MISCELLANEA

MORE FINDS OF CORITANI COINS IN LINCOLNSHIRE

In January of 1970 Mr. Harrison of Winterton had the good fortune to find at Dragonby, two Coritani coins within the one week.

The first and most important was a Stater inscribed ESUP ASU; this is the sixth coin of this type I have recorded and may be described as follows:

**Obv.**: A crude wreath crossed by a line with crescent-shaped ends, enclosing beaded circles with pellets in the centre.

**Rev.**: Horse to the left with a star beneath the tail, parts of IISVP and a pellet above, and below ASV.

*Mack reference*: 456B

*Weight*: 78 grains

*Specific gravity*: 9.7 (Pl. X, 8).

The second coin is a silver half denomination with the horse to the right; I have recorded some nine other coins in this general type, the horse having an open mouth and no pellets below, but on this coin the traces of the boar on the obverse are more pronounced. It may be described thus:

**Obv.**: Faint traces of a boar.

**Rev.**: Maned horse to the right with open mouth, circle of seven pellets above, and a pellet below tail. Die duplicate of a coin found at South Feriby, *BNJ* iii, plate Ancient British Coins, no. 19.

*Weight*: 8.5 grains.


In March of this year, I found on the Owmby Cliff site a full silver denomination of the inscribed coin VP CORF; this is the third coin I have recorded for this rare type, all of which are from different dies; it varies from the Lockett coin illustrated by Commander Mack as number 464, having a star beneath the tail. It may be described as follows:

**Obv.**: Portions of a wreath design.

**Rev.**: Horse to the right with VP above, CO-F below, the F being formed from the front legs of the horse, a star below tail and a pellet under the neck.

*Mack reference*: 464 variation.

*Weight*: 17 grains (Pl. X, 10).

In September 1969 the Owmby Cliff site was deep dragged for the purposes of stubble cleaning. This produced a crop of Roman coins and also a most interesting silver half denomination from the Coritani Tribe, of a type hitherto unrecorded. This coin may be described as follows:

**Obv.**: Boar to left.

**Rev.**: Maned horse to right, with open mouth. A circle of seven joined pellets above, and also above the tail part of a plain ringed ornament. A pellet below the tail.

*Weight*: 6 grains (Pl. X, 11).

This coin, I feel, should be placed early within the issues of silver coins with the horse to the right and an open mouth.

Mr. Derek Allen has brought to my notice a coin recorded by Stukeley, plate 7, no. 10 in his twenty-three plates of Ancient British Kings. This also shows a boar to the left on the obverse. However, I feel that this coin, if it be Coritanian, may fit into an earlier issue than the one found at Owmby, but it does serve to remind us that there may be more types of coins to be discovered from the Coritani Tribe.

During the spring workings in 1970 on the fields at Owmby Cliff, one gold and three silver coins have been found, all from different parts of the site over a period of two months. I was fortunate to find the first three to be described.

No. 1.

An inscribed stater ESUP ASU

**Obv.**: Traces of a wreath design.

**Rev.**: Horse to the left, above parts of ESUP showing, below ASU.

*Weight*: 81.5 grains. (Pl. X, 12).

*Specific gravity*: 11.3.

*Mack reference*: 456B.

This is the second coin of this rare type to be found in Lincolnshire this year and is of good quality gold.
No. 2.
May be described as follows:

*Obv.*: A boar to the right, above a rosette and other ring ornaments, below and behind other ring ornaments.

*Rev.*: A solid-headed maned horse to the left, above a rosette and ring ornament, and below another ring ornament.

*Weight*: 16 grains (Pl. X, 13).

This is a full denomination of the silver coin described by Derek Allen in his *Sylloge* of the Coins of the Coritani as belonging to type F; I feel, however, that this coin and four other known coins of this type can now be placed in a separate class.

No. 3.
Is as follows:

*Obv.*: Slight traces of a wreath design.

*Rev.*: A solid headed horse to the right with *ve* above, and below three pellets, and a pellet below tail.

*Weight*: 7 grains (Pl. X, 14).

This is a silver half denomination of the coin *VEP*, and is very similar to one found in the excavations at Dragonby.

In the 1968 issues of this *Journal* (p. 190) I described a broken full silver denomination as a possible *VEP* coin; this latest find makes it virtually certain that I was wrong, and so the large fragment must at present remain as an unidentified inscribed coin until another similar is found.

It is also interesting to note that this *VEP* issue can now be fully recognized as separate from those coins inscribed *VEP CORF*.

No. 4.
This last coin may be described as follows:

*Obv.*: A boar probably to the left, above a wheel with eight spokes and another ring-type ornament, below an annulet enclosing a small pellet and traces of a plain exergual line.

*Rev.*: A solid-headed maned horse to the left, and above a circle of joined pellets enclosing a pellet.

*Weight*: 7-7 grains (Pl. X, 15).

This a most interesting half silver denomination as it shows for the first time a recognizable obverse design to the issue of coins described by Commander R. P. Mack as number 456.

H. R. MOSSOP

A SCEATTA FROM PORTISHEAD, SOMERSET

In the late summer of 1969 the son of Mr. W. J. Purkiss found in the garden of their house at 57 Wetlands Lane, Portishead (ST 46257540), the sceatta illustrated on p. 164. It has since been acquired by the City Museum, Bristol.

The findspot is about seventy feet above Ordnance Datum and therefore well above the level of the marine transgression of the Late Roman period which probably continued well into the Dark Ages.¹ It is in the immediate vicinity of a sub-Roman or Dark Age cemetery of at least twenty-six graves, excavated during 1969,² and of a Roman site in the grounds of the Gordano Comprehensive School immediately to the east. The house is part of a recently developed housing estate and there is no evidence whatever to suggest that the coin might have been a collector’s stray. It should, however, be noted that about ten feet away was a surface find of a half-groat of James I of England. The sceatta was found about nine inches beneath the surface. The developer’s agent confirms that to the best of his knowledge no soil from elsewhere has been brought to the site. It has been thought proper to scrutinize and record the circumstances of finding in this detail as the findspot is on the south-western fringe of the known distribution of coins of this type.³

The sceatta, which is struck in fairly good silver, is of *BMC, Anglo-Saxon Coins*, i (1887), type 16 (cf. plate II, 20), and thus belongs to P. V. Hill’s ‘London-derived’ group.⁴ Not all of this group were necessarily struck in London, but this

² *Medieval Archaeology*, forthcoming.
³ Cf. P. V. Hill, ‘Saxon Sceattas and their Problems’, *BMC, Anglo-Saxon Coins, i* (1887), p. 130 and Map 1, p. 144. This map needs much addition and revision, but the pattern of distribution is unaltered.
example is technically akin, in the treatment of the eye and nose on the obverse and the drapery on the reverse, to the archetype inscribed clearly DE LVNDONIA, and was probably minted in the City. The weight, 0·765 gm. (11·8 gr.) is very light compared with the mean and mode for the group and the two B.M. specimens cited by Hill for this particular type (15·0 and 15·8 gr.),¹ but equally light examples of the group are known and this specimen is corroded and slightly chipped. The widest diameter is 12·5 mm.

**Obv.**: Diademed bust right, drapery in arcs; 'Floral decoration' of branch twisted to a figure of 8 in front of face.

**Rev.**: Standing figure with two-lobed 'cuirasse' and flared skirt, carrying cross-staff in right hand and, on all analogy, also in left, but the head of the staff is corroded and might have been knobbled. The stance can be compared with that of the 'Finglesham Man' on the gilt-bronze brooch from the Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Finglesham, Kent.² No 'boat' beneath feet.

This is, in weight, metal, and design, a 'secondary' sceatta. S. E. Rigold has argued that the 'London' series should probably begin c. 730-5;³ this specimen is stylistically not far from the archetype and its date would be c. a.d. 735-40. The writer is grateful to Mr. S. E. Rigold for valuable assistance in the interpretation of this coin.

L. V. GRINSELL

**STEPHEN TYPE VII—A ‘NEW’ MINT**

At the time of writing my paper on Stephen Type VII for this *Journal* four years ago there was only one coin which could have been, and which indeed already had been, assigned to the mint of Northampton.

That coin, *BMC*, no. 204 (Fig. 1 opposite), which very clearly reads +PÆN:ON—was assigned by Wells to Northampton, PÆN being a well-attested Northampton moneyer in this reign and it is illustrated by him in his paper "The Northampton and Southampton Mints."⁴

¹ *BNJ* xxvi (1952), p. 272.
⁴ *BNJ* xxviii, part iii (1957), pp. 535-54.
⁵ *BNJ* xx (1929-30), pl. VI, no. 21.
In *BMC* Brooke followed suit but with a query and, as it transpires, his doubts were well founded. As is recorded in my paper mentioned previously, *BMC*, no. 204 is in fact a die duplicate of a coin in the Fitzwilliam Museum (ex Clark, 23: v: 1898, lot 66)\(^1\) and also of one in my own collection (Fig. 2 above) which enables to establish the full reading of the three coins as being +PAEN: ON:LINEO. The ‘LI’ of the mint signature is visible on my coin and the ‘EO’ on the Fitzwilliam Museum coin; the ‘R’ is shown on yet a third die duplicate, the existence of which has only just come to my knowledge.

It is significant to note that the Fitzwilliam Museum coin is of course correctly assigned to Lincoln in *BMC*\(^2\) but the entry is in italics to indicate that Brooke had not himself seen the coin (its then whereabouts being unknown) but that he was prepared to accept the accuracy of the Clark sale catalogue description.

At that time (1916) those were the only two recorded coins of the moneyer PRE II in this rare type and, not having seen the coin ex Clark Lot 66 which was not acquired by the Fitzwilliam Museum until 1933, Brooke could not possibly have known of the die-link and recognition of it only came to light subsequent to then. Its recognition has clinched the attribution of *BMC*, no. 204, to Lincoln with the result that, until recently, no other coin which could possibly be assigned to Northampton has hitherto been known and accordingly I felt that Northampton must be excluded from the list of type VII mints recorded in my paper.

However, it is now apparent that, as might be expected, Northampton is in fact a mint in this type although it is virtually certain that Wells could not have known of the existence of the coin which proves it.

That coin (Fig. 3 above) has only recently come to light (it is now in my collection) and I am sure its significance as an undoubted coin of the Northampton mint has not hitherto been recognized.

It is a poorish specimen and is a typical type VII striking as to legibility (or rather lack of it) but —\(\text{TEN—}\) is clearly visible.

These few letters are only capable of extension to +PAEN:ON:NORH\(\text{AE}\) and are, in my opinion, sufficient to establish the attribution to Northampton.

The purpose of this note therefore is to correct my rejection of Northampton as a type VII mint and to record its addition to the tally of thirty-four mints listed in my paper; a tally which incidentally is now increased to thirty-eight by the addition of the mints of Bath, Ilchester, and Rye, which, like Northampton, have only come to light since my paper was written in 1956.

F. ELMORE JONES

---

\(^1\) *BNJ* xxviii, part iii, pl. XXXI, no. 12.

\(^2\) *BMC* i, p. cxxix.
In the most recent listing of coin hoards deposited in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, no hoard deposited in Staffordshire during the fifty years after c. 1603 is included, which is perhaps surprising in view of the hostilities which took place there during the Civil War. A Civil War hoard of unusual composition from Tursell in 1677 has, however, since been published in this journal, while the present writer is preparing for publication a discovery at Pillaton Hall, Staffs., in 1741 of a purse containing twenty-eight unites, two gold five-shilling pieces, and eighteen Scottish unites. No further details are known of these coins which represent a subsidiary parcel to a larger hoard, which was formed and deposited in the early eighteenth century. The date of their deposition is unknown but it is tolerably certain that they represent casually mislaid coins which may well have been collected and deposited in the first half of the seventeenth century.

The purpose of this note is to place on record two further hoards of the early seventeenth century from Staffordshire, together with a stray find of two coins lost at that time.

Golden Hill, Oldcot (March 1832). Deposit: probably 1648.

A bag containing silver coins, the total weight of which was about two pounds and which were mainly of the reign of Elizabeth I, together with thirty-six unites of James I and Charles I was found inside the tiering of the roof of an old thatched house in the course of its demolition. Associated with the find was a parochial notice dated 5 July 1648.


Disposition: some of the coins were purchased by a local collector, H. H. Williamson, but these and the remainder may not now be traced.

The hoard would appear to date from the end of the Civil War period and long after hostilities had ceased in Staffordshire. Relatively few hoards of these years are known. The greater majority of Civil War hoards date before c. 1645, while there is only one published hoard which dates later than this but before the death of Charles I and only five are known which were deposited during the Commonwealth. The absence of further details of the silver coins is most unfortunate. It has been shown that crown and half-crown pieces of Elizabeth I occur very infrequently in mid-seventeenth-century coin hoards. If, therefore, the majority of the coins from Golden Hill were of Elizabeth I, they should have been largely 1s. and 6d. pieces. In view, however, of the size of this hoard one would expect to find that the silver coins were mainly of the higher denominations and it may well be that although numerically there were more coins of Elizabeth I in the find, the coins of James I and Charles I had a greater over-all monetary value.

Ward conjectured that the depositor was Randle Whytall, one of the two churchwardens named on the parochial notice and who is known to have lived in Oldcot. A Randle Whittal of the parish of Wolstanton was indeed buried on 16 March 1648/9 but whether this was the churchwarden of that name is not certain nor is it known for sure whether the churchwarden’s house was that in which the coins were found.

Bore Street, Lichfield (1788). Deposit: Uncertain date within the reign of Charles I.

An unstated number of half-crown pieces of Charles I was found in a ‘large pot’.

Stebbing Shaw, History and Antiquities of Staffordshire, i, 1798, p. 333. T. Harwood, History and Antiquities of the Church and City of Lichfield, 1896, p. 479.

Disposition: unknown.

It would be incautious to assume that as this find consisted of selected coins of high denomination only, it must necessarily have been a large one, although the emphasis given to the size of the container in both sources would suggest that this is quite possible.

Suffolk, deposited in about 1649 (NC 1939, p. 183).
The following two coins were found in the early 1920s while a wall in a field at Copley Farm, Pattingham, was being demolished. They are now in private possession and were brought to my attention by Mr. J. Burke. There is no evidence to suggest that they formed part of a larger find.


   **Obv.** CAROLVS • D • G: MAG[ BR ]FRA: ET • HIB: REX • i.m. Plume.
   **Rev.** CHRISTO etc.
   i.m. Rose.

   14-075 grammes. Worn and edge filed down in places.

2. Charles I, Oxford half-crown of 1643 (North 2413).

   i.m. Plume. No ground line; plume behind king.

   **Rev.** EXVRGAT etc.
   i.m. two pellets. Three Oxford plumes above Declaration. Die flaw across the bottom left corner of the date and other indications of wear on the die.

24-3 grammes. Clipped in two places.

Photographs of these two coins have been deposited in the Dept. of Coins and Medals at the B.M.

---

**A NEW TAVISTOCK TOKEN (?)**

The massive nineteenth-century piece in my collection illustrated above is recorded by Davis,\(^1\) and Bell,\(^2\) with locality unknown. The ornate cypher is difficult to interpret and the letters may be taken for TH, TIC, TIC, JIC, or JJC.

An article in a Halifax newspaper a few years ago suggested that this piece had been issued by the Wainstalls firm of J. & J. Calvert, worsted spinners. The brothers John and Jonathan Calvert worked together in the water mill, now known as the Old Mill, below Kell Butts. The partnership ended in 1850 with the death of John at the age of sixty-two. When Jonathan died in 1875 his son, Jonathan Calvert junior, succeeded to the business. This seems an unlikely explanation, as the first and second letter of the cypher, although similar, are not the same.

In a personal communication Mr. R. G. Harry\(^3\) has drawn my attention to a description of the piece by H. S. Gill:\(^4\)

‘Nineteenth-century token. TAVISTOCK

   **Obv.:** T.I.C. (In cypher filling the field)
   1812 (In exergue)

   **Rev.:** ONE PENNY TOKEN (In three lines)

   **Edge:** Milled. [This is thread milled. R.C.B.]

The 19th Century Token No. 30 [continued from Vol. VI, p. 167] is one of those issued in this county in the early part of it by the Tavistock Iron Company, doubtless for the convenience of their workmen, at the

---

\(^1\) W. J. Davis, *The Nineteenth Century Token Coinage of Great Britain, Ireland, The Channel Islands and the Isle of Man.* Not local, no. 40, 1904.


\(^3\) R. G. Harry, Personal communication, 1970.

There seems little doubt that this is the correct explanation of this puzzling piece. For those who wish to do so there is room on page 168 of *Copper Commercial Coins, 1811–1819* to add this information.

R. C. BELL

### NUMBERED STRIKINGS OF VICTORIAN BRONZE COINS, 1860–1868

A few years ago, when looking through a box of nineteenth-century coins which had remained in the family of their original owner, I discovered a Victorian bronze penny of 1863 with the numbers 222 engraved before the face. There were a number of other Victorian coins, both English and Imperial, in mint state and it seems possible that their collector had access to a source close to the Royal Mint.

In the *British Museum Catalogue* Peck listed eighteen pennies, dated between 1860 and 1867, four halfpennies of 1861 to 1868, and six farthings of 1864 to 1866, all with pairs of numbers scratched in the field on the obverse, either as an improper fraction before the face or one before and one behind the bust. In explanation of these pieces Henry Garside wrote:

The numerator is the number of the obverse die and the denominator the number of the reverse die in use during the year in which the coins were struck. Coins bearing them are the first impressions of the dies that were submitted by the workmen to the responsible authorities at the Royal Mint, London, for approval before they proceeded with the actual coinage of the pieces.

Garside had seen only two pennies with these numbers, both of 1867 (542/329 and 582/369), and two halfpence, of 1867 (593/174) and 1868 (598/178).

It is not clear from Garside's wording whether he thought that only the reverse dies were numbered according to the sequence of those in use during the year in which the coins were struck, but in any case his explanation does not seem to be valid in the light of the greater number of examples now recorded, which may be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>BMC no.</th>
<th>Pennies</th>
<th>Halfpennies</th>
<th>Farthings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>40/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>63/63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>99/99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>102/102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Set out in this way the numbers fall into obvious series. The greater numbers are continuous throughout, regardless of denomination, whereas the lesser numbers are consecutive within the separate series of each denomination. There are two anomalies to be explained. The first is that the earliest numbered halfpenny is 102/102, whereas the first ninety-nine numbered strikings had been pennies. This could have arisen if at the start the second number had been in sequence regardless of denomination, but the system was later changed. The second is that there are two specimens known of the farthing with 236/11 which, if both are genuine, could be explained, as Peck does, 'by the supposition that the first trial was temporarily mislaid necessitating a second'.

If the general theory here proposed is correct, certain inductions can be made about the numberings which are not recorded. Where several are known close together, then if the addition to both numbers is the same between the first and the last,
all those intermediate would have been of the same denomination. So, 1/1 to 39/39, 41/41 to 62/62, 64/64 to 98/98, 224/128 to 227/131, 346/208 to 350/212, 477/300 to 481/304, 483/306 to 485/308, 544/331 to 549/336, 551/338 to 568/355, and 570/357 to 581/368 would have been pennies; three of the four numbers between 594 and 597 inclusive would have been halfpennies; and 235/10 would have been a farthing.

Even if 229 to 232 were all farthings (229/4 to 232/7), three numbered farthings must have come earlier in the series than 228/132, and therefore been dated 1863 or earlier. Of the first 228, if 132 were pennies and 3 were farthings, 93 would have been halfpennies. Between 240/137 and 345/207, 74 of the 104 items were presumably pennies, so that since the maximum possible number of farthings was 8 (19 minus 11) at least 22 should have been halfpennies. Between 351/213 and 476/299, 85 of the 124 items were presumably pennies, so that, with a maximum possible of 20 farthings (40 minus 20), at least 19 should have been halfpennies. Of the 55 items just before 542/329, only 19 were pence so that 36 must have been halfpennies or farthings (including 514).

The highest sequence number is 598, but the sum of the highest for the several denominations (369, 178, 41) is 588, so that a total of at least 10 pennies and/or farthings, later respectively than 582/369 and 514/41, are missing. (One of them would lie between 594 and 597.) This suggests that the latest known numbering of each denomination is not far short of the end of its own sequence, i.e. that 1868 was probably the last year covered by the practice and that the total of numbered specimens did not much exceed 598 in all.

Certain general observations can also be made. There are no known examples dated 1862, although current coins of all denominations of this year are common. Assuming that all the first ninety-nine items were pennies, no numbered halfpennies or farthings could have been dated 1860. On all the known numbered farthings the figures are before the bust, but all the halfpennies have the higher figure behind the bust and the lower before it. All the pennies, except those dated 1860 and 1861, and 482/305 of 1866, are marked on the former pattern. It is also noteworthy that, with the exception of the first three pennies and of two isolated numbers among both the halfpennies and farthings, all the surviving examples are in groups of from two to five adjacent or nearly adjacent items.

It must be concluded that Garside's confident explanation of the numbering will not fit the now more plentiful material. The higher number relates to the series as a whole, running from 1860 to 1868 and regardless of denomination. The second or lower number relates, not to the reverse die in a particular year, but to the series of each denomination throughout the period. Unfortunately we do not know whether the second part of Garside's explanation, as to the purpose of these pieces, was more reliably founded than the first. The evidence demonstrates that at frequent intervals during the first eight years of the bronze coinage certain strikings were put aside and numbered in sequence, both as a whole and by denominations, presumably for reference.

Their purpose, however, remains a mystery. They cannot have been specimens set aside for the Trial of the Pyx, since this applied only to coins of gold and silver. They are, in fact, not unlikely to have been impressions, perhaps first impressions, submitted for approval and may have been in some way connected with the efforts of the Royal Mint in the 1860s to find a satisfactory metal for the dies. Yet they cannot represent every die used during the period, since over 350 million bronze coins were struck in 1860–8, a total requiring several thousand dies for both obverse and reverse. Nor do the numberings relate closely to the quantities issued, either by denominations or by dates. Up to the end of 1868, 149 m. pennies were struck, 154 m. halfpennies, 48 m. farthings, and 3 m. third-farthings, yet the numbering on the pennies runs to double that of the halfpennies and to nine times that of the latest known farthing; and in one year—1862, for which no numbered strikings are known and a maximum of only 119 is available—more than 126 m. bronze coins were struck, whilst the three years 1861–3 accounted for more than 270 m. coins including over half the total of farthings of 1860–8, more than three-quarters of the pennies and an even higher proportion of the halfpennies.

Even so, it seems on balance probable that the numbered strikings of bronze coins are to be connected in some way with the usage or output of certain dies or groups of dies. Low figure die numbers occur below the date on a few pennies of 1863 and early letters of the alphabet have been noticed on halfpennies of 1862, as if experiments were being made at this period in identifying individual dies of the bronze as well as of the silver coinage. Unfortunately, the annual Mint Reports, in which such practices might have received comment, did not begin until 1870.

---

1 e.g. BMC nos. 1656, 7.
2 e.g. Glendining 15.4.70, lot 309 (B at foot of lighthouse).
Ansell's explanation\(^1\) of the die numbers which occur on florins, shillings, and sixpences from 1864 to 1879, is as follows:

'For the past few years the reverse die has been made to carry, in addition to its recognised device, a small number, with a view to determining at which coining press, and on what particular day, that die was used, that bad work might be traced to an individual. It need hardly be said that the accidents encountered in daily life overcome the object thus sought, for a die may last either minutes or days in wear owing to the irregularities of the steel from which it is made, and besides, the boys who work the presses are of necessity changed at irregular intervals.'

The numbering of coins as opposed to dies cannot have had the same purpose. We can only wonder whether the numbered bronze coins were trial pieces of some sort, first impressions from some (but far from all) pairings of new dies, preliminary strikings made before particular sessions of coining, or examples required for some other procedure of analysis or record.\(^2\)

---


\(^2\) I am grateful to Messrs. Grierson, Lyon, and Sealy for helpful comment on the subject of this paper.