Coins*, p. 122) is the most practical division yet available.

C. A. WHITTON

### *A Long-Cross Pattern?*

There lies in the British Museum a collection of rusty medieval dies which were found in 1914 in the Chapel of the Pyx at Westminster. Most of those which can be identified are, like those in the Public

Record Office, for coins of Edward III of the York and Durham mints. There is, however, one die which is sufficiently out of the ordinary to deserve a special note.

Unfortunately the die is in the worst possible condition and only an attentive study by eyes accustomed to interpreting and reading such objects reveals what was once there. It is a trussel or upper die; that is to say that it was intended to be hit by the hammer, not to be fixed by a spike into the anvil. It is therefore odd to find that it bears a head, for by immemorial practice the head has been the lower die. The type of the coin is a king's head and shoulders not unlike the earlier version of the king's head on Long-Cross coins of Henry III, except that it lacks the inner circle. Though the diameter of the coin is the same as that on the regular coins, the head is larger, the crown and the chin both reaching almost to the surrounding beaded circle. Owing to the additional space the king's beard is shown as longer. A legend on either side, divided by the shoulders, reads as follows:

HENRIC VSREX



In the accompanying drawing most of the right-hand side of the face has been reconstructed from the left. Some details of the shoulders may be fanciful. It is not certain whether there are intermediate ornaments between the flowers on the crown, or letters over it. It is, however, substantially accurate. The arrangement of hair and beard, the crown in its main details, the fringe in front, the details of lips, nose, and eye are certain. In addition the placing and reading of the legend on either side are certain.

No coin precisely resembling this has been found. It is therefore probably a die for a pattern coin, the type of which was never adopted. This is also suggested by the fact that, though an obverse die, it was engraved on a trussel, not on a standard. For a pattern it would be enough to submit a uniface impression such as could be struck with this die. It shows no signs of having been used.

The occasion on which the pattern was prepared may be guessed at. In 1247 the first discussions and deliberations commenced which ended in the Long-Cross issue of 1248. It is most likely that this die was prepared as a possible type for the Long-Cross coinage. We do not know why it was not adopted. Artistically it is a definite improvement on the one accepted, so much so as to suggest that it might be a later pattern in the same reign, an intended improvement on the current type. A third alternative is that it might have been a pattern for the gold penny. The first suggestion is, however, the most probable.



A careful search amongst the dies in the British Museum has failed to discover, so far, a corresponding reverse.

D. F. ALLEN.

*The "Twopence" of Henry III in the Drabble Sale*

A coin which has always had a certain notoriety among numismatists has recently passed under the hammer for the third time. It is an example of a long-cross penny struck on a large-size flan. The readings are:

*Obv.* HENRICVS REX III      Bust with sceptre.

*Rev.* WILLIEM OICANT      Long-cross type.

The type is that of Lawrence class Vg, which he dates between 1260 and 1272. It first appeared in the Ready Sale, 1920; it was sold again in the Wheeler Sale, 1930, and has finally been sold in the Drabble Sale, 1939. It has been described as a double penny, and indeed its weight, which is 43.8 grains, is double that of the ordinary penny. Measurement with a callipers will, however, show that the piece was struck from the ordinary penny dies of that time, not from special dies. It may therefore be doubted whether it was ever struck for circulation. There is no documentary authority for such a coin, and nothing but its weight would have distinguished it from an ordinary penny. The piece has been gilt and mounted, and it is far more likely that it was struck as a special piece for this purpose than that it was a true double penny. The gilding is on the reverse, the side with the cross. This is a regular practice a little later, when the groats of Edward I were often so treated. That pennies were also treated in this way can be told from a document published in abstract by Thorold Rogers in his *History of Prices* (vol. ii, pp. 13-14). In the inventory of John Sevekworth's effects (he was bailiff at Merton College, Oxford), 1314, occurs the following item: two "firmacula", valued at two shillings, one of them being mounted by a gilded penny as a symbol. Firmacula is translated by Rogers as seals, but this is an error; it is the regular medieval word for brooches. Here then we have almost contemporary evidence for just such a piece as the "twopence" of Henry III. It seems to me not at all unlikely that the mint would strike special pennies for this purpose, showing the details of the reverse to better advantage than on the ordinary penny. The flan is just wide enough to show the complete outer circle.

In Ruding's Supplement, Part II, plate II, no. 23, there is illustrated on dubious authority a similar coin reading ROBERT OICANT, not now known. Should this coin turn up, it would be of great interest to know whether it too was gilded. If so, the Canterbury mint may have made a speciality of these *pièces de plaisir* for the purpose of turning them into brooches.

D. F. ALLEN