FOUR ANGLO-SAXON, NORMAN, AND PLANTAGENET NOTES

F. ELMORE JONES

THE MYSTERIOUS MINT OF 'DERNT'

These remarks follow up and are complementary to a little article by Mr. R. H. M. Dolley entitled 'A New Late Saxon Mint in Suffolk' which appeared in *Spink's Numismatic Circular* for November 1960. Briefly to recapitulate, that article suggested the general area in which there should be sought the mint of some coins of Edward the Confessor's fourth substantive issue (Brooke type 3) which are all from one reverse die which reads +PVLGARODYR'.—I would differ from Mr. Dolley in interpreting the second letter of the mint-signature as an 'i' and not a 'y', though Mr. Dolley remains unconvinced. In the article in question the mint is located with virtual certainty as being Suffolk and in the general area of Ipswich. The *British Museum Catalogue* attribution to Dereham in Norfolk, one which never seemed quite convincing, now appears to be quite out of the question, for Mr. Dolley was able to clinch his case by two remarkable discoveries. The first of these is the existence of an obverse die-link with the mint of Ipswich, *BMC* 202 being from the same obverse die as *BMC* 438, a coin of the Ipswich moneyer Edwig. The second concerns the provenance. It is now virtually certain that all the known specimens from the *DIR* reverse die come from the Thwaite hoard of 1832 (Thompson *Inventory* 69 and 360) a find-spot which is in Suffolk some fifteen miles north of Ipswich.

The purpose of this note is to record in detail some other coins which in Mr. Dolley's words 'could be of the same mint', and I hope to show that there exist good grounds, again provided by the mint of Ipswich which in this context possibly furnishes our sole numismatic evidence, for the claim that *DIR* and *DERNT* represent one and the same place. The coins in question, as few as three in number, are of the same reign and chronologically are not far removed from the *DIR* coins. One is of the Confessor's sixth substantive issue, and two of his eighth. The absence of the seventh issue (*BMC* type IX) is not to be wondered at, as the type is surprisingly rare where East Anglian mints are concerned. The coins certainly do exist but in the *British Museum Catalogue*, for example, not one single specimen is recorded from the mints of Norwich, Thetford, Ipswich, and Bury St. Edmunds.

The three *DERNT* coins are illustrated in the text-block on the next page, and details are as follows:

1. Brooke type 6 = *BMC* VII (Pointed Helmet)
   *Obv.* +EDFER/DREX Cross sceptre with two pellets on shaft.
   *Rev.* +PVLFSIE ONDERNT:
   In Mr. A. H. F. Baldwin's collection.

2. Brooke type 8 = *BMC* XI (Hammer Cross)
   *Obv.* +EADPARD/RD REX
   *Rev.* +PVLFSIE ON DERNE
   In the collection of the writer.
3. Same type and same obverse die.
   
   Rev. + PVLSIE ON DERNT
   
   In the collection of the writer.

Provenances and earlier attributions are: Coin 1, published and illustrated here through the courtesy of Mr. Baldwin, is from the Grantley Sale (lot 1203) and in the
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sale catalogue was attributed to 'Darenth' albeit with a query. Coin 2 is from the Lockett Sale (lot 849) and formerly belonged to Sir John Evans. It is from the City find, and its first owner read the mint-signature as PERHE (cf. NC, 1885, p. 269, foot of page) and assigned it to Wareham. This attribution was accepted by Brooke, and followed in the Lockett sale catalogue. Coin 3 is without pedigree and unpublished.

Consequently this is the first time that there has been noticed the link between DERNT and DERNE, and indeed this is the first time that the unequivocal DERNE on coin 2 has been read as such. No reference to either reading will be found in the British Museum Catalogue, in Brooke's English Coins, or in Hildebrand's Anglosachsiska Mynt, nor is there any reference in P. W. P. Carlyon-Britton's 'Uncertain Anglo-Saxon Mints and some New Attributions' in the 1909 British Numismatic Journal.

It is to be remarked at once that Wulfsige, the moneyer of the three coins now
published, is also an Ipswich moneyer at just this period. Numismatically, too, the name
is a rare one on coins of the issues concerned. The Ipswich Wulfsige is recorded in the
British Museum Catalogue for the fourth substantive issue of the Confessor (BMC
type II—the type in which Wulgcar is known for the mint of DIR), and Ipswich coins of
his are also known of the fifth and sixth substantive issues, so that in the latter (BMC
type VII) there is an overlapping with the Wulfsige coin of DERNT. No coin of a Wulfsige
at either mint is as yet recorded in the seventh issue (BMC type IX already noted as so
surprisingly rare where East Anglia is concerned), and in the eighth issue there are two
coins of DERNT—from two reverse dies—and no coin of Ipswich. In the sixth issue,
though, Wulfsige coins of Ipswich are not particularly rare. Two from different dies are
in my own cabinet, and there is a third in the British Museum. It is all the more dis-
appointing, therefore, that I am not able to record a die-link between Ipswich and Mr.
Baldwin’s unique coin of DERNT, and this despite the fact that I have checked the obverse
die of the latter against every Ipswich coin of the type which is known to me.
A die-link of this kind would of course clinch my case as conclusively as it clinched the
association between Ipswich and DIR. However, whether or not this further link will be
found to exist, I feel that the indirect evidence for the identification of DIR, DERNE, and
DERNT as mint-signatures of one and the same mint is so strong that it may be left to
speak for itself. As to where DERNT is to be located on the map of Suffolk I am not
qualified to express any opinion, nor can I pronounce on the claims of Darsham and
Darnford, to take the two most obvious candidates. The mystery is one which may
never permit a certain solution, but DERNT is by no means the only Anglo-Saxon mint
which cannot as yet be marked in on a numismatic map, and even to have been able
to determine its general area may be thought to represent a not insignificant advance.

POSTSCRIPT

Since these notes were written Mr. C. S. S. Lyon has drawn my attention to an
Æthelraed II Last Small Cross coin (Hild. 689) with reverse legend +EADRICMÓN DERP
which there is reason to think may likewise emanate from East Anglia. For my part I
am not satisfied that this is yet another coin from the DIR/DERTN mint—Mr. Lyon,
incidentally, has found this obverse die used at Cambridge, London, and Dover (!)—
but the query exists, and the problem is one which Mr. Lyon will discuss in the course
of a forthcoming paper. On the question of Darsham, Mr. Dolley has pointed out to me
that the modern village is only four miles from Blythburgh where Domesday records a
cambium. Thwaite, too, is almost equidistant from Darsham and from Ipswich.

TWO UNPUBLISHED PENNIES OF WILLIAM II

The readings in conventional transliteration of these two coins, both of BMC type III
of William Rufus, are as follows:

1. Obv. ———ILL———RE
   Rev. +SE[p]ORD———III
   In the collection of the writer.
The moneyer is undoubtedly Seword, and the attribution to Malmesbury is discussed below. We may note the wide spacing of the reverse legend—the full reading could as well be ON MAL or ONMAL or even ONMIL.

2. **Obv.** +PILLELM RE
   **Rev.** +EDFORD ON SII

In the collection of the writer.

The moneyer is undoubtedly Edword, and the attribution to Southwark is discussed below. Again we may note the widely spaced lettering which leaves insufficient room for the initial cross and barely sufficient for the downstroke of the third letter of the mint-signature.
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The first of the two coins gives us a new type for this very rare mint, and, on the present evidence, this is the last coin which is known for the Malmesbury mint—if, that is, we except the unique ‘Baronial’ piece from Stephen’s reign which is now in the British Museum (ex 1918 Roth Sale, lot 137) and which has been tentatively assigned to Henry of Anjou. Seword, it will be remembered, is a well-attested Malmesbury moneyer in the three preceding issues, the Paxs type of William I and the first two types of William II. Under Rufus, at any rate, the mint appears to have been reduced to ‘one-moneyer’ status. Other than at Malmesbury, Seword (and then as Siword) is known for William II only at Colchester, a mint which could not possibly fit the –II signature which is so clearly visible on the coin.

In the 1906 *British Numismatic Journal*, L. A. Lawrence has illustrated a number of
well-known forgeries of Norman pennies. Prominent as nos. 35 and 36 on pl. ii of that paper are two which both purport to be coins of this very type, mint, and moneyer, the mint-signature in both cases being the significantly fuller MALME. Although the coins are demonstrably false, the work of these forgeries is quite plausible, and specimens continue to appear on the market from time to time. For the exact legend of these forgeries there is still no prototype, but it is interesting that we can at last be certain that the type was in fact struck at Malmesbury, a genuine coin of the mint and moneyer having now appeared and proving to be from dies very different from those employed by the unknown forger.

The second of the two coins can be found illustrated in the 1954 H. A. Parsons sale catalogue (lot 233), and so may not be thought unpublished in the strict sense of the word. The moneyer, however, is quite unpublished for the mint of Southwark to which it is now attributed. Parsons' own attribution was to Guildford and resulted from a misreading, of a kind by no means uncommon in this type, which interpreted as a G the very peculiarly formed s. The reverse die is the same as that of two coins in the British Museum. The first is BMC 229, the only 'Uncertain Mint' coin of the type in the British Museum Catalogue, of which the reverse legend was quite correctly read by Brooke as +EDPORDON—II. The second is a recent acquisition from the Lockett cabinet (lot 2899). In the sale catalogue, due to a similar misreading of s as G and to a misinterpretation of the moneyer's name, the coin in question was assigned to Ilchester. My coin and the two in the British Museum, then, are all from one and the same reverse die, but from different obverse dies; none of these three obverse dies links into the three other Southwark coins of the type in the National Collection. These are by three moneyers, Aldred, Lifwine, and Wulgar, and each has its own obverse die. Despite the absence of any link between the three obverse dies now recorded for Edword and those recorded for Aldred, Lifwine, and Wulgar, Mr. Dolley fully endorses my attribution of the three coins concerned to the Southwark mint (not Sudbury), and in the British Museum trays both the 'Ilchester' coin ex Lockett and the 'Uncertain Mint' BMC 229 now appear under Southwark. For my part I am satisfied that the possible alternative attribution to Sudbury for which I was responsible in the Parsons sale catalogue had nothing to commend it beyond the fact that the abbreviated mint-signature could in theory indicate either mint. Wulfric, however, is an undoubted Sudbury moneyer throughout the reign, and all the evidence is that Sudbury was a 'one-moneyer' mint throughout the Norman period—if not indeed throughout its existence. Southwark, on the other hand, was definitely a 'multiple-moneyer' mint, and never more so than under William II. It is not surprising, therefore, that the complement of three moneyers recorded for the type in the British Museum Catalogue should now be increased to five. As well as Edword there should be added Aldred now in the British Museum ex Lockett (lot 3886).

In conclusion it should be observed that in my opinion the foregoing in no way affects the question of the attribution of the unique coin of Stephen type VII which is now in the British Museum ex Lockett (lot 1147) and which is by the moneyer Edward. Here the mint-signature is once again the ambiguous svd. Edward, however, is a common personal name, and BMC type III of William II and type VII of Stephen are separated by close on fifty years. Further Southwark is not known as a mint of Stephen type VII whereas Sudbury is. On balance, therefore, I still favour an attribution to the Suffolk mint for that particular coin.
STEPHEN TYPE VII—FOUR ‘NEW’ COINS
(PL. IV. 13–16)

1. MINT OF BEDFORD.

Obv. +STIEFNE'.
Rev. +DA[¥]ID:ON:BEDE (Pl. IV. 13)

This remarkably fine coin was recently found in the garden of a house in Cambridge. It is of a very rare mint, and by an unpublished moneyer. Hitherto Tomas has been the only moneyer recorded for the mint and type, and this on the basis of possibly no more than two specimens. As it happens too, Tomas has also been the only identifiable moneyer of the Bedford mint for the whole reign. The name of the moneyer of the unique BMC type I coin in the British Museum is illegible as also is that of the unique BMC type VI (H. A. Parsons 1954, lot 254). The new coin also adds a new mint for the moneyer in the type. Until now Davi has been known only for Norwich (cf. BMC 222) and even there the attribution is not completely certain. However, since the mint-signature of that coin ends in ic: there is no possibility of this being another coin of Davi of Bedford.

2. MINT OF ILCHESTER.

Obv. +ST—E:
Rev. +I (?D or p) ON IV (Only the downstroke of the first letter visible.) (Pl. IV. 14)

Strictly speaking this coin is not ‘new’ in the sense that it was unknown to me when I was writing my paper in the 1957 British Numismatic Journal, since it is ex H. A. Parsons (1954 sale—lot 256) and Drabble (lot 713). However, until now it has always been assumed to read ——ON:LV——, and, as there is no die-link with any London coin in the British Museum (or elsewhere to the best of my knowledge), and as the moneyer’s name is completely illegible, the coin could find no place in my Table A (Mints and Moneyers). The first letter of the mint-name, however, is clearly an ‘i’ and not an ‘l’, and, since ‘v’ can represent both ‘v’ and ‘u’ (as in EVER and LVND), I have no hesitation in putting forward the reattribution to Ilchester. If I am right, the coin is not only unique of the type for the mint, but it is also unique of the mint for the regular coinage of the reign. Unfortunately the name of the moneyer is completely illegible, but it is a short one, probably of no more than five letters, and the initial letter is one that begins with a downstroke. The Adam of the Henry of Anjou coin of WIVELOC (BMC 282) is assuredly precluded. In the same way the spacing cannot possibly fit the name of any of the known ‘Tealby’ type moneyers of Ilchester, not that such a fit is to be expected since there was virtually a clean sweep of moneyers in the next reign.

3. MINT OF NORWICH.

Obv. +STIEFNE'.
Rev. +ALVR——:NOR: (Pl. IV. 15)

This could conceivably furnish a new moneyer (Alvred?) for the mint, but it is much more likely that it is an alternative spelling for the Alfric of BMC 205.

4. MINT OF (?) PEVENSEY.

Obv. +STIEFNE'.
Rev. +ALV—:E (or possibly EN). (Pl. IV. 16)
In this type Alwine is known only as a moneyer of Pevensey, and, although there is no
die-link, I take this to be a coin of that mint and moneyer with an alternative spelling
of the moneyer's name.

The four coins described above are now all in the possession of the writer. The work-
manship, lettering, style, &c. are all perfectly regular except that the bust on the Ilchester
coin is a little unusual. The lock of hair seems to be missing, and the crown is tilted at
an extraordinary angle.

AN UNPUBLISHED EDWARD III/EDWARD II MULE

The left-hand coin, which is in the collection of the writer, is a rare penny of the
Canterbury mint, and very possibly unique. It combines an obverse die of the first
coinage of Edward III (Fox type XVd) with a reverse die of the last type of Edward II
(Fox type XVc). It is to be dated to the period 1329–32 when both from London and
from Canterbury the output of coin was extremely small—and hence the very great
rarity of Fox XVd coins of both mints. Indeed, it is not impossible that it should be
dated to the precise year 1329 when the issue of pennies from London and Canterbury
was virtually negligible. So far as I am aware, no London example of this mule exists,
and I know of no other specimen of Canterbury.

The obverse die is of early type XVd style with the Lombardic 'N' and the pellet stops
which are the essential criteria of the type, and a bust which is virtually indistinguishable from that found on coins of type XVc. The form of the initial cross, which differs as between the two types, is not visible on this coin, but there is not the least reason to suppose that it is otherwise than of the type XVd variety which is peculiar to the Canterbury mint. The reverse die with the Roman form of the letter ‘N’ proper to type XVc—and to all preceding ‘Edwardian’ types—calls for no particular comment.

The counter-mule (XVc/XVd) also exists. It too is of the Canterbury mint, and is represented apparently by a single coin—also unpublished—which is in the British Museum. It is one of the many rarities which the National Collection was fortunate enough to acquire from the Lawrence cabinet by private treaty in 1950, and, by kind permission of Dr. John Walker, it too is illustrated above as the right-hand coin. The absence of the three little pellets in the ‘TAS’ quarter of the reverse is interesting. However there is no uniformity in type XVd as between mints, and the presence of the extra pellets is not the hard and fast rule for Canterbury that it is for York. Presumably this too is an early die. The reverse die of the XVc/XVd mule occurs on a true XVd coin in the British Museum, also ex Lawrence, but so far I have not been able to find a true XVd coin from the obverse die of the new XVd/XVc mule.