THE "WEYMOUTH" AND "SALISBURY" MINTS OF CHARLES I:
AN OMISSION RECTIFIED

In 1938 the *British Numismatic Journal* accepted an article which I had written on the above subject (vol. xxiii, pp. 97-118). I do not now know why I omitted from it a coin in the British Museum which certainly should have been included. This coin, which Kenyon attributed hesitantly to Weymouth, has long been known. There are other additions and corrections which might be made to my original article, but, so far as I know, this is the only important omission. The coin, illustrated below, is a gold Unite and may be described as follows:

*Obverse.* Mint mark: Fleur-de-lis?
Type: Bust of king in armour to left, wearing the George. Hair falls on shoulder in a twisted lock. No studs on armour. \(01010\) on crown band.

*Reverse:* No mint mark.
Type: Round shield surrounded by scrolls and \& ornaments. Lis-headed harp. \(01010\) on crown band, which does not overlap shield.

Both dies belong as unmistakably to the series linked with the :SA: half-crown as do those of the Unite described in the original publication to the series associated with Weymouth. The obverse is similar to Shilling die C while the reverse is similar to Half-crown die 42. Both series thus include a Unite, as indeed might well have been expected.

D. F. ALLEN.
A NEW COIN OF HENRY OF ANJOU

[This paper, in a slightly longer form, has been included in an unpublished complimentary booklet dedicated to Dr. Willy Schwabacher in 1947.]

The coin illustrated above was discovered by the late Dr. G. C. Brooke and acquired by the British Museum in 1928 from a Miss W. Marsden. No other details of its origin are recorded. It may be described as follows:

**Obv.** Bust of warrior to right, showing collar of tunic and right arm; right hand holds sceptre in front of face; crown surmounted by two arches but without fleurs-de-lis. Beaded circle; legend HENRICVS.

**Rev.** Cross crosslets, with small cross superimposed diagonally at centre, contained in a tressure of four arches; a group of four pellets in each spandril. Beaded circle; legend + W-LE? - - ON: GLOE-.

Weight. 14.8 grains.

The coin is certainly of baronial origin; weight and fabric both differ from those of coins struck by Stephen's official moneyers with dies made from official irons. Neither obverse nor reverse are copied exactly from regular English coins, but the obverse is not unlike Stephen's first type. It differs in having the crown, if that is the right description, decorated with simple pellets in place of the royal fleurs-de-lis, and in the form of the arches. The reverse is quite original; it may owe something to the second type of William II; it certainly owes something to the ninth type of Henry I, but it is not copied from either. In general character it anticipates the "Tealby" coinage of 1158.

There can be no doubt in whose name the coin was issued. Struck at Gloucester in the heart of the Angevin territory, its legend can only refer to Henry of Anjou, on whose behalf after 1142 Matilda and her supporters claimed the throne.

Gloucester is in fact one of the principal places from which we should expect to find coins of Henry, but none have hitherto been known. Coins of *B.M.C.*\(^1\) types I (a) and (b) are recorded at the mint of Hereford (moneyers Willelm and Wicric), and at mints usually but unconvincingly identified as Malmesbury (moneyer Waltier?), and

\(^1\) *Catalogue of English Coins in the British Museum, Norman Kings, G. C. Brooke.*
A New Coin of Henry of Anjou

Devizes. Coins of B.M.C. type I (c) are only recorded from one legible mint, indicated by the letters CRST, usually interpreted as Cirencester (moneyer Willem). Coins of B.M.C. types II (a) and (b) were struck at Bristol (moneyer Arefin), at a mint usually interpreted as Wiveliscombe but far more likely to be Ilchester (moneyer Adam), and at one which has been interpreted as Sherborne. It has been usual to try to arrange the series in chronological order of types, but at present no single mint is known to have struck more than one type, and it is at least as probable that the difference between the types is one of locality and not of time. Indeed, the discovery of a completely new type which has little in common with those already known from a mint not previously recorded in the series points strongly in this direction. A sequence of types from a semi-official mint or mints, as we should perhaps treat those of the Angevin party, implies a degree of organization which is foreign to the times.

The possible limits of date for the issue for this and other coins of Henry are not very wide; it is hopeless to seek an exact place within them. The coins cannot have been struck before 1142, when the crown was first claimed for Henry; they can hardly have been struck after 1153, since it was one of the terms of the Treaty of Wallingford that there should be only one coinage throughout the realm. Stephen did nothing to put this agreement into effect, but after 1153 we must surely exclude unofficial coinage in Henry’s name. Within these limits we have no means of knowing when the coins were struck. Although Henry himself was not continuously in England, Gloucester was continuously in the hands of his party.

If it could be established that the parallel series of coins bearing the name of Willelm or Willelm Dux, now usually attributed to William of Gloucester, either preceded or succeeded those of Henry, a slight modification of these limits might be possible. In one case certainly, and perhaps in two, the Willelm coins come from the same mints as those of Henry. The attribution to William of Gloucester has little to recommend it except the presumption that the coins must have been copied from those of Henry and therefore be later. If we can dispense with the theory of a sequence of types, there seems no reason why we should not attribute the series to William de Mohun, Earl of Dorset and Somerset, at one time the most prominent William on the Angevin side, who deserted the Empress in 1143. The Winterton Hoard, from which one coin of William and six of Henry are recorded in a context where the latest regular coin of Stephen is of his second type, implies a relatively early date for the series. Although it is not the purpose of this paper to enlarge on this issue, it is not impossible that the Willelm coins precede those of Henry.

The moneyer’s name on the new coin, which should probably be restored as Willelm or Willem (rather than as Wibert), has not hitherto been recorded at the mint of Gloucester. There are regular coins of Stephen from this mint, struck, as in the case of other mints in parts of the country held by the Angevins, in type I before the
troubles started and in the last type after a peace had been patched up. The moneyers known up to the present in the first type are Alfwine, Gillebert, and Wibert or Wiberd, and in the last type Raulf. A complete change of moneyers would not be surprising; at this date the office was not held by craftsmen but by leading citizens as a source of profit. It would be natural that with a change of master some supporter of the new régime would be rewarded. Mr. F. Elmore Jones has, however, recently re-read one of the coins in the British Museum of the last type (no. 193), previously read as Ralf, and considers that it in fact reads PILLEM. He himself has another coin probably of the same moneyer. It seems therefore that the moneyer appointed to issue coins in Henry’s name was retained in office by Stephen when he recovered the town. I have not traced any mention of this moneyer’s name in manuscript records.

This coin, which appears to have been overlooked up till now, is a welcome addition to a very rare series.

AN UNPUBLISHED “MULE” OF STEPHEN

MULES of Stephen are so excessively rare that the discovery of an unnoticed one in the British Museum from its illustration in Norman Kings may perhaps be described as remarkable.

Whilst looking at the coins of Stephen’s last type figured on Pl. LV with particular reference to no. 6 (the BRAN... coin) I was struck by the unusual style of the obverse portrait of no. 8, a Canterbury coin by the moneyer RODBERT; provenance, the Awbridge find, 1903.

The explanation of the peculiarity of style of the obverse is that this coin is in fact a mule of type II/type VII. There is a very general similarity in both the obverse and reverse designs of the two types and it is possible that other unsuspected mules of the two types may exist.

The only mule coin of Stephen’s known to Brooke when preparing Norman Kings was the mule type I/type II illustrated on Pl. LIII, nos. 1 and 2, and referred to on p. 41 of the Introduction. Both specimens (one a penny and one a cut halfpenny) are from the same dies, and neither is (or was in 1916) in the Museum. The penny came from the Sheldon find which also contained another halfpenny of the same mule which Brooke thought was probably from the same dies as the other two known specimens. Since then a second Stephen mule has come to light, viz. the Henry I last type/Stephen first type mule which was in the South Kyme, Lincs., find, 1922, and is now in the British Museum. My safest course is, I think, simply to draw attention to this third mule and not to attempt any surmise as to whether its discovery affects the B.M.C. sequence of types. I feel tempted, however, to draw attention to the peculiar lettering and spelling on the reverse of the types I/II mule, and to suggest that this coin might conceivably be a contemporary forgery—Brooke states that there
were apparently two contemporary forgeries of type II coins in the Sheldon find, which seems significant.

As to the Canterbury coin (the II/VII mule) there can be no doubt that this mule is genuine. The position of types I and VII cannot be altered, but the excessively rare types III, IV, V, and VI, if indeed all are in fact substantive types, might easily be the subject of possible rearrangement as to sequence. Against altering the position of type II the epigraphical evidence and that of the Linton find (which, however, seems to have been the only find of type II coins in any number, namely, 40 coins) is definitely in favour of its being correctly placed.

The problem of the sequence of types II to VI is therefore very perplexing in the light of this discovery of a II/VII mule. I fear it is one which cannot be taken further in the light of present knowledge.

F. ELMORE JONES.