A FINE ANCIENT BRITISH COIN FROM COLCHESTER

A REMARKABLY fine specimen of an Ancient British bronze coin has recently been found at Kelvedon, Essex, in a ditch of some size, accompanied by Belgic pottery. By the kindness of Mr. M. R. Hull, M.A., F.S.A., Curator of the Colchester and Essex Museum, I am able to publish it here. The coin has been given to the Colchester Museum by Mr. M. J. Campen, the finder, and an electrotype has been placed in the British Museum. It is reproduced below enlarged and on Pl. XXV, 4 in its natural size.

The coin is a new and perfect example of the type found at Braughing, Herts., and published by Sir John Evans on plate xxii, 14 of his Ancient British Coins. That specimen, now in the British Museum (as no. 498), is defective, but a better specimen was found during the excavations at Camulodunum and was published in the official report (page 140) as no. 112, plate xviii, 12. By the kindness of the Excavation Committee, no. 112 is also in the British Museum (as no. 499), while another specimen, no. 113, in poor condition, was retained in Colchester Museum. No. 112 is also reproduced by Commander R. P. Mack on plate xiv of his Coinage of Ancient Britain as no. 224. So far as I am aware, these four are the only known specimens of this coin. The two specimens in the British Museum are from different reverse dies and possibly different obverse dies, while the new coin is from the same dies on both sides as the Evans coin. The weight of no. 498 is 29.3 grains, of no. 499 27.2 grains, and of the new specimen 30 grains precisely.

We can now for the first time give a reliable description of this remarkable type. As Evans observed, the obverse consists of a ram's
head and a coiled body, tightly packed in a circular frame. This frame consists of two concentric circles joined by numerous arcs. On the reverse a spirited animal prances to the left; it has the body of a horse, the head of an eagle, and apparently the cloven hooves of an ox. The head is turned back and shows a knotted mane in front, while the thin S-shaped tail is erect. Above the horse's back is another ram's head, rather smaller, but otherwise almost exactly like that of the beast on the obverse. As ornaments there are a pellet above the back and a ring ornament below the tail. Beneath is a legend as clear as could be wished, CML. Other specimens show the reverse type to have been surrounded by a beaded circle.

While the obverse has been intelligible from previous specimens, the reverse has been described in various ways, and the legend has been a matter of speculation. Evans read it as CNI, the Camulodunum Report gives it as CVV, i.e. CUNO in monogram, while Mack read it unashamedly as CVN. My own notes, taken before the war, read the Evans specimen as CA/J.O. It is now certain that the legend on all the specimens is the same as on the new one, CML, an obvious monogram of Camulodunum, and that the coins do not display the name of Cunobelin.

There are, of course, a large number of coins with the name of Cunobelin and a few with that of Tasciovanus which have on them also the name of the mint city, Camulodunum; but, unlike coins of Verulamium, which often have no ruler's name, it is extremely rare to find the inscription Camulodunum alone. Indeed the only other one of which I know is a unique quarter-stater, similar to known coins of Tasciovanus and, if the corresponding stater, which it closely resembles, is anything to go by, another specimen might show that the complete legend on the die included the name of Tasciovanus. There is no space on the new bronze coin where another legend might have gone, and I can only assume there never was one.

I find it difficult to be positive whether this type should be attributed to Tasciovanus or to Cunobelin. The form of monogram is not identical with that on the only two Tasciovanus types of Camulodunum, Mack nos. 186 and 187, where it appears as CAA., but the beast on the reverse is similar in character to the Tasciovanus horse and the ram's head above is arranged precisely as is the bucranium on the more common staters of Tasciovanus, Mack nos. 149-50. The surrounding circular cage on the obverse, without parallel on coins of Cunobelin, is reproduced precisely on a bronze type bearing the name RVIIS (i.e. RUES), a legend which on another type is linked with Verulamium and hence with Tasciovanus. There is, therefore, some connexion between the new coin and Tasciovanus. On the other hand the Camulodunum legend is identical with that on what must be the first gold stater of Cunobelin, Mack no. 201. The ram-headed animal on the obverse provides a link with a silver coin of Cunobelin, no. 214, also from Colchester, the reverse of which bears obvious affinities to the stater and quarter-stater of Tasciovanus with the Camulodunum
legend; its legend is, however, unambiguously CVNO. All we can say of the new bronze coin is that it must fall either at the end of the period of Tasciovanus or at the beginning of that of Cunobelin at Camulodunum.

Mr. Hull has made the ingenious suggestion with regard to the obverse type that it represents a fleece, a not unreasonable possibility, as wool was for long one of the main products of Essex industry. If the coin stood by itself I would be inclined to accept this view; taken with Mack no. 214, however, which appears to show two similar ram-headed devices intertwined, in a comparable guilloche border, I would prefer the view that it represents, to the best of the engraver’s skill, a ram-headed serpent coiled. This beast is a familiar subject of Celtic art, occurring on a number of Gaulish monuments as well as, several times, on the Gundestrup vase. Moreover the serpent is often shown with a spotted body, as if the curly quality of the ram’s fleece had overflowed on to the smooth skin of the reptile. On British coins there are several likely or certain representations of ram-headed serpents, for instance, beneath the horse on the staters of Vosenos, Mack no. 297, or on the strange silver coin from Braughing, Mack no. 445.

The ram’s head, presumably repeating the serpent, also occurs as an emblem on the reverse of the coin. The mythical beast here has, however, no precise parallel; it is a griffon without wings, almost as unnatural to heraldry, even of the Celtic type, as is a griffon to nature. Winged griffon are plentiful on British coins. It may be that this animal needed no wings because it was a draught-griffon. There is a hint of this in the two bands of beads across the neck and the shoulders. This is a decorative feature of a number of Ancient British coins. It is best known on silver coins of the Iceni, both inscribed and uninscribed, either as two bands or two rows of dots; it is also seen on rare bronze coins of Cunobelin, Mack no. 261, and on a unique uninscribed small silver coin from Colchester, Mack no. 272a. The animals on the obverse of the former, also with turned-back head, and on the reverse of the latter seem to be horses, but are in other respects close to our wingless griffon. (The quarter-stater incidentally is, I think, to be associated rather with Dubnovellaunus than Addedomaros; compare Mack no. 285, but the last three coins are all linked by the use of the magical ★ symbol, not a common ornament on British coins though known on Gaulish coins.) These recurring bands on neck and shoulders appear to have their origin in the harness of a type familiar from classical monuments for the attachment of thongs to draw carts or chariots. I know of no monument which connects these with Britain, but a good example of this kind of harness is on the horses from the pinnacle of the tomb of Mausolus in the British Museum. Of course in the fanciful form of a coin such as this they make no pretence to accurate representation, but I have little doubt that that is where their origin lay. I have wondered similarly whether the origin of the large ring which so often decorates the horse’s shoulder on Ancient British coins lies in the metal roundel which undoubtedly formed part of the
trappings of a saddled horse on parade at this time, as seen for instance a little later on several Roman tombstones of auxiliary horsemen found in Britain (e.g. at Colchester and Cirencester). However, the decoration of the haunches and shoulders of animals had by this time a respectable history of several centuries in the annals of Celtic art.

This fine new specimen is a good example of the partly romanized art of south-east Britain very early in the first century A.D. Neither obverse nor reverse could possibly be considered a Roman work, and yet neither could have been devised by a Celtic artist unless he were more than superficially familiar with the classical tradition. The ram-headed serpent of the obverse is a purely Celtic theme, while the wingless griffon of the reverse belongs to a fairly large class of more-or-less correctly borrowed fabulous classical beasts; indeed they are amongst the commonest subjects on Ancient British coins. Small, but beautifully preserved, this coin is as fine an illustration as has survived of the artistic and mythological concepts of the age when the country first began to emerge from the mists of prehistory.

D. F. Allen

A SURFACE FIND OF THREE SILVER COINS OF THE DOBUNI

By the courtesy of Mr. H. Morrison of Colerne, Wilts., I am able to illustrate three silver coins found lying on the surface of a field at Northwood Farm near Chippenham. The three coins were not found together, but there would seem little doubt but that they are the "scatter" from a hoard disturbed by the plough either recently or in the past, and other coins may well come to light. The first of the three coins (Pl. XXV, 1) is of the inscribed type, and corresponds to Mack 387 (Evans I. 8), and, although chipped, weighs 16·5 grains. The other two coins both approximate to Mack 382 (Evans F. 8), although they are very different in style. The slightly heavier (13·5 grains) (Pl. XXV, 2) illustrates admirably the triple-tailed horse that is so characteristic of coins of this area, while the lighter (13·2 grains) (Pl. XXV, 3) is notable for the straight treatment of the neck which is held almost vertical. Both the uninscribed coins have an uneven but by no means unattractive greenish patina, and would appear to have a certain copper content in addition to a fairly high proportion of silver. Neither, however, would appear to be a plated forgery as that term is usually understood by the student of the Dobunic series.

In putting on record a new find-spot for two classes of Ancient British coin, I would like to put in a plea for the making of a comparable record of the find-spots of Anglo-Saxon pence, and especially the so-called "common" two-line type of the tenth century. The plotting of single finds of these may throw considerable light on the problem of which prolific moneyers of Edward the Elder are to be associated with which major mints.

R. H. M. D.
A CONTEMPORARY FORGERY OF A DOBUNI COIN FROM WILTSHIRE

Mr. F. K. Annable, of the Wiltshire Archaeological Society Museum at Devizes, has kindly supplied particulars of a plated forgery of a silver coin of the Dobuni found in July 1956 by a Mr. Reeves on Clarke’s Hill, approximately one mile north-east of Sandy Lane, in the parish of Colne Without (N.G. Swindon, Sheet 157, 974693). The coin has been presented to the Devizes Museum. Mr. Derek Allen has also seen the coin and has helped in identifying it.

The type is Evans I. 9 = Mack 389 = Allen (Arch. 1944), Pl. IV. 12. It is virtually identical with a forgery found in the Bagendon excavations in 1955 and could even be from the same reverse die. The core is of iron and copper, largely iron, and the plating is of base silver, which combine to give the coin a red interior and a greenish exterior. It can be dated c. A.D. 30–40.

SOME UNPUBLISHED SAXON AND NORMAN COINS

1. Sceatta (Pl. XXV, 5).
   Obv. Small standing facing figure of Victory with wings expanded.
   Rev. A form of cross with circle of dots enclosing pellet in the angles, a pellet in centre, somewhat similar to B.M.C. iii. 25.
   Parson sale, lot 102.

2. Sceatta (Pl. XXV, 6).
   Obv. Very crude facing head, perhaps derived from B.M.C. Type 31.
   Rev. Dragon-like animal to the left with head turned to right, very similar to B.M.C. Type 40. Many pellets in the field.

3. Offa penny (Pl. XXV, 7).
   Obv. Bust to right, hair in Saxon-style curls very similar to B.M.C. Pl. v, 9, and Lockett Pl. vii, 11 OFFA.
   Rev. Cross with trefoils between links, four ovals dividing the legend. Similar to B.M.C. Pl. v, 12 and Lockett Pl. vii, 3. # VD.
   An unpublished combination of types. From Drabble sale, 1939, lot 319.

4. William I Type I of Norwich. Variety without sceptre.
   Obv. + PILLEMV REX I
   Rev. + MAN ON NORDPI
   A new moneyer for Norwich for this reign. From Ryan sale, lot 872.

5. William I mule types 1–2 of Stafford.
   Obv. + PILLEMVRS REX
   Rev. + GODPINNE ON SI/EI
   Appears to be from the same obverse die as a coin of type I
of Stafford (GODPINE ON STÆF) in the Carlyon-Britton sale 1913, lot 1194. Unpublished mint for this mule. From Ryan sale, lot 873.

6. Henry I type 15 of Sandwich.

*Obv.* +HENRIEVVS:

*Rev.* +Æ[ ] ON SANDP

Possibly Adalbot. Unpublished mint for this type.

R. P. MACK

**A NEW TYPE FOR ARCHBISHOP CEOLNOOTH**

In the Supplement to Brooke’s *English Coins*, on revising the Anglo-Saxon portion of which I assisted Mr. C. A. Whitton, I suggested, not without some misgivings, the inclusion of a fragment of a penny of Archbishop Ceolnoth which formed lot 324 of the Montagu sale, 1896. This was described in the catalogue as having a tonsured bust facing, with, as reverse type, a floriated cross with a leaf in each angle; the cataloguer noted that certain rare coins of Æthilberht have a similar reverse. Misgivings about the coin arose from the fact that it had been “passed” in the Montagu sale, normally a sign that its genuineness was suspected, but a manuscript note in my copy of the catalogue read “Only a piece, passed over” which suggested that this might not be the case here.

It is therefore a pleasure to be able to record not only that the coin has now turned up again and proves to be undoubtedly genuine, but also that, through the generosity of Major R. M. Simon, it has been presented to the British Museum. With it Major Simon presented a number of other coins “passed” at the Montagu sale, all of which seem rightly to have been condemned as forgeries.

The Ceolnoth coin reads:

*Obv.* +ÆC––CHIEP–

*Rev.*––LDMONET (Pl. XXV, 12).

The Montagu catalogue says that “the moneyer’s name is undoubtedly CENVEALD as on Æthelbert’s coin”. This may well be so: Cenweald was a moneyer of Ceolnoth’s on the “moneyer’s name on cross” type as well as of Æthilberht’s. But a moneyer Herebeald also struck the floriated cross type for Æthilberht and one cannot rule out the possibility that he was responsible for the Ceolnoth fragment.

It does not appear to have been sufficiently recognized what an important reform in the coinage was marked by Æthelwulf’s introduction of the “moneyer’s name on cross” type. For the first time a uniform coinage, common both to the kings of Wessex and to the Archbishop of Canterbury, was introduced. This practice continued until some time in Alfred’s reign when once again a variety of types appears, though what may be called a basic type, the one with a cross on the obverse and the moneyer’s name on the reverse, was then
introduced and continued alongside the more varied types for nearly another century.

Meanwhile Æthelwulf’s uniform type was continued initially by his successor Æthilberht, but towards the end of his reign he changed it to the floriated cross type here recorded as of Ceolnoth also. Æthilred, who succeeded Æthilberht in 866, four years before the death of Ceolnoth, introduced the so-called “lunette” type which was also struck by Ceolnoth and the Mercian king Burgred and continued by Alfed. This appears to have been a substantial issue in the regal series, though the coins of the Archbishop have survived in few specimens.

That a reform calling in this type must have taken place is suggested by the fact that it is seldom found in hoards mixed with later types. The great Cuerdale hoard, with its 920 coins of Alfred, had none of the lunette type. The reform was doubtless prompted by the debased state of the coinage.

The uniform coinage was not, however, abandoned on the reform taking place. Alfred’s type V is also found struck by Ceolwulf II of Mercia and by Archbishop Ethered.

We thus get a period dating from about 855 to perhaps 880 during which only four reverse types, all struck consecutively, are found in middle and southern England. The first two were struck by the Wessex kings and the Archbishop of Canterbury; the last two by the Mercian kings also. The legislative measure that resulted in this uniform coinage has not survived, but one is justified in believing that it marked a major attempt at monetary reform. It may also be significant that East Anglia was not a party to this currency union.

C. E. Blunt

THE EARLIEST COINS OF THE MINT OF ROCHESTER

This note is no more than a vindication of an attribution made by Rev. Daniel Haigh as long ago as 1869 but since then so completely ignored by later writers as to lead anyone who chanced to light on it to believe that it must be untenable. Writing in the Numismatic Chronicle for that year¹ Mr. Haigh said: “I am not aware whether the unique coin of Ceolwulf (I), once in the cabinet of the late Mr. Cuff, with the reverse legend DOROBREBIA CIBITAS, has ever been correctly assigned, as it ought to be, to Rochester.” This coin (Pl. XXV, 13) is now in the British Museum (B.M.C. 112).

His grounds for this attribution were, of course, that Dorobrevia was the British name for Rochester just as was Dorovernia for Canterbury.

Among subsequent writers Kenyon, in the third edition of Hawkins’s Silver Coins of England,² attributes the coin to Canterbury and does not mention the possibility of Rochester; Keary in the first volume of the British Museum Catalogue does the same;³ so does

¹ p. 193. ² p. 46. ³ p. 41.
Brooke\(^1\) who goes further and says "incidentally the form of the name, Dorobrebia Cibitas (with the last three letters used to form the design in the centre of the coin) is of interest but as an example of the interchange of the letters \(B\) and \(v\) (or \(F\)), which we get also in Fotred for Botred, and later in Albred for Alfred, and as an instance of the use of the field of the coin for the completion of the legend, as in Merci-oru(m) and quite commonly, Monet-a(rius)". Oman\(^2\) appears at first sight to be supporting Haigh when he refers to a rough-looking coin of Ceolwulf's from Rochester. But he adds that it has a St. Andrew's cross and the apostle's name on the reverse. No such coin is known to me.

Since Haigh wrote, another coin of Ceolwulf I with this mint reading has come to light in the Middle Temple hoard.\(^3\) The reading DoR-obREBIA is consistent with the Cuff coin but Civitas (or Cibitas) is omitted. Instead, the field contains the letter A. These appear to be the only two specimens known.

The absence of a moneyer's name markedly differentiates these two coins from all Ceolwulf's other issues and would, of itself, suggest that they came from a one-moneyer mint. Conversely the presence of the names of the various moneyers on coins of Egbert with the Dorob C monogram and on those of Æthelwulf with the letters DoRIBI tends to suggest that Haigh's doubt\(^4\) as to whether these coins belonged to Canterbury or Rochester is unjustified. The fact that most of Æthelwulf's coins with these letters read Cant on the other side might of itself have been expected to allay it.

Haigh was aware of two coins of Ecgberht of Wessex with the reverse legend Scs Andreas (\(B.M.C.\) 13 and one similar to \(B.M.C.\) 12) and rightly attributed these to Rochester on the grounds that St. Andrew was the patron saint of the cathedral there. These coins likewise have no moneyer's name. Since his time another specimen of each type has appeared (\(B.M.C.\) 12 and B.M. Acqns. 325) and, in addition, a new type which reads Scs Andreas Apostolus, the last six letters being in the field (B.M. Acqns. 324). Brooke attributes, somewhat tentatively, yet another coin of Ecgberht to Rochester, one that has on the obverse a monogram which he reads as a double "A" and suggests may indicate Andreas Apostolus. This coin has a moneyer's name, that of Beagmund, and so differs, in this material respect, from the coins that unquestionably bear the name of St. Andrew. Brooke feels that the Beagmund coins of this and the following reign may be of Rochester and adds "It is not necessary to assume that a mint was opened at Rochester; the coinage may have been struck in Canterbury."\(^5\) If he had said that the dies may have been prepared in Canterbury it would be easy to agree with Brooke. It is less easy to accept that the valued privilege of coining would have been allowed to take place outside the immediate control of anyone fortunate enough to possess it. Not only would the profit be difficult to check,

---

\(^1\) *English Coins*, p. 23.  \(^2\) *The Coinage of England*, p. 25.  
\(^3\) B.M. Acqns. 118.  
\(^4\) N.C. 1869, p. 193.  
but abuses, for which the penalties were heavy, might also occur. I prefer therefore to leave this coin among those of Æcgberht for which no certain mint can be given, though Canterbury is their likely provenance. The monogram is, in any case, doubtful. In the Montagu catalogue it was read as double "MM?" though this seems unlikely.

But whatever one may say about the Beagmund coin, it does nothing to disturb the idea that a mint existed at Rochester in Æcgberht's reign and it is consequently in no way surprising to find a coin of the same mint struck by the Mercian king who ruled in Kent a year or two before Æcgberht conquered it.

A SUSPECT "TOWER" TYPE PENNY OF KING EDWARD THE ELDER

RECENTLY the Department of Coins and Medals at the British Museum has been able to acquire a "tower" type coin of Edward the Elder of which the authenticity has been impugned, and apparently not without justification inasmuch as the price realized at the Ryan sale (lot 750) could only suggest that there was nobody in the room prepared seriously to dispute the remark of the cataloguer "This coin appears to be a cast". The Hon. R. W. H. Erskine, however, was convinced that the coin was genuine, and his belief is shared in full by the present writer. That our opinions are disinterested should be guaranteed, we trust, by the fact that the coin (Pl. XXV, 14) has now passed to the National Collection for precisely the same purely nominal sum that was paid in the open market in 1952.

The coin in question was first listed in a major sale-catalogue in 1895 when as lot 597 in the Montagu collection it fetched £5. 10s., a price which argues that there was then no doubt concerning its authenticity. It was described as from the Yorke Moore and Brice collections, and would seem to have passed privately to Montagu with the rest of Brice's coins. In 1916 the coin was in the Bliss sale and as lot 89 fetched £5, which again suggests that it was still accepted as genuine. In November 1930 another specimen from different dies was sold at Glendinings (lot 58) and reached the price, surprisingly high for the period, of £50. It is now in the Lockett collection. Certainly there could be no doubt as to authenticity in this case as it was an open secret that all the coins in the sale were from the Vatican hoard. The Lockett coin, incidentally, is so different in treatment as almost to constitute another variety, but it does provide welcome corroboration of the fact that Eadwald was a moneyer of the "tower" type which in the last year or so has been associated with the Chester area and the decade c. 915-25.1

As Mr. Blunt has shown recently, by the middle of the nineteenth century there were forgers who could have produced plausible dies for a penny of Edward the Elder, but the suggestion that has been made is that the Ryan coin was a cast and not a struck forgery. Casting,

1 Chester Archaeological Society's Journal, xlii (1955), 5.
however, presupposes the existence of an original from which the copy can be cast, and *prima facie* it is not likely that this original would be destroyed. A most thorough check through twentieth-century sale-catalogues and other relevant literature has established that the only two “tower” type coins of Edward the Elder by the moneyer Eadwald are the Lockett and Ryan specimens, and we have seen that there is absolutely no possibility of the one being cast from the other. To find records of a possible third specimen we have to go back to Ruding’s plates and Bryer’s transcript dated 1813 of Taylor Combe’s manuscript corpus of Ancient British and Anglo-Saxon coins to which reference has been made before in these pages. From these two sources we learn that a coin corresponding in every way to the Ryan coin had been sketched before 1803 by Taylor Combe, but without indication of its whereabouts, presumably because he had been shown it in confidence.

As early as 1803, then, there was in existence a coin, accepted by Taylor Combe himself as perfectly genuine, which is either the Ryan coin or an original from which the Ryan coin could have been cast. At that early date we are reluctant to postulate a forger skilful enough to have *fabricated* a plausible set of dies for a penny of Edward the Elder, and so it must be conceded that if the Ryan coin is cast it is from a genuine coin and not from a concoction. That this concession is reasonable seems further borne out by the fact that the Ryan coin has all the appearance of an overstrike—one is scarcely prepared to believe that an eighteenth-century forger in the Anglo-Saxon series would have gone to all the trouble of engraving traces of an undertype. It would be remarkable, too, that he should have hit on a type which we now know to be consistent with a sequence of striking demanded by consideration of hoard evidence not then available.

The essential problem, therefore, is quite simply whether or not the Ryan coin is a cast. If it is a cast, we have to explain the disappearance of the original—though a note by Commander Mack in this very number of the *Journal* does demonstrate the possibility of a coin published in the seventeenth century escaping both Taylor Combe’s net two centuries later and Brooke’s a century later still. If, on the other hand, the Ryan coin is not a cast, there can be little doubt but that it is the piece sketched by Taylor Combe, and I am grateful once again to my colleague Mrs. J. S. Martin for establishing what must surely be its full pedigree. The coin first appears, without provenance, in the plates that accompany Snelling’s *Tracts* published in 1762, and we would stress that it is conspicuously absent from Speed, Gibson, and Fountaine. It recurs in the 1803 Taylor Combe plates, again without provenance, and is first recorded in the sale-room in 1824 when it formed lot 610 at the Dimsdale sale. It was bought by Young for Barrett and passed to the Dymock collection. In 1848 it formed lot 61 at the Dymock sale where it was purchased by the Rev. Dr. Neligan. In 1851 it was again in the market, and as lot 17 in the

---

1 The undertype appears to be a penny of “two-line” type on the small flan characteristic of Edward the Elder coins from the Cuerdale find.

Neligan sale passed to Sir Thomas Tobin, whence it came privately to Yorke Moore. It formed lot 84 in the latter’s sale and was bought by Webster for Brice. Unless therefore the Ryan coin is a cast, the presumption must be that the full provenance is “from the Ryan, Bliss, Montagu, Brice, Yorke Moore, Tobin, Neligan, Dymock and Dimsdale collections, and engraved for Taylor Combe and Snelling by Parsons and Hill respectively”. The one weak link in the chain is the transition between Tobin and Yorke Moore, but it would be an extraordinary coincidence if one unique coin disappeared at some date after 1851 and its die-duplicate appeared before 1879.

Fundamentally, then, the question is a simple one. Is or is not the coin from the Ryan sale a cast? If the answer be that the coin is struck, its authenticity seems established beyond reasonable doubt, and fortunately the advance of modern technology enables a clear-cut answer to be given by the scientist. The coin in question was submitted to the authorities of the Royal Mint, and I am indebted to the Deputy Master for permission to quote Mr. Dunning’s report as communicated to me in a letter dated 23 August 1956:

It is not a cast coin as can be seen from the attached photomicrograph. The small equi-axed grains indicate that it has been annealed, and the twinning within some of the grains that it has been worked. The structure is not inconsistent with what might be expected from what is believed to have been the Anglo-Saxon coining procedure. According to Mr. Stride, this consisted of pouring the molten metal onto a stone slab, hammering the resulting sheet—possibly while still hot—to the required thickness, cutting out the blanks and then striking.

The intergranular constituents show that the silver from which this coin was made was impure, and this is confirmed by a density determination which gave 9.96 as
compared with $10.49$ for pure, and $10.35$ for $925$ silver. If all the impurities were present as copper, this density would correspond to a fineness of about $680$, an alloy which would show a large amount of lamellar Ag-Cu eutectic. No eutectic whatever was seen on the section examined. It seems improbable that silver which might have been used for a modern counterfeit would contain diluents, other than copper, to the extent that this coin does.

Having no standards with which to compare the coin, it is not possible to establish whether it is genuine or not, but it is certainly not cast.

The photomicrograph reproduced here seems even to the non-scientist decisively to endorse Mr. Dunning's verdict, while the numismatic evidence already adduced seems conclusive that the coin is not merely "not cast" but authentic. On the other hand it would be idle to pretend that the coin in question does not have a thoroughly cast appearance—and especially about the obverse. It is my belief that this is to be explained partly by overstriking, and partly by "scrubbing" when the coin was first discovered in the eighteenth century.

R. H. M. Dolley

AN UNPUBLISHED PENNY OF EDMUND FROM THE COTTON COLLECTION

In the spring of 1956 I purchased a penny of Edmund of the Norwich mint by the moneyer Eadgar. I knew Eadgar was an unrecorded moneyer for Norwich for this reign.

I showed the coin to Mr. Dolley who identified it immediately as a hitherto missing coin from the Cotton collection and referred me to his article in B.N.J. vol. xxvii where he had written (p. 304) referring to losses that had occurred from the Cotton collection, probably in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries—"Even so, the National Collection is the poorer for lacking the Pembroke Cynethrith (now in Lockett), not to mention the unpublished moneyer of Norwich for Eadmund."

Sir Robert Cotton, the famous antiquary and contemporary of James I, formed what was probably one of the earliest collections of Anglo-Saxon coins. It eventually passed to the British Museum and was catalogued by Samuel Pegge in the middle of the eighteenth century. It is probable that the collection suffered losses from pilfering after Cotton's death, the Edmund penny of Norwich being one of the coins stolen, for it is amongst the nineteen coins engraved by Speed which Pegge claimed to have once been part of the Cotton collection (see B.N.J. vol. xxvii, pp. 303 and 312) but which are now missing from the B.M. trays.

The coin, which on the obverse reads +EADMVND REX and on the reverse +EADGAR MO NORDPT (Pl. XXV, 15), is of Brooke type 4 with crowned bust to the right and small cross on reverse. It is illustrated on page 381 of Speed's Historie of Great Britaine (1611) and on plate vi opposite p. cxxxix of Gibson's edition (1695) of Camden's Britannia.
It would be interesting to know the circumstances under which it came to be missing from the Cotton collection and in whose hands it has been all the intervening years, but these details are not forthcoming. It is only to be hoped that most of the missing Cotton coins will eventually come to light and perhaps one day return to their rightful place in the British Museum.

R. P. Mack

AN ALLEGED AGNUS DEI PENNY OF THE WAREHAM MINT

Recently the writer's attention has been drawn to a passage in Charles Warne's Ancient Dorset which seemed to provide good evidence for the existence of an Agnus Dei penny of the Wareham mint. The relevant passage occurs on p. 328 under the general heading "Anglo Saxon and Danish Coins struck by Dorset Mints and now in the following Foreign Collections. ADDITIONAL". It runs as follows:

LUNDEN

Ædred II, A.D. 978–1016

Palfgar mo fer Hildebrand, Type G.

On p. 320 we are told that information concerning the coins at Lund had been furnished by a Professor Thorberg of that University. Warne's Ancient Dorset was published in 1872, and there is internal evidence that the correspondence with Professor Thorberg is to be dated to that year. Consequently the reference to a Hildebrand classification must allude either to the 1846 edition of Anglosachsiska Mynt, or to the same author's comparatively youthful disquisition on the Anglo-Saxon coins belonging to Lund University which was published in three successive fascicules in 1829. The latter possibility, however, seems precluded by the fact that the alphabetical type sequence there proposed does not extend beyond the letter "F". The reference must, therefore, be to the 1846 Stockholm Catalogue, where the classification adopted is the same as that followed in the 1881 edition. Consequently there is a strong *prima facie* case that we are here confronted with an unpublished coin of the celebrated Agnus Dei issue, a type so rare that fewer than a dozen specimens are known to the numismatist.

The existence or non-existence of this coin is critical for the serious student of the late Saxon series for the simple reason that it would be the first penny of this type to be associated with a mint from Wessex proper. The late W. C. Wells seems to have been the first to recognize the peculiarly "Mercian" flavour of the issue, but unfortunately had to resort quite unnecessarily to some very specious but not very convincing special pleading in order to include the two coins of Malmesbury. There is absolutely no need for the numismatist to speculate on whether this or that county came within Eadric's ealdormanry, and certainly there are few numismatists today who would care to be
associated with the remarkable claim that "there can be no doubt but that the ealdormen held control of the coinage issued in their ealdor-
manry". Leaving aside, too, the question of the date of the Agnus 
Dei issue—and the present writer believes that a good case can be 
made for dating it five years earlier than Wells did—the coins of the 
period c. 1010–20 themselves make it abundantly clear that the terri-
tory north of the Bristol Avon was a sort of no-man's-land as far 
as the supply of dies was concerned, and that for some reason unknown 
to us the pattern of eleventh-century administration preserved in this 
matter at least a memory of the old sub-kingdom of Hwicce with its 
Mercian and not West Saxon associations. This is seen of course most 
clearly in the case of the geographical distribution of the variety of the 
Quatrefoil issue of Cnut which Hildebrand distinguishes as Type E, 
var. d, but even in the last years of Æthelræd II there is evidence that 
mints north of the Avon received some at least of their dies from the 
same centre that supplied Chester and Oxford. Consequently the fact 
that Malmesbury struck the Agnus Dei type is no argument against 
the "Mercian" character of the issue.

An Agnus Dei penny from Wareham, on the other hand, would 
fairly put the cat among the pigeons. A possible way out of the diffi-
culty would be to suggest that the coin is wrongly attributed, and 
should be given to Warwick. Admittedly the most abbreviated mint-
signatures are so similar that confusion is easy, PER and F/ER, but 
the unpleasant fact remains that the moneyer Ælfgar is known from 
undoubted Wareham coins of just this period. It is not simply a matter 
of readings such as PERHA and PERHAM which simply cannot be War-
wick, but certain of the coins are of a style which is strictly confined 
to Wessex.

The answer must surely be sought in quite another direction. The 
first point to be borne in mind is that Bror Emil Hildebrand knew well 
the Lund Collection, and in fact added to it during his long career in 
the Stockholm Coin Cabinet. He was also personally very interested 
in the Agnus Dei type, and in the 1881 edition of Anglosachsiska Mynt 
drew up what was obviously intended to be a complete list of all the 
examples known to him, including for this purpose a coin in Copen-
hagen and another described in an early nineteenth-century German 
work. It is, therefore, improbable, to say the very least, that another 
specimen could have been acquired by the Lund Collection between 
1829 and 1872 without being brought to his notice, while the normal 
operation of the Swedish law of treasure trove in any case should have 
ensured that the discovery of it came to his official cognizance.

The second consideration is that there is in the Systematic Collec-
tion at Lund a Wareham penny of the moneyer Ælfgar which there is 
reason to believe was there before 1872, and which Professor Thorberg 
did not bring to Warne's attention. The reading of the reverse legend 
approximates to that given by Warne, but the type is that of the Crux 
issue. According to the Hildebrand classification of 1846 and 1881 
this would have been described by Professor Thorberg as "Typ. C", 


and it is easy to see how a confusion could arise in manuscript between a "C" and a "G". It is the suggestion of this note that the *Agnus Dei* penny of Wareham is mythical, and that the origin of its existence lies in an error of transcription or in a slip on the part of the printer. Warne obviously was not familiar with Hildebrand’s 1846 catalogue, and still less with the classification there adopted. Indeed for most late Saxon coins he resorts to a rather clumsy system of references to Ruding’s plates. Consequently it is very doubtful if he would have appreciated the vital import of the letter “G”, and the mistake having once been passed in proof—if indeed it was not always present in Warne's copy—its perpetuation was inevitable.

The balance of probability, then, is that the *Agnus Dei* penny of Wareham does not and never did exist. It only remains for the present writer to extend his thanks to Mr. C. E. Blunt for drawing his attention to the Warne reference, Fil. lic. fru Brita Malmer of Lund for doing the same as regards the *Crux* coin otherwise so unaccountably passed over by Professor Thorberg, and to Mr. Elmore Jones who has supplied what may seem the final proof that the solution proposed is the right one. According to Warne the crucial coin reads:

\[\text{HAFEAR MO PER}\]

Perhaps the most characteristic epigraphical feature of coins of the *Agnus Dei* type is that the *monetarius* contraction is never used, the reverse legends invariably consisting of the moneyer’s name and that of his mint *without* a copulative or with *ON*.

R. H. M. D.

---

THE SUPPOSED FINDS AT THWAITE AND CAMPSEY ASH, 1832

There are references in numismatic literature to two finds of Anglo-Saxon coins in Suffolk in the year 1832. One of these was at Thwaite and is referred to, for example, by Hawkins in his *Silver Coins of England* and in two sale catalogues; the other find has been stated to have been at Campsey Ash and has been instanced by Burn in his *Catalogue of London Tradesmen’s Tokens*, Akerman in *Pagan Saxon-dom*, and Lindsay in *Coinage of the Heptarchy*. Thompson in his *Inventory of British Coin Hoards A.D. 600–1500* has listed both finds (nos. 69 and 362). Accounts of both these finds state that the coins were of the eleventh century and included a number of cut half-pennies and farthings.

It would be a remarkable coincidence for two such hoards to be found in the same year and further investigation has shown that there was in fact only one find, namely that at Thwaite. It would seem that the misapprehension arose from a somewhat ambiguous account given

---

1 Major Sheppard sale, 25 February 1864, lot nos. 86 and 87. Lady sale, 19 May 1885, lot no. 145.
in the *Bury and Suffolk Herald* of 12 February 1832 which runs as follows:

A few days since, as some labourers on the estate of Mrs. Sheppard of Campsey Ash, were felling an old pollard oak, they discovered two parcels of ancient coins, enclosed in thin lead cases; one of them was quite embedded in the solid part of the root. They are chiefly pennies of Edward the Confessor and Harold II,¹ and amounted altogether to nearly 600 pieces. What appears most singular is, that many of them are divided into halves and quarters, which evidently shew that at that remote period these divided parts were circulated as ½d. and ¼d.

Mrs. Sheppard was indeed of Campsey Ash but she also had an estate at Thwaite some twenty miles distant. Another original account of the find is in the *Essex Standard*, February 1832, which reads as follows:

A short time since, a man employed in removing the butt of an oak pollard, recently felled at Wickham Skeith, near Eye, Suffolk, discovered several packages, containing ancient coins of different kinds. In one of the packets there were as many as 500 of these interesting relics of bygone days; and there were several others smaller, making in all about 700. Unacquainted with their value as antiquarian curiosities, the man took them to the chandler’s shop; and, finding that they would not purchase any of those necessaries of which he stood most in need, he liberally distributed them by handfuls to any one that would have them. A gentleman of Colchester, being in the neighbourhood shortly after the discovery procured six of them, all different. An adept in antiquities here has pronounced them to have been coined previous to the Conquest. One of them bears the effigy and name of Canute, who began to reign, A.D. 1017; another is supposed to be of the reign of Edred, A.D. 946;² and several bear rude but distinct representations of the fleur de lis. They are all in an excellent state of preservation.

The village of Wickham Skeith adjoins that of Thwaite; and confirmation that Thwaite was the real find-spot comes on various tickets relating to coins in the National Collection, and which were certainly written before 1838.

It will be noted from the two accounts given above, that while they do not differ greatly as regards the place of deposit the circumstances of discovery are not at all in accord, it is possible of course that the account in the *Essex Standard* is entirely incorrect, for we know that Mrs. Sheppard did come into possession of a considerable number of coins. It is also possible, however, that one of the workmen employed appropriated for his own use some of the coins and disposed of them as stated by the *Essex Standard*.

In the Provenance paper published in the *British Numismatic Journal*, 1955, I have shown *B.M.C.* nos. 48, 49, 51, 104, 201, 258, 437, 472, 668, 691, 770, 781, 791, 792, 795, 798, 811, 825, 827, 828, 861, 878, 888, 1090, 1224, 1245, 1378, 1525, 1535, as having been presented by the Hon. Mrs. Wilson (1877). I have now established that the Hon. Mrs. R. Wilson was in fact the very Mrs. Sheppard on whose land the coins were found and I have no hesitation in including these now among the Thwaite coins. This was indeed anticipated by Mr. R. H. M. Dolley in his introduction to the Provenances.

¹ An error for Harold I.

² This is in all probability a misread Edward.
As this note is published merely to remove a long-standing misapprehension I have not felt it necessary to list the known coins individually nor to comment on the hoard as such.

J. S. Martin

THE HEAVY CALAIS QUARTER-NOBLE OF HENRY IV

Recently the Rector of Ashurst near Tunbridge Wells, the Rev. A. J. White, submitted to the British Museum for identification a small gold coin which had been found in the churchyard. It proved to be one of the extremely rare heavy quarter-nobles of Henry IV struck at Calais before that mint was closed in 1411. As will be seen from the illustration (Pl. XXV, 17,) the coin corresponds exactly to Mr. C. E. Blunt's description (B.N.J. xxiv. 22-27) and in fact the two coins in the National Collection and that found at Ashurst prove all to be from the same pair of dies. Thus the new coin is welcome not only for providing an actual find-spot—neither of the two coins in the British Museum has a hoard-provenance—but because the fact that the three known specimens should all be from one pair of dies argues strongly that the issue was indeed very limited. The new coin weighs no less than 28-27 grains, appreciably more than either of the specimens previously known, and, although bearing traces of circulation, is generally better preserved, the Walters coin in the National Collection being marred by a chip, while the Webster specimen is cracked and heavily clipped. Consequently it is all the more satisfactory to be able to report that the Ashurst specimen has been acquired for the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.

This is perhaps a convenient opportunity for tidying up one loose end in Mr. Blunt's war-time study of the heavy gold coinage of Henry IV mentioned above. Constrained to write on the basis of notes made before the war, Mr. Blunt remarked that he had no record of having seen at the British Museum the Walters specimen of the heavy quarter-noble of London with the French arms consisting of three lis arranged +++. In fact this coin is in the National Collection, having been acquired at the Walters Sale (lot 229) along with the second of the Calais heavy quarter-nobles, and for the sake of completeness it is illustrated here (Pl. XXV, 18). It is badly clipped—it weighs no more than 24-4 grains—but it appears to provide a new reverse die as well as a new obverse die for the series, and we thus have two obverse and four reverse dies represented on seven coins, which may suggest that the London issue was substantially larger than that put out from Calais.

R. H. M. D.

FOSCOTE (BUCKS.) TREASURE TROVE

On 3 and 4 December 1955 at Foscote, near Winslow, Bucks., Master T. J. Rossiter and Master F. King discovered 198 silver coins of the Tudor and Stuart period (Edward VI–Charles I). Another one was
found by Mr. J. Rush. Denominations represented were half-crowns, shillings, and sixpences, and a single 30s. Scots piece of James I. The latest mark represented was Triangle in Circle (1641–3), which was present in such numbers (20 coins) as to show that the hoard had been concealed soon after the start of the Civil War and doubtless in connection with some early local troop movement. The excellent condition of the coins is noticeable—half-crowns average 230 gr., shillings over 90 gr., and sixpences 42 gr.—and suggests that the severe clipping found in many hoards with coins of this period is a feature of the Restoration epoch; cf. the Yearby¹ and Ashton hoards.²

A coin of exceptional interest is the Charles I shilling of Type 3a, mint-mark Bell. This has been overstruck on a shilling of Type 3¹, of which the head, shield, and Portcullis marks on both sides are clearly visible. This is, so far as I can trace, the first overstrike of this series to have been published, and its raison d'être is not apparent. It may be suggested that it arose through the earlier dies being inadvertently used in the Bell period. The coins thus produced would have been re-struck with correct dies before leaving the mint.

Reference numbers in square brackets are to H. A. Seaby, Notes on English Silver Coins, 1066–1648. Numbers not italicized or in brackets refer to the abbreviations of the royal title, e.g. 323 = ANG FR HIB; 3432 = MAG BRIT FRA (ET) HI.


Elizabeth I

Shillings (31): Crosslet (8) 324 x, 323 x, 223 2, 333 3, 322 x. With 3, 2, 1 or no stops after ELIZABETH, Martlet (2), 332 x, 222 x. With 1 or 3 stops after ELIZABETH, Bell (3), 323 x, A 2: Escallop 5: Crescent 1: Tun 3: Woolpack 3: Key 3: I x.


James I

Shillings (13): 1st coinage 2nd bust Thistle 3333 x; Lis 3333 3; 2nd coinage 3rd bust Lis 3433 x; Rose 1; 4th bust 2: Escallop 1; 5th bust, Coronet 3432 2; 3rd coinage 6th bust Thistle 3332 1; (plume over shield) 3333 x.

Sixpences (10): 1st coinage 1st bust Thistle 3333 1603 1; 2nd bust Lis 1604 3; 2nd coinage 3rd bust Lis 3433 1604 1; Rose 1605 1; 4th bust 2: Escallop 1606 2.

Scots

Six shillings (1): Thistle 3443 1605 1.

Charles I

Half-crowns (6): [Type 3a]: Crown 2222 1; [3a²]: Triangle 3432 1; 3433 1; [4]: Star 3333 2; Triangle in Circle 3332 1.

² See forthcoming B.N.J.
Shillings (60): [Type 3\(^1\)]: Harp 2222 I; Portcullis 2223 I; [3a] Bell 2222 I (overstruck on [3\(^1\)] Portcullis); Crown 6; Tun 3; [4\(^1\) (but with large XII)] I; [4\(^2\) I; [4\(^3\) Anchor \(\cdot\cdot\cdot\) I; \(\cdot\cdot\cdot\) I; \(\cdot\cdot\cdot\) I; Triangle 3333 2; [4\(^4\)]: 3433 3; 3432 I; 3332 2; 3332 3; 2332 I; Star 3333 I; 3332 9; Triangle in Circle 19.
Sixpences (12): [Type 1] Lis 3222 1625 I; [1a\(^1\)]: Castle (rev. over Negro’s Head) 1627 over 6 I; [3] Portcullis 2222 I; Harp or Portcullis 3222 I; [3a] Crown 2222 I; Tun I; [4\(^1\) I; [4\(^2\) Anchor \(\cdot\cdot\cdot\) I; \(\cdot\cdot\cdot\) I; [4\(^3\) Triangle 3333 2; 3322 I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2s. 6d.</th>
<th>1s.</th>
<th>6d.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Face value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward VI</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>£ 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth I</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. 3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James I English</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scots</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles I</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4 1 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
\text{Edward VI} & \text{Elizabeth I} & \text{James I English} & \text{Scots} & \text{Charles I}  \\
\hline
3 & 31 & 13 & 6 & 60 & 107 & 86 & 199 & 8 5 0  \\
\end{array}\]

The hoard was contained in an earthenware vessel,\(^1\) which is commonly called a drug-pot. Of Italian albarello form, it measures 4 4 in. high and is decorated with bands and chevrons in blue and a pale orange-brown. It was found in many small pieces and has been restored in the Department of British and Medieval Antiquities, British Museum. Although incomplete, there were sufficient fragments to establish the profile and exact shape and size of the pot.

\(^1\) Now exhibited with the hoard in the Buckingham County Museum.

J. P. C. Kent

THE FOSCOTE HOARD CONTAINER

The hoard was contained in an earthenware vessel, which is commonly called a drug-pot. Of Italian albarello form, it measures 4 4 in. high and is decorated with bands and chevrons in blue and a pale orange-brown. It was found in many small pieces and has been restored in the Department of British and Medieval Antiquities, British Museum. Although incomplete, there were sufficient fragments to establish the profile and exact shape and size of the pot.

\(^1\) Now exhibited with the hoard in the Buckingham County Museum.
This drug-pot belongs to the category of pottery known as delftware. The name delftware with a small "d" is used to describe all English pottery covered with a tin-glaze, the chief characteristics of which are that it is white and opaque. This glazing technique, which passed from the maiolica of Italy to the rest of Europe, reached England by way of the Netherlands about 1550, but the name is, strictly speaking, misleading, because this type of ware was made in England long before similar pottery was made in the Dutch town of Delft, afterwards renowned for it.

The products of English delftware in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries are almost indistinguishable from those of the Netherlands potteries, mainly because Flemish and Netherlandish potters settled in England and originated the production here. In 1571, two Antwerp potters, Jaspar Andries and Jacob Janson (who later anglicized his name to Jacob Johnson), petitioned Queen Elizabeth and were granted permission to found a pottery in London. A number of Flemish potters and pot-painters later joined Jacob Janson, whose pottery must have grown quite large. The identification of this English delftware is made more difficult by the fact that examples dug up in England may have been imported from the Netherlands. It was only about 1620–30 that delftware of a distinctive character was made in England, and in the previous fifty years English delftware was too much the product of Flemish potters living here to be distinguishable from that made in Flanders and the Netherlands. However, the colours on the English delftware, often painted in blue, orange, green, yellow, and purple, are rather duller than the similar pieces made and found in Flanders. This seems to be the case with the Foscote hoard drug-pot, which was probably made in England in the period c. 1570–1630.

HUGH TAIT

THE CONGLETON (CHESHIRE) TREASURE TROVE—JAMES I AND CHARLES I. GOLD

While carrying out repairs in an old cottage in Moody Street, Congleton, Mr. Aaron Machin discovered eighteen laurels and unites of the period 1623–41. At an inquest held on 10 October 1956 these were declared treasure trove. The entire find was purchased by the Grosvenor Museum, Chester.

The main interest of the hoard lies in its emphasis on the earliest issues: these appear to be considerably more abundant than the later. None of the coins was much circulated, and there was no marked difference in condition between the earlier and later pieces. The poor state of the latest coin must be attributed to faulty striking rather than long circulation, though it should be remembered that accounts show a ready currency for these "broad pieces" down to their recoinage in 1733.
In the following list the royal title is expressed by the number of letters in each component, e.g. 3332 = MAG BRI FRA (ET) HI (REX)—a convenient system which I adopt with acknowledgements to Mr. B. R. Osborne.

**JAMES I**

Seven unites (laurels): all have on obverse the 6th “laurel” bust and colon stops, and on reverse no stops and legend terminated by privy mark. All but no. 7 have reverse legend: FACIAM EOS IN/GENTEM/VNAM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Privy mark and date</th>
<th>Royal title</th>
<th>Weight (140.5 normal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lis (1623–4)</td>
<td>3332</td>
<td>140.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3333</td>
<td>140.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Trefoil (1624–5)</td>
<td>3333</td>
<td>140.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2333</td>
<td>139.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3323</td>
<td>141.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2343</td>
<td>137.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>2342¹</td>
<td>140.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHARLES I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Privy mark and date</th>
<th>Kenyon type</th>
<th>Royal title</th>
<th>Obv. Rev. privy</th>
<th>Weight (140.5 normal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Lis (1625)</td>
<td>I (tall crown)</td>
<td>3222</td>
<td>: E</td>
<td>137.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td>:</td>
<td>: E</td>
<td>140.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td>:</td>
<td>: B</td>
<td>137.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I (wide crown)</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>: E</td>
<td>138.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Castle (1672–8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>22–22³</td>
<td>: E</td>
<td>139.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Heart (1629–30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>: B</td>
<td>139.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Feathers (1630–1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>:</td>
<td>139.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>:</td>
<td>138.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Rose (1631–2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3333</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>138.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Anchor (1638–9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3222</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>140.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Star (1640–1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3333</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>140.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. P. C. Kent

**NEW LIGHT ON A HERTFORDSHIRE TOKEN**

Recently Miss E. Grosstephan of Tring was kind enough to present to the National Collection an example of the token halfpenny struck at that place in 1668 for William Axtell (Williamson 194). Although in the case of Tring the possibility of misattribution was remote, the coin is the more welcome for having been found locally. Miss Grosstephan, too, has very kindly consulted the registers of Tring Parish Church, and the following entries add information about the issues not available in Williamson.

¹ No. 7: reverse legend: FACIAM EOS IN/GENTEM/VNAM.
² B = beginning of legend, E = end of legend.
³ Nos. 13–15: obverse legend broken by front of bust, BR–FR.
⁴ No. 16: no stops in reverse legend.
William Axtell and Sara Gorton (?) were (?) married the — day of June Anno Domini 1649.
Sara daughter of William Axtell born the third of August 1650.
Elizabeth daughter of William Axtell and Sara his wife bapt’d 30 of June 1653.
Son of William Axtill born twenty-fifth of March 1657.
John the son of Will. Axtill was born 10th day July 1658.
February 1663 William son of William Axtill baptised.

Earlier references to the family include the following:
William Axtill and Joan Cutler married the ninth day of October 1621.
Marye daughter of Anthony Axtell (?) bapt’d February 26th 1610.

R. H. M. D.

THE 1667 HALFPENNY TOKEN OF JOHN NEWTON OF MORTON

Three specimens have recently been found in the parishes of Gedney, Thurlby, and Manthorpe,¹ in south Lincolnshire, of the halfpenny token issued by John Newton of Morton in 1667,

Obv. JOHN. NEwTON. A man dipping candles. l.m.n.
Rev. IN. MORTON. 1667. HIS. HALF. PENY.

Williamson attributed the token to Moreton Hampstead in Devonshire² on the ground that Newton was a Devonshire name, though he recognized that it might well belong elsewhere as there were several other Mortons in England. Smith described the token again in 1931 in his Catalogue of Lincolnshire Tokens³ from the specimen in the collection of The Spalding Gentlemen’s Society, but was apparently unaware of Williamson’s previous attribution to Devonshire.

The three recent finds from south Lincolnshire fully bear out Smith’s attribution of the token to Lincolnshire and show clearly that the Morton is Morton by Bourne and not Morton near Gainsborough in the northern part of the county.

In the registers of Morton by Bourne Parish Church there are no fewer than sixteen entries mentioning the Newton family in the ten years between 1625 and 1634. John Newton who issued the token in 1667 may have been the John Newton who was churchwarden for 1633 or, more probably, the John Newton who was baptized in November 1634 and would have been 33 years old in 1667.⁴

D. W. MacDowall

¹ The specimen found at Gedney is now in the possession of Mrs. Kunning, who sent it to the British Museum for identification; the token found at Thurlby belongs to the schoolmaster at Morton; and a piece found at Manthorpe, but now unfortunately lost, seems to have been another specimen of John Newton’s token. The three examples that I have examined are from the same obverse and reverse dies.
² G. C. Williamson, edition of Boyne’s Trade Tokens Issued in the Seventeenth Century, vol. i, p. 150.
³ A. Smith, A Catalogue of the Town and Trade Tokens of Lincolnshire Issued in the Seventeenth Century, p. 38.
⁴ I am deeply indebted to the Rev. E. G. Close, Vicar of Morton by Bourne, who has given me this information about his parish registers and has drawn my attention to the two specimens found at Thurlby and Manthorpe.
A LATE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY FORGER'S PEGGED DIE

Forgers' dies are not infrequently met with, but it is not often that examples can be associated with a particular individual. In my collection, however, there is a pair of pegged dies that is not without interest for the English numismatist although intended for the production of forgeries of a foreign coin. As will be seen from the accompanying photograph of casts made directly from the die-faces, the engraver imitated with fair success the dobra de 4 escudos of John V of Portugal, and collation with the admirable engravings in Moedas Portuguesas by J. Ferraro Vaz (Lisbon, 1948) shows how closely he approximates to the types of the issue of 1741 of the Rio de Janeiro Mint. Portuguese gold coins circulated freely in this country, as is borne out by the frequency with which Kirk's brass weights for them occur, and it is difficult not to see a connexion between my dies and the following passage in Sir John Craig's The Mint (London, 1953), p. 224:

How shocking then that in 1796 a young Mint engraver, John Milton, was found to have supplied dies to counterfeiters of French louis d'or and gold joannes of Portugal. Being dense, he had been misled by the freedom with which he and his
colleagues furnished dies for traders’ tokens, or private substitutes for copper coin. He was regretfully discharged under Treasury pressure and the charges against his customers, the counterfeiters, were quietly dropped.

Recent papers in the *Numismatic Chronicle* by Mr. Philip Grierson (1952, pp. 99–105) and Dr. Paul Balog (1955, pp. 199–201) have discussed the employment of pegged dies, and the new example cited here must considerably strengthen the presumption that the technique is one peculiarly associated with forgery. Dr. Balog, too, has argued that the technique was evolved in the eighteenth century, and some support for this comes from the completely different technique of seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century English forgers as exemplified by false dies in the British Museum and Royal Mint collections (R. H. M. Dolley, *B.N.J.* 1953, pp. 170–1) and by the forger’s dies for the Joannes of 1722 preserved in the Bankfield Museum, Halifax (H. Ling Roth, *The Yorkshire Coiners*, p. 6). These dies are all of “box” type, the square reverse die fitting into a square collar attached to the obverse die—a technique apparently known to the Anglo-Saxons but not employed officially after c. 1130. A similar type of die appears, however, to have been used in a local mint at Shanghai as late as 1857 (H. F. Bowker, *The Numismatist*, Sept. 1956, pp. 993–4). One of the nineteenth-century square-headed dies from China is in the Victoria and Albert Museum. It is illustrated in the *Numismatist*, Oct. 1956, p. 1138. There is also a full description, pp. 1138–9.

Two technical details of my dies seem to merit attention. The actual faces are engraved on brass insets let into the iron. In the case of the obverse die which would have rested on a suitable block of wood, the brass core is simply surrounded by an iron ring. In the case of the reverse die, however, which would have received the full force of the hammer, the brass is sunk into a cup of iron. The second feature of interest is that the three pegs are so arranged that only one die-relationship can be obtained, the normal f f of the genuine coin struck in a coining-press. Other pegged dies known to the writer have only two pegs, and in consequence, as Mr. Grierson has remarked, two opposing die-relationships can be obtained.

It only remains for me to acknowledge the very kind assistance given by Mr. R. H. M. Dolley in the preparation of this note.

F. N. Hepper

A HOARD OF FORGED BANK OF ENGLAND TOKENS

On 1 October 1956 a workman, in removing the stump of a wooden post adjoining the house at 117 Foden Road, Birmingham 22a, found a solid mass of coin-like objects at its base. Mr. D. H. Cherrington submitted the objects to the City Museum, Birmingham, for examination and has provided particulars of the discovery. The total number found was 63, 45 by the workman and a further 18 by Mr. Cherrington. The hoard consisted of forged 1s. 6d. Bank of England tokens, dated
1811, and showing no signs of wear (Pl. XXV, 20). The originals were struck at the Soho Mint near Birmingham and were intended to weigh 7·30 gr. The average weight of the forgeries is 6·14 gr., and their specific gravity is 8·78. Instead of being of silver, they are of copper with a plating of tin alloy. The same pair of dies was used throughout and the engraving is noticeably good. The only obvious irregularities occur in the lettering, where the c has the limb below the bar projecting downwards and the R has a curled-up tail. No other objects were found with the forgeries, but small fragments of paper adhered to some as though they had all been wrapped originally.

The site of the discovery would in 1811 have lain in the middle of Far Perry Wood. It is half a mile from the farm which William Booth, the forger and coiner, occupied and where he was arrested on 16 March 1812. His trial followed, and at this one of the charges on which he was found guilty and sentenced to death was that of coining forged five-shilling dollars, and three-shilling and eighteen-penny bank tokens. Immediately after the arrest, a search was made of the farm and resulted in the discovery of tools for coining, presses, and dies, while round about was dug up £3,000 in good notes, 200 guineas in gold, and about £600 in bad silver.\(^1\) A description of a counterfeit is. 6d. bank token, dated 1811, which was found along with forgeries of regal silver and gold coinage some time before 1871 over a doorway of Booth’s old house and which must therefore be associated with the coiner, is given in the *Birmingham Daily Post* of 31 May 1871. It was “an exquisite specimen of a is. 6d. Bank Token, finely executed, and in excellent preservation ... apparently composed of copper, with a coating of silver”.

Probably the forgeries in the hoard that is the subject of this note were identical and if they are the work of William Booth they are likely to have been buried by him or at his direction. A likely date for the deposit is when Booth had most reason to fear a search of his premises and this was between 10 February 1812, about when a servant of his, Job Jones, was arrested charged with uttering a forged Bank of England note,\(^2\) and 16 March 1812 when Booth’s own arrest took place. That some hiding of evidence occurred during this period is indicated by the statements of two of Booth’s employees at the trial. One buried a copper-plate wrapped in paper, at Booth’s direction, a fortnight before the arrest and another three plates six days before.\(^3\)

The forged tokens are now disposed so that 42 have been presented to the City Museum, Birmingham, and 21 are in private ownership.

R. J. SHERLOCK

---

1. *Gentleman’s Magazine* (1812), part i, p. 381.
I have been privileged to use Mr. Thompson's manuscript notes and have watched this book grow from them into a Dodonean oak which all may now gratefully consult. It offers in concise form the composition of every hoard, in as much detail as the information now available allows. There is a slender hope of recovering some of this lost information, since Mr. Thompson records the disposition of the coins, besides giving full, though not quite impeccable, references to printed sources and occasionally publishing hoards for the first time. Furthermore, some thirty earthen or metal containers are illustrated, mostly according to the usual half-section convention, providing a corpus of those all too rare zone-fossils of archaeology, precisely dated medieval pots. At least as many other pots are mentioned in the text, but, alas, were never recorded properly. There are also photographs of silverware included in the hoards: this is chronologically less valuable, but further justifies the grant from the C.B.A., which subsidized the publication in the service of all archaeologists.

One can have no quarrel with the area, which is more than the title implies. During the period concerned Britain and Ireland were largely an economic unity under the English penny. Though in the terminology used I should prefer "Continental" to "foreign", as against Anglo-Saxon, Oriental (!), &c., the fact that anything more precise (e.g. "French") would involve difficult frontier problems only stresses the economic insularity of the Isles vis-à-vis the continuum of the mainland. "Danish" should be "Anglo-Danish" in an age when coins of Denmark were not quite foreign.

With the period I am less happy. Although coins are pre-eminently regal things, their natural epochs are not reigns, still less centuries. Centuries are a current plague of archaeology. A powerful, semi-official body that shall be nameless destroyed many of its records simply because they were after the historically insignificant year 1500. The book should not have ended then—possibly in 1526, or even 1464, but preferably in 1544. Likewise, the distribution-map would have been more valuable if the Edwardian hoards had been taken to 1351 rather than 1377.

Nor am I certain that all the hoards are properly so called. The book should have followed the Common Law and distinguished between hoards and grave-deposits. It is true that the immensely important Sutton Hoo purseful comes into the second category. Certainly coins in graves as jewellery or other offerings or bezique survived into a nominally Christian period. Consider, for instance, the Carolingian cemetery at Foissy-les-Vézelay. In this book Nos. 10, 34,
43, 54, and 269 appear, among others, to be of the same description. Perhaps all, perhaps only those large enough to resemble hoards, deserve inclusion. In either case there should be consistency. Where is the Sarre necklace, or the coins found by Miss Evison in a partly Christian graveyard at Dover, to name but two instances? On the other hand some products of nineteenth-century church repairs (44,108) may be assemblages of casual finds.

These criticisms do not affect the main body of this most valuable work. It is tantalizing to think how much better it might have been, had records reflected the best knowledge of their time. There is a sort of unsteady progress, from so many ounces of metal, through so many coins of King $x$ to the full descriptions now happily in force. But it is sobering to think that the earliest find in the book (1611) is among the best recorded, though the coins have not been seen for 300 years—far better than many discovered within living memory. The legacies, such as this, of thorough old antiquaries, are not yet exhausted, and it is unfortunate that the forgotten but morally certain hoards now being reconstituted by analysis of the B.M. acquisition lists are just too late for inclusion. Other museums and old family collections might yield similar results. The Manx Museum in particular needs visiting. Indeed the Manx hoards are inadequately described and then only in peculiarly inaccessible works. Many will be stimulated to follow the queries that by implication Mr. Thompson has raised. Perhaps we may hope to see a supplement to his worthy Inventory.

S. E. R.


On page 30 of this study of some pieces of Viking silver ornament there is published and illustrated for the first time a fragment of a penny of Æthelstan (Brooke Class 5) by the York moneyer Regnald (cf. B.M.C., no. 14). This coin was found at Saltvik in the Åland Islands in 1914 but escaped notice in Nordman’s classic Anglo-Saxon Coins Found in Finland on account of its having been earlier classified as German, a natural enough error in all the circumstances. The reviewer believes this is the earliest Anglo-Saxon coin to be found on the territory of modern Finland, and certainly the first penny of Æthelstan to be found so far to the north-east. R. H. M. D.
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ORDINARY MEETING
25 JANUARY 1956

MR. H. H. KING, President, in the Chair

Death
The death was announced of MR. D. S. NAPIER.

Exhibitions

By MR. H. H. KING:
1. A penny of Æthelræd II's last "Small Cross" type of the Cadbury mint, moneyer Wulfelm.
2. A penny of the same king of the Chichester mint, moneyer Eadnoth, an unpublished variety of the Crux type with the "Long Cross" portrait and diadem, with an inner circle on the obverse and an omega copula on the reverse.

By MR. F. ELMORE JONES:
A series of coins of Æthelræd II, Cnut, and Edward the Confessor in illustration of the papers.

Papers

MR. R. H. M. DOLLEY read notes on (1) The 1955 Dover treasure trove; (2) A new Anglo-Saxon mint at Caistor, Lincs.; (3) New evidence of a mint at Bridgnorth; (4) On the Cadbury and Bruton mints; (5) With MR. F. ELMORE JONES. On a newly identified intermediate "Small Cross" type c. 997.

ORDINARY MEETING
22 FEBRUARY 1956

MR. E. J. WINSTANLEY, Vice-President, in the Chair

Elections

MR. THOMAS LISMORE, Calle 23, no. 413, Vedado, Havana, Cuba.
MR. D. C. NICHOLS, 2 Victoria Parade, Torquay, Devon.
DR. P. H. VERNON, 25 Queenwood Avenue, Wallington, Surrey.
The G. C. Merriam Company, Springfield 2, Massachusetts, U.S.A.

Exhibitions

MR. G. E. L. CARTER exhibited coins, gems, beads, &c., in illustration of his paper.

Paper

MR. G. E. L. CARTER read a paper entitled "Roman Cultus in Anglo-Saxon Sceattas".

ORDINARY MEETING
23 MARCH 1956

MR. H. H. KING, President, in the Chair

Election

MR. D. G. D. VORLEY, Twineham, 63 Birdham Road, Chichester.

Exhibitions

On behalf of MR. ALBERT BALDWIN by MR. PETER MITCHELL:
Various Service Medals.

On behalf of an anonymous owner by MR. D. G. LIDDELL:

Edward IV (second reign, 1471-83). Early half-angel with transposed legends. Blunt + Whitton Type XII.

Obv. i.m. SCF, Cross in nimbus, trefoil stops in legend: Ο ΑΡΧΙ- ΤΙΤΟΝ-ΣΠΕΣ-ΥΝΙΟΤ. From the same obverse die as the Ashmolean coin listed by B. + W. as variant 1.

Rev. no i.m., trefoil stops in legend: ΕΘ/ΒΑΤΡΔ' ΣΙ ΓΡΑ- ΡΑΧ- ΤΝΓΙ' \ ΡΡ Similar to the reverse listed by B. + W. as variant 1. Reverse unpublished and the second known reverse with trefoil stops for B. + W. Type XII, var. 1. The bowsprit cuts ΕΘ/ΒΑΤΡΔ instead of ΕΘΒ/ΒΑΤΡΔ for all other dies, including B. + W., Mules XIV/XII, var. 2, illustrated on Plate XIV, no. 12, which was erroneously recorded as reading ΕΘ/ΒΑΤΡΔ.


Provenance: Schulman sale at Amsterdam on 1 February 1956, lot 1591.

By MR. D. G. LIDDELL:
A number of medallic curiosities.

By MR. OWEN F. PARSONS:
A fine series of medals.
Proceedings of the Society

Papers

Short papers were read: (1) on behalf of MR. H. SCHNEIDER on the last laurel bust of James I; (2) by MR. R. H. M. DOLLEY on the relevance of Anglo-Saxon coins to certain seal-matrices in the British Museum.

ORDINARY MEETING
25 APRIL 1956
MR. H. H. KING, President, in the Chair

Election

The Librarian, The University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, U.S.A.

Exhibitions

By MR. J. M. ASHBY:
Twenty-six shillings and sixpences of James I.

By MR. A. E. BAGNALL:
Twenty-five gold and silver coins of James I.

By DR. J. P. C. KENT:
A shilling of Charles I of Type 3a (Bell) overstruck upon Type 31 (Portcullis) from the Foscote treasure trove and four crowns of James I, the property of MR. A. E. BAGNALL, in illustration of the paper.

On behalf of MR. B. H. I. H. STEWART:
An unpublished twelve-shilling piece Scots of Charles I of Type 4b but with star above crown and the obverse from unrecorded puncheons and with variant obverse legend.

Paper

DR. J. P. C. KENT read a paper on the transition between the second and third coinages of James I.

ORDINARY MEETING
23 MAY 1956
MR. H. H. KING, President, in the Chair

Elections

MR. A. C. GRIFFIN, 27 Westmoreland Street, Bath, Somerset.
MR. B. LOUTH, 26 Carly Road, Keighley, Yorks.
By MR. H. H. KING:
A penny of William I Type VIII reading DVNIE ON HiESTI and omitting the inner circle on the obverse.

**Paper**

DR. C. H. V. SUTHERLAND read a paper entitled "Diocletian's Mint at London".

**ORDINARY MEETING**

27 JUNE 1956

MR. H. H. KING, President, in the Chair

**Exhibitions**

By MR. P. J. SEABY:
A series of fifteen coins illustrative of forgery through the ages; a Cromwell half-crown in gold; "Bradford Workhouse" countermarked coins and tokens; an Edward the Confessor penny of the Lydford mint, "Pacx" type, +ELFRIC ON LYD, an unpublished type for this mint.

On behalf of MR. R. CARLYON-BRITTON:
A plated specimen of the Ormonde crown.

By MR. ALBERT BALDWIN:
Rebel and Ormonde crowns.

By MR. H. G. STRIDE:
A large number of Ormonde crowns in illustration of the paper. These had been made available by Messrs. A. H. Baldwin & Sons, Ltd.

**Paper**

MR. H. G. STRIDE read a paper prepared in collaboration with his colleagues at the Royal Mint, MR. NEWMAN and DR. DUNNING, on the subject of the Ormonde crown.

**ORDINARY MEETING**

26 SEPTEMBER 1956

MR. A. E. BAGNALL, Vice-President, in the Chair

**Elections**

MR. HAROLD S. BAREFORD, 1041 Kenyon Avenue, Plainfield, N.J., U.S.A.


MR. G. TEASDILL, 3 New Way, Tranmere Park, Guiseley, Leeds, Yorks.
Proceedings of the Society

Exhibitions

By MR. P. J. SEABY:
(1) A penny of William I, type I, of Winchester, moneyer Anderboda. The obverse is from the same die as B.M.C. 53; the reverse legend is retrograde; (2) a William I, type VII, of Hertford, moneyer Saemon. Not recorded for this type in B.M.C.; (3) a Cromwell crown with hair re-cut and face and drapery re-stippled.

By MR. B. H. I. H. STEWART:
An Irish groat attributed to Lambert Simnel and various “Short-Cross” pennies.

Paper

MR. C. S. S. LYON read a paper reviewing the Northumbrian coinage of the eighth and ninth centuries.

ORDINARY MEETING

24 October 1956

MR. C. E. BLUNT, Vice-President, in the Chair

Elections

MRS. M. BUSSELL, 242 Westbourne Park Road, London, W. II.
MR. A. S. HOOPER, 17 Dirdene Gardens, Epsom, Surrey.
MR. W. LAING, 67 Baldock Road, Letchworth, Herts.
MR. L. MCCORMICK-GOODHART, 610 East Boulevard Drive, Alexandria, Virginia, U.S.A.
MR. W. MCCR. WILSON, Pig and Whistle Hotel, Meru, Kenya Colony; and as a Junior Member:
MR. M. J. ANDERSON, 51 Patching Hall Lane, Chelmsford, Essex.

Exhibition

By MR. A. H. F. BALDWIN:
Two Type II proof unites of Charles I (i.m. plumes/plumes and rose/plumes) and a Briot unite (i.m. flower and B/B).

Paper

MR. H. SCHNEIDER read a paper on the Tower Unites of Charles I.

ANNIVERSARY MEETING

30 November 1956

MR. E. J. Winstanley, Vice-President, in the Chair

Elections

DR. C. L. COLLINS, 17 Ladbrooke Gardens, London, W. II.
THE LIBRARIAN, The University of the Saar, Saarbrücken, Germany.
By MR. W. LAING:
A penny of Eadberht Praen by the unpublished moneyer Ethelmod.

By MR. E. J. WINSTANLEY:
Groats of Henry VII and Henry VIII in illustration of his paper.

By MR. P. J. SEABY:
A halfpenny of John as Lord of Ireland by the Limerick moneyer Siward, a new moneyer and type for this mint; a comparable coin of Dublin.

By MR. R. H. M. DOLLEY:
The Neath treasure trove and (on behalf of DR. J. P. C. KENT) the Congleton treasure trove.

Papers

Short papers were read by the following: MR. R. H. M. DOLLEY on the Eadberht Praen penny exhibited; MR. C. E. BLUNT on a new type for Archbishop Ceolnoth and on the earliest coinage of the mint of Rochester; MR. E. J. WINSTANLEY on the latest groats of Henry VII and the earliest of Henry VIII.

Sanford Saltus Medal

By vote of the Members the Sanford Saltus Medal for 1956 was awarded to MR. F. ELMORE JONES.

Officers and Council

The following were elected officers and members of Council for 1956-7:
President: H. H. KING, ESQ., M.A.
Vice-Presidents: A. E. BAGNALL, ESQ.; C. E. BLUNT, ESQ., O.B.E., F.S.A.; G. V. DOUBLEDAY, ESQ.; and E. J. WINSTANLEY, ESQ., L.D.S.
Director (and Acting Secretary): R. H. M. DOLLEY, ESQ., B.A., F.S.A.
Treasurer: J. M. ASHBY, ESQ., M.A.
Librarian: W. FORSTER, ESQ.
THE BRITISH NUMISMATIC SOCIETY

EXPENDITURE AND INCOME ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 OCTOBER 1955

**EXPENDITURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1954</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Stationery</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 52 468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses of Meetings, Rent, and Library Facilities</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16 0 8 10 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry Expenses</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 11 446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Cost for Journals underprovided:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for 1955 Journal</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockett Collection:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographer's Prints</td>
<td></td>
<td>246</td>
<td>7 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>11 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus carried to General Purposes Fund</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL EXPENDITURE | £662 | £662 |

**INCOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1954</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions received for 1955</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions in arrear received during the year</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Fees</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>7 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera C. O. Ellison</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. L. Dresser</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. C. Briggs</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Received</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Back Volumes and Duplicates</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax Recovered</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>16 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of Expenditure over Income carried to General Purposes Fund</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL INCOME | £864 |  17 |  7 |
| Surplus carried to General Purposes Fund | . |  . |  . |

| TOTAL INCOME | £864 |  17 |  7 |

<p>| TOTAL INCOME | £864 |  17 |  7 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions received in advance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions compounded</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry Creditors and Outstanding Charges</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Sanford Saltus Medal Fund: Capital Account</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Debit Balance on Income Account</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and Research Fund</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Estimated Cost of Journal</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Purposes Fund: Balance as at 31 October 1954</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Excess of Expenditure over Income for the year</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£2,470

£2,697 7 1 £2,470

Investments at Cost:
£833. 5s. 1d. 4½% Defence Bonds | 833 | 5 | 1 |
£500 4½% Savings Bonds | 426 | 13 | 3 |

J. Sanford Saltus Medal Fund: £166. 14s. 1d. 3½% Defence Bonds | 166 | 14 | 11 |

Library at cost | 151 | 12 | 5 |
Furniture at cost | 10 | 7 | 6 |
Stock of Lockett Collection Photographs at price subsequently realized | 10 | 0 | 0 |
Cash at Bank: Bank Current Account | 605 | 2 | 6 |
Post Office Savings Bank | 490 | 11 | 9 |
Petty Cash in Hand | 2 | 19 | 8 |

£1,098 13 11

REPORT OF THE AUDITORS TO THE MEMBERS OF THE BRITISH NUMISMATIC SOCIETY

We have obtained all the information and explanations which to the best of our knowledge and belief were necessary for the purposes of our audit. In our opinion proper books of account have been kept by the Society so far as appears from our examination of those books. We have examined the above Balance Sheet and annexed Expenditure and Income Account which are in agreement with the books of account and no credit has been taken for subscriptions in arrear. In our opinion and to the best of our information and according to the explanations given to us, the Balance Sheet gives a true and fair view of the state of the Society's affairs as at 31 October 1955 and the Expenditure and Income Account gives a true and fair view of the excess of expenditure for the year ended on that date.

51 Coleman Street,
London, E.C. 2

GILBERTS, HALLETT, & EGLINGTON, Chartered Accountants