MISCELLANEA

ANOTHER MODERN FORGERY OF A SCEAT

In the Journal for 1968 Lynnette Hamblin and I published an eighteenth-century forgery of a sceat of BMC type 8. A companion piece has now come to light, of BMC type 2c (see Fig. 1). On the obverse, the runes, æapa, are excessively large, distinct, and complete. The reverse, which is reminiscent of the other forgery, is badly off-centre, and the letters that are on the flan are too regular, the r being unusual, and the o a mistaken annulet. The edge of the coin is also too regular. The weight, 1·32/20·3, is on the high side. The coin has a very acceptable brown patina, reminiscent of many specimens of the primary series. X-ray analysis by 'isoprobe' reveals a total absence of silver, copper, and gold—the elements which normally make up c. 99 per cent of the Frisian runic sceattas—and instead an alloy consisting of lead, tin, and bismuth. There may be other specimens of this forgery, but I have not come across any.

D. M. METCALF

CORRECTION

Correction to Rigold and Metcalf, 'A Check-list of English Finds of Sceattas', BNJ xlvi (1977), pp. 31-52. Plate 11, 22, is from Wicken Bonhunt, Essex (J. type 27, p. 56), not from Hoo, Kent.

A CUERDALE PARCEL REDISCOVERED

In the summer of 1977, whilst following up references to Institutions which had applied for material from the Cuerdale hoard of 1840, the authors were fortunate to come across an unrecorded parcel of thirty-seven coins given in 1841 by the Duchy of Lancaster to the Royal Manchester Institution (the forerunner of the present City Art Gallery in Manchester). Permission to publish the parcel has been kindly granted by the Gallery.

The coins, still wrapped in their original paper, were found amongst a miscellaneous reserve collection of coins and medals when one of the authors was asked to look through the Gallery’s numismatic holdings. Accompanying the coins was a contemporary manuscript note which reads: 'Selection of specimens from the coins discovered at Cuerdale in Lancashire presented by the Duchy of Lancaster Nov 1841.'

Subsequent research in the archives of the Institution has failed to uncover any further reference to the acquisition of the parcel, apart from a copy of the original letter of 1st September, 1841 requesting 'some of the ancient coins and medals found in Cuerdale in this County', addressed to Sir George Gray from Thomas Winstanley, the Institution’s Honorary Secretary at the time.

1 BNJ xxxvii (1968), 190-1.
2 From the G. E. L. Carter collection, now in the Ashmolean Museum.
3 I am indebted to Professor E. T. Hall, Director of the Research Laboratory for Archaeology, for facilities there.

1 This discovery is a by-product of research being carried out by Mrs. J. Lewis, an extra-mural student at the University of Liverpool, into silver ingots from the Cuerdale hoard. The Royal Manchester Institution was included in a copy list, provided by the Duchy of Lancaster, of institutions and individuals that had requested coins from the hoard. It is not known, however, how complete the original list is.
The coins were contained in four packages, corresponding to individual groups in the hoard. A full list of the pieces, with the weights given first in grains and then in grammes, is as follows:

The Vikings of Northumbria, c. 895–c. 903

Group IIe  C-1b/CR-G

_Obv._ small cross with pellets in two angles. _Rev._ CNVT REX, patriarchal cross

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>21-6</td>
<td>1-40</td>
<td>+CVN: NFT</td>
<td>CNVT R E X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>22-2</td>
<td>1-44</td>
<td>+CVN: NET: TI</td>
<td>CNVT R E X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>21-0</td>
<td>1-36</td>
<td>+CVN: NET: TI</td>
<td>CNVT R E X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>22-1</td>
<td>1-43</td>
<td>+CVN: NET: TI</td>
<td>CNVT R E X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>21-6</td>
<td>1-40</td>
<td>+CVN: NET: TI</td>
<td>CNVT R E X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>21-8</td>
<td>1-41</td>
<td>+CVN: NET: TI</td>
<td>CHVT R E X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>23-0</td>
<td>1-49</td>
<td>+CVN: NET: TI</td>
<td>CHVT R E X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>21-2</td>
<td>1-37</td>
<td>+CVN: HET: TI</td>
<td>CNVT R E X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>21-5</td>
<td>1-39</td>
<td>+CVN: NET: TI</td>
<td>CNVT R E X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>21-6</td>
<td>1-40</td>
<td>+CVN: NET: TI</td>
<td>CNVT R E X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

St. Edmund Memorial Coinage late ninth and early tenth century.

Group I with recognizable moneyers’ names:

(a) with wedge-shaped central bar

13. 22-2 1-44 \textit{Adalberie} \textit{(Adalbert)}  
BMC 135

14. 21-3 1-38 \textit{Anwihthi} \textit{(Ansige)}  
BMC 229

15. 20-4 1-32 \textit{Anwirhe} \textit{(Ansier)}  
BMC 254

16. 20-6 1-33 \textit{Adolhwm} \textit{(Adulf)}  
BMC 442

17. 17-3 1-12 \textit{Ottprwmt} \textit{(Obert)}  
BMC 493

18. 21-6 1-40 \textit{Baretrw} \textit{(Rearl)}  
BMC 524

19. 20-6 1-33 \textit{Risplefrw} \textit{(Risleca)}  
BMC 535

20. 20-1 1-30 \textit{Sigmund}  
BMC 558/546

(b) with three pellets below

21. 20-3 1-38 \textit{Quarncw} \textit{(Quaran)}  
BMC 515

(c) with three pellets above

22. 21-0 1-36 \textit{Wineceaw} \textit{(Winecer)}  
BMC 613/614

(d) with numerous pellets above

23. 21-3 1-38 \textit{Wineawmoti} \textit{(Winier)}  
BMC 621

24. 19-3 1-25 \textit{Wineaw} \textit{(Winier)}  
BMC 639

(e) with one pellet at each side

25. 22-6 1-46 \textit{Adalbert} \textit{(Adalbert)}  
BMC 159

26. 19-5 1-23 \textit{Adalbert} \textit{(Adalbert)}  
BMC 159

(f) with three pellets at each side

18. 18-9 1-22 \textit{Daedmont} \textit{(Daegmund)}  
BMC 340

19. 20-4 1-32 \textit{Adalberie} \textit{(Adalbert)}  
BMC 135

20. 19-2 1-24 \textit{Daegwrat} \textit{(Daegmund)}  
BMC 181

Group II with uncertain names, probably denoting moneyers:

(a) with crescent above, one pellet at each side, one in centre, and one below

23. 17-9 1-16 \textit{Onginair} \textit{(Orni Mon retrograde)}  
BMC 490

(b) with four pellets at each side

24. 21-2 1-37 \textit{Bosecin}  
BMC 142

Group III with other legends:

‘Danac’ group

25. 21-5 1-39 \textit{Eraltmon} \textit{(Ersalt)}  
BMC 398

26. 19-2 1-24 \textit{Ersalt} \textit{(Ersalt)}  
BMC 402

Continental coins

Charles the Bald, 843–77

Melle (Morrison, 1064)


Obv. a cross. Rev. Karolus monogram
33. 25-3 1-64 + CARLVS REXF + METXVLLO
34. 25-5 1-65 + CARLVS REXF + METXVLLO
35. 25-2 1-63 + CARLVS REXF + MET + VLLO
36. 25-0 1-62 + CARLVS REXFR + MET + VLLO

Odo, 887-98
Limoges (Morrison, 1332)
Obv. +/ODO/+ in field. Rev. a cross
37. 26-7 1-73 \ + GRATIAD-IRE + LIMOVCAS CIVIS

The present parcel seems to constitute a fairly average small group as distributed by the Duchy of Lancaster, although it is perhaps surprising that no coin of Alfred was included. It is useful to compare its composition with that of four other groups:5

(1) Liibeck Library received a total of 23 coins:
12 St. Edmund Memorial; 5 Cnut/Cunnetti; 6 Continental.

(2) The Royal Numismatic Society received a total of 96 coins:
6 St. Edmund Memorial; 21 Cnut/Cunnetti; 8 Alfred; 15 Continental; 46 Sundries.6

(3) Saffron Walden Museum received a total of 15 coins:
8 St. Edmund Memorial; 3 Cunnetti; 4 Continental.

(4) The Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle received at least 19 coins:
8 St. Edmund Memorial; 10 Cunnetti; 5 Alfred.

The group of coins at Manchester does not appear to have been handled to any extent since the discovery in 1840 and therefore offers an opportunity of studying the characteristic light-brown patination of coins from the hoard.

Other small parcels have been located but it is likely that more remain; the authors would appreciate any information or details of such groups. Finally our acknowledgements are due to Mr. Wheeler of the Duchy of Lancaster, Mrs. Jen Lewis, and the Manchester City Art Gallery.

KEITH SUGDEN and MARGARET WARHURST

WINCHESTER MONEYERS

Volume xlvii of the Journal contains a review of Winchester in the Early Middle Ages: An Edition and Discussion of the Winton Domesday (Reviews, pp. 149-50). The review presents a very fair, if brief, picture of the book, which contains a remarkable array of information of interest to the numismatist and it is not the intention of this note to amend the opinions expressed by the reviewer. However, in the part of the book which deals specifically with the moneyers, there are a small error and an omission which, although minor, should nevertheless be noted as they are contained in a volume which will, without doubt, be quoted in the future whenever the coinage of mediaeval Winchester is being discussed.

(a) On page 415 (n. 3) there is a reference to a paper by R. H. M. Dolley which appeared in Seaby's Bulletin dated January 1969. The footnote suggests that an argument was put forward in this paper to the effect that Lyfing was either one moneyer, with an interrupted career, or two moneyers of the same name. The paper by Dolley, in fact, criticizes the theory put forward in a note in Seaby's Bulletin in November 1968, where the 'one moneyer' suggestion is made, and suggests alternatively that the situation was probably that of a father followed by homonymous son.

(b) Page 416 notes two types recorded from Winchester for Stephen and lists the eight moneyers known. For the record, it should be mentioned that the type bearing the obverse inscription PERERIC is also recorded for Winchester, represented by a single specimen, moneyer Geffrei, in the collection of the writer of this note and formerly in the collections of B. Roth (Pt. I, lot 145) and G. C. Drabble (Pt. 1, lot 723).

R. J. SEAMAN

5 These four institutions are also named on the list mentioned in note 1. The breakdown of types for the Royal Numismatic Society parcel was published in the Numismatic Chronicle for 1841. That of the other three institutions has been extracted from their own internal records.

6 Sundries would include types such as Mirabilia Fecit, Siefred, etc.
THE 'ENIGMATIC MARK' OF RICHARD II

The coin shown here is a York penny of Richard II, type III. It bears on the reverse a mark after TAS which has long been known but has often been misinterpreted either through poor striking, deterioration of the dies, or through wear or clipping of the coins.

Walters, writing in 1904 described it as an escutcheon and said that though the mark was often indistinct and blurred he had a specimen which was perfectly struck. Unfortunately, though, he did not illustrate it.

In 1962 Mr. Frank Purvey, in his Paper on the smaller coins of the reign, differed from Walters over the designation of scallop. Although he could find only one coin on which the mark was relatively clear he considered it more like a trefoil. He went on to say that on some coins 'this trefoil-like form disintegrates and resembles a flaming sun', and if it was intended to be a sun he offered the suggestion that its presence on the coin might possibly be explained by the fact that late in the reign Richard adopted this device as his personal emblem.

In 1969 Miss Archibald, in her Paper on the Attenborough Hoard, referred to six coins with the 'enigmatic mark' after TAS. She expressed a preference for Walters's earlier suggestion that it was a scallop shell rather than the trefoil or sun suggested by Mr. Purvey. The Attenborough hoard coins were not distinct, however, and she considered that until a really well-preserved penny showing the mark turned up its interpretation must remain uncertain.

Although the penny illustrated here is not well struck, the mark is very clear and undoubtedly a scallop; therefore it is published to place it on record. Whether this was the coin which belonged to Walters cannot be determined. His 1913 Sale Catalogue lists two specimens described 'both very well preserved and rare', and the writer has another one with the mark almost equally clear.

As to the reason for this unusual mark, one can only speculate. Although it is found on certain of Richard's gold coins, Walters could find nothing to account for its presence on a York penny and came to the conclusion it could only be the mark of some die engraver or mint official. Mr. Purvey considers that its purpose may never be known but that it is 'just one of the many things which make the medieval series so interesting'. Miss Archibald regards the mark as one peculiar to York and analogous to the Archbishops' personal marks which appear on the pence of this mint at later periods. This definition is probably as near to the truth as we are likely to get.

M. DELME-RADCLIFFE

A YORK PENNY OF RICHARD II

Some years after writing my article on the pence, halfpence, and farthings of Richard II which appeared in the BNJ xxxi (1962), I was re-examining the late style penny from the Clarke-Thornhill bequest in the British Museum. This coin is illustrated on Pl. VIII, 79 in the above mentioned article. From careful examination of the quatrefoil on the reverse there seemed, albeit rather shadowy, the outline of an R in the centre.

At the time I did draw the attention of Miss Marion Archibald of the Department of Coins and Medals to this rather extraordinary phenomenon and she agreed with me that there was little doubt that there was an R in the centre of the reverse. Indeed so certain was I that several editions ago I added the description 'R in centre of quatrefoil' to the Class 4 York pennies listed in the 'Standard Catalogue'. Needless to say nobody has ever queried this statement or asked where the information came from. However, Mrs. Delme-Radcliffe has written a small note on another aspect of the coins of Richard II and I thought it

1 NC Series IV, vol. iv.  
2 BNJ xxxi, 1962.  
3 Ashmolean Museum.

4 BNJ xxxviii, 1969.  
5 Sotheby, 20 May 1913, lot 211.
only right and proper that I draw the Members' attention officially to this coin.

It is quite possible that all the Class 4 coins which are listed (Pl. VIII, 77-80) do have an R in the centre but only no. 79 is in any way distinct and indeed is visible from the illustration in the *Journal* through a low-power magnifying glass.

The illustration reproduced here is enlarged ten times from the original and is, if anything, somewhat clearer than a magnifying glass examination of the coin (Fig. 1).

The only coin that has an R punch the right size to go into the quatrefoil (assuming that an existing punch was used, and not a new one), is the half noble. There is in the British Museum a cast (the coin is in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris) which has an R on the reverse which appears to be almost identical to the R on the York pennies (Fig. 2). This cast has also been enlarged to the same scale as the penny.

This is the only instance that I can recall of the King's initial, for this is what it must surely be, appearing on the reverse of an English silver hammered coin.

I shall be pleased to hear from any Members who may be able to shed any further light on this.

**FRANK PURVEY**

---

**ADDITIONS TO THE ANGLO-GALIC GOLD SERIES**

Since publication of my paper on the Salutes of Henry VI in the 1973 volume of the *Journal*, the following coins have been reported to me.

1. From the National Museum of Antiquites of Scotland, Edinburgh.
   A specimen of Henry VI salute Paris mint 3rd issue, *Obv.* as 2nd issue, with AVE written downwards, *Rev.* with pellet under T of REGNAT.
   Listed by me as 'no specimen known'.

2. From the Koninklijk Penningkabinet s'Gravenhage, Holland.
   *Rev.* 1st issue with R gothic instead of the M Roman of the regular 2nd Issue.

   This is a die-link of the 1st and 2nd issues, previously unknown.

3. A new mint for the gold Harde of the Black Prince. A specimen of this coin from the mint of Poitiers has come into my hands.
   This mint has not previously been recorded for the gold Harde, though Poey d'Avant mentions a silver pattern, which he did not actually see, and of which there is now no trace.
   *Obv.* ED PO GNS REGIS ANGLI AQUITA
   Plain fillet on Prince's head.
   *Rev.* AUXLLUM MEUM A DOMINO P
   In first angle: lis.
   (Note two L's and no I in AUXLLUM.)

**R. D. BERESFORD-JONES**
THE SCOTTISH COPPER COINAGES, 1642–1697

A Postscript

In the BNJ xli (1972), 109–10, we put forward arguments showing why we considered that CR and CR" turners were struck during the reigns of Charles I and Charles II respectively. At the time the paper was written no documentary evidence had been found which supported these conclusions. Since then an important document has come to light among the Lauderdale muniments which bears on this problem.1 This is a petition by Sir John Falconer, master of the Scottish mint, addressed to the Lord Commissioner (i.e. Lord Middleton, the king's commissioner to the Scottish Parliament) and to the lords of the Privy Council; although undated, it was probably written during the first half of 1663.

The petition draws attention to the care taken and expenses incurred by Falconer in repairing the mint buildings and equipment. It ends with a request for a warrant to strike 1,500 stones of copper in turners, having the same 'impression and circumscription' as the previous issue, but with the addition of 'two ii for secundus'. This phrase not only confirms our suggestion about the sequence of the two types of turners, but shows that the numeral is to be read with the initials of C(arolus) R(ex) to indicate the reign. In July 1650 the mint-master had received a warrant for a small issue (60 stones) of turners, and strictly speaking this was an issue of Charles II, whose Scottish reign dated from his father's execution in 1649 and not from his English restoration in 1660; but in effect this issue was merely a prorogation of the much larger copper coinage (4,000 stones) of 1642–8, and the coins belonging to it cannot today be distinguished from those struck previously.

Since 1650 the Scottish mint in the Cowgate, Edinburgh, had been out of use and both buildings and equipment had been allowed to fall into a state of disrepair. Indeed some of the 'toolls and work loones' had vanished and on 1 January 1661 an act of the Scottish Parliament authorized the General of the mint to try to find them.2

On 12 June 1661 an act of the Scottish Parliament had authorized the striking of 3,000 stones of copper turners, of which 2,000 stones was to be coined within three years and the remaining 1,000 stones at some later date.3 But according to an act of 24 April 1662 the minthouse was not yet ready.4

The petition is reproduced below, all the abbreviations having been expanded.

'To his Grace the Lord Commissioner and the lordis of his Majesties privie Council

The humble petition of Sir John Falconer, Master of his Majesties mint Shewith

That ffor so much as your petitioner efter much care paines and extraordinarie expense that he hes bestowed in repairing the workhouses and toolles and putting both in a posture for work (about which he hes bein necessitat not onlie to mainteine all sortis of workmen necessary for the same and upon his awin charge and creddit hes furnisched all materiallis necessary for the work But also he hes provydit Coopper to be coyned in turnoirs so that there is nothing wanting for the goeing therof and coyneing of the said cooper But your Lordships warrand for doing the quantitie therof and the impression and circumscriptions that sail be upon the same

May it therfoir pleas your Grace and Lordships grant to your petitioner a warrand to coyne fyftejne hundreth stane weight of Coopper in Turnoirs and ordine the impression and circumscription that was upon the last cooper journay to be continued upon the present journey of tournoirs with this addition of two ii for secundus: And your peti-

J. K. R. MURRAY and I. H. STEWART

1 Scottish Record Office ref. 69/6/12. We are most grateful to Captain G. E. I. Maitland-Carew for permission to discuss and reproduce Sir John Falconer's petition.

2 R. W. Cochran-Patrick, Records of the Coinage of Scotland, ii. 138, item XIV.

3 See BNJ xli. 107.

4 R. W. Cochran-Patrick, Records, ii. 146, item XXVI.
The two hoards published here were examined in the British Museum after being declared Treasure Trove. After examination the Burghclere hoard was acquired intact by the Hampshire County Museum Service and the Winsford hoard also remained intact and was acquired by Grosvenor Museum, Chester. A summary report of the latter hoard is contained in Coin Hoards III (1977) no. 345.

The Winsford (Cheshire) hoard was found during construction work at Winsford in Cheshire in 1970. The hoard was found in a pot now in the Grosvenor Museum, Chester. It was deposited after A.D. 1643 and contained 243 silver coins and three base silver forgeries (face value £9. 5s. 5d.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLAND</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shilling (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tun</td>
<td>(1552-3), 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>great (22)</td>
<td>pomegranate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sixpence (1)</td>
<td>lis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>great (4)</td>
<td>lis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shilling (19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lis</td>
<td>(1558-60), 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>martlet</td>
<td>(1560-1), 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cross crosslet</td>
<td>bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>(1583-5), 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>escallop</td>
<td>(1584-7), 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tun</td>
<td>(1591-6), 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sixpence (57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phœcon</td>
<td>(1561), 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phœcon</td>
<td>(1561), 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rose</td>
<td>(1564), 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portcullis</td>
<td>(1564), 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lion</td>
<td>(1564), 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coronet</td>
<td>(1564), 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>castle</td>
<td>(1565), 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as</td>
<td>(1565), 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ermine</td>
<td>(1571), 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ermine</td>
<td>(1571), 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erminion</td>
<td>(1573), 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erminion</td>
<td>(1573), 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eglandine</td>
<td>(1577), 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eglandine</td>
<td>(1577), 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cross</td>
<td>(1578), 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1578), 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| JAMES I | LONDON | |
| --- | --- | |
| shilling (20) | thistle, 1st bust | (1603-4), 2 | 5·64* |
| thistle, 2nd bust | (1603-4), 2 | 5·76* |
| lis, 3rd bust | (1604-5), 3 | 5·43* |
| rose, 4th bust | (1605-6), 2 | 5·37* |
| escallop, 4th bust | (1606-7), 2 | 5·08* |
| grapes, 4th bust | (1606-7), 3 | 5·58* |
| groat, 5th bust | (1611-12), 1 | 4·58 |
| sixpence (14) | thistle, 1st bust | (1603), 1 | 2·90 |
| thistle, 2nd bust | (1603), 1 | 2·69 |
| lis, 3rd bust | (1604-5), 1 | 2·74 |
| rose, 3rd bust | (1604-5), 2 | 2·92* |
| rose, 4th bust | (1605-6), 1 | 2·55 |
| thistle, 6th bust | (1622), 1 | 3·03 |
| lis, 6th bust | (1624), 1 | 2·36 |
| trefol, 6th bust | (1626), 1 | 2·60 |

| CHARLES I | LONDON | |
| --- | --- | |
| half crown (7) | tun, 3rd horse | (1636-8), 3 | 15·08* |
| triangle, 3rd horse | (1639-40), 1 | 14·89 |
| triangle in circle, 4th horse | (1641-3), 3 | 13·67* |
| shilling (16) | lis, 4th bust | (1625), 1 | 4·50 |
| lis, 5th bust | (1625-6), 1 | 5·00 |
| plume, bust C | (1630-1), 3 | 5·39* |
| portcullis, bust D | (1633-4), 1 | 5·95 |
| bell, bust D | (1634-5), 1 | 4·34 |
| crown, bust D | (1635-6), 1 | 3·7* |
| crown, bust D | (1635-6), 1 | 3·7* |
| contemporary imitation | (contemporary imitation) | (contemporary imitation) |
tun, bust D  (1636-8), 1  4.05  (contemporary imitation)
anchor, bust E  (1638-9), 1  5.87*
triangle, bust E  (1639-40), 1  5.98
triangle, bust F  (1639-40), 5  6.12*
triangle over anchor  (1639-40), 1  5.84
star, bust F  (1640-1), 4  5.89*
triangle in circle, bust F  (1640-1), 10  5.83*

[Continued]

star, bust E  (1640-1), 4  5.89*
triangle, bust E  (1639-40), 1  5.98
triangle, bust F  (1639-40), 3  5.98*
star, bust F  (1640-1), 1  5.84

OXFORD
half crown (2)
Shrewsbury horse  (1642), 1  14.42
Oxford horse  (1643), 1  14.84

ABERYSTWYTH
shilling (1)
book  (1638-42), 1  5.90

SCOTLAND
thistle merk
(English Is. I d.) (1)  (1601-4), 1  6.27

IRELAND
JAMES I, LONDON
shilling
(English 9d.) (6)
rose, large, 3rd bust  (1604-7), 1  4.03
rose, small, 3rd bust  (1604-7), 1  4.38
rose, large, 4th bust  (1604-7), 1  3.84
rose, small, 4th bust  (1604-7), 1  3.59
easle, 3rd bust  (1604-7), 1  3.75
martlet, 3rd bust  (1604-7), 1  2.04 (broken)

N.B. Weights are expressed in grammes; average weights are marked with an asterisk. The varieties cited are those outlined in J. J. North’s *English Hammered Coinage*.

Although this hoard is a typical example of an emergency deposit of the Civil War period containing low denomination coins, it seems worthwhile, however, to publish it in full, because previous hoards of this type have not been published with records of the weights of the coins they contain.

An analysis of the weights of the coins in this hoard has shown that they provide a concrete example of the fact that the lower a coin’s denomi-
nation the more it is likely to be worn with use. They also illustrate the loss of weight to a coin relative to the length of time it has been in use. The following table shows the average percentage weight losses which are observable in this hoard (percentages taken from groups of less than five coins are in brackets).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coin Type</th>
<th>Edward VI</th>
<th>39%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philip and Mary</td>
<td>(44%), (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>38%, 30%, 18%, 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James I</td>
<td>10%, 15%, 11%, (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles I</td>
<td>5%, 3%, 4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although a few coins in this hoard are clipped this is not sufficient to distort the over-all picture of wear shown by the weights of the coins. The greater wear of lower denomination coins is dramatically demonstrated and the rate of wear is shown to be also relative to the length of time in use.

The inclusion in the hoard of three contemporary forgeries and several non-English coins along with so many very worn coins suggests strongly that the hoard was not carefully accumulated over a period but drawn straight from circulation. The military activities in Cheshire during the period 1643–6 suggest a likely context for its concealment.

The Burghclere (Hampshire) hoard was found during restoration work on a cottage in Burghclere, Hampshire in 1971. The hoard was found in a pot and on top of the coins was pushed a screwed up piece of paper to act as a bung. (This piece of paper was torn from a notebook belonging to a certain Benjamin Avery. On it were written his name and an account of methods for making monetary calculations; the paper was too damaged to be certain what these calculations were for. The handwriting used was typical of the reign of Charles I. Extensive researches discovered only one person of the name alive at this time. He was a resident of Frome in Somerset and a trustee of the Frome charities. He died in 1676 aged at least seventy. It was not possible to find any links between him or his family and the part of Hampshire where the hoard was found. It is, however, possible that the page was torn from this Benjamin Avery’s notebook.) The hoard was deposited after A.D. 1660 and contained 167 silver coins (face value £8, 10s. 3d.). The small number of clipped coins in the hoard is worthy of note; only about ten coins seem to have suffered from it to any obvious extent.
Although it is possible to determine the date of the latest coin in this hoard (a Charles II half-crown struck at the Tower mint during the period
1660-2), this does not give a precise indication of its date of deposit. The reason for this is that coins issued up to 1662 continued to be the mainstay of circulating currency for the next thirty-five years until the recoinage in 1697.¹

Hoard known from their contents to have been deposited during this thirty-six year period from 1662 to 1697 attest to the minimal role played by the coins struck after 1662 in the currency at that time. For example, 138 coins deposited at Staple² (Canterbury) after 1673 contained only 2-1 per cent machine struck coins, 1,884 coins deposited at Crediton ³ after 1683 contained 1-4 per cent and 1,197 coins deposited at Yearby⁶ in 1697 contained 14-5 per cent. In view of the relative scarcity of machine struck coins even in hoards deposited late in this period it would be unwise to maintain that the absence of such coins from this hoard indicates its deposit before the initiation of the machine striking of coins in 1662.

A full account of the weights of the coins in this hoard has been published here because no hoards of similar composition have yet been published with the weights of the coins they contain recorded. Like the Winsford hoard, the weights of the coins in this hoard show an increase in the loss of weight from use in relation to both denominations and time in circulation. Most of the types common to this hoard and that from Winsford show a deterioration in weight relative to the twenty or more years separating their date of deposit. The only exception to this decrease are the Elizabeth I shillings in the Burghclere hoard which show an average increase in weight of 4-5 per cent over those in the Winsford hoard. This is probably an indication of the less hectic circumstances of the deposit of the Burghclere hoard.

A comparison of the weight loss observed in the coins of this hoard can be made with that of the Broadwoodwidger hoard (the only datable hoard of the period 1662-97 which has been published with a record of the weights of the coins it contained). This hoard which must have been deposited after 1685 shows increased weight losses in the coins it has in common with the Burghclere hoard. The average percentage losses for each coin type in these two hoards is shown in the following tables (average taken from groups of less than five coins are in brackets).

**Burghclere hoard**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coin Type</th>
<th>6d</th>
<th>9d</th>
<th>1/-</th>
<th>1/11</th>
<th>2/6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth I</td>
<td>18-4%</td>
<td>12-5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5-6%</td>
<td>3-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James I</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12-2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6-4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles I</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5-6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6-4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles II</td>
<td>10-3%</td>
<td>9-3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6-4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Broadwoodwidger hoard**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coin Type</th>
<th>6d</th>
<th>9d</th>
<th>1/-</th>
<th>1/11</th>
<th>2/6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth I</td>
<td>29-6%</td>
<td>13-7%</td>
<td>19-3%</td>
<td>12-2%</td>
<td>9-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James I</td>
<td>20-6%</td>
<td>13-7%</td>
<td>19-3%</td>
<td>12-2%</td>
<td>9-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles I</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6-4%</td>
<td>5-6%</td>
<td>3-9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The necessarily different circumstances of the accumulation and deposit of these two hoards may account for some of the greater weight loss observed in the Broadwoodwidger hoard in comparison with the Burghclere hoard, but the uniformity of this decrease throughout the hoard suggests that the disparity of weight loss between it and the Broadwoodwidger hoard could be a direct result of the earlier deposit of the Burghclere hoard. It seems likely therefore that this hoard was deposited earlier than 1685. How much earlier cannot be determined on the basis of the evidence at present. Until more seventeenth-century hoards are published with fuller details of the weights of the coins they contain the application of the evidence of coin wear found in this and the Winsford hoard must remain limited.

The inclusion of Irish and Scots coins with non-English denominations in English seventeenth-century hoards is not unusual. Even as late as the year of the recoinage in 1697 the depositor of the Yearby hoard included in it three Irish shillings. The Irish coins in these hoards are shillings which were made to a lower standard than that of England. They are silver 'thistle' merks valued at Is. 1  

probably lost their original identity in the minds of their users. The Irish shillings were probably used as English sixpences being about the same size and having approximately similar types. The Scots 'thistle' marks were probably used as English shillings being the same size and almost the same weight.

Irish shillings of James I from these two hoards are of added interest as they augment the range of bust and privy mark combinations known at present. The following table shows the range of these varieties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Coinage</th>
<th>2nd Coinage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bust 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bust 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>B, BM, AS, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martlet</td>
<td>B, BM, AS, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose (large)</td>
<td>B, W, BM, AS, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose (small)</td>
<td>B, W, BM, AS, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scallop</td>
<td>W, BM, AS, S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The large and small varieties of the rose privy mark result from the use by the die cutters of two different punches when engraving it. The larger punch was borrowed from those made for the English shilling dies; the smaller was borrowed from those for the English sixpence dies. It was the smaller of these rose marks which Aquilla Smith must have mistaken for the cinquefoil mark (which he dated to 1613–15).

J. CRIBB

---

JOHN WILKINSON HALFPENNY: A TWENTIETH-CENTURY FABRICATION?

In Provincial Token-Coinage of the 18th Century Dalton and Hamer listed nine variants of Wilkinson's halfpennies with the Vulcan reverse dated 1790.¹

A few years ago Mr. John R. Farnell sen.² gave me a twentieth-century fabrication (Fig. 1); and also supplied the information recorded on page 243 of Specious Tokens and those struck for General circulation 1784–1804.³ To repeat from that work: 'In 1947 a very small number of uniface replicas of the reverse of Wilkinson's third type of halfpenny . . . were struck to the order of Mr. Edward West, the Eastern Representative for ORCo. The original pieces and the copy are masonic items . . . Only some dozen pieces were struck . . . The Osborne Register Company of

Cincinnatti, Ohio, (ORCo) is now the Osborne Coinage Company.

Recently, a collector who wishes to remain anonymous, purchased a Wilkinson token in America shown in Fig. 2. The reverse is from the same die as Fig. 1; but the obverse is unrecorded, and is different from all the eighteenth-century pieces illustrated in Dalton and Hamer’s work. The tie of the queue points to the I of IOHN, lower than the eighteenth-century pieces; in varieties War. 424-5 the tie points to the o, and in varieties War. 426-9 it points between the o and the H. Variety War. 430 has a period after the R of IRON-MASTER.

It would seem that this newly reported piece is another twentieth-century fabrication, probably emanating from the same source as that described in Specious Tokens.

R. C. BELL