## THE 1953 BOOTHAM TREASURE TROVE

By R. H. m. DOlley and I. H. Stewart

On 29. September 1953 a workman was digging a deep trench for a drain in the courtyard at the back of Bootham School, York, when he came upon a very corroded bronze vessel containing no fewer than 908 silver coins of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. He at once called out to the secretary of the school's archaeological society who happened to be passing, and in consequence the find was promptly reported to the Keeper of the Yorkshire Museum who himself was on the scene within a matter of hours. The Coroner and the British Museum were informed with no less promptitude, and one could only wish that all cases of treasure trove were investigated with the same universal spirit of co-operation. At the subsequent inquest the coins were declared treasure trove, and the finder received the full market value of the hoard, which was acquired intact by the Yorkshire Museum with the exception of eight coins required by the British Museum.

The 908 coins had been wrapped in cloth before being placed in the container, and this had protected most of them from the full effect of the corrosion. Even so, a large number needed cleaning before they could be read, and this was of course done in the British Museum Research Laboratory. Of the coins, 839 proved to be English pence ranging in date from $c$. 1251 to $c$. 1326, and of the remaining 69, I6 were Irish, 40 Scots, and I2 Continental. All were "sterlings", and there was also one contemporary forgery.

The date of the hoard is to be established on the basis of the English coins alone, as the whole of the foreign element falls well within this bracket. All the fifteen Fox classes are represented, and this may seem sufficient in itself to preclude a date before I325, especially as no fewer than sixty of the coins are of Class XV. Consequently the hoard belongs to a well-known group concealed at the very end of the reign of Edward II, though in point of fact it would seem slightly later in date than the classic find from Boyton. ${ }^{\text {r }}$

A feature of the new hoard is its very uneven pattern as between the different Fox classes. This cannot be explained simply in terms of variations in annual output from the mints, though obviously there is some relationship between bullion coined and the proportion of coins of a particular type present in the sum of all the hoards. Comparison with Boyton reveals such striking discrepancies that it has been thought desirable to tabulate the English pence from Bootham in skeleton form (See table on following page).

Perhaps the most satisfactory explanation is that we have here not so much a "currency" but a "savings" hoard, a family "nest-egg" that was added to in times of local prosperity and even raided when

[^0]all was not well．The high proportion of the late issues of Edward II is of course to be explained by the hasty addition to the＂nest－egg＂ of the owner＇s ready money immediately prior to the hoard＇s final deposit．A further argument in favour of the theory that it was a
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\hline Fox class \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline I \& 22 \& ．． \& $\cdots$ \& ． \& $\cdots$ \& $\cdots$ \& $\cdots$ \& $\cdots$ \& $\cdots$ \& $\cdots$ \& \& $\cdots$ \& 22 <br>
\hline II \& 32 \& 2 \& $\cdots$ \& 2 \& ． \& 1 \& ． \& ． \& $\cdots$ \& ． \& 6 \& $\cdots$ \& 43 <br>
\hline III \& 90 \& II \& 3 \& 22 \& I \& 12 \& ． \& ． \& ${ }^{1} 5$ \& 4 \& 21 \& 3 \& 182 <br>
\hline IV \& 77 \& ． \& 6 \& 46 \& ． \& 4 \& ． \& ． \& ． \& $\ldots$ \& ． \& ． \& 133 <br>
\hline V \& 1 \& $\ldots$ \& ． \& 3 \& ． \& I \& ． \& ． \& ． \& ． \& $\cdots$ \& \& 5 <br>
\hline VI／V \& 1 \& ． \& ． \& ．． \& ． \& $\cdots$ \& ． \& ． \& ． \& $\ldots$ \& ． \& $\ldots$ \& I <br>
\hline VI \& 1 \& ． \& $\cdots$ \& ． \& ． \& ． \& ． \& ． \& $\ldots$ \& ． \& ． \& ． \& I <br>
\hline VII \& 2 \& $\cdots$ \& 1 \& ． \& ． \& ． \& $\ldots$ \& ． \& ． \& $\ldots$ \& $\cdots$ \& $\ldots$ \& 3 <br>
\hline VIII \& 5 \& $\ldots$ \& I \& $\cdots$ \& ． \& $\cdots$ \& ． \& $\cdots$ \& $\cdots$ \& $\cdots$ \& $\cdots$ \& $\cdots$ \& 6 <br>
\hline IX \& 2 I \& 3 \& I \& 8 \& ． \& 2 \& $\ldots$ \& I \& $\ldots$ \& ， \& 5 \& I \& 44 <br>
\hline X \& 114 \& $\cdots$ \& 9 \& \& $\cdots$ \& 14 \& $\cdots$ \& $\cdots$ \& $\cdots$ \& $\cdots$ \& ． \& $\cdots$ \& 187

7 <br>
\hline XI \& 32 \& $\cdots$ \& 3 \& 28 \& $\cdots$ \& 16 \& $\cdots$ \& ． \& $\cdots$ \& ． \& $\cdots$ \& $\cdots$ \& 79 <br>
\hline XII／XI \& I \& $\cdots$ \& $\cdots$ \& $\cdots$ \& ． \& $\because$ \& $\ldots$ \& ． \& $\cdots$ \& ． \& \& $\ldots$ \& I <br>
\hline XII \& ． \& ． \& 1 \& 1 \& ． \& 1 \& ． \& $\cdots$ \& $\ldots$ \& $\cdots$ \& ． \& $\cdots$ \& 3 <br>
\hline XIII \& 5 \& $\ldots$ \& 7 \& 16 \& ． \& 5 \& ． \& ． \& $\ldots$ \& ． \& ． \& $\cdots$ \& 33 <br>
\hline XIV \& II \& ． \& 2 \& 8 \& ． \& 5 \& ． \& ． \& $\ldots$ \& ． \& ． \& ． \& 26 <br>
\hline XV \& 12 \& ． \& 8 \& 20 \& ． \& 20 \& ． \& ． \& ． \& ． \& ． \& ． \& 60 <br>
\hline \& 427 \& 16 \& 42 \& 204 \& 1 \& 8I \& ． \& 1 \& I5 \& 6 \& 32 \& 4 \& 829 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

domestic hoard is afforded by the archaeological evidence，which sug－ gests that the vessel had been concealed immediately below a clay floor or hearth．

Generally speaking，the Bootham hoard gives a very favourable picture of the state of the English coinage，though it must be remem－ bered that a＂savings＂hoard accumulated over many years tends to be rigorously selective．Even so，the small proportion of＂lusshe－ bournes＂must be considered notable，and，with one or two excep－ tions，the intruders are little if anything inferior in weight and，it would appear，purity to the run of the English pence．One curious coincidence should perhaps be remarked，though quite without valid significance．In 1953 there were discovered two fourteenth－century hoards，one at Beulah Hill and the other at Bootham．The former was a mixed gold and silver hoard deposited $c$ ．I364 and apparently composed of ready money．The latter，deposited less than forty years earlier，consisted entirely of silver hoarded over a number of years． At Beulah Hill the face value of the hoard was $£ 3$ ．I5s．rod．；at Bootham $£ 3$ ．I5s．8d．－a difference of only twopence or rather less than $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent．！How much might have been built upon that fortuitous coincidence by an earlier generation of numismatists！

In the English series few of the coins are of individual importance， but one at least prompts reconsideration of its correct position in the series，namely the Fox XVc of Durham with cross patee initial mark on the obverse．This cannot well be a sede vacante issue，as Bishop

Beaumont did not die until 1333, whereas there is no other coin in the hoard that can be dated later than 1327. Moreover, though this has been disputed, it is generally conceded that Beaumont was responsible for the early Durham pence of Edward III with Lombardic n and a crown in the centre of the reverse, none of which are present in the hoard. The Fox brothers rightly preferred an alternative explanation to the sede vacante theory, though not, in our view, the correct one. They suggested that in the later part of the reign of Edward II Bishop Beaumont fell into disgrace, and that the prelate was deprived of his temporalities. Although the substitution of a normal initial cross for the cross moline initial mark had been the public symbol of Bek's disgrace, there is no documentary evidence to suggest that Beaumont's right of coinage ever passed to a royal receiver.

The present writers would suggest a simple solution that does not involve the numismatist in conflict with the historian proper. In Mr. Blunt's collection there is the complementary mule of the same type XVc, a Beaumont obverse with a London reverse. We feel that the true explanation of both the apparent mules is that they are, in effect, mules, and that a pair of London dies had been sent in error to Durham. If this is in fact what occurred, the best remedy of the Bishop's mint-master, anxious to avoid the delay of sending the offending dies back to London, would have lain in using the new London obverse with an existing Durham reverse and vice versa. The resultant coins, though administratively irregular, could not have been confused with products of the London mint, and the Bishop's moneyer would no doubt have felt himself in some measure protected from the penalties attaching to irregularity as he could have demonstrated that the error lay in London and that he for his part had done his utmost to correct it.

The absence of a true coin of Class XII of London means that at no mint is every Fox class represented in the Bootham hoard. On the other hand, the find did produce two mules, both unfortunately already known, a VI/V and a XII/XI, both of London. There is no coin from Exeter, but no fewer than sixteen from Bristol, and this may seem another pointer to a change in the owner's circumstances between 1285 and 1300. We may compare the parallel absence of Berwick coins later than Blunt Class IV and of Scottish pence of the Bruce discussed below. It is surprising, too, that a hoard of goo coins from York should have contained only a single penny of Hull.

The Scottish coins in the hoard comprised thirty-eight secondcoinage pence of Alexander III, and one from each of the two coinages of John Baliol. The absence of coins of Robert Bruce may seem significant in a hoard buried at the very end of Robert's reign. It could be put down to the fact that there was a tendency for English coin to go to Scotland and not the other way at the time that the owner of the Bootham hoard was adding to a family hoard originally amassed in the palmy days of Edward I, but it is undeniable that the pennies of Robert Bruce are notably rare-and the halfpence and
farthings more so-for a prince who reigned for over twenty years. It would seem, indeed, that no coins with Bruce's name were struck for some years after his accession, and the outstanding workmanship and excellent execution of the coins with his name may suggest that they were issued only in the second half of his reign when his position and authority were assured. We cannot draw a parallel with the Eccles Hoard and the pennies of Alexander II, and argue that the absence of pennies of Robert Bruce is evidence that they had not been issued, but it is not improper to suggest the possibility that some pence with the name of Alexander III were in fact struck during Robert's reign. If Robert did issue coin without his name, it is far more probable that it was in the name of Alexander than of Baliol.

The first, or rough-surface, coinage of Baliol has the Berwick reverse-four mullets of six points-and was presumably issued from I292 until the fall of Berwick and deposition of Baliol in 1296. Baliol's second, or smooth-surface, coinage has the Edinburgh re-verse--four mullets of five points--and was perhaps issued in 1296-7. All Baliol pence are scarce, and, since the two issues are connected by a mule of St. Andrews, it would seem that the two issues were consecutive and that the latter had probably ceased soon after Baliol's deposition, as it is rather scarce.

There remains the problem of the very large number of Alexander's second coinage pennies-the ratio of 19 : I with Baliol pence found in this hoard being a fairly accurate reflection of their relative frequency in finds generally. There can be little doubt but that the coinage of Alexander III continued for five or six years after his death-in 1286--and right up to Baliol's accession in 1292, as is evidenced by some very rare mules of John Baliol with Alexander III reverses. The Bootham find, however, might suggest that it was revived after Baliol's deposition, though we hesitate finally to commit ourselves to this hypothesis on the strength of a single hoard of such curious composition even as regards the English coins.

Should our hypothesis even so find favour, we would suggest that the two groups of Alexander pence distinguished by Burns in The Coinage of Scotland, vol. i, pp. 163-82, may be to some extent preBaliol and post-Baliol respectively. It is a curious fact that a complete series of "two-way" mules is known which connects all the classes of Group I with one another, and another complete series to do the same for Group II, whereas between the two groups there is known only a single and solitary mule. It is interesting, too, that Class II of Group II has hollow-sided lettering exactly comparable to that on Fox Class X coins of Edward I, the last issue of the reign. A major objection, however, is in the fact that the supposed "Berwick" reverse of four stars of six points occurs throughout Group II, whereas Berwick was in English hands from 1296 until 1318. Perhaps some of the Group II pennies had been issued before Baliol's reign (this would account for the Baliol first coinage/Alexander III mule) and the group was revived after his deposition.

The irregular class of coins with crude obverses coupled with reverses of classes ii and iii of Group II would seem to be later than either of these classes, but the class with Baliol fabric and style must surely have been issued immediately before the Baliol rough-surface coins, i.e. in the disturbed period immediately preceding 1292. We would emphasize that these remarks are no more than suggestions that we advance in an attempt by controversy to arrive at a more logical arrangement of a series that is unusually puzzling. We are only too conscious how slender is our evidence, and eagerly await new hoards, preferably from Scotland, which will supply definitive evidence of the correct arrangement and sequence of these problematical issues. We have listed the Bootham coins according to the Burns classification, and confess that we ourselves have not always found it easy to employ. Accordingly we append a few notes which we may hope will be of assistance to others who have found the Burns descriptions perplexing.
Group I. All with four six-pointed mullets on the reverse. The characteristic of this group is the small, neat punch for the hair, of which the curls have very little backward sweep from under the back of the crown.

Class I. Open C and E. Barred A. Initial cross potent, straightsided letters. Usually GR'A for GRA. S composed of two crescents and two fishtails. Wedge-tailed R. Tall serif on front of L. Two varieties: (a) with small sunken spaces beneath the crown, squarelinked $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{M}$ with single vertical stroke in centre (one coin of this var. has the ESCOSSIE REX inscription on the reverse) ; (b) with row of curls beneath crown, X with rounded ends. A scarce class.

Class II. C and E closed. Unbarred A. Smaller letters. Small initial cross patee. Normal M. Waisted S. Curl and tail of R from single punch. No initial cross on reverse. This is the usual class for ESCOSSIE REX coins. Pellets and colons liberally used in the inscriptions on both sides. Some coins have three pellets in place of the obverse initial cross. GRA, G'RA, G'EIA, G'CIA or G'SIA ; ALEXSANDER: The pennies of this class all have small pellets on the interstitial points of the crown. Very rare.

Class III. A unbarred, C and E usually open. Small plain cross both sides. GRA, sometimes with contraction line over R. Some have pellets on points of crown. Frequently pellet or colon stops in obv. legend. SEOT sometimes for SCOT. Rarely ALEXSANDER and G'RA.

Mules, as noted by Burns, between the classes of Group I are all known, viz. I/II, I/III, II/I, II/III, III/I, III/II.
Group II. All the varieties of reverse, from a total of 20 to 28 points on the stars and mullets, are found in this group. The distinguishing feature is the hair sharply swept back from under the crown, giving the whole head a broader appearance than that of Group I.

Class I. Usually cross potent, very rarely plain. Barred A, C, and E open, waisted S, C with peaked body, R sometimes with plain wedge tail, otherwise with ornamented finish. Contraction mark often over R of GRA. Reverses: $4 \times 6 ; 3 \times 6, I \times 7 ; 2 \times 6,2 \times 7$.

Class II. Plain initial cross. Hollow-sided lettering. A unbarred, C and E open (but occasionally appear closed through the joining of the front wedges. Front serif to L. Line over R of GRA frequently. Particularly thin sceptre. Wedge-tailed R. Some with stop or crescent after D of ALEXANDER. Reverses: $4 \times 5 ; 2 \times 5$, $2 \times 6$; $\mathrm{I} \times 5,3 \times 6 ; 4 \times 6 ; 2 \times 6,2 \times 7$; $\mathrm{I} \times 6,3 \times 7 ; 4 \times 7$.

Class III. Plain initial cross. Usually open C and E. No stops. Thick-waisted S, A unbarred. Straight-sided letters, sometimes with no serifs at all. Burns describes three different heads, but these are not always distinctive. Reverses: $3 \times 5,1 \times 6 ; 1 \times 5,3 \times 6$; $4 \times 6 ; 3 \times 6, \mathrm{I} \times 7 ; 2 \times 6,2 \times 7$.

Mules in Group II, as noted by Burns, again form a complete series, I/II, I/III, II/I, II/III, III/I, III/II. There is possibly also one group mule: obv. Group II, class III, rev. Group I, Class I.
With Class III of Group II the halfpence and farthings of Alexander III most closely correspond. There are two further rare classes of Alexander sterlings, the first with crude obverse dies and reverses of Group II, Classes II and III, the second with the style and fabric of the first coinage of Baliol.

As listed by this classification, the Bootham coins are all quite normal, and all but two are recorded by Burns. The exceptions are a Group II, ii/i mule reading ALEXANDE.R-apparently the first coin to be recorded with the pellet between the E and R , though the pellet between the $D$ and $E$ is known-and a Group II, iii penny with three mullets of five points and one of six points on the reverse. Burns did not know the true coin, but only a ii/iii mule.

We are much indebted to Messrs. E. J. Winstanley and F. Elmore Jones for checking a number of our identifications and offering many helpful suggestions. Without their assistance publication in this form could scarcely have been attempted.

## ENGLAND <br> Mint of London

Henry III
Lawrence Vb , Ricard, $\mathrm{I} 8 \cdot 3 \mathrm{gr}$. I coin
Edward I
Fox Ic $19 \cdot 0$ (reading CIVI|TAS|TAS|DON), 20.3, $20 \cdot 7(2), 20 \cdot 75,21 \cdot 4 \quad 6$ coins Id $19 \cdot 8,20 \cdot 4,20 \cdot 5,20 \cdot 9,20 \cdot 95,2 r \cdot 0,2 r \cdot 2,2 r \cdot 25,2 r \cdot 4,2 r \cdot 5$,
$2 r \cdot 6(2), 2 I \cdot 75,22 \cdot 2$ Variety with annulet on breast, $20 \cdot 8$, $2 \mathrm{r} \cdot \mathrm{I} \quad \quad \begin{gathered}14 \text { coins }\end{gathered}$
II (One or two coins have many features of Id), $18 \cdot 2,19.7,20 \cdot 0$, $20 \cdot 1,20 \cdot 3$ (2), $20 \cdot 4,20 \cdot 45,20 \cdot 6$ (3), 20.8 (2), $20 \cdot 85,20 \cdot 9$ (2), $20 \cdot 95,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot \mathrm{O}(2), 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot \mathrm{I}$ (2), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 2$ (4), 2I•25,2I•3 (4), 2I.4 (2)

32 coins

III (The coins would seem to be divided between the Fox varieties, as follows: (a) 4, (b) 3, (c) 39, (d) $9,(f) 5,(g / f) 2$, (g) 28)
17.45, $18 \cdot 2$, 18.9, 19.0, $19 \cdot 3,19.5,19.7$, 19.75, $19 \cdot 8$, 19.9 , $20 \cdot 0(2), 20 \cdot 1$ (2), $20 \cdot 2$ (3), $20 \cdot 35$ (2), $20 \cdot 4$ (2), $20 \cdot 5$ (3), $20 \cdot 55$ (4), $20 \cdot 6,20 \cdot 65,20 \cdot 7$ (3), $20 \cdot 75$ (2), $20 \cdot 8$ (5), $20 \cdot 95,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 0$ (5), $2 I \cdot 05(3), 2 I \cdot I(6), 2 I \cdot 15,2 I \cdot 2(2), 2 I \cdot 3(4), 2 I \cdot 35(2), 2 I \cdot 4(5)$, $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 45,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 5$ (5), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 6$ (3), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 75$ (2), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 8$ (3), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 85,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 9$ (3), $22 \cdot \mathrm{I}, 22 \cdot \mathrm{I} 5,22 \cdot 25$
IV (The coins seem to be divided as follows: (a) $13,(b) \mathbf{1 2},(c) 8$, (c/d) $1,(d) 29,(e) 14)$

I8.I, I8.5, I8.85, 19.0 (2), I9.I, 19.5, I9.7, I9.8, 19.85 , 19.9, $20 \cdot 1$ (3), $20 \cdot 2$ (2), $20 \cdot 3,20 \cdot 4,20 \cdot 45$ (2), 20.5 (2), $20 \cdot 6$, $20 \cdot 7$ (3), $20 \cdot 75,20 \cdot 8(2), 20 \cdot 85(3), 20 \cdot 9(5), 20 \cdot 95,2 I \cdot 0(2)$, $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot \mathrm{I}(7), 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 2(5), 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 3$ (3), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 4$ (3), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 5$ (5), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 6,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 7$ (4), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 75,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 8$ (3), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 85,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 9$ (2), $22 \cdot 0,22 \cdot 9$
V $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 6$
VI/V Muie 20.85
VI $22 \cdot 0$
VII $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 0,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 3$
VIII $16 \cdot 85,20 \cdot I(2), 2 I \cdot 15,2 I \cdot 5$
IX (The coins seem to be divided as follows: (a) with star 3, without star I, (a/b) with star I, (b) with star Io, without star 6)

I8.I5, $19 \cdot 5,20 \cdot 6,20 \cdot 7(2), 20 \cdot 75(2), 20 \cdot 8,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot \mathrm{O}, 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot \mathrm{I}, 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 4$ (2), 2I•45, $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 5$ (2) $, 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 6,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 75,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 8(3), 23 \cdot 6$

X Reading EDWARD
I8•I, $20 \cdot 5,20 \cdot 8,2 I \cdot I(2), 2 I \cdot I 5,22 \cdot 0$
Reading EDWAR
$20 \cdot 0,20 \cdot 2,20 \cdot 9,2 I \cdot 0,2 I \cdot 2,2 I \cdot 3,2 I \cdot 5,2 I \cdot 7(2), 2 I \cdot 9(3)$, $22 \cdot 2$ (2), $22 \cdot 3$
Reading EDWA
I8.I, $18 \cdot 4$, I9.2, 19.3, $19 \cdot 7,20 \cdot 1,20 \cdot 2,20 \cdot 3,20 \cdot 4,20 \cdot 5$ (2), $20 \cdot 6,20 \cdot 7,20 \cdot 8,20 \cdot 9(3), 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot \mathrm{O}(2), 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot \mathrm{I}(3), 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 2(5), 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 3(4)$, $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 4$ (4), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 5$ (5), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 6$ (5), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 7,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 8$ (8), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 9$ (6), $22 \cdot 0$ (9), $22 \cdot \mathrm{I}(5), 22 \cdot 2$ (6) $, 22 \cdot 3,22 \cdot 5$ (2), $22 \cdot 6$ (2), $22 \cdot 7$ (2), $23 \cdot 0,23 \cdot \mathrm{I}$, $23 \cdot 6,24.4$

Edward II
XI The coins seem to be divided as follows: $(a) 8,(b) 24)$
I8.9, I9.0, $20 \cdot 7,20 \cdot 8,20 \cdot 9$ (3), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 0,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot \mathrm{I}, 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 4,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 5$ (4), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 65,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 7,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 8,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 9$ (2), $22 \cdot 0,22 \cdot \mathrm{I}(2), 22 \cdot 2(2), 22 \cdot 25,22 \cdot 3$, $22 \cdot 4$ (3), $22 \cdot 5,22 \cdot 7,22 \cdot 8$
XII/XI Mule 22.4
XIII (One coin seems very close to XIV) 5 coins
$2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 2,22 \cdot 0,22 \cdot \mathrm{I}, 22 \cdot 2,22 \cdot 4$
XIV $20 \cdot 3,2 I \cdot 2,2 I \cdot 5,2 I \cdot 9,22 \cdot 0,22 \cdot I(2), 22 \cdot 25,22 \cdot 4,22 \cdot 5,22 \cdot 7$ II coins
XV (The coins seem to be divided as follows: (a) 4, (b) 3, (c) 5) I2 coins 19.7, $20 \cdot 9,2 I \cdot 0,2 I \cdot 3,2 I \cdot 4,2 I \cdot 6,2 I \cdot 7,2 I \cdot 8,22 \cdot 0,22 \cdot 3$, $22 \cdot 5,23 \cdot 1$

## Edward I

Blunt IIa 2I•I, 2I•65

IIIb $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 2$
IVa $20 \cdot 85,21 \cdot 5,22.4,23 \cdot 6$ (lacks pellet)
IVb $20 \cdot 8$
IVc $20 \cdot 5$

## Mint of Bristol

## Edward I

Fox II $20 \cdot 3,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 0$
III (The coins seem to be divided as follows: $(c) 2,(d) 4,(f) 2$, (g) 3 )

2 coins I9.5, $20 \cdot 3,20 \cdot 7,20 \cdot 8(2), 2 I \cdot I, 2 I \cdot 2,2 I \cdot 3(2), 2 I \cdot 9(2)$
IXb (All with star on breast?)
3 coins 16.6, 19.2, $20 \cdot 9$

## Mint of Bury St. Edmunds

## Edward I

Fox III (The coins seem to be divided as follows: $(d) \mathrm{I},(g) 2) \quad 3$ coins $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 4,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 6,22 \cdot 6$
IV (The coins seem to be divided as follows: (a) 3, (b) $\mathrm{I},(\mathrm{c}) 2$ ) $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 4,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 45,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 6,22 \cdot 25,22 \cdot 4,23 \cdot 3$
VIIa (Omitting rose) 2I•9
VIII $22 \cdot 9$
IXb
X Reading EDWAR I coin $23 \cdot 6$
Reading EDWA I8.9, 19.7, $20 \cdot 0(2), 20 \cdot 7,21 \cdot 6,22 \cdot 0,22 \cdot 3$
Edward II
XIb $22 \cdot 2,22 \cdot 5,22 \cdot 8 \quad 3$ coins
XII $21 \cdot 7$ I coin
XIII $21 \cdot 2,22 \cdot I, 22 \cdot 2,22 \cdot 3,22 \cdot 7(2), 22 \cdot 9 \quad 7$ coins
XIV $21 \cdot 7,22 \cdot 3$
XV (The coins seem to be divided as follows: (a) $4,(b) 3,(c)$ x) $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot \mathrm{O}, 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 3,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 4,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 8,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 9,22 \cdot 0,22 \cdot 5,22 \cdot 6$

## Mint of Canterbury

[^1]2 coins
22 coins
-

```
IX (The coins would seem to be divided as follows: \((a) 2,(b) 6\).
        All have star on breast)
            I8•2, \(2 \mathrm{I} \cdot \mathrm{I}, 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 2,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 3,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 7(2), 22 \cdot 0,22 \cdot \mathrm{I}\)
        X Reading EDWARD
                \(22 \cdot 4,22 \cdot 8\)
        Reading EDWAR
            \(20 \cdot 5,20 \cdot 6,20 \cdot 8,2 I \cdot 0,2 I \cdot 9,22 \cdot 2,22 \cdot 3,22 \cdot 4\)
        Reading EDWA
            I9.45, 19.95, \(20 \cdot 4,20 \cdot 6,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 2(3), 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 4(3), 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 5(5), 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 55\),
        \(2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 6,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 65(2), 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 7(3), 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 8,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 9(3), 22 \cdot \mathrm{O}(3), 22 \cdot \mathrm{I}(4), 22 \cdot 2\),
        \(22 \cdot 3\) (3), \(22 \cdot 4\) (2), \(22 \cdot 5\) (one reads EDWARARNGL, \&c.)
```


## Edward II

XI (The coins would seem to be divided as follows: $(a) 6,(b) 22) \quad 28$ coins I8.9, 19•6, 20.7, 20.9, $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 2$ (2), $20 \cdot 3,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 5$ (2), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 55,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 6$, $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 8$ (4), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 9,22 \cdot \mathrm{O}(2), 22 \cdot 2,22 \cdot 3,22 \cdot 4$ (2), $22 \cdot 5$ (3), $22 \cdot 6$, $22 \cdot 8,23 \cdot 0$
XII $22 \cdot 5$
XIII $20 \cdot 2,20 \cdot 7,20 \cdot 8,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 4,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 5,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 7,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 9,22 \cdot 0,22 \cdot 05,22 \cdot \mathrm{I}(2)$, $22 \cdot 15,22 \cdot 2,22 \cdot 3,22 \cdot 4,22 \cdot 5$
XIV $20 \cdot 8,21 \cdot 0,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 9,22 \cdot 0(4), 23 \cdot \mathrm{I}$
XV (The coins would seem to be divided as follows: $(a) 8,(b) 8$, (c) 4)

## Mint of Chester

## Edward I

Fox IIIg 20.6 I coin

## Mint of Durham

## Edward I <br> Bishop de Insula

Fox II 20.8 I coin

III (The coins would seem to be divided as follows: (c) I, (e) 4,
(g) 7)

I2 coins I6.85, $19 \cdot 7,20 \cdot 3,20 \cdot 5,20 \cdot 7,20 \cdot 8(2), 2 I \cdot I(2), 2 I \cdot 25,2 I \cdot 3$, 2I.5
IVa $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot \mathrm{I} \quad \mathrm{I}$ coin
Bishop Bek
IV (The coins would seem to be divided as follows: $(b) 2,(d / e)$ I)
3 coins $20 \cdot 3,20 \cdot 8,2 I \cdot 0$
$\mathrm{Vb} 22.0 \quad \mathrm{I}$ coin
IXb (Both with star on breast) 2 coins 20.I, 20. 25

X Reading EDWA
12 coins
I9.3, $19 \cdot 5,20 \cdot 2,20 \cdot 3,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 2,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 4,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 6,22 \cdot 95,23 \cdot 0,23 \cdot 5$, $23.7,24.4$
King's Receiver
X Reading EDWA 22.4 (2)

I coin
I6 coins
8 coins

8 coins
2 coins
8 coins
40 coins

## Edward II

## Bishop Bek or sede vacante?

XIb $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 3 \quad$ I coin
Sede vacante
XIa $16.95 \quad$ I coin
Bishop Kellawe
XI (The coins would seem to be divided as follows: (a) 4, (b) 10) 14 coins 17.0, $18 \cdot 5, \mathrm{I} 8 \cdot 7, \mathrm{x9} \cdot 0$, $19.95,20 \cdot 4,20 \cdot 55,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 2,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 3,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 35$, $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 5,22 \cdot 7,22 \cdot 95,25 \cdot 2$
XII 17.75
I coin
XIII 18.95, $20 \cdot 85$ (2), 20•9, 21•3
5 coins
Bishop Beaumont
XIV $19 \cdot 7,20 \cdot 8,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 0,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 35,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 6$
5 coins
XV (The coins would seem to be divided as follows: (a) $7,(b) 6$, (c) 6, ? 2)
19.0, 19.3, $19.4(2), 19 \cdot 8,20 \cdot 0$ (London/Durham mule), $20 \cdot 25,20 \cdot 5$ (2), $20 \cdot 7,20 \cdot 75,20 \cdot 8(2), 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot \mathrm{O}, 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 2,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 3,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 7$, $22 \cdot 0,22 \cdot 4,22.45$

Mint of Kingston-upon-Hull
Edward I
Fox IXa (Star on breast) I coin $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 3$

## Mint of Lincoln

## Edward I

Fox III (The coins would seem to be divided as follows: (c) 2 , (d) 7 , (f) $\mathrm{I},(g / d) \mathrm{I},(g) 4)$ $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 3$ (2), 2I•35,2I•5,2I•7

## Mint of Newecastle

## Edward I

Fox IIIe $18.7,20.4,20 \cdot 5,20.8 \quad 4$ coins
IXb (Both with star on breast) 2 coins $20.5,22 \cdot 65$

## Royal Mint of York

## Edward I

Fox II $17 \cdot 2,20 \cdot 2,2 I \cdot 25,2 I \cdot 4,2 I \cdot 5,2 I \cdot 7$
III (The coins would seem to be divided as follows: (b) 6, (e) 15 21 coins
I9.55, $20 \cdot \mathrm{I}, 20 \cdot 3$ (3), $20 \cdot 8,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 0$ (4), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 05$ (2), $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot \mathrm{I}, 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 2$, $2 I \cdot 3,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 6(2), 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 7,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 8,22 \cdot \mathrm{I} 5,23 \cdot 2$
IXb (Three with star on breast)

Edward I
Archbishop de Wickwaine
Fox IIIe 2I•2, $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 6$ (2) 3 coins
Archbishop de Corbridge
IXb (With star on breast)

IRELAND

## Edward I

Mint of Cork
I coin
Mint of Dublin

| B 22.3 |
| :---: |
| C $17 \cdot 9,19 \cdot 8,20 \cdot 4$ |
| E 21.4, $22 \cdot 8$ |
| F 19.2, 19.8 |
| H 21.7 |

I coin
4 coins
2 coins
2 coins
I coin
Mint of Waterford
C $16 \cdot 5,21 \cdot 5$
2 coins
D $20 \cdot 6,21 \cdot 2,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 6$

## SCOTLAND

Alexander III
Second Coinage
Group I
Class I
B. $2 \quad 20 \cdot 5$
B. $3 \quad 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 2,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 3,22 \cdot 0$
Class III
B. $13 \quad 21 \cdot 5$
B. $15 \quad 20 \cdot 2$
Mules
B. 17 (Ia/III) 22.0
B. 19 (Ib/III) 22.0
B. 23 (III/Ia) 21.9

4 coins 2 coins

Group II
Class I
As B. 30 but GR'A 2I•4 I coin
Class II 6 coins
B. $32 \quad 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot \mathrm{I}$
B. $34 \quad 18 \cdot 7,21 \cdot 5$
B. $37 \quad 18 \cdot 4,22 \cdot 3$
B. $38 \quad 21 \cdot 4$

Class III 7 coins
B. $442 \mathrm{x} \cdot 6$
B. $46 \quad 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot \mathrm{O}, 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 7$
B. $50 \quad 20 \cdot 6,21 \cdot 4$
B. $52 \quad 20 \cdot 2$
B. $\quad \mathrm{I} \cdot 8$ (Mullets of $5,5,5$, and 6 points)

Mules
B. 54 (I/II) $21 \cdot 4,24 \cdot \mathrm{I}$
B. $55(\mathrm{I} / \mathrm{II}) \quad 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot \mathrm{I}$
B. 56 (I/II) $20 \cdot 0,22 \cdot 15$

As B. 60 (II/I) but DE.R 19.8
B. 64 A (II/III) $2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 3$
B. 67 (I/III) $19 \cdot 6,20 \cdot \mathrm{I}, 2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 2,22 \cdot 4$
B. 68 в (I/III) 21.6
B. 70 (III/II) $\quad 22.3$
B. 7 I (III/II) $22 \cdot 3$
B. 74 (III/II) $22 \cdot 3$

John Baliol

| FIRST COINAGE ("Rough") | I coin |
| :--- | :---: |
| Four mullets of six points | $20 \cdot 5$ |
| SECOND COINAGE ("Smooth") | I coin |
| As Burns, Fig. 22 I 2I•I |  |

## Flanders

Count Guy de Dampierre (1280-1305)
Namur
As Chautard, p. 6, No. 6 I8. 3
Count Robert de Bethune (1305-22)
alost
As Chautard, p. 9, No. I2, but triangular stops $23 \cdot 25$
As Chautard, p. 9, No. I3 $21 \cdot 7$

Herstal
Seigneur Jean II de Montcornet (13I8-24) ? I coin
As Chautard, p. 79, No. 139 I7.5

## Luxembourg

Count Jean l'Aveugle (King of Bohemia) (I309-46) I coin
As Chautard, p. II6, No. I87 2I. 5

## Lorraine

Duke Ferry IV (I3I2-28) 2 coins

As Chautard, p. 124, No. 192 $7 \cdot 6$, $5 \cdot \circ$

Ligny I coin
Count Valeren II (r3i6-54)
As Chautard, p. 152, No. 229 24.4

## Porcien

Count Gaucher (1303-29)
yves
As Chautard, p. 159, No. 24 I $20 \cdot 7$
As Chautard, p. 159, No. 244 $20 \cdot 5$
neufchateau
As Chautard, p. 160, No. 248 but G L S
20.0

Gelderland
Count Renaud I (x272-I326)

| Rnhem | I coin |
| :---: | :---: |
| As Chautard, p. 305, No. 462, but N reversely barred $21 \cdot 7$ |  |
| Contemporary Forgery |  |
| Penny of Edward I, class X(?), heavily debased 19.7 | 1 coin |

NOTE ON THE BRONZE CONTAINER OF THE BOOTHAM COIN HOARD By G. F. Willmot, b.A., f.S.A.
The container is of bronze and has been badly damaged. The fragments show that it was circular, with a diameter of 10 cm . and a height

of 5.1 cm . The sides were almost vertical. It was made of a strip of metal riveted with four rivets. The base was riveted to the sides, the rivets being irregularly spaced. There is no trace of a lid.


[^0]:    ${ }^{\text {I }}$ Num. Chron. (1936), Pp. 115-55.

[^1]:    Edward I
    Fox II 2I•6, 2I• 8
    III (The coins seem to be divided as follows: (c) 7 , (d) $2,(g)$ 13) I8.0, $19 \cdot 4,20 \cdot \mathrm{I}, 20 \cdot 5,20 \cdot 6,20 \cdot 7,20 \cdot 8,20 \cdot 9,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 0,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot \mathrm{I}(2)$, $2 I \cdot 3,2 I \cdot 4(4), 2 I \cdot 5(3), 2 I \cdot 8,22 \cdot 3,22 \cdot 4$
    IV (The coins seem to be divided as follows: (a) 2, (b) ro, (c) 5 , (d) 25 , (e) 3 , ? I)

    I7.9, I8.8, I8.9, I9.4, I9.5 (2), I9.6, I9.8, $20.5(2), 20.8(2)$, $20 \cdot 9,2 I \cdot 0,2 I \cdot I(2), 2 I \cdot 2(4), 2 I \cdot 3$ (3), $2 I \cdot 4$ (2), $2 I \cdot 5$ (5), $2 I \cdot 6(3), 2 I \cdot 7(3), 2 I \cdot 8(2), 2 I \cdot 9,22 \cdot 0(2), 22 \cdot 2(2), 22 \cdot 3,22 \cdot 5$, 22.7

    Vb $20 \cdot 4,2 \mathrm{I} \cdot 5,22 \cdot 0$

