I am grateful to Mr. John Gardner, F.S.A., for permission to publish a debased silver coin of the Dobuni, found while excavating a Romano-British site at Brockham End, O.S. 6-inch, Somerset VII, NE. and SE., 2·2 inches from the top edge and 6 inches from the right edge, marked Roman villa, site of. Digging took place in 1939 and from 1946 to 1948. The coin was unstratified. Pottery dated from the Flavian period to the fourth century, but two small sherds of Early Iron Age “A” were also found.

The coin is of small module, 12 mm. maximum diameter, weight 9·75 grains. It appears to be uninscribed, and to contain very little, if any, silver. Obverse: Remains of a head showing the eye, nose, and mouth to the right, and before the face a crescent and other ornamental marks. Reverse: A horse galloping right in natural style, above it a retrograde s flanked by two inverted crescents, and behind the horse another s, not retrograde but more elongated. A fairly close parallel is Evans, Pl. N. 6 for the reverse, and for the obverse Evans, Pl. F. 9. Neither parallel is exact. The s ornament, which should not be taken as an inscription, may be seen in an earlier example of the Dobunnic silver coinage, Evans, Pl. F. 5. The naturalistic style of the horse probably derives from Belgic influence, and the coin may perhaps be dated to the first half of the first century A.D. It is considerably worn, and while it may be a stray loss, would not be out of place on an early Roman site.

H. de S. Shortt

A NEW TYPE FOR ALFRED

A new type for the coinage of Alfred is something of a numismatic event—one, I believe, that has not occurred since the discovery of the great Cuerdale hoard in 1840. In this instance the new coin is also significant because it offers evidence for the relationship—one must not arbitrarily assume sequence, for the types do not always appear to have been issued consecutively—of Alfred’s types.

The coin, a penny, was found in the course of the excavation of an Anglo-Saxon site at Southampton in 1949 and has been acquired by the British Museum. I owe it to the courtesy of Mr. Carson that it was brought to my notice. It is unfortunately so corroded that a cast of it cannot safely be taken and the moneyer’s name, even, is
doubtful. But the type of both obverse and reverse is clear. Commander Mack has kindly done a drawing of the coin.

The obverse shows the King’s head diademed, facing right, the bust reaching to the edge of the coin. The inscription so far as it is visible reads \(-LFERD REX\cdots\) beginning to the left of the head.

The reverse shows a cross reaching to the edge of the coin and voided in the centre with a large lozenge containing a cross saltire. In the quarters are traces of the letters of the moneyer’s name, made the more difficult to read by the fact that the coin is chipped as well as corroded. The word \(\text{MONET\cdots}\) is clear; the only letters of the moneyer’s name that one can read with a fair degree of certainty are the initial \(\ell\) and an \(\epsilon\) beginning the second half of the name. The second letter might be \(D\) or \(\ell\), the third \(I\) or \(L\); the fifth is undecipherable, and the sixth (and last) appears to be \(E\) but might be \(\epsilon\).

The weight, in view of the condition of the coin, has little significance.

To deal first with the obverse, it will be seen that the type is that of Alfred’s first issue according to the British Museum Catalogue and Brooke’s classification. This is the type that was also struck by Alfred’s predecessor Æthelred I, by Burgred of Mercia, and by Archbishop Ceolnoth of Canterbury, and which was significantly absent from the Cuerdale hoard. It is often found of apparently base silver, as are the Burgred coins, and may on that account have gained an ill reputation that resulted in its withdrawal when the quality of the current issue had improved. The reading (E)lferth is unusual, indeed I do not remember to have seen it elsewhere, but ELFERED occurs occasionally.\(^1\) The Saxon title, for such one must assume the word beginning with \(\epsilon\) to be, is not normally found on coins of Alfred’s first type, but occurs on B.M.C. type 5 (Brooke 5).

The reverse is of this rare type, B.M.C. 5, and it remains only to attempt to identify the moneyer. The range is restricted by our having the initial letter reasonably certainly established. Of the moneyers beginning with \(E\) who struck both types (1 and 5) we have Eadwulf and Ethelred. The first can clearly be ruled out and the second does not well fit the letters that can be seen. But a moneyer Ethelere occurred on two coins in the Beeston Tor hoard of type 1, and it seems likely that this is the man we have to do with here. If the second letter is, as is possible, a \(D\) and the third an \(L\), we may complete the name \(EBLER.E\). This cannot be regarded as certain, but appears the most likely interpretation on the slender evidence available.

In later series, one would call this coin a “mule” and use it as evidence in building up a sequence of types. Generally in the early Anglo-Saxon series this would be a false premiss as it is quite clear that a variety of types was often issued concurrently. The seventeen (or more) types issued in the short reign of Ceolwulf I (821–3) prove this. By the time of Alfred’s accession, however, the types had become stabilized—his predecessor in his five years’ reign issued but one type—and although later in Alfred’s reign there appears to have

\(^1\) Cp. B.M.C. ii, p. 57, no. 172.
been a reversion to some extent to the older practice, it may well be that *B.M.C.* type 1 was, for a short time, his only type and that later it was superseded by type 5 and a variety of other types, many represented today by single specimens, as is the case with Brooke types 2, 3, and 4.

In this instance, therefore, the word "mule" would seem justified.

C. E. BLUNT

THE MEDALLIC JETTON OF PERKIN WARBECK

The purpose of this note is to place on record one or two further facts regarding the rare silver pieces sometimes, though it would seem erroneously, called groats, a detailed description of which is given in *Medallic Illustrations of the History of Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. i, p. 21. In considering whether they should rather be called jettons or medals, it is worth noting that Barnard¹ points out that it was in the Burgundian Low Countries, whence it is generally accepted that these pieces emanate, that the historical jetton originated. He cites two struck in the 1430's and draws attention to the vogue they enjoyed there in the sixteenth century. We may perhaps best employ his own phrase of medallic jettons for these Warbeck pieces.

The pieces are anonymous, but have generally been accepted as being associated with Perkin Warbeck on account of the date they bear, 1494, and of the fact that they carry the royal arms of England and, as legend on one side, a version of the writing on the wall at Belshazzar's feast, a seeming threat to Henry VII, and on the other the Latin equivalent of 'O Lord, save the King', which may be assumed to refer to the pretender.

The association of these pieces with Warbeck is considerably strengthened by a description that James Gairdner gives in his *Richard III*² (p. 290) of a seal of Warbeck's. This, it will be seen, bears a general resemblance to the obverse of the jettons; it shows, says Gairdner, a shield quartered, bearing in the first and fourth quarters the lilies of France, and in the second and third three leopards, the whole covered with a crown closed-in. Within the

² Published by the Cambridge University Press.
circle of the crown are lilies and crowned leopards holding ostrich feathers over them. The document to which this seal was attached is dated 24 January 1495 (1494 old style) and is signed ‘Rychardus Angleterre, manu propria’. By it Warbeck makes over, in the event of the failure of his issue male, to Maximilian, King of the Romans and his heirs, all his rights in his own Kingdom of England and France, his Duchy of York, his Lordship of Ireland, and his Principality of Wales.

I have had to speak in the past tense of the seal being attached to the document, for when, after some inquiry, I traced the original to the State Archives in Vienna, it was only to learn that the seal had become detached and could not be found. This is the more to be regretted as no reproduction of it appears to exist.

Another feature which points to the pieces being medals or jettons rather than coins is that all appear to be from the same dies. The ten specimens of which either photographs or casts were available to me are undoubtedly so. A reproduction of the specimen in the Vienna collection I have not seen. As potential currency for an invading army the product of one pair of dies would be of little use.

In one respect the _Medallic History_ has fallen into a slight error when it states that the weight is about that of an English groat. The groat at this time weighed 48 grains, whereas the average weight of the Warbeck pieces is about 60 grains. Correction of this error serves of course to strengthen the medallic attribution. On the other hand, undue importance should probably not be attached to the gilding of the British Museum specimen, a feature which is used to support the medal theory, for, so far as I know, it is the only specimen so treated.

The date of 1494 on these pieces has caused some doubt as to their being rightly associated with Warbeck inasmuch as his “invasion” took place in July 1495. It is clear, however, that it had been planned to take place some months earlier, that is, in the year 1494 old style, and the _Cambridge Modern History_ (i. 468-71) explains that the project was upset by the arrest of Stanley who was executed by Henry VII on 16 February 1494-5.

Only one other point remains to be made. The specimen of this rare piece in the Fitzwilliam Museum was bequeathed to the University as long ago as 1589. It would be interesting to know how the piece was then described, but my friend Mr. Shrubbs tells me that unfortunately no such description has survived.

C. E. BLUNT

**A SHIP TYPE OF CHARLES II**

_Thomas Simon's_ silver trial-piece for his angel coinage of 1660 has been illustrated several times, but there is one point about the type and its derivatives that still needs clarification. I mean the ship on the reverse, which is, I believe, the only case of an identifiable ship-
portrait on the English coinage. The descriptions of the pieces selected for discussion are as follows.

1. A thin silver cliché (rev. only), a trial-piece for Simon’s angel of 1660. **AMOR POPVLI PRAESIDIVM REGIS.** Port broadside view of a three-masted warship under mainsail and main topsail. Quartered English arms on mainsail and C II R on topsail. The hull has two complete tiers of gun ports, and a carved quarter gallery. The ensign at the stern has a St. George’s Cross in canton.¹

![Fig. 1](image)

2. Pattern farthing, “Dominion of the Seas” coinage, 1662–5. **Obv. CAROLVS • A • CAROLO** Rose, thistle, and harp, crowned and arranged in form of cross. **Rev. QVATVOR • MARIA • VINDICO.** A much smaller and more detailed portrait of the same ship, under all canvas except mainsail, lateen mizzen, and spritsail-topsail. Royal yards with furled sails are fitted above the fore and main top-gallant sails. There are two tiers of gun-ports. The ship flies a large square flag at each masthead, with a pendant below, and similar pendants at fore and main yardarms, peak of lateen, and under spritsail-topmast. Ensign and jack are also flown.² The characteristics of this vessel are (1) her large size and magnificence, (2) the presence of royal yards and sails, an unusual fitting at that date.

The second of these two coins is undoubtedly based on the first, but it embodies many improvements in the technical representation; Simon’s original design is a compromise between the old heraldic style of the sixteenth century and a new feeling of realism. The farthing is obviously engraved from a picture, or from first-hand knowledge of ships, and is a meticulous copy.

One other representation of the same ship can be added. This is the Great Seal of James, Duke of York, as Lord High Admiral, made after the battle of Lowestoft in 1665. It is the farthing on a large scale.³

From this information we must conclude that the vessel illustrated was one of extraordinary size and power, the last word in technical progress, and carrying royal sails, a fitting unknown at that time.

² Montagu, **Copper Coins**, p. 48, 14; British and Foreign Naval Medals relating to Naval and Maritime Affairs (National Maritime Museum, Greenwich), 1937, p. 176, 1a.
³ Engraved by Vertue (1780 edn.). Compare also Simon’s medal of the Declaration of Parliament, 1642. **Med. Ill.** (1), p. 294, 110 [Pl. xxv, 7]. This may be the first portrait of the Sovereign.
except in one French warship. We have not far to look for such a vessel. The *Sovereign of the Seas*, of 100 guns and 1,637 tons, was built for Charles I by Phineas and Peter Pett and launched at Woolwich, by a coincidence, in the year 1637. She fulfilled all the conditions of the coin-type, being the largest and most powerful ship of her time. Infinite pains were taken to make her beautiful with carvings and gilt, and she is known to have been fitted with royal sails. It has been unkindly said of her that she was the most useless ship afloat, owing to her great size, but in spite of this handicap, she earned a great reputation in the Dutch Wars. The *Sovereign* was the first of a series of ships ordered under the “Ship-money” programme, and Charles in authorizing her construction showed his realization of the need for a strong fleet, capable of redeeming his early failures at Cadiz and La Rochelle.

Naturally the *Sovereign*’s launch excited attention in the public mind and the playwright Thomas Heywood extolled her in a rare pamphlet, published in 1638. He spoke of the ship

> Whose brave top-top-top Royal nothing bars  
> By day to brush the sun, by night the stars,

and, most important of all, an engraving of the ship in full sail was made before her launch by John Payne. This engraving agrees

1 Thomas Heywood, *A True Description of his Majesties Royall and Most Stately Ship called the Sovereign of the Seas, built at Wolwitch in Kent, 1637*, publ. by I. Okes, London, 1638.

down to the smallest detail with the Pattern Farththings of 1662–5 [Fig. 2]. There can be no question that the latter were carefully copied from Payne’s engraving. The hull shown on Simon’s trial-piece also agrees with Payne, and so do the Duke of York’s Seal and the gold Touchpieces of Charles II–Anne.

Simon’s warrant for the angel is dated 18 September 1660; during the years 1659–60 the Sovereign had been completely rebuilt at Chatham, and in July and August 1660 she was fitting for sea. While there she was visited by the king, who complemented Peter Pett, her original builder, on his work of reconstruction. About this time a painting of her stern and a wash-drawing of her hull were made. The latter agrees well in general characteristics with both angel and farthing.¹

With all this evidence in mind it is reasonable to conclude that Simon was told to produce a design which would call attention to the royal visit to Chatham to inspect the reconstructed Sovereign, a symbol of English sea-power. The “Dominion of the Seas” coinage which so annoyed Louis XIV was another manifestation of Charles’s desire to carry on the revival of sea-power begun by his father and exploited by Cromwell.

One type of farthing has the inscription ISTA FAMA PER AETHERA VOLAT on the edge; the Latin is faulty, but ought to mean “Her fame flies through the air”. Combined with QVATVOR MARIA VINDICO (I claim the Four Seas), this must surely refer to the Sovereign.²

I have not yet seen a copy of Heywood’s pamphlet, but I suspect that this quotation may come from his description of the Sovereign. The work is full of Latin tags and verses, some taken from Virgil and the Vulgate, others of Heywood’s own invention. His knowledge of Latin often proved unequal to the task. Incidentally it is interesting to note that in the painting of the Sovereign’s stern the inscription SOLI DEI GLORIAM appears on her taffrail. This provides another link with the coinage, this time with the obverse inscription SOLI DEI GLORIA on some pattern halfpennies of Charles (sometimes called tickets for the Touching ceremony) which have the ship reverse (Montagu, p. 41, no. 1).

The Sovereign of the Seas had a distinguished career; although she missed Lowestoft, she took part in six fleet actions during the Dutch Wars, and earned the nickname of “Golden Devil” from her opponents. Once she was nearly lost through running aground, coming out of the Thames, and in 1685 was rebuilt for a second time, her name being changed to Royal Sovereign. She continued in commission until 1696, when she was burned by accident at Chatham. Some of her timbers were probably used in the construction of her successor, the Royal Sovereign of 1701.

One last point. It is doubtful whether Simon himself engraved the dies for the pattern farththings of the “Dominion of the Seas” issue.

² Callender, op. cit., p. 8.
He concentrated on medals from 1660 until his death in 1665, and left the current coins to his rival in Charles’s favour, Jan Roettier. The latter must have been responsible for copying Payne’s engraving of 1637 so closely, but Simon first conceived the portrait of the Sovereign of the Seas.

J. D. A. Thompson

WILLIAM III 1697 HALF-CROWN OF THE YORK MINT, WITH AN EDGE INSCRIPTION ANNO REGNI OCTAVO

In English Silver Coinage 1649–1949, H. A. Seaby shows this edge dating with a high degree of rarity (R6) for the Exeter and Norwich mints, but the OCTAVO variety does not appear to have been recorded for the York mint.

The condition of the coin is average for the reign, and came into the possession of the present owner labelled “Sprowston”.

Its first known owner was the Rev. E. F. Linton, M.A. Oxon., vicar of Sprowston, Norwich, from 1878 to 1888. Though interested in coins, he was not a collector, and it is unlikely that he bought it or acquired it from any well-known collection. Several worn copper coins of William III had been turned up by the spade in the vicarage garden, and it is probable that the coin here described was found in the same manner.

The Y below the bust on the obverse is of the usual type, and the shields are large with a hooked harp of seven strings on the Irish shield. The size of the shields and this type of harp are common to all the 1697 half-crowns examined, but there is considerable variation in the number of strings.

The British Museum and Messrs. B. A. Seaby kindly gave facilities for the inspection of the coins in their possession, and twenty-one 1697 half-crowns with the NONO edge inscription were examined, with the following findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>No. of strings</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>Six</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>Six</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>Six</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>Six</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>Six</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three specimens, in which the strings were too worn to count, are omitted.

The only 1697 half-crown, with an OCTAVO edge dating in the British Museum is from the Norwich mint, and has a seven-stringed harp.

E. C. Linton

AN UNPUBLISHED ANGEL OF EDWARD IV

At the Society's meeting on 26 April 1950 there was exhibited on behalf of Mr. Herbert Schneider a cast of an extremely interesting and hitherto unknown variety of the rare angel of Edward IV's first reign, and it is by Mr. Schneider's kind permission that this record of it is published.

**Obv.** EDWARD REX ANGEL PATRIARCH DNS HIBERN

The archangel killing the dragon which is of an entirely new form with a second head at its tail, the mouth armed with sharp and clearly defined teeth.

**Rev.** I.M. Rose. PER CRUDE TVN SAVN ROST XPISTE REDEPTOR

Normal type for the early angels with rays of the sun from the masthead. Large rose to left, large sun to right of the cross that springs from the shield. A small trefoil in the field on either side outside the ropes to the mast. [Pl. B. 8]

Edward IV introduced the angel under an indenture dated 6 March 1465 to meet the continuing need for a coin of 6s. 8d. that arose when the value of the noble was increased. The few varieties known of his first reign (that is, issued prior to 1470) are listed in this Journal, vol. xxii, pp. 197–8 and vol. xxv, p. 170. In the former paper attention was drawn to a hitherto unpublished variety in Lord Ellesmere's cabinet which was remarkable for the length of both legends. The obverse ended HIBERN and the reverse was as on the coin described above. The rose beside the cross was large as on Mr. Schneider's coin but the sun was smaller. On a second coin, where the legends had been reduced to their more usual length, the size of the sun had been increased. These it was suggested were, in that order, the first two angels issued.

The coin now under review clearly falls into this early class of the 1465–70 angels. The full spelling XPISTE on the reverse links it with Lord Ellesmere's coin and the unusual form of the dragon clearly marks it down as an issue made while the type had still finally to be established. The coin can therefore be regarded as one of the earliest, and may possibly be the earliest, of the angel series, and Mr. Schneider is to be congratulated on making so important a discovery.

C. E. Blunt.