MISCELLANEA

FIVE RECENTLY FOUND ANCIENT BRITISH COINS

During the season 1968–9, four coins from the Coritani tribe were picked up on known Iron Age sites in Lincolnshire and Rutland. The first was found by myself at Dragonby in Lincolnshire in September of 1968, and is a most interesting prototype gold stater.

Obv.: Portions of the laureate head of Apollo to the right.

Rev.: Crude horse to the left with rosette and large central pellet beneath; an exaggerated exergual line. Above a crescent and pellets. Ring ornament in front.

Weight: 89.5 grains.

Mack reference: 54 variety.

Pl. IX. 1.

The most significant feature of the coin is the distinctive exergual line, which shows in full; and has enabled me to subdivide this class of stater from the others, which are illustrated by Commander Mack as No. 54.

This coin is a die duplicate to a coin in the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge, No. 41 of the Sylloge, and the reverse die duplicate to a coin in the British Museum, and one in the collection of Major Lister.

The next two coins are half silver denominations, both found on the same day in February 1969 by myself at the Owmbly Cliff site in Lincolnshire. The details are as follows:

Obv.: Blank.

Rev.: Horse to left with a rosette of joined pellets above.

Weight: 7 grains.


Pl. IX. 2.

The second of these two coins may be described as follows:

Obv.: Blank.

Rev.: Horse to right with a rosette of pellets above.

Weight: 6 grains.


The fourth coin was found in February of 1969 on the Thistleton site in Rutland and is an inscribed full silver denomination of the so-called Aun Ast coins.

Obv.: Blank.

Rev.: Horse to left, AVN above, TVOS below neck and body.

Weight: 16 grains.


Pl. IX. 3.

Having studied all the known copies of this class of coin, I have come to the conclusion that the nearest reading we can get is either a Aun Ost or Aun Vost, but both of these readings are uncertain.

The fifth coin I should like to mention is a rare gold stater of the Cantii tribe, attributed to their King Dubnovellaunus, found on the beach of the Isle of Sheppey in August 1969.

Obv.: Plain with a raised band across the field.

Rev.: A horse to right with UNO above, with bucranium between two pellers and a ring ornament; below a ring and a crook-shaped ornament.

Weight: 84 grains.


Pl. IX. 3.

These coins are all in the H. R. Mossop collection.

H. R. MOSSOP
RECENTLY FOUND ANCIENT BRITISH COINS

COINS OF STEPHEN FROM RALEIGH MOUNT

EDWARD THE CONFESSOR OVERSTRIKE $4$

MISCELLANEA
A NEW TYPE FOR OFFA

Though there is good reason to believe that we still have much to learn about Offa’s coinage, the appearance of a new type by a hitherto unrecorded moneyer is something exceptional. It is therefore with a very real sense of gratitude that we acknowledge the courtesy of the Royal Coin Cabinet of The Hague and of the Dutch State Service for Archaeological Excavations in allowing us to record the coin here and we are particularly indebted to the Director of the latter, Dr. W. A. Van Es, and to Mr. R. I. Page, of Cambridge, who has carefully studied the runic inscription and given us the benefit of his views on it.

The coin was found on 26 March 1968, in excavations being carried out by the State Service at Wijk bij Duurstede (the ancient Dorestad). It was unearthed in a disturbed layer in level 3 of trench 26, and nothing was found in association with it. It remains at present in the hands of the State Service.

The coin may be described as follows:

Obv.: Legend OFFA, the o lozenge-shaped, the A chevron-barred. The name is set in a concave panel with three pellets in each corner. Above and below are two arches of a similarly curved trellace with pellets inside. Either side of the panel is what appears to be a leaf placed vertically. The whole is contained within a linear circle.

Rev.: A runic inscription which is discussed below. Design generally similar to the obverse, but there are no sides to the centre panel. One bar of the ‘b’ is continued, top and bottom, to join a linear circle which contains the design.

Weight: 1.17 grammes; 18.1 grains.

The runic inscription is not entirely clear. Mr. Page would be inclined to read it Ednod, but is puzzled by the two seemingly quite deliberate hooks at the foot of the first letter. These are abnormal and their significance is not clear. However, the rune for the diphthong ea in Old English is ð and it is just possible that the first element in the name might be intended to combine e (e) with ea ð, the latter inverted. This would produce the name Eadnod.

The absence of the royal title on the obverse will be noted. This, though exceptional on Offa’s coins, is occasionally found.

The possibility that the coin might be a continental imitation of a coin of Offa’s was first considered, but was rejected on two grounds. First there is no known prototype, for obverse

---

1 See Anglo-Saxon Coins (1961), p. 46.
2 e.g. on Nos. 7, 30, 38, 46, and 48 illustrated in Anglo-Saxon Coins (1961), Pls. IV and V.
or reverse, from which it could have been copied (not, however, a conclusive argument, because, as already explained, our knowledge of Offa's coinage is manifestly incomplete); the second, that the letter ⊿ is of a type much more common in England than outside it.

unknown King Eadwald, who may have occupied the East Anglian throne for a short period after Offa's death. 2

Only one other moneyer is known to have worked for this king and his name is EadnoS. Two (or possibly three) of his coins have survived. 3

The new coin from Holland thus fits very neatly into the East Anglian group of Offa's coins and the fact that the obverse is not of the 'three-line' type suggests that it is not of his latest issue, introduced some four years before his death.

C. E. BLUNT and G. VAN DER MEER

THE 1912 WELWYN FIND OF PENCE OF EADGAR AND OF EDWARD THE MARTYR

In 1961 it was observed that there appears to be no published find from southern England including coins of Eadgar (A/S Coins, p. 141 and map opposite p. 142). It was also claimed that Eadgar's Three-line type (BMC ii = Brooke 1 var. = North 757 = Seaby 652), which is associated with Chester in particular, is one that belongs comparatively late in the reign. Both topics had also been touched upon in a note commemorating the millennium of Eadgar's accession (SNC 1959, p. 76), and the late (post-973?) date of the Three-line type was further postulated in a paper discussing the Dalkey hoard (JRSAI xci (1961), pp. 1-18). Recently, however, a London sale-catalogue (Sotheby, 19 February 1969, English, Scottish, and Foreign—confusingly there had been earlier the same day and in the same rooms a Roman sale) included in an unusually full description of lot 145 a reference to an unpublished coin in the British Museum to which attached the provenance 'ex Wellwyn [sic] Treasure Trove, 1913 [sic]'. No hoard of this name is listed in Mr. Thompson's Inventory (1956) or is cited in my own review of Viking-age hoard-evidence from these islands on pp. 47–54 of SCBI B.M. H/N (1966), but through the courtesy of Mr. R. A. G. Carson, F.S.A., of the British Museum, it is possible for there to be offered here a partial reconstruction of a little find which seems not without significance where students of the tenth-century English coinage are concerned.

The British Museum coin (registration No. 1913-3-10) is a Three-line penny of Eadgar from the Chester mint and by the moneyer Aldewine.

Grantley coin, but since the latter has a pedigree going back at least to the Dymock sale of 1858, and is presumably the specimen described by Haigh in his Numismatic History of the . . . East Angles (1845), p. 6, as recently discovered, this seems unlikely. If in fact it is a third specimen, its present whereabouts are unknown.

1 Ibid., pp. 49–50 and 59.
2 Ibid., p. 50.
3 BMC i, p. 84; 3; Grantley 881; Grueber in NC 1894, p. 54 n., in his account of the Middle Temple hoard, writes that he had 'very recently seen a coin of Eadwald, a duplicate of that in the Museum (B.M. Cat., vol. i., Pl. XIV. 3) which I strongly suspect came from the same hoard'. This could, of course, be the
It is the only coin from the find which was acquired by the English national collection. From certain treasure trove files which survived the 1941 bombing of the Coin Room it emerges that the find consisted of no more than four coins—unless indeed there were other pieces that were not recovered—which came to light in the course of roadworks where the Great North Road passes through Welwyn. The date of discovery was August 1912, but the coins were some weeks in reaching the coroner as they had been acquired by a local resident, and the treasure trove aspect was not realized until he chanced to submit them to the British Museum for identification in the course of the autumn. Unfortunately the descriptions of the remaining three coins are tantalizingly incomplete—one must assume that a fuller record was made for a publication of the find which in the event never appeared owing to the outbreak of the Great War. All we are told is that one was of Eadgar and of the Chester mint; one, broken in three pieces, of Edward the Martyr and of the Winchester mint; and the third so chipped around the edges that no attribution was possible beyond the guess that it was of Eadgar. Inasmuch as a fairly rigorous demonetization does appear to have accompanied Eadgar’s reform of c. 973, it is probably safe to say that the Chester coin of Eadgar not acquired by the British Museum was a second example of the Three-line issue or of Reform type (BMC vi = Brooke 6 = North 751, 752 = Seaby 662). Since, too, the coin is not described as broken, it may be thought unlikely that it was the latter—to this day there is no Reform coin of Chester for Eadgar in the British Museum trays. It is unlikely, too, that the Welwyn provenance can attach to Locket 2754, apparently the only Chester penny of Reform type to have passed through the saleroom without a pedigree that is inconsistent with discovery as late as 1912. In contrast, Chester coins of Three-line type are not all that rare, and as early as 1893 there were a dozen specimens by nine different moneys in the British Museum trays. That the Edward the Martyr penny of Winchester should be described as broken in three pieces could be significant. Normally one would have assumed that its non-acquisition by the British Museum implied duplication of a coin already in the national collection, but there is some evidence that at this period broken coins were generally eschewed. It would be unwise, therefore, to press the argument too hard by the supposition that the coin must have been by either of the Winchester moneys then represented in the Museum trays, Wihtsige and Wynsige (BMC 35 and 36). There remains the question of the coin only doubtfully of Eadgar. That reign and mint alike were rendered ambiguous by damage must suggest that it had a reverse of circumscription type, in other words that if of Eadgar it was either a true Circumscription coin (BMC iii and iv = Brooke 4 = North 748, 749, 758, and 759 = Seaby 654–7) or a Portrait coin from before or after the reform (BMC v and vi = Brooke 5 and 6 = North 750, 751, and 752 = Seaby 658–60). If a Circumscription coin, however, any ambiguity would have been as to whether it was of Eadwig or of Eadgar, and one might have expected Brooke to have come down strongly in favour of the latter. As a recent paper (NC 1962, pp. 195–202) has demonstrated, in 1912 Circumscription coins of Eadwig were still so quite exceptionally rare that it is doubtful if three at the very most were known to English numismatists. If a Portrait coin, on the other hand, ambiguity would be twofold. If the bust broke the inner circle, confusion could only be with Eadwig, a highly improbable ambiguity inasmuch as then as now any Portrait coinage of the earlier king is represented by a unique survivor, SCBI Hunter 675. All this would seem to preclude the possibility of the Welwyn find including Circumscription and pre-Reform Portrait coins, always an improbability inasmuch as the demonetization of c. 973 does appear to have been very thoroughly executed. In contrast, the outstanding ambiguity, the possibility of confusion between a post-Reform Portrait coin of Eadgar and one of Edward the Martyr, has much to commend it. The two series did circulate side by side—they were, after all, part of the same issue—and even today, when so much more is known about them as a result of the 1914 Chester hoard (Inventory 85) and of work on the Swedish material, the regnal attribution of chipped coins of the issue can often present very considerable difficulty. On balance, then, the probability must be that the fourth coin in the Welwyn find was a Reform penny of Eadgar (BMC vi = Brooke 6 = North 752 = Seaby 660), with the possibility that it was one of Edward the Martyr (BMC i = Brooke 1 = North 763 = Seaby 662).

As already remarked, only one of the above four coins came to the English national collection. The fate of the others is uncertain. The file shows that it was the mind of H.M. Treasury to put them into the London saleroom, and it further emerges that there was a specific proposition that they be included in the same sale as the 210 pennies of Henry III which the Museum did not
take from the 1912 Steppingly hoard (*Inventory* 342). The latter did in fact figure in the Reynolds sale (Sotheby, 4 May 1914, lots 117-19) along with two gold coins of Charles II and William III from a treasure trove in the Channel Islands (ibid., lots 120 and 121) which appears to be unpublished at least where numismatic journals are concerned. A check through other sale-catalogues of the period has been unproductive, and the probability must be that in the event the Treasury fell in with (Sir) George Hill’s representations that heed should be given to the claims of Mr. Davis, the Welwyn resident who had brought the coins to the Museum’s notice. It is possible that the coins are in the possession of a member of the family to this day, but the condition of the obvious rarity, the Edward the Martyr of Winchester mint, must mean that if since disposed of it is unlikely in the extreme that Mr. Davis or an heir was ever able to secure for the coins separate lotting in any sale.

Reduced to modified *Inventory* format, then, a summary of the 1912 Welwyn Find might run something as follows:

**Welwyn (Gt. North Rd.), Hertfordshire, August 1912.**

4 i®. Anglo-Saxon pennies. Deposit: c. 978 ± 2 (?).

**Kings of England:** Eadgar, *BMC* (A) type ii —Chester, Aldewine, 1; *BMC* (A) type ii 2, Chester, moneyer not recorded, 1. Eadgar, *BMC* (A) type vi (or Edward the Martyr, *BMC* (A) type i?)—uncertain mint and moneyer, 1. Edward the Martyr, *BMC* (A) type i—Winchester, moneyer not recorded, 1.

The coins came to light in the course of roadworks. There is no mention of any container. One coin is in the British Museum.


The find may be small, but it is none the less critical. For the first time we are given a find which contains *Three-line* coins of Eadgar beside *Portrait* coins struck in the years immediately following the recoinage of c. 973 and as such it may be thought a not unwelcome crumb of evidence in support of the hypothesis that the *Three-line* pence represent a special coinage to meet the requirements of Irish Sea trade struck in the years immediately following Eadgar’s reform and perhaps even continuing for a short while after his death. This seems also to be the first time that *Three-line* coins of Eadgar have been found in England, and equally the first time that there has been an Eadgar element in a hoard from south and east of a line from the Severn to the Wash, but the historian will not be surprised that the hoard must be dated after Eadgar’s death. It remains true that the reign of Eadgar the Peaceful was a time when the greater part of England basked in a security the envy of following generations.

**Michael Dolley**

---

**AN OVERSTRUCK PENNY OF EDWARD THE CONFESSOR**

Overstruck coins of Edward the Confessor are of sufficiently rare occurrence to warrant recording a specimen in my collection (Pl. IX. 4) which came from the Grantley sale, lot 1207, ex L. A. Lawrence, ex W. Allen sale (1898), lot 260. It is a coin of Chichester of *BMC* type ix (sovereign type) by the moneyer Godwine and is from the same dies as *BMC* 120.

That the coin is an overstrike is apparent, and closer examination discloses that the coin over which it is struck, obverse on reverse, is of the preceding type (*BMC* vii, pointed helmet). There are traces of the moneyer’s name, which may be Ælfwine, and of the mint which appears to end -cest. This could be either Winchester or Chichester, at both of which an Ælfwine is known in the type, but the spacing suggests that the latter, which would have one letter less than Winchester before -cest, is the more likely.

Major Carlyon-Britton published in 1905 another Chichester overstrike of the same types and actually from the same obverse die as the coin under review. Another, this time of the Wallingford mint, is in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford.

I am much indebted to Miss M. M. Archibald and to Mr. Elmore Jones for examining my coin and for their advice, on which much of this note is based.

**P. A. Hodgkinson**

---

1 NC 1905, Pl. VII. 15.

2 *SCBI* (Oxford), No. 932.
A FIND OF STEPHEN COINS AT RAYLEIGH MOUNT

For many years there has been on view in the museum at Prittlewell Priory, Southend-on-Sea, Essex, a parcel of pennies of the reign of Stephen. Until recently the coins, all of which are of the 'Watford' type (BMC i), were displayed in a pile together with a label on which the words 'Pennies of King Stephen, 1135–1154' appeared in faded ink. The coins have now been examined and prove to be a small hoard not previously published.

Eight pieces came into the possession of the museum shortly after being found at Rayleigh Mount, the site of Rayleigh Castle, in excavations conducted by E. B. Francis between autumn of 1909 and September 1910, when a report on the excavations was read (Transactions of the Essex Archaeological Society, new series, xii (1913), 147–85). This report, however, mentions only seven, possibly counting Nos. 5 and 6, below, as fragments of one coin. Some time later they were stolen and one was missing when the parcel was recovered. Further excavations in 1961, as yet unpublished, directed by Mr. L. Helliwell, curator of the museum, produced another ‘Watford’ penny.

The following is a complete list:

1. London mint, moneyer Dereman (Pl. IX. 5).
   Obv.: +STIEFNE R (with inner circle).
   Rev.: (- - -) MAN: ON: L (- -) 21-9 grains.

   Neither obverse nor reverse dies are duplicates of BMC No. 63.

2. York mint, moneyer Laising?
   Obv.: + S (TIEF) NE R (E) (with inner circle).
   Rev.: (+L.AISIG: ON: EV ?) ERPI Broken, 21-3 grains.

   A die duplicate of the coin in British Museum collection from the South Kyme find.1

   Obv.: +STIEEN (- -) (with inner circle).
   Rev.: (+) EDPAR (- - - - -) Broken, piece missing.

   Neither obverse nor reverse dies recorded at British Museum.

4. Canterbury or London mint? moneyer Wulfwine? (Pl. IX. 6)
   Obv.: (+ST) EF (N) E: (with inner circle).
   Rev.: (+P) VLF (- -) N (- - - - -) Broken, part of rim missing.

   Neither obverse nor reverse dies recorded at British Museum.

5. Fragment Mint? Moneyer?
   Obv.: Illegible.
   Rev.: ON: - - - - - - -.
   Weight: 4-9 grains.

6. Cut farthing Mint? Moneyer?
   Obv.: Illegible.
   Rev.: ON: - - - - - - -.
   Weight: 4-9 grains.

7. Local dies Mint? Moneyer? (Pl. IX. 7).
   Obv.: (- - - - - - -) NE (with inner circle).
   Rev.: (- - - - - - -) (?) T: ON /

   Very small piece missing, 15-0 grains. Tall, thin letters on reverse, no colon between on and initial letter of mint name.

8. Stolen coin
   According to museum records the eighth coin was by the moneyer Wulfwold of the Southwark mint. (Cf. BMC 95–7.)

   All the above coins were found in 1909 or 1910.

9. London mint?
   The coin excavated in 1961 is very badly corroded but appears to be the product of the moneyer Estmund of London.

   That the first eight coins are part or whole of a hoard may be assumed; the seven pennies now remaining all have similar patination. They are brittle and very black. The find has two important features. It is the first recorded hoard of the reign of Stephen buried in Essex and it is possible that none has been found in East Anglia either.2 It is also one of the rare occasions on which an irregular coin (No. 7) has been found with specimens of BMC type i of Stephen only. The irregular penny has a small piece of the rim missing after the word 'on' and, although the first letter of the mint town appears to be A it is not possible to allocate the name of a known mint commencing with this letter. Moneyers recorded as having

---

1 No. 267, NC 1922, ii, p. 79.
2 For another find which may have been discovered in Norfolk see report in BNJ xxxvii (1968), pp. 41–2 by C. E. Blunt and F. Elmore Jones.
struck the 'Watford' type pennies and whose names end with 't' are:
Gilbert (Bury St. Edmunds, Gloucester),
Ravenswert (Chester, Shrewsbury),
Robert (Canterbury, Hastings, London, Shrewsbury),
Saiet (Winchester),
Wibert (Gloucester).

Historical and Archaeological Background (by S. E. Rigold)

Rayleigh Mount now appears as a large motte-and-bailey complex, comprising a 50-foot-high motte, at the north-west, and a compact inner bailey, forming a fairly level platform without an inner bank, both of which are within a wide ditch with a counterscarp-bank; and, finally, a lightly banked outer bailey. The castle existed by 1086, but not in its present form. Domesday records that in hoc manerio (sc. the largest of the four in Rayleigh) Suenus fecit suum castellum. Sweyn was the son of Robert fitz-Wimarc, a Norman settler under the Confessor; father of Robert, the founder of Prittlewell Priory, and grandfather of Henry 'of Essex', the Constable who forfeited all his hereditary tenures in 1163, having lost a wager of battle on a, possibly unjust, imputation of cowardice cast by Robert de Montfort who sought his lands and offices. Very properly, Henry II kept the lands for himself. Rayleigh remained in Crown hands until granted to Hubert de Burgh in 1215.

Henry of Essex had been generally loyal to Stephen, but enjoyed royal favour in the early years of Henry II. His proximity to the ambitious and unstable Geoffrey de Mandeville is enough to make it tolerably certain that he took advantage of the conditions of anarchy to transform the castle of Rayleigh, which was his principal seat, into something like its present shape and Mr. Helliwell’s excavations appear to confirm the view that the motte was heightened, if not, indeed, altered from a ring-work, at that period, and the surface of the bailey raised and perhaps extended. These excavations show two phases of intensive occupation during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. The documentation, however, suggests that this was non-military and that Rayleigh, though maintained as a castle under Henry II, had reverted to pastoral (horse-rearing?) use by 1277. The penny found in 1961 may have been disturbed, as the post-hole where it was found adjoined another post-hole containing thirteenth-century material, but this does not imply that those found in 1909-10 had been disturbed.

The report on the excavations of 1909-10, accompanied by an extremely schematic plan, shows that:

(i) on the slope of the motte, an area to the north-east was stripped and two middens on the south-east emptied, one penetrating an earlier stratum containing stone-work;

(ii) much of the inner bailey was stripped of one to two feet of featureless topsoil, revealing an occupation-level with floors and wall footings, and the foundations of a stone-reinforced rampart, if not a curtain-wall;

(iii) only in one place was this occupation-layer breached (position XIX on the published plan, near the ditch separating the bailey from the motte), to reveal a waterlogged timber structure of great interest and apparently excavated with some care and neatness in the circumstances, over six feet below the occupation-layer.

Without prejudice to the interpretation of Mr. Helliwell’s excavations in 1959-61, the complexion of the finds from the occupation-level suggests a fairly continuous use, with minor modifications, from the mid-twelfth century to quite late in the thirteenth, i.e. from the alterations by Henry of Essex to beyond the effective abandonment of the castle as such. The floors and footings are perhaps mainly from the late thirteenth- to early fourteenth-century occupation.

However, certain pottery, of which both sections and photographs are published and which is quite acceptable in the second quarter of the twelfth century, is described as ‘found at a depth of 6 feet or more in that part of the bailey where the coins of Stephen were found’. This can only imply the excavation for the timber structure, at position XIX. The blackened condition of the coins fits the waterlogged surroundings. The association is complete; the hoard was undisturbed and buried by the alterations, including the raising of the bailey area by over six feet, that on historical grounds alone would fit best in the early 1140s.

The writer wishes to acknowledge, with considerable gratitude, the assistance received from

1 Trans. Essex Arch. Soc. new series, xii (1913), 147-85.
2 Ibid. 175.
Mr. D. G. Macleod, M.A., Dip.Anth., F.R.A.I.,
Assistant-in-Charge of Priory Museum, Prittlewell, and also from Mr. S. E. Rigold, M.A., F.S.A.
This note is concluded with a summary of the Rayleigh find in Inventory format:

9 /R English pennies. Deposit c. 1140.
uncertain mints: Canterbury or Colchester?, Edward, 1; Canterbury or London?, Wulfwine?,
1; London?, Estmund?, 1; (local dies), 1;
fragment, 1; cut farthing, 1.
Disposition: Prittlewell Priory Museum, Southend-on-Sea, Essex. The coins were stolen from the museum some years ago but, with the exception of the Southwark specimen, all were recovered.

ROBERT SEAMAN

THE SHORT CROSS COINS IN THE RAS SHAMRA HOARD OF 1966

The castle of Ras Shamra, about 12 km. north of Latakia in Syria, is best known as the site where the Ugaritic tablets were discovered. The excavations there have also yielded an important hoard of archaic Greek staters,¹ and, more recently, a large hoard from the period of the Crusades. This comprised 251 coins of Lucca, 58 of Valence, 180 of Antioch, and 8 miscellaneous French and Crusading coins (all of which have been catalogued and discussed elsewhere),² together with 52 English Short Cross pennies. The latest coins in the hoard were a ‘helmet’ denier of Antioch of D. F. Allen’s Type 6 (c. 1230 or later),³ and two worn deniers of Henri I of Cyprus (1218-53). The hoard’s age-structure is, however, complex. It includes, for example, a block of coins of the ‘bare head’ type issued at Antioch in the 1150s, and another group of the ‘helmet’ type from the 1160s and 1170s, which were not much worn. The English coins likewise are uncharacteristic for the date at which the hoard was con-

1. Abel Vc
2-3. Abel Ve?
4. Abel Vlai
5. Abel Vlb
6. Andreu Vc
7. Beneit Vbi
8. Elias VII
9. Fulke Vbi
10. Ilger Vc
11. Ilger Vb or VI
12. Rauf Vc
13. Rauf Vb or VI
14. Rauf Vlai

CANTERBURY

28. Goldwine Va
29. Johan Vbii
30. Johan? (?)
31. Jan VII
32. Robert Vb

33. Samuel Vb
34. Samuel Vbii
35. Tomas Vb
36. Walter Vlc

² See Hamburger Beiträge zur Numismatik, 1969/70.
⁴ See BNJ xxxiii, p. 66.
I would like to record a groat of class IVa/4, recognized by the crescent on the breast from new dies which has recently come to light.

*Obv.*: +RICARD I DEI* GRAE REX ANGL ET* FRANCIE  
*Rev.*: +POSIV DEVM A DIVTOR EN EM EV  
*Weight*: 69-1 grains.

Mr. Potter in his paper on the coinage of Richard II in this Journal located four specimens using two obverse and four reverse dies. Both obverse dies read DEI whereas this one reads DEI. On the reverse die, stops, etc., are as Potter 4; however, the distinguishing feature is that the R is double cut.

J. ATKINSON
NEW EVIDENCE CONCERNING THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE 1655 HALF-CROWN

RECENT discovery of what had the appearance of a genuine 1655 half-crown prompted me to try to reach a definite conclusion concerning its authenticity. Over the last 130 years, several attempts have been made either to maintain or to refute the authenticity of different specimens that have gradually come to light. While at times providing useful information, no theory as yet advanced seems to be really satisfactory, mainly because rarely were all the known specimens at the time of writing taken into account.

There are in the British Museum at present four half-crowns dated 1655:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Ticket</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) 223·8 g.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1935 Clark-Thornhill bequest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 221·3 g.</td>
<td>VF (clipped)</td>
<td>1896 Montagu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) 212·6 g.</td>
<td>F (tooled)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) 282·0 g.</td>
<td>VF (tooled)</td>
<td>1839 Cureton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in addition to the one now in my own collection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Ticket</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(e) 222·8 g.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1655 half-crown from Cureton in 1839, which was the only specimen there when Montagu attempted to show in 1884 that his own coin, bought from Wigan, was the only genuine known 1655 half-crown. He referred to the Museum’s coin as one of Stapley’s (see below) forgeries ‘of base metal covered with silver plating’, and Hawkins also condemned it.

The three other specimens, however, demand more scrutiny. Strangely enough, Samuel Spink disputed the authenticity of Montagu’s specimen, asserting that all the experts of his day considered it to be merely plated. Judging by the appearance of the coin labelled Montagu, this seems highly unlikely, so that Spink was either mistaken—which seems doubtful—or somehow the label has been displaced. In the same article Spink claims authenticity for his own newly acquired specimen, about which he writes: ‘More than its weight, its thoroughly genuine appearance and ring convince me that here at last is found at any rate one genuine half-crown of the year 1655.’ One might tentatively guess that this, if not subsequently indefinitely lost, is coin e, which is the nearest of the above coins to it in weight, for Spink weighed his at 222½ g.—which may not be too accurate in view of the date of weighing.

Coins a and b seem to be from the same obverse die, in so far as one can see from the worn
condition of the former, while it is impossible to be certain about the reverse (date side). Coin e is made from different dies. Nevertheless several of the letter punches are the same on all three coins.

(A) The v of vs on the reverse is missing part of the first horizontal bar (fig. 2).

(b) On coins b and e the w of WITH on the reverse has a short right bar and the central apex has a flaw giving the effect of a third bar. This probably applies also to coin a, which is too worn to be judged, as in all seeable aspects its reverse is as b's (fig. 3).

(c) On the obverse and reverse of coin a, on the reverse of coin e, and possibly on the reverse of coin b, where there is a misstrike, the upper and lower vertical bars of the G sometimes form a continuous line, the lower being thicker than the upper and rounded at the top left-hand corner (fig. 4).

Not only are there common punches on the dies of the three half-crowns of 1655, but one may also find punch-links with some half-crowns of 1654 and 1656—e.g.:

(1) Punch A is found on a 1654 half-crown reverse (own coll.) (fig. 5) and on a 1654 obverse (B.M.).

1 The flaw is stronger on 1655 coins than on those of 1654.
(2) Punch B is found on two 1654 reverses (B.M. and own coll.) (fig. 5).
(3) Punch C is found on two 1656 obverses (B.M. and own coll.) (fig. 6), and one 1656 reverse (B.M.).

There are in all probability even more punch links between half-crowns of 1655 and those of other dates, but the above are the most obvious, primarily because the punches are slightly out of the ordinary.

The implication behind these observations is that the coins are genuine—or at least struck from official dies. There is, however, the problem of weight. As Spink points out, the weight of 1654, and 1656 that I weighed all fell between 224.1 g. and 234.9 g. (exceptionally heavy specimen); those of 1655 are all outside this range. Since two of the three specimens look unclipped, this low weight cannot be explained by clipping.

If, however, these half-crowns were forged, it would be hard to understand why, since such a venture can hardly have been very profitable—even if the forger had free access to silver. Bearing in mind the penalties of the day for forging coins of the Commonwealth, one wonders whether such a small profit for such a large outlay would have been worth while in relation to the penalti-
risk involved. Indeed, if they were forged, they were done with at least some official letter punches which must have been removed from the Mint. It seems strange too that a forger would have produced at least two obverse and two reverse dies unless they were wholly made officially at the Mint and later removed, no coins having been officially made from them. On the whole then the above arguments weigh against the 1655 half-crown's being a forgery.

Before concluding, however, it is perhaps worth mentioning an advertisement in the *Publick Intelligencer* of 22 to 29 October 1655 by one Richard Pight, 'Surveyor of the Melting-house in his Highnesse Mint', which runs as follows: 'This Abraham Stapley is a false Coiner of Money, for, in his house at Deptford were found several false Coining Irons for half crowns, and false half crowns, coined with the date 1655, and this is to give notice to all persons whatsoever, that shall receive any of the said money of Stapleys, dated 1655, there being none of that date in his Highness Mint coined to this day the 26. of October.' From this statement and from the fact that he had searched in vain in all the most prominent cabinets of his day, Sir Henry Ellis concluded that no genuine 1655 half-crown could exist. Hawkins followed suit. As, however, Spink pointed out when trying to authenticate his own specimen, there was still time after October for coins to have been minted. There is in fact no record at the Mint of a man named Stapley having worked there, hence having been able to remove dies or punches. Mint records of this period, however, are very incomplete.

To sum up then, this paper set out to survey the literature about the 1655 half-crown and to try to explain the consistently low weight of these coins. Much of the literature has been concerned with what are clearly forgeries. Some has been concerned with one specimen alone, so that the importance of seeing the 1655 half-crown in the context of the whole series of which it is a part has been overlooked. The evidence of the punches, and of the weights, looked at in relation to other dates and—in the latter case—denominations, seems a very good indication of authenticity.
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**THE GOLD FORTY-SHILLING PIECE OF JAMES VI OF SCOTLAND**

At the Scottish mint the warden and counter-warden maintained a register in duplicate recording the particulars of the species and quantity of coins struck. These registers are extant principally for the periods 1590 to 1634 (with some gaps) and 1664 to 1681. One of them has two pages which contain details of the amount of gold coined during the period 10 November 1591 to 1 November 1592. The first page is headed:  

The register of the four pund and fourtie schillingis pieces of gold of the fynes of xxij carrettis, conforme to the ordinance.

There follows a list of sixteen journeys for each of which there is given the date of the journey and the amount of gold coined. At the end of the second page there has been written in a different hand: 'Summa of the haill gold of four lib. and fourtie s. peces of gold fra the tent day of nouem-ber 1591 inclusiue To the first day of novem-ber 1592 inclusiue extendis to Thrie stane sex pund xiiij vnces.'

The four-pound piece, which was struck during each of the years 1591-2-3, is better known today as the hat piece, a name by which it became known soon after its issue. The obverse has a portrait of James VI wearing a remarkable high-crowned hat. The reverse is a lion sejant holding a sceptre, and a cloud above with Jehovah in Hebrew; the legend is *TE SOLUM VEREOR* (Thee alone do I fear).

A coinage of gold four-pound, and forty-shilling pieces, as well as silver half-merk, and forty-penny pieces, had been ordered by the Scottish Parliament on 6 August 1591. The Act stated that the gold coins were 'to haue cours for four pundis the pece with halffis accordinglie'. Taken together, the evidence of the Act and the warden's register seems conclusive that both hat pieces and their halves were struck, even though none of
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the smaller denomination is known today. It is only when one delves more deeply into the records for additional information about these coins that doubts and difficulties begin to arise.

An important source of information for the student of the Scottish coinage is *The compt of the coynzehous*. This manuscript volume covers the period 1582 to 1627 and contains a record of the receipts and expenditure at the mint and the amount of gold, silver, and billon coined. There are many references in it to the gold and silver issues of 1591–3. During the accounting period from 1 September 1590 to 1 November 1592 there occurs the entry (folio 22):

Item, past the irnis in foure pound peces of gold in the said space of the fynnes of xxij carrettis according to the said vmquhile [late] wardanis buikis Thrie stane sex pound fourtene vnce wecht.

This entry corresponds to the one in the warden’s register which has already been quoted, but with this difference, that the *compt* does not mention the forty-shilling piece. Such omissions do not occur when references are made to the silver coins, for we find such entries as: ‘past the irnis in half merkis and fourttie penny peces of siluer . . . ’ (fol. 22 verso).

On another page of the *compt* we find the entry (fol. 23 verso):

Item payeit to Thomas foulis, sincker, ffor saincking of thrie pair of Irnis viz. ane for four pound peces of gold, ane for half merk peces and ane uther for fourttie penny peces of siluer, ilk ane fourttie pundis, conforme to his acquittance Is j c xx lib.

£40 was the standard amount paid to the die-sinker as his ordinary due at any alteration of the coin or renewing any puncheons. In the case of a new coinage it appears that he received £40 for each denomination. The item quoted above was the only payment of this kind to be made to the die-sinker for the coinage of 1591–3. Had he made puncheons for a gold forty-shilling piece, he would surely have been entitled to a further £40 for making them.

Still another reference to the coinage is the following (fol. 24): ‘Item, gevin to my Lord Chancellar ane pece of ilk sort Is iiiij lib x s.’

The Lord Chancellor was one of several officials whose perquisite it was to receive one piece of each denomination whenever there was a new coinage. The amount of £4. 10s. is the sum of the gold four-pound piece and the silver half-merk, and forty-penny pieces, and this once again seems to confirm that only one species of gold coin was struck.

Although there are numerous references to four-pound pieces in the *compt*, the forty-shilling piece is nowhere mentioned. The total weight of 22-carat gold coined during 1591–3 in four-pound pieces is given as 14 stone, 12 pounds, and 2|\1\2| ounces. There were 6\1\2 of them to the ounce, so if the entire amount was coined in the larger denomination the number of hat pieces struck was almost exactly 25,500.

It must be very rare to have apparently sound documentary evidence both for the existence and non-existence of a particular coin, and this emphasizes the need for caution when consulting contemporary records. It did happen from time to time that the Scottish authorities decided on a certain coin or coinage, then minds were changed and a different coinage was issued. In the present instance it seems possible that, on learning of Parliament’s intention to have two gold denominations, the warden entered their names on the first page of his register. Shortly afterwards, orders may have been given canceling the smaller species and so none was struck. When the bottom of the second page of the register had been reached (vide the *compt*, fol. 22) and the second writer simply copied the denominations shown at the top of the first page. The writer of the *compt* would have been aware that forty-shilling pieces had never been struck and so omitted any reference to them.

J. K. R. MURRAY

was so small that none has survived.
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