MISCELLANEA

THE COINS OF THE SUSSEX MINTS: ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

CHICHESTER

Stephen, type B.M.C. i

195a. [+ST]IEFN RE:
+[G]ODPIN:ON:LI[CE]

Moneyer Location

Godwine H. H. K.

HASTINGS

Cnut, type B.M.C. viii: Hild. E

30. Add to Location East Berlin

33. This is of Winchester, not Hastings, reading P[••]EST

34a. +ENVNT REX ANGLORVMM
+EL+/ZIII/HEZ/TIN

Location

Elst East Berlin

Edward the Confessor, type B.M.C. vii, Brooke 6

110a. As no. 103 but different die from it and 110. Dunninc
Same die as no. 108 but no pellet

William II, type B.M.C. ii

166. For PILLEM REX read PILLELMREMEX
For HIES read HI·EST

Stephen, type B.M.C. i

190a. [+STIFJNE R:
+S[APINE:ON:h]AST:

Sawine H. H. K.

192a. +FNE
+SAPINE:ON:HASTI-

Obverse defaced with large "m"

Sawine In a private collection (ex Nottingham hoard, 1880)

LEWES

Cnut, type B.M.C. viii: Hild. E

139a. +ENVNT REX ANGLORVI
+LEOFNOD M L[••]P

Leofnoth Hild. 1364 under ‘Leicester’ (Chester)

149b. +ENVNT REX ANGLOR-
+PVLFHEH MM LEE

Wulfheh Stockholm

Cnut, type B.M.C. x: Hild. E i

150a. +ENVNT REX ANGLO
+GODPI ON LEE

Godwine? Hild. 1339 under ‘Leicester’ (Chester)

Godwig? Godwig?

150b. +ENVNT REX ANCOLOVI
+LEOFNOD:L EP

Leofnoth East Berlin

Edward the Confessor, type B.M.C. iii, Brooke 1

203. On reverse, for L·EXPE read L·EXPE; under Location for ‘F. Elmore Jones’ read ‘H.H.K. (ex F. E. J. coll.), Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris’.

My attention has been called to the East Berlin coins by Miss van der Meer, to the Stockholm coins by Mr. C. S. S. Lyon.

Horace H. King
A DIE-LINK BETWEEN THE MINTS OF DOVER AND LONDON AT THE END OF THE REIGN OF ÆTHELRAED II

RECENTLY a small parcel of Viking Age coins was submitted for examination and report to the Royal Swedish Coin Cabinet at Stockholm. Fifteen of the coins proved to be English, and one of them may be described as follows:

ÆTHELRAED II
Issue of c. 1003–9

(Helmet type = Hild. E = Brooke 4 = B.M.C. viii = Hawkins 203)

Obv. +ÆBELRÆÐE + ANGLÆ
Rev. +BYO | £⁄S | ØLOV | NDENÆ

Die-axis 90° Wt. 19.3 grains (1.25 g.)

The mint is clearly London, and the curious spelling of the moneyer's name must surely be for Bo(i)ga who is known for the mint and type from Hild. 2232. There is, however, no die-link. This particular personal name is not of frequent occurrence in the last years of Æthelraed II, and it was impossible to overlook the coincidence that there is recorded in Hildebrand a coin of the same Helmet type and with the same remarkable spelling BYOΓA but of the Dover mint (Hild. 387). Both coins are here illustrated by enlarged direct photographs which have been supplied by the authorities of the Royal Swedish Coin Cabinet:

It will be noticed that both coins are from the same obverse die, and there can be little doubt but that B(y)oga was a moneyer both of Dover and of London in the same type.

Obverse die-links between late Saxon mints, a phenomenon not recorded even seven years ago, are now almost a commonplace, but we would draw attention to the fact that this is the first time that Dover has been die-linked with another mint, and only the second time that a die-link has been published from the Helmet issue.
London and Dover are some seventy-five miles apart, but the style of both coins is such that we are confident that they are from official dies and that the die-link in this case is not indicative of imitation at some Scandinavian centre.

In the same parcel of coins were three other Helmet coins of Æthelraed II which may be considered new in that the moneyers are not recorded for the type in Hildbrand. They may be listed as follows:

**Canterbury**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
<th>Wt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ÆEL</td>
<td>+ÆEL</td>
<td>23-2 grains (1.50 g.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÆDEL</td>
<td>FRDY</td>
<td>270°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÆDEL</td>
<td>MΩ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÆDEL</td>
<td>CÆNT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Moneyer Ælfryd: cf. Hild. 123–7, &c.)

**Ipswich**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
<th>Wt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ÆEL</td>
<td>+ÆEL</td>
<td>16-5 grains (1.07 g.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÆDEL</td>
<td>LEON</td>
<td>0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÆDEL</td>
<td>EMΩ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÆDEL</td>
<td>GIPES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Moneyer Leofwine: not previously recorded for the mint.)

**Stafford**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
<th>Wt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ÆEL</td>
<td>+ÆEL</td>
<td>22-5 grains (1.46 g.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÆDEL</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>180°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÆDEL</td>
<td>POLD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÆDEL</td>
<td>MΞ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÆDEL</td>
<td>TÆDF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Moneyer Alfwold: cf. Hild. 3420–3, &c.)

The same parcel, too, is the source of the new *Transitional Crux* obverse discussed elsewhere in these pages.

R. H. M. Dolley
G. van der Meer

**TWO UNPUBLISHED BARNSTAPLE/EXETER DIE-LINKS**

Lot 142 in the Sale Catalogue (Glendining 19/7/1954) of the late Mr. W. J. Lawson's fine collection of coins of the reign of William I comprised two Paxs type (*B.M.C.* type 8) pennies of the very rare Barnstaple mint. Both were correctly catalogued—the first coin as *B.M.C.* 498 and the second as 'Another same moneyer but different dies—obv. reads +PILLELMSEX annulet on left shoulder'.

The former, a die duplicate of *B.M.C.* 498, is therefore an obverse die duplicate of *B.M.C.* 499 of Barnstaple and also of *B.M.C.* 668 of the Exeter moneyer, Saemar.

This Barnstaple/Exeter die-link is but one of several obverse die-links between neighbouring mints which are recorded in *B.M.C. (Norman Kings)* and which were first published and analysed by Brooke in *Num. Chron.* 1911, pp. 1–23 and pl. xiv–xvii ('Notes on the reign of William I').

2 For this problem cf. the forthcoming paper by Mr. C. S. S. Lyon entitled 'The Æthelraed Types of Cnut'.
3 Supra, pp. 258–64.
4 The scope of the contents of this short paper is hardly apparent from its title comprising, as it does, the results of the research work on the reign undertaken by the author in preparation for the compiling of *Norman Kings*.

When it is remembered that Brooke was dealing with no less than 660 of these Paxs type pennies with very few die duplicates and all, within certain limitations, of extraordinarily uniform style and that he was, as it were, starting from scratch, his achievement in the discovery of no less than ten die-links between different pairs of mints can only be regarded as a miracle of concentration and skill. And the results of his analysis of these die-links is only part of his 1911 paper.
Having been put on the scent by Brooke we should therefore always be on the look-out for further die-links between the various pairs of mints which are listed in *B.M.C.* and the second Lawson coin, now in Mr. P. Brettell's collection and which was exhibited to the Society on 26 May 1959, proves to be a second example of a Barnstaple/Exeter die link.

It is an obverse die duplicate of *B.M.C.* 670 of the same Exeter moneyer, Saemar.

It is, however, from a different reverse die to either of the two Barnstaple coins *B.M.C.* 498 and 499 which, though obverse die duplicates (the same die also of *B.M.C.* 668 of Exeter), are from reverse dies which are different to each other.

The reverse die of the Lawson coin ([Pl. XXVIII, 5](#)) is the same as that of the coin which is no. 3 on plate ix of *B.N.J.* v (Carlyon-Britton's Numismatic History of the reign—'The Barnstaple Mint') and this fact has led on to the discovery of yet a third obverse die-link with Exeter.

That coin, no. 3 of Carlyon-Britton's plate (and [Pl. XXVIII, 6](#)), is, I now find, from the same die as *B.M.C.* 656 of the Exeter moneyer Lifwine; it is quite a distinctive obverse and I was able to find the die-link without having to look any further than the first three coins in the Exeter tray at the Museum.

Unfortunately, the present whereabouts of the Barnstaple coin of the *B.N.J.* plate is not known; at that time (1908) it was in Carlyon-Britton's own collection but it is not to be found in any of his sale catalogues.

However, the coin must exist and that being so it is now possible to record the details of the three die-links with Exeter as set out below in a list of all the known Barnstaple coins of the type which are from different die combinations to each other and to illustrate those two which are unpublished, [Pl. XXVIII, Nos. 4–7](#) (Exeter Nos. 4 and 7—Barnstaple Nos. 5 and 6):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th><em>B.M.C.</em> no. of Exeter die-link</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>*B.M.C. no. of Barnstaple coin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+PILLELM REX</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>+SEPORD ON BIIRD</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Same form of crown as no. 1)</td>
<td>(Pl. fig. 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+PILLELM REX</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>+SEPORD ON BIIRD</td>
<td>(Pl. fig. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Different form of crown to nos. 1 and 2)</td>
<td>(Pl. fig. 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+PILLELM REX</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>Same die</td>
<td>(P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note that in the case of obverse die no. 1 Brooke showed conclusively that the die must have travelled from Barnstaple to Exeter and not, as might be expected, vice versa but this is not the only instance he gives of a die movement from the smaller mint to a larger one.

In the case of die no. 2 the evidence of the coins seems to point fairly definitely to the Exeter strikings being the earlier and therefore to the die having travelled the opposite way to no. 1.

As regards no. 3 it is not possible to express any opinion without seeing the Barnstaple coin and I should like to feel that this note will result in its present ownership coming to light.

F. ELMORE JONES
THREE APPARENTLY UNPUBLISHED NORMAN PENNIES OF LINCOLN

On different occasions during the last year I have been fortunate to acquire the following Norman coins of the Lincoln mint which would appear to be quite unpublished.

1. **William I, Brooke Type 1.**
   
   **Obv.** + PILLEMVS REX I
   **Rev.** + OSBERAN ON LINCO
   Wt. 20.5 grains

   (Pl. XXVIII, 1)

   The moneyer is presumably Osbern, and this coin would appear to be the first struck by a moneyer of this name at Lincoln.

2. **William II, Brooke Type 2.**
   
   **Obv.** + PILLELMRI
   **Rev.** ... IRMAN ON LINEL
   Wt. 20.5 grains

   (Pl. XXVIII, 2)

   The first letter or letters of the moneyer’s name cannot be read, but from the remainder it is clear that the moneyer is one hitherto unrecorded for the Lincoln mint. It is probable, too, that the name is one which does not occur elsewhere on Norman coins. Mr. R. H. M. Dolley suggests that the legend is to be restored [+S]IRMAN to give SCIRMAN (= OE. *Scarmacu)*, a name that would be by no means improbable in a Lincoln context and which survives, of course, as the modern surnames Sherman and Sharman.

3. **Henry I, Brooke Type 15.**
   
   **Obv.** + • • • NR • • • •••
   **Rev.** • • • • ON: NIC • E:
   Wt. 20.0 grains

   (Pl. XXVIII, 3)

   The coin is largely illegible, but is included here because neither of the dies is represented in the National Collection nor in Sir Francis Hill’s cabinet. Presumably the moneyer—with a short name and unquestionably of Lincoln—will one day be identified on the basis of a die-link, and hence the desirability of illustration.

H. R. MOSSOP

NEW LIGHT ON THE 1864 HOARD FROM KINGHORN

By the personal kindness of Mr. G. V. Doubleday I am allowed to print the following transcript of an autograph letter in his possession:

[1]

Townsend  
Kirkcaldy 6th Jan 1868

John Lindsay Esqu  
Cork

Dear Sir

I have heard that you intend to publish another supplement, which I suppose will be entirely on Scotch Coins. However, I enclose rubbings of two curious Edwards I have, and if they are not useful to you now, they may be after, they were both found near this among other Edwards. No 1 is similar to ‘Hawkins’ 313 as regards Bishop Kellaw’s M.M., but otherwise it is entirely different, reading on obv EDWARDVS REX AIR and on rev CIVITAS DVNELME, it weighs 19 grains. No 2 is the same as a common Edward I on obv, but on rev it reads CIVISINCES. TIN without the least appearance of having been intended for anything else, it only weighs 14 grains.

Endorsement in Lindsay’s hand.
There were a good many David II of Scotland pennies found along with these Edwards, but I don’t see anything particular about them, except different heads, sceptres and with & without pellets between legends, all read REX SCOTTORVM, if you would like to see one of each variety, I will be glad to send them.

In case you may not be aware, I may also say that a horde of Scotch Coins (consisting of placks of Jas II III IV & V & Mary, also a few Testoons & ‘Iam non sunts’ of Francis & Mary, and a portrait Testoon of Mary,) was found below the floor of an old house at Abernethy Perthshire in Dec 1866. I got a lot of them but they are all common, the rarest being 2 Stirling placks of Mary.

The horde of Edwards & Davids (also a few of John Baliol, Robert Bruce, and a good few of Alexander III) was found at Abden 2 miles from this on the 26th Jany 1864.

In my Collection I have nothing particular in Scotch, but some are very rare, such as Mary portrait Testoon, similar to yours, lot 711, this is not the one that was found at Abernethy, I don’t know where it was found.

Hoping to hear from you at your convenience

I am,

Yours very respectfully

J M Lornie

Address
John Lornie
Townsend
Kirkcaldy
NB

With the letter are rubbings made by two different methods (with the two ends of a pencil) of the two coins mentioned in the first paragraph. They can be identified with confidence as one of the so-called REX AIN pennies of Durham, almost certainly the identical specimen now in the cabinet of Mr. C. E. Blunt, and one of the contemporary or near-contemporary imitations of a Fox Class III penny of Edward I of the Chester mint (cf. a coin in the British Museum ex L. A. Lawrence with registration number 1950, 10–1–76, and weight 13.8 grains, apparently the coin in question).

The sixteenth-century hoard from Abernethy\(^3\) lies outside the scope of this note, but the references to the fourteenth-century hoard found at Abden in 1864 alone warrant the publication of the letter in these pages. There can be no doubt that the find is to be equated with one described in the recent Inventory in the following terms:

217. KINGHORN, Fifeshire, Jan. 1864

Over 1,000 English, Irish, Scottish, and Foreign (about 100 examined). Deposit: 1340–50.

England (a very large number). Pennies of Edward I–II (and III?).

Ireland (a few?). Edward I. Pennies of Dublin and Waterford.

Scotland (a fair number?): Sterling of Alexander II, III, John Baliol, Robert Bruce, and David II (= majority). No details of individual coins.


Disposition: The bulk of this hoard was dispersed without being examined; the coins mentioned above—or some of them—were presented to the Museum of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland at Edinburgh.

\(^1\) These four words are interpolated at the end of, and beneath, the first line and seem to represent an addition when Lornie was reading through the letter before sealing.

\(^2\) Supra, p. 329.

\(^3\) Cf. J. Lindsay, Second Supplement to the Coinage of Scotland, Cork, 1868, p. 40; P.S.A.S. vii (1866–68), p. 195.
Not only are Kirkcaldy and Kinghorn no more than 3½ miles apart, but Abden lies between them, and the coincidence of date must mean that Lornie and Douglas were describing the same hoard. Douglas, it is true, twice illustrates the pot in which the coins were found—an unfortunate omission from the main body of the Inventory—but Lornie’s silence is of no consequence, and all that should be inferred is that Lornie obtained a parcel from, and not the whole of, the hoard.

For the numismatist the new description of the Abden (‘Kinghorn’) find is of importance because it allows us to date the hoard with considerably more precision than has been possible hitherto. Thompson’s dating ‘1340–50’ was in any case too early—the presence of coins of David II pointing to a date after c. 1350 (cf. B. H. I. H. Stewart, The Scottish Coinage, p. 25). We are now told, however, that all the David II pence have the REX SCOTTORVM reverse, and so there is now a terminus ante quem provided by the 1357 coinage. All in all, a date of deposit c. 1355±2 may seem very reasonable, and especially since the David II pence obtained by Lornie do not appear to have included any of the earlier SCOTORVM coins put in issue not much before 1351. Incidentally, the new dating gains in significance when we correct, as we must, the Inventory dating for the great Montrave hoard which cannot be as early as ‘c. 1356’ if only because of presence of the Scots groats first ordered in 1357. The statement in the Introduction (p. xliv) that such groats were absent not only conflicts with the listing on p. 105, but also with the contemporary account of the discovery contributed by no less an authority than George Sim. Hoards deposited during the decade c. 1350–c. 1360 are in reality quite rare, and we are probably justified in excluding not only Montrave but those from Beaumont, Closeburn (pace Thompson there is no groat of David I) and Knocknasna, all of which contain coins which cannot have been struck before 1357 at the earliest. This leaves only the 1868 hoard from Oxford as in anyway comparable in date with the Kinghorn hoard, though one might perhaps wish to add the little hoard from Dailly in Ayrshire which Thompson seems to date too early (‘After 1320’) if in fact it contained a coin of David II (1329–71, no coins before c. 1350?).

It will probably be wondered why reference has not been made to the coins in the Museum of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland at Edinburgh, now the National Museum of Antiquities. The reason is that, pace Thompson, no coins from the Abden (‘Kinghorn’) hoard in fact were acquired, although the normal construction of Douglas’s comment seems certainly to imply the contrary.¹ Accordingly, the Lornie letter is still more enhanced in importance, a reminder of the urgent need to preserve all old manuscript material relating to coins. Just how important the letter is can be gauged from the circumstance that it provides the only recorded hoard-provenance for a coin of the little REX AIN grouping which Mr. Elmore Jones has discussed with such admirable clarity elsewhere in these pages,² and it is a source of gratification for the present writer that the Abden provenance should be completely consistent with the conclusions arrived at in that paper.

R. H. M. Dolley

¹ Information contained in a letter from Mr. R. B. K. Stevenson to the present writer.
² Supra, pp. 326–33.