MISCELLANEA

'A NEW TYPE' FOR BURGRED

In vol. xxix of the Journal (pp. 10-11) I illustrated what I described as a new type for Burgred with on the reverse two M-like objects at top and bottom of the coin. I was not aware at that time that a similar coin, though by a different moneyer, had been published by Mr. E. Prawdzic-Golembierski in the Annual Report of the Peverel Archaeological Group for 1955. Through his courtesy and that of the Peverel Archaeological Group, I am now permitted to record here this latter specimen which was found during excavations at Stoke Bardolph, Notts., in 1955. The obverse is of the normal Burgred type and omits the Mercian title. The reverse reads ECCVLF MON ETA. Ecgulf, though not recorded as a moneyer for this reign in BMC, has since that publication been added to the National Collection (BMA 143).

It is now possible to record a third specimen of this type. A second coin by the moneyer Cenred has recently turned up, from different dies from the one previously recorded, and this has now been added to the National Collection.

C. E. BLUNT

A CONTEMPORARY FORGERY OF EADGAR

A coin of Eadgar by the moneyer Heriger (BMC type I) was recently submitted to the Royal Mint by Mr. R. H. M. Dolley on behalf of Dr. E. J. Harris for metallographic examination.

The coin was sectioned and a study made of the transverse structure. The accompanying photomicrograph (magnified about 70 times) shows that the coin consists of two distinct types of material arranged in sandwich fashion, the outer layers being readily distinguished from the central core by their darker spotted appearance.

It was noted that the boundaries between the different layers follow approximately the contours of the coin; this together with the elongated grains of the outer layer indicate quite clearly that the coin was struck from a plated flan.

G. P. WARDEN
A NOTE OF TWO PROBLEMATIC PENNIES OF ÆTHELRÆD II

In a previous paper I commented on the necessity of checking the London coins of Æthelræd II in the Stockholm Systematic Collection, in order to eliminate incorrect readings from Hildebrand’s Anglosachsiska Mynt.\footnote{1} There I was particularly concerned with moneyers’ names. With the two coins under consideration here, it is the mint that is in question. In the case of one, reattribution is fairly certain, whilst the other is rather more problematic.

On p. 120 of the 1881 edition of Anglosachsiska Mynt the following entry appears:

\begin{quote}
2856 a 3 +OSFERD M-O LVN Typ. e.
\end{quote}

This is at first sight unexceptionable. It is preceded by three entries for coins of a London moneyer Osferth, in types B1, B2, and B3. It might seem a little odd that the moneyer should reappear in type E after an interval of twelve years, but other examples are not lacking where there is evidence for a moneyer’s activity in an early and a late type but none for the intervening types.

This particular coin is in poor condition, but the mint-signature looked sufficiently unlike the form in which it is recorded for me to turn to the other mints at which an Osferth is known in this type. Among the coins of Lincoln I found the same reverse die, and was able to supply the correct reading as + OSFERD M-O LINT, and to conclude that the supposedly London coin is a duplicate of Hild. Æthelræd 1820. This latter coin is attributed to Lincoln by Hildebrand and in my opinion this attribution must stand. Mr. H. R. Mossop has kindly shown me a photograph of another coin on which it is possible to read the mint-signature as LINT, but there is no other known mint which such a reading would fit, and it would certainly be unwise to postulate a new mint on the grounds of these coins. Forms such as LING and LINE are found, and their attribution to Lincoln has not been questioned; the cutting of T for C is surely an error in the same class. It is almost certainly to Lincoln that the misread ‘London’ coin should be reattributed.

In the case of the second coin such a definite reattribution is not possible, but it is worth calling in question Hildebrand’s attribution to London. The coin is Hild. Æthelræd 2869, the moneyer Osmund, the type Long Cross or Hild. Typ D and the mint-signature is recorded as LVN. It must in fairness be said that Hildebrand did not overlook the coin’s irregularity, and provided a footnote ‘slutet af inskriften oredig’—the end of the inscription is uncertain, or indistinct. In fact the whole of the mint-signature is so blundered as to make it almost valueless for purposes of assigning the coin to its mint. The form would appear to be IAVH.

A moneyer Osmund is known in Æthelræd’s reign at London, Lincoln, and Stamford. There is no other Long Cross coin of Osmund at London, and at Stamford a moneyer of the name is known only in the Last Small Cross type. For Lincoln, the Systematic Collection has eight coins of an Osmund in Long Cross, seven listed in Anglosachsiska Mynt and one added since the compilation of that work. This unlisted example appears to be struck from the same obverse die as our problematical coin.

The pattern that has emerged in the study of die-links in this phase of the Anglo-Saxon coinage is this: the same obverse die may be found on coins of different but adjacent mints, but where the same obverse purports to share reverses of widely spaced mints, there is usually evidence that some at least of the coins in question were not struck in England.\footnote{2} It is unlikely, then, that the Osmund penny is a genuine London coin die-linked with Lincoln. Two possibilities remain. The simplest is that the blundered coin is in fact a coin of Osmund of Lincoln, with no complications of an inter-mint die-link. This possibility has the added attraction that there is plenty of evidence for the moneyer in the type. The other explanation notes the presence of an Osmund at Stamford and postulates a die-link between that mint and Lincoln. We know of a die-link between these same mints occurring in the reign of Harthacnut\footnote{3} so this is by no means impossible. If the four blundered letters of mint-signature can bear any interpretation at all, it is perhaps easier to read STAN in them than a contraction for Lincoln. Against the Stamford theory is the fact that we have no evidence that the Stamford Osmund was striking earlier than 1009, the inception of the Last Small Cross type. Whilst we can be fairly certain that the coin should not be attributed to London, the claims of Lincoln and Stamford cannot well be resolved, unless future finds should give us an example of the obverse die with an unquestionable reverse of Osmund at Stamford. V. J. SMART
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Ibid., p. 170, quoting Miss G. van der Meer.
In his note on the Anglo-Saxon mint of Reading\(^1\) R. H. M. Dolley has come to the conclusion that of the five coins which had so far been attributed to that mint only one can be said with any degree of confidence to have been struck there. The coin in question which belongs to Edward the Confessor's Trefoil Quadrilateral type struck c. 1046-8\(^2\) is preserved in the Systematic Collection in Stockholm (Hild. Edw. Conf. 635). The moneyer's name on this coin is spelled EORFF, but it has never seriously been doubted that this should be read as CORFF.

The name Corff (also written Corrf and Corf) is of Scandinavian origin (cf. Old West-Scandinavian *Kurfr* = stump).\(^3\) It is not known from written sources, but only from coins struck in London during the period 1035-44, in both types of Harold I, the second type of Harthacnut, and the first type of Edward the Confessor.\(^4\) The fact that a moneyer with such a rare name struck at

\(^1\) **BNJ** xxx (1960), pp. 70-75.


Reading in Edward the Confessor’s third type suggests that this was the same person and that he moved from London to Reading between c. 1044 and c. 1048. This supposition has now received considerable support by the discovery of a second Anglo-Saxon coin certainly struck at Reading. It belongs to Edward the Confessor’s Radiate Small Cross type, his second type (c. 1044–6), and thus provides a link between the last type struck by Corff in London and the coin which was hitherto unique for Reading and is still unique for its type at that mint.

The new coin was discovered in the Mannegärda hoard (SHM Inv. 11300) and is here illustrated by enlarged photographs which have been kindly supplied by the authorities of the Royal Coin Cabinet in Stockholm. Next to it is shown a London coin of Corff of Edward the Confessor’s Pacx type (Hild. Edw. Conf. 443). The legends of the Reading coin are as follows:

**Obv.:** +EDPER DREXA

**Rev.:** +CORFF ON READII

The spelling READ of the first element of the mint name has not been recorded before, and it must be due to a confusion on the part of the die-cutter. At the end of the tenth century the pronunciation of the diphthong ea in Anglo-Saxon underwent a change and developed into the monophthong Ñ, but the spelling during the eleventh century mostly remained ea. The die-cutter may have started to engrave ÑED, because of the pronunciation of the name, and in time have remembered that the spelling should be READ, and have added an A. Similar mistakes are known in personal names on coins, specially names with Ead as their first element. The first instance of this on a late Anglo-Saxon coin occurs c. 980, while the last Ñead-spelling in a moneyer’s name noted so far is found on a coin of Cnut’s Short Cross type (c. 1029–35), and in King Edward’s name on two coins of his Facing Small Cross type (c. 1062–5).

The abbreviation of the ending of the mint name does not present any difficulties. It often happened at the end of legends, when there was not enough space for a whole letter, that the die-cutter only engraved the first down-stroke, in this case of the N.

The importance of this new coin is that it proves that in the period 1044 to 1048 a mint was active at Reading, with a moneyer Corff who had probably moved from London c. 1044. The possibility always remains that also later types of Edward the Confessor were struck at Reading and further work on the Viking hoards in the Royal Coin Cabinet in Stockholm or new hoards elsewhere may still bring one or more of these to light.

GAY VAN DER MEER

---

**A SMALL FIND OF STEPHEN PENNIES FROM BERKSHIRE**

In January 1963 Mr. D. A. Sherlock of Orford in Suffolk submitted to the Department of Coins and Medals at the British Museum an inscribed card on which were mounted plaster-casts of five pennies of the first issue of Stephen. This card, by the courtesy of Mr. Sherlock, is here illustrated photographically, and the legibility of the holograph captions, the work apparently of the future Sir George Hill himself, is such that the block is very largely self-explanatory. In 1881, it is clear, some BMC type I pennies of Stephen were discovered at Park Place, Henley-on-Thames, but close on forty years elapsed before their potential significance was appreciated and they were brought to the notice of the numismatic world. At the British Museum the five coins were seen by Sir George Hill but not, it would seem, by G. C. Brooke, and with commendable generosity the owner Mr. Heatley Noble, the great-grandfather of Mr. Sherlock, presented to the National Collection the finer of the two die-duplicate pennies of Oxford and an enigmatic penny with a mint-signature of which the initial letter is indubitably R. The Oxford coin is of interest because a further die-identity establishes the moneyer of BMC 88 as Ra(w)ul(f)—we may compare, too, yet another coin formerly in the S. M. Spink collection which is perhaps to be identified

According to Luick, o.c. 264, the monophthongization of ea may have begun in West Saxon as early as the ninth century, so that the same explanation may be valid for these early instances.

---

3 The spelling is also found on five coins of King Eadmund of Wessex, cf. H. A. Grueber and C. K. Keary, *A Catalogue of English Coins in the British Museum II*, London, 1893, nos. 8, 9, 19, 91, 94.
4 Cf. Hild. Æthelred 3677–81, 103, 2019–21; Cnut 1221, 1849–51, 1086.
5 H. A. Grueber and C. F. Keary, op. cit., p. 369, nos. 401 and 405.
with one which Stainer recorded as belonging to W. J. Andrew. The second of the coins presented by Mr. Heatley Noble was to exercise Brooke very considerably, but in the end he was able to run it to earth as a die-duplicate of BMC 20, a coin which in Norman Kings is given, but with a query, to Castle Rising. As we shall see, though, the presence of this coin in the little find from Henley-on-Thames in itself could be another straw in the wind, and few today would claim that the attribution to Castle Rising as opposed to Rye was other than controversial. Of the remaining coins little can be said beyond the fact that they appear to be by known moneyers but from dies unrecorded in the British Museum Catalogue. One is from London and by the well-attested moneyer


Estmund, and the other from Winchester by a moneyer whose name began with s, but whether Saiet or Siward—or even Sawulf or Stigant—in the absence of a die-link there seems no means of discovering.

Surprisingly, Brooke, though recording the Henley-on-Thames provenance on the back of the tickets accompanying the two coins acquired by the British Museum, took no steps to publish the find, an omission the more surprising since it is probably to Brooke that there should be given the credit for the suggestion that the BER—moneyer obtained by collation of BMC 20 with the new coin from the mint of R is the same man as the Bertold of the two coins in South Kyme hoard published by L. A. Lawrence in 1922, a Bertold whom W. J. Andrew is found associating provisionally with Castle Rising in a note read before the British Numismatic Society in 1930.

It is significant, though, that Bertold appears as a moneyer neither of Rye nor of Castle Rising in the original edition of English Coins, and the truth is probably that Brooke appreciated that the whole question needed investigation far more thorough than could be undertaken in view of his other commitments. In this connexion, too, it should be remembered that it was not until October 1921 that Brooke returned to the museum from the Central Liquor Board where he had been since 1916, and so was amply preoccupied with more urgent arrears of work at the time when the little find from Henley-on-Thames still possessed any real immediacy.

That the five coins shown at the museum in 1920 represent the full extent of the find may be taken as certain. Not only is family tradition quite specific on this point, but we must not forget that the find was unknown to Stainer in 1904 and Brooke in 1916, not to mention Mr. J. D. A. Thompson in 1956 and the present editors of the Victoria County Histories both of Berkshire and of Oxfordshire. Had there been other parcels it seems almost inconceivable that by now they would not have come to the attention of interested parties, and it may be observed that such parcels would almost certainly have included coins of the Oxford mint—cf. the die-duplicate pennies of Ra(w)ul(f) in the find as now published—and as such they would have had a double claim on the attention of Stainer who was living and working in the same county as Henley-on-Thames. There is, too, no tradition of a container, and this again is consistent with there being so few pieces. The historical occasion for the concealment or loss is obvious, and it is suggested that in the new edition of the Inventory the little find from Henley-on-Thames might merit an entry on the lines of the following:

HENLEY-ON-THAMES, Berkshire, 1881.

5 s. Norman pennies. Deposit: c. 1140.


No container. The coins were found at Park Place on the Berkshire side of the river. Two were presented to the British Museum in 1920, and three are in the possession of the then owner's descendants.


R. H. M. DOLLEY

THE ASTON CHURCH FIND

The medieval chancel of Aston Church, Birmingham, was rebuilt during 1879. The newspaper report of the laying of the foundation stone quotes the Rev. W. Eliot as saying that the previous week four coins were found in the southeast corner of the chancel under the sedilia. The find therefore was made during the week ending 20 September 1879. The vicar, having attributed three of the coins to Edward I and one to Alexander III of Scots, suggested that they were a foundation deposit connected with the rebuilding of the chancel at the end of the thirteenth century. In the 1930 supplement, however, Bertold appears as a moneyer of Castle Rising.

1 Report of 22 Oct. 1930 meeting of British Numismatic Society as printed in Spink's Numismatic Circular, 1931, cc. 69 and 70. The report is a verbatim transcript of the paper as published in BNJ xx (1929/1930), pp. 117–21) except for the omission of perhaps the most decisive argument—the Linton hoard-provenance.


3 J. D. A. Thompson, Inventory of British Coin Hoards, A.D. 600–1500 (1956), p. 15.


Mr. P. B. Chatwin, the son of the architect in charge of the restoration work, recalls that the coins were found embedded into the mortar between the stones of the chancel wall below the sedilia. It appeared to the finders that the coins had been pushed into the mortar when it was first laid.¹

In view of the amended attribution² of two of the coins to the reign of Edward III the date of that part of the chancel wall in which they were found is of importance in deciding whether the find was in fact a foundation deposit and, if so, the date of its deposition.

There is unfortunately no documentary evidence for the date of the chancel. Writing before the date of the restoration A. E. Everitt³ describes the chancel as a whole as having a few courses of earlier masonry in the wall which he ascribes on stylistic grounds to the later thirteenth century. Neither is there any record in the fuller documentation of the following century of rebuilding or repairs consistent with the dates of the coins.

The find may then represent the foundation deposit of an unrecorded fourteenth-century repair to the sedilia, the traces of which in the masonry were too slight to attract Everitt's attention.

The coins remained in the possession of the architect, Mr. J. A. Chatwin, until they were presented to the Birmingham City Museum in 1892. They are at present on loan to Aston Church.

The coins are:⁴

2. Edward III. London halfpenny. 1344–51 coinage. 0.65 gr. (North 1131).

M. M. ARCHIBALD

A CHESTER UNITE OF CHARLES I

There is a unite whose place in the provincial series of Charles I has hitherto been doubtful (Fig. 1). North (no. 2324) and the Lockett Catalogue (English, pt. iv, lot 4183) follow Brooke and Kenyon in listing this extremely rare piece under Aberystwyth, but it is too rough and crude to

¹ I am indebted to Mr. P. B. Chatwin for this information.
² Thompson, op. cit.
⁴ I am indebted to Mr. R. H. M. Dolley for checking the attribution of the coins.
The neat and well-made silver of that mint. The attribution has generally been recognized as unsatisfactory, but has not been formally challenged.

I attribute it to Chester because of the identity of several of its punches to those of the half-crowns inscribed CHST (Fig. 2). The following points are especially to be noted:

1. The plume of the unite’s privy mark is identical with that behind the king on the half-crown.
2. The harps of the royal arms are identical.
3. Several letters of the fount are identical, notably E, N, R, and S—compare, for example, the word REX.

The Chester coinage, hitherto certainly known only in the half-crown denomination, was produced during 1645. On 31 January of that year, the Corporation ordered the conversion of £100 worth of plate into coin ‘for the necessary use and defence of this city’. Chester surrendered to its Parliamentary besiegers on 3 February 1646 (new style).

J. P. C. Kent