AN UNCERTAIN MINT OF DAVID I

BY B. H. I. H. STEWART

Berwick and Roxburgh, the two border fortresses, are the acknowledged mints for the group I sterlings of David I (those having the characteristic Scottish type of reverse—a cross fleury with a pellet in each angle). Specimens of Berwick are rare, and of Roxburgh very rare, but a sufficient number is known to establish each as a one-moneyer mint. At least four different obverses and four reverses were used by Folpart (= Folcward) at Berwick, and three separate pairs of dies by Hugo at Roxburgh.

Two coins from the Bute hoard, however, do not belong with these; Burns was rightly cautious over their attribution and, although certainty is still impossible, the appearance of two further specimens has somewhat clarified the picture.

The fully legible parts of the inscriptions of the four known pennies suggest a moneyer called Ricart working at a mint or mints not hitherto recorded for this issue. Details of the individual extant specimens are:

Type a: annulet instead of pellet in the second heraldic quarter of the reverse cross, and as lower stop in colon before ON.

1. Obv. [DAVIT]: REX:
   Rev. [● ● ?? ?] ART:OH[? l ??] (Pl. XXVIII, 8)
   E. Burns, The Coinage of Scotland, i. 6 and 14; fig. 6b.
   A. B. Richardson, Catalogue of Scottish Coins in N.M.A., no. 4.

2. Same dies as no. 1.
   Obv. [DAVIT]:R[EX]:
   Rev. [● ● ● ●] ART:OH[? l ?] (Pl. XXVIII, 9)
   Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.
   References: H. A. Parsons sale 1954, lot 698 (illustrated).

Type b: a cross pommée superimposed on the cross fleury of the reverse.

   Rev. [RIC]ART:ON[? ?]A[ ] (Pl. XXVIII, 10)
   References: Pollexfen, locc. cit.
   Burns, op. cit. i, 6 and 15; fig. 6c.
   Richardson, op. cit., no. 5; fig. 2.

4. Same dies as no. 3.
   Obv. DAVITR[EX]
   Rev. [+?]RICAR[T:ON • A] ?II?? (Pl. XXVIII, 11)
   Writer’s collection = ? Drabble sale, part 1, lot 754.

The reverse inscriptions of these four coins present many problems. No. 2 contributes nothing except to confirm the suspicion from no. 1 that an upright follows hA in the mint-name. The moneyer’s name clearly ends —ART.
Of the mint-name, which appears to consist of three letters, the second is certainly an A on no. 3, the first may be a square C on no. 3, and the third is very corroded on no. 2 but gives the impression of two uprights.

There are two approaches to solving these problems, depending upon whether several small, and in themselves inconclusive, pieces of evidence are in conjunction considered strong enough to suggest that all four coins were struck by the same moneyer at the same mint. If not, little progress can be made, but the apparent possibilities must be stated. They are for type a:

*Hamilton*: this could not be the mint of nos. 1 and 2 since it was the new name given to Cadzow by Charter of James II in 1445.

*Hamer*: now Whitekirk, an abbey, which was of importance in the twelfth century, could possibly have been the mint of nos. 1 and 2.

*Haddington*: possible for nos. 1 and 2, but I share Burns’s doubt that on no. 1 the third letter could be a D, for the upright does not seem to be followed by a bottom horizontal. (This is the attribution on Parsons’s ticket for no. 2.)

*Ayr*: is found as hARc in the first coinage of Alexander III, and is possible for nos. 1 and 2.

The supposition that types a and b may contain substantially the same inscription is more profitable. The strongest clue in this direction is the moneyer’s name, which the recently discovered coin no. 4 proves to be Ricart. The two doubtful letters of no. 1 have been read in the past as if the name was Folward or some version of it: Richardson confidently reconstructs —LDART in his catalogue, and I followed this before seeing a cast of the coin. They could, however, more probably be read as EC, i.e. [R1]ECArt. Richardson’s LD seems unlikely in that the bottom of both letters are clear and exactly similar.

One point may be made in connexion with the name of both mint and moneyer. So far, every known coin of this type is clearly from Berwick, moneyer Folward, or from Roxburgh, moneyer Hugo, except for these four coins. The facts that the moneyer of this type b is certainly Ricart, while the moneyer of type a could plausibly be Ricart as well, and that each mint-name has a second letter A followed by an upright, are, in this context, significant. There seems far less likelihood that Ricart was moneyer at two mints (with only one die at each), than that a third one-moneyer mint should be added to Berwick and Roxburgh. Burns, evidently feeling the difficulty of breaking the pattern of one moneyer per mint, says of type b that ‘possibly it may belong to the same mint as the preceding (type a), the name of the moneyer being apparently the same on both coins’.

The evidence for the mint-name(s) is very defective. Type a’s mint-name is to be found from the letters hA followed by an upright not joined at the bottom: hAF, hAh, hAI, hAM, hAN, hAP, hAR—all seem unpromising. Type b’s mint-name appears (from no. 3) to begin with a square letter, C; again the A is certain; the third, indistinct through corrosion, is again an upright followed by, perhaps, another: thus the same possibilities are relevant as for the letter after hA. How can C and h ever be equated? In only one way, if h = K. This is not such an improbable hypothesis as it might seem

---

1 *The Scottish Coinage*, p. 132.
at first sight. Consider the moneyer Ricart: what do we know of him? He struck (or, at least, someone called — card struck) a coin illustrated by Burns as fig. 27, at a mint Car—.

In type XIV of Henry I of England's coinage, we find a mint in operation at Carlisle, where a bishopric had been established in 1132 and profitable silver mines discovered about the same date. In 1136 Cumberland and Northumberland were seized by David I of Scotland, and in the peace settlement were granted to his son Earl Henry; after the latter's death in 1152, they reverted to David and, on his death the next year, to Malcolm IV, who ceded them in 1157 to Henry II. In a quarter of a century, therefore, Carlisle could have struck coins for Henry I, Stephen, David I, Henry the Earl, Malcolm IV, and Henry II.

Extant coins\(^1\) are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry I</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Durant</td>
<td>(B.M.C. 116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Erebald</td>
<td>(B.M.C. 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Erebald</td>
<td>(B.M.C. 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David I</td>
<td>IVc</td>
<td>Ricard</td>
<td>(B. fig. 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IVb</td>
<td>Erebald</td>
<td>(S. fig. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Henry</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Erebald</td>
<td>(S. fig. 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm IV</td>
<td>No recorded</td>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry II</td>
<td>A, &amp;c.,</td>
<td>Willem</td>
<td>(B.M.C. 212-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these, a curious coin\(^2\) with a bristly sceptre, and three annulets in each angle of the cross fleury, but otherwise of the Scottish type, has been attributed to the Bishop of Carlisle under David I: the moneyer may be Erebald. Carlisle as an English mint coined throughout the reign of Henry II; was active at some stage, if not continuously, between 1189 and 1205, and participated in the major recoinage of 1205. Its last appearance as a mint was for the recoinage of 1248; John of Oxenedes, the chronicler, who lists all the mint-officers of this recoinage, calls Carlisle 'Karlel'.

To return to our enigmatical coins of David I: we have seen that David I himself used the Carlisle mint with two moneyers, Ricard and Erebald; that Earl Henry used it with Erebald as moneyer; that it was an active mint throughout this period while the mines were prolific, and that a century later John of Oxenedes calls the town Karlel. Now our type b coins read RICART: ONE(?)A (II?:); I believe that II: on no. 4 may be R:, which with the C from no. 3 gives EAR.

Can we attribute type a to the same mint? The letter after A in the mint-name could be R, but can h = K be an alternative for C?

We have noticed that John of Oxenedes writes Karlel: this is but one of many examples from documents of the period in which K offers an alternative for C, especially in place-names. On coins, there are several instances, both of the substitution of K for C, and of the letter K not always having been correctly identified:

\(^1\) English classified according to types in British Museum Catalogues; Scottish as in The Scottish Coinage.

\(^2\) Lockett sale, part v, lot 14: see B.N.J. vii, p. 47.
1. In the English coinage.
   (a) Cnut, York, Pointed Helmet type; the moneyer’s name *Crucan* is found as *CRVRN*, i.e. *Cruk(a)n*.
   (b) Edward the Confessor, Thetford, *B.M.C.* type vii; the moneyer’s name *Blacer* is written *BLARERÆ*, i.e. *Blakere*.
   (c) *KAN* denotes Canterbury on long-cross coins of Henry III, type *Vd*.

   (a) Late (? posthumous) coinage of William the Lion; *ROh = ROK*.
   (b) Same period; *R0R6(Î) = R0KÈS*.
   (c) Alexander III, first coinage; *ROhÈSB = R0KÈSb* and *ROB = ROK*.

3. Other Scottish mints.
   (a) Berwick, Alexander III, first coinage; *BQRWIh* = *BSRWIK*.
   (b) *KING* (moneyer Wilam) and *RIN* (moneyer Walter) in this issue are, I believe, different mints. The initial letters are not the same.

From this it appears that there was firstly, some interchangeability between *K* and *C*, and secondly, doubt as to how the rarer letter *K* should be written. It is thus not impossible that the inscription of nos. 1 and 2 should be reconstructed as *RICCARTÔIKAR*. To support this we have *type b*, struck by the same moneyer, probably at Carlisle; the annulet on *type a*, an ornament found on the reverse of the Carlisle coin which has been attributed to the Bishop under David I; and an even greater difficulty if a mint *h A • • •* has to be located elsewhere. Hamer (Whitekirk) was Burns’s suggestion, but an abbey so far north is much less likely than a border fortress, known to be a mint at the time, which would complete the chain of strategic castles with Roxburgh and Berwick, the two certain mints of this type.

---

2 According to *B.M.C.*, vol. ii (no. 1543).
3 E. Burns, op. cit., figs. 68 and 68A (same reverse die).
4 B. figs. 67b and 69; the two ‘R’ s are not the same.
5 B. fig. 126. 6 Unpublished.
7 e.g. B. fig. 140. 8 e.g. B. fig. 108.
9 e.g. B. fig. 93b. 10 See *P.S.A.S.* lxxi, p. 411 and *B.N.J.*, xxix, p. 97.