A RE-EXAMINATION OF SOME HOARDS CONTAINING COINS OF STEPHEN

R. J. SEAMAN

IN the British Numismatic Journal for 1968, Mr. E. W. Danson made a very noteworthy attempt at reconstructing the Nottingham hoard of coins of Stephen, discovered in January 1880. The hoard was first reported upon in 1881, but only twelve coins were listed out of a total of 177 included by Danson, to which I can add just one piece, albeit an important one. The reports of hoards containing coins of Stephen vary in reliability and some were not published until many years after the discovery. Despite assurances by the writers of the reports that the finds were intact, it is for consideration that some error or omission has occurred, unbeknown to the reporter and, more important, there may have been the odd coin added to the hoard just because it happened to be around and was from approximately the same period. There is evidence for this in the reports on the medieval coins found at Dunwich.

Estimating the date of deposition of hoards of this period has been a difficult task. Most of the larger hoards, which have sufficient coins on which to base a reasonable conclusion, were published in the last century, since which time research has produced different suggestions as to the dates of emission of both the regular and certain irregular coins of Stephen’s reign. Excluding the recent find at Prestwich, which has yet to be fully published, there are ten hoards which are known to have contained fifty or more coins of the reign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of hoard</th>
<th>Date found</th>
<th>Publication and contents</th>
<th>Suggested date of deposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashby-de-la-Zouch</td>
<td>1788/9</td>
<td>BNJ 1968. Said to contain over 400 coins of Henry I and Stephen, of which 9 only are described.</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awbridge</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>NC 1905. Said to contain about 180 coins of Stephen and Henry II: 34 of Stephen and 104 of Henry II are listed.</td>
<td>1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartford</td>
<td>1817 or 1825/6</td>
<td>NC 1851: said to contain about 65 pence of Henry I and Stephen, of which 4 of the former king and 55 of the latter are listed. In BNJ 1968, another 4 pieces of Stephen are attributed to the find.</td>
<td>c. 1150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 I am indebted to several members of the Society for valuable assistance so willingly given to me. In particular, I wish to thank Mr. Ian Stewart, M.P., without whom the paper would not have been published. I wish also to thank Professor R. H. C. Davis for the advice given to me on the history of the period, although responsibility for any errors which may have occurred in the interpretation of this advice must rest with me.

2 BNJ xxxvii, 'The Nottingham Find of 1880: A Stephen Hoard Re-examined', pp. 43-64, and plate.

3 BNJ xli, 'A Further Find of Coins from Dunwich', pp. 27-33; and BNJ v, 'Finds of Medieval Cat Halfpence and Farthings at Dunwich', p. 126.

4 Coin Hoards I (Royal Numismatic Society, 1975), no. 360. Full report yet to be published.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of hoard</th>
<th>Date found</th>
<th>Publication and contents</th>
<th>Suggested date of deposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latton</td>
<td>Between 1860 and 1900</td>
<td>Wiltshire Archaeological Magazine, 1911 and 1969: between 50 and 200 coins of Henry I and Stephen thought to be in the hoard, of which 1 of Henry I and 2 of Stephen are listed in the later volume.</td>
<td>c. 1145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linton</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>NC 1883: thought to contain about 150 coins of Henry I and Stephen, of which 7 of Henry I and 82 of Stephen are listed.</td>
<td>1140/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>Dec. 1883</td>
<td>BNJ 1968: stated to contain at least 60 coins of Stephen but none listed.</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>Jan. 1880</td>
<td>NC 1881; thought to contain over 150 coins of Henry I and Stephen, of which 2 of Henry I are described and another 7 mentioned. 10 of Stephen are listed and all 12 listed pieces are illustrated. BNJ 1968, contains a relisting of the hoard and describes 14 coins of Henry I and 163 of Stephen, to which another one of the latter king is now added (see below).</td>
<td>c. 1141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>BNJ 1910, carefully lists 3 coins of Henry I and 98 of Stephen, almost certainly the entire hoard.</td>
<td>c. 1142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Kyme</td>
<td>Long before 1922</td>
<td>NC 1922; 334 coins carefully listed. Although the discovery is thought to have occurred many years earlier, it is probable that the hoard was intact at the time of the report.</td>
<td>1141+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watford no. 1</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>NC 1849; 1,127 coins examined. Of William II (1), Henry I (477), and Stephen (649). Despite a number of rumours and the interval of 30 years since the discovery, it was considered that the hoard was probably complete. 779 coins were listed.</td>
<td>c. 1140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the list of finds, it can be seen that six were published many years after discovery and the same probably applies to South Kyme. In spite of the fact that all these coins are available and known to have come from particular hoards, one still hears the comment ‘if only we had a really big hoard from Stephen’s time’. This is because, notwithstanding the hoards published to date, there still exist a number of problems and it is to be hoped that the recent find at Prestwich will provide answers to at least some of them.

Two questions which need to be considered further are, when did type I cease to be struck? and why does only the Linton hoard contain a representative number of both types I and II? It is proposed to comment on these two problems later; for the present, however, and in an attempt to reassess the dates of deposit of these hoards, a critical examination has been made of just five of them, namely those discovered at Linton, Nottingham, Sheldon, South Kyme, and Watford (no. 1). The research has taken the form of a close look at the regular coins of BMC I, divided into the various obverse inscriptions: a check to see whether coins which are of prime importance in the dating exercise really did form part of the hoard, as well as an examination of the dates for the issue and currency of BMC types I and II.
Inscriptions

The obverse inscription of the first type of Stephen’s coinage, barring a very few exceptions, falls into four styles, namely:

STIFNE REX (or occasionally STIEFNE REX)
STIEFNE RE
STIEFNE R
STIEFNE

A paper was read to the British Numismatic Society in 1972, although it did not appear in print, which attempted to demonstrate that the earliest of these inscriptions is that reading STIFNE REX and the supporting evidence for this suggestion takes two forms. Firstly, coins with this reading are of neater style and this is to be expected for the first issue of a king who, although he had a claim to the throne, was not clearly the first choice to succeed. The inclusion of the full title REX undoubtedly was used as one of the few ways to tell the inhabitants of this country that Stephen was the king. There is also supporting evidence on the coins from Lincoln mint, insofar as the spelling of the mint name is concerned. In the reign of Henry I, the mint is shown as NICOL, and this spelling also occurs on the coins reading STIFNE REX. However, the coins with the legend of just STIEFNE in larger lettering and often without an inner circle, have the mint shown as LINCOLNE, or a shortened form thereof. Later issues from Lincoln, including types IV and VII of Stephen, also have the spelling LINCOLNE. It would appear to follow that the coins with no title at all are the last of the type and, if further evidence is needed here, then this perhaps lies in the fact that, with a single exception, BMC II coins all have the obverse legend reading STIEFNE. As far as can be ascertained, all coins of types VI and VII have just the king’s name on the obverse, although it is interesting to note that the other BMC types, III, IV, and V, include STIEFNE R amongst the specimens recorded. This situation calls for more research, as it may add weight to the suggestion that type VI followed type II.

In addition to examining the various obverse legends of type I pennies contained in the five hoards mentioned above, I have also considered the weights of the coins, separately for each spelling. It would appear that some conclusions may be reached from this examination but, as one would expect with these particular coins, the result is not entirely conclusive. However, the findings are as follows:

Watford no. 1

A comparison of the regular coins of BMC type I from Watford shows that this hoard was probably concealed earlier than either South Kyme, Sheldon, or Nottingham. It is a pity that the weights were not given in the original report of the hoard, for the coins were presumably weighed, as Mr. Rashleigh mentions that ‘the average weight of many of the worst preserved of these coins was 20½ grains . . . but ten of the

---

6 R. Seaman at the October meeting of that year. See also M. Dolley and K. A. Goddard, ‘The Anglo-Norman Spellings “Stifne”, “Stefne” and “Stiefne” Found on the obverse legends of English Coins of Stephen’s first Substantive Type’, Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, 1971, pp. 19-34, which discuss the obverse legend, but the major part of the paper is concerned with the Anglo-Norman origins.
8 Dolley and Goddard, op. cit., includes a similar exercise on coins from the Watford hoard only.
best struck coins averaged more than 22$\frac{3}{4}$ grains, or about a $\frac{1}{4}$ grain above the proper weight.\(^8\)

For the purpose of this exercise, the coins from Watford currently in the British Museum’s trays have been included but, as with the other hoards, specimens on which the obverse reading is in doubt have been omitted. This means that some sixty-eight coins only out of a total of over 600 have been used. This is unfortunate but, nevertheless, an interesting picture emerges, as with the other hoards, of a slight but gradual reduction of weight. The average weights in this hoard are for REX—21-7; RE—21-2; R—21-1, and no title at all 21-5. It should be remembered that as the coins with the clear readings only have been taken into account, the weights recorded are from the better-preserved specimens. Although mention needs to be made of this point, on the other hand it will be seen from Rashleigh’s report that the very worst specimens were, on average, not much lighter than the superior specimens.\(^9\)

There were a number of irregular pieces in the hoard. These comprised two coins reading PERERIC, one erased die, one coin with a mint reading ETB (and another of similar style), and a penny listed as of Matilda. The coins reading ETB, although somewhat light, appear to fall into the category of blundered pieces and do not seem to be any more significant. Another coin with a blundered legend, listed by Rashleigh when reporting the find, appeared as number 15 and was later in his Sale. The obverse legend had been read as ———RCEX and it was suggested that it should have been EREX, but the letters that remain could be construed as being RCE + L. The suggested reading of the reverse was given as ———TE or TZ and an attribution to the mint of Thetford cannot be confirmed. The weight of this piece is 18 gr. Number 16 in the original list has no legend, but with a weight of 19-4 gr. does not seem to be a baronial piece. The remaining coin listed, number 17, seems to be a coin from the London mint and weighs 21-5 gr.

The coin attributed to Matilda is now regarded as doubtful\(^10\) and, as such, cannot be relied upon as occupying the position of being the latest coin in the Watford hoard. The only other irregular coin listed in the Numismatic Chronicle is given to Henry of Anjou, but it has a most indistinct legend and is of very rough workmanship. Therefore, the attribution is again doubtful and cannot be taken as reliable in relation to the dating exercise.

**South Kyme**

The chart suggests that the South Kyme hoard was concealed a number of years after 1135, but unlike the Nottingham hoard, discussed later, there is a high proportion of coins reading REX and RE. This produces two thoughts; the first being the suggestion that the Nottingham hoard was formed fairly hurriedly, whereas the South Kyme parcel is made up of coins which had been put by on a regular basis over five years or more. The other thought is that the coins from South Kyme still show a pattern of a reduction in the average weight during issue, although there is one specimen without any form of title weighing 23 gr. The average weights are for REX—21-4; RE—20-6; R—20-2, and for no title at all 19-6.

---

\(^8\) J. Rashleigh, NC, 1st ser., xii, p. 163.  \(^9\) Ibid., p. 149.  \(^10\) BNJ xlvii, 'A London Penny of Matilda', by Ian Stewart, links the Watford coin with one then owned by Mr. Tasker. The latter piece has been declared not to be a coin of Matilda but possibly struck from a die originally prepared for the empress and altered before use.
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Sheldon

This hoard has been included because, as far as can be ascertained, it was complete when recorded and, with possibly one or two exceptions, is still intact at Chatsworth House. There are more coins with no title than of the other varieties and the ranges of the weights follow the same pattern. The average weights are rex—20·3; re—20·2; r—20·4, and with no title 19·4. What are probably the latest coins in the hoard are those in the name of Matilda, and two examples which appear to be mules of the first two regal issues. The former coins are very unusual in style and have a facing bust, which is otherwise unknown for the empress. They are not generally accepted as being genuine coins of Matilda. The latter coins are also rough in style and are likely to be forgeries. Nevertheless, the hoard was presumably buried during the currency of type II and, as there were no actual coins of this type, it may be assumed that concealment was at the beginning of the second regal issue.

Nottingham

Danson includes a total of 177 coins in his relisting and, for the record, two observations should be made. Firstly, coin number 18 is, with little doubt, from the Durham mint, and the question-mark may be removed. Danson was right in questioning this piece, as it has had a chequered past. It was first listed as being from the London mint in Montagu’s sale. Then, although the correct mint was arrived at, the published reading was false. The letters which were stated to be legible were shown as making up +HE[NRI] ON D[...].N, whereas the coin actually reads [ +]IE[NRI] [ON] DVN. This piece passed through the collections of R. C. Lockett and N. C. Ballingal and is now in the writer’s cabinet. The other observation to be made is in the form of an addition to Danson’s listing. The piece is the coin from Winchester mint with the obverse reading PERERIC. This coin is also in the present writer’s collection, with all the earlier tickets, showing that it came from the Nottingham hoard, Toplis (not in Sale), Roth I (lot 145) and Drabble I (lot 723) collections. This coin does not appear to have been in the collection of Montagu and this is probably the reason why it was not included in the relisting; for, without the accompanying roundels, Danson could not have connected the coin with the Nottingham hoard.

Of the coins contained in the relisting, I have used eighty-nine specimens of BMC type I for the purpose of analysis. Pieces which are broken or on which the legend is not entirely clear have been omitted but there have been included those of the erased-die variety which can be read. This is because these coins make up a significant part of the first issue, but their weights are discussed separately below. The coins reading rex appear generally to have been issued at full weight. Some wear would naturally have taken place, particularly during an issue which lasted considerably longer than normal and one might also expect a slight reduction in the weight of issue. This appears to have happened. However, the average weight of the coins with this reading contained in all the hoards under examination, except Linton, is not far below the full weight, indicating that the effect on the weight as a result of circulation is not very great. Why a few coins of considerably light weight should exist with the king’s name,
when the general standard is good, is difficult to explain, and it may well be that they are, in fact, some of the pieces supposed to have been issued in vast quantities by barons, many of whom would probably not go so far as to put their names on the coins. It is interesting to note again that, with those very few exceptions, light coins are not generally found amongst those with the inscription REX.

As will be seen from the accompanying chart, the REX and RE pennies had disappeared almost entirely when the Nottingham hoard was concealed, but the weights of the surviving coins with this inscription are good and it could be that many of the REX coins had become light through years of circulation and those particular specimens were not chosen by the hoarder. The absence of REX specimens and the large proportion of coins with no title may well indicate that the Nottingham hoard was concealed at the end of the currency of the first type of Stephen but before the circulation of BMC type II.

If it is accepted that the coins reading STIEFNE were the last of type I, then the chart shows that they were issued at a lower average weight. There are still some coins which nearly reach the full weight but there are also coins of virtually every weight within the range, the average weight being 16.9 gr. As a fair proportion of the coins with no title are light, and it is not just a case of the isolated piece, it seems that the low average to be found in the Nottingham hoard is more the result of lightweight issue than of being in circulation.

Of the irregular coins in this hoard, there was a high proportion of the erased-die variety, namely forty-one. As mentioned earlier, those with a clear obverse legend have been included in the chart. It appears to be a fact that all the coins with erasures of some kind are with the legend STIEFNE R or STIEFNE, although coins from eastern mists with roundels are recorded from dies having REX and RE. The weights of the erased-die coins vary between 13.9 and 19.5 gr. The two heaviest coins are from Lincoln mint with only the slightest form of erasure (Mack numbers 150(a) and (c)) and, if they are omitted, the heaviest coin reaches only 17.4 gr. The other irregular pieces are two coins reading PERERIC, five with roundels and fifteen coins which appear to be from local dies. There is also a coin in the name of Matilda and another in the name of Henry of Anjou. These two coins both imitate BMC type I and assist considerably in determining the earliest date of deposition. But what would undoubtedly be the latest coin in the hoard is the single example of BMC type VI. This piece is number 107 in Danson's list and seems to be out of place in the hoard. This view is expressed by Danson and, although the coin has a provenance similar to many of the coins which can be traced to the Nottingham hoard with certainty, it seems that there is sufficient doubt as to remove it from the list.

Linton

This hoard was included because of its unique position of combining a good representation of coins of BMC type II with coins of the first issue. The only other hoard to contain type II coins was Winterslow, with just five, although Dartford may have contained some and Sheldon had two contemporary forgeries of the type. Linton may, therefore, be presumed to have been concealed at a time when the first type had ceased

13 Mack, op. cit., p. 64. 12 Mack, op. cit., p. 102.
to be struck, although still generally current. The report of the Linton hoard is not
very accurate in that a number of pieces were misread. Also, some eighty coins were
not listed and there is a noticeable absence of irregular issues, other than the type of
the moneyer SANSON.

The Linton hoard needs relisting and this task is presently being undertaken by the
writer of this paper. However, for the purposes of this exercise, the published report
will suffice. It can safely be assumed, if indeed anything can be with coins of this reign,
that the hoard was put down after the issue of *BMC* type I had ceased to be struck.
Therefore, it is suggested that one might look at this hoard to prove, or disprove, the
suggestions that have been made earlier. In fact, the statistics do not disprove the
suggestions. There are fewer coins reading *rex*, *re* and *r*; only fourteen of all three
subtypes. Specimens with no title number thirteen alone, including a cut halfpenny, but
there were a high proportion of coins on which the obverse legend could not be read.
As will be seen from the chart, the weight progression is again similar; the average
weights being *rex* 19-9, *re* 20-8, *r* 19-9, and with no title 19-2.

The hoard had more coins reading *rex* and *re* than those reading *r*. But the owner
of the coins seems to have been selective. This could be the reason why there are no
baronial pieces listed, although it is an interesting fact that the finds from Kent and
Hertfordshire, whilst containing Angevin pieces in some cases, did not have any coins
in the names of barons. Perhaps this is an indication that baronial pieces did not
circulate in south-east England. We are assured by Wakeford, who wrote the report of
the Linton hoard in 1883, that although not all types were acquired by him, he care-
fully examined and recorded all varieties in the hoard. There is no real reason to
doubt this statement and the absence of irregular pieces is accepted.

An interesting feature of this hoard is the unusually high proportion of cut pieces.
There were no fewer than 24 halves and quarters out of a total of 88 pieces, suggesting a
parcel of current cash rather than savings. Of the 39 specimens of type II, 14 were cut
pieces. This proportion appears to be about the same for all the type II specimens
recorded and leads one to the conclusion that the majority of the examples of this
quite rare type came from the Linton hoard.

This hoard contained just three irregular pieces. There were two coins with the
legend *PERERIC* and one reading *SANSON ON ANT*. There seems little doubt that the
*BMC* type II coins are the latest in the hoard and, as there is an even balance between
*BMC* types I and II, it is probable that the Linton hoard was concealed early during
the emission of type II.

**Dating for BMC type I**

The period of issue for this type most commonly quoted is c. 1135 to c. 1141. There
are, however, several reasons for questioning the later date. Firstly, there were only
four, and possibly three, distinctive issues during Stephen's reign; namely *BMC* types
I, II, VI, and VII or I, II/VI, and VII. So, there is a need to distribute three or four
main types amongst the nineteen years of the reign. Secondly, there is some evidence
afforded to us by the coins in the names of Matilda and Henry of Anjou, which imi-

---

16 But see M. Dolley, 'The Anglo-Norman Coins in the
Uppsala University Cabinet', *BNJ* xxxvii. p. 34, where the
suggestion is made that the first type may have continued
in general circulation (and in issue) until the 'beginning of
the late 1140's'.

---
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Matilda came to England late in 1139, and coins in her name could have been issued then. It is more likely, however, that the few specimens issued in her name were struck in 1141 when she was in a much stronger position, with Stephen in prison and her coronation in sight.

It is almost as likely that the coins could have been issued in the following year. Mack records that Matilda took no further part in the war after December 1142 and that, for the next five years, her brother Robert of Gloucester carried on the battle on behalf of her son Henry. It should be remembered, however, that Matilda remained in England, in the Bristol area, until January 1148, when she returned to Normandy, following the death of Earl Robert in October 1147. It seems less likely that coins would have been struck in Matilda’s name in the late 1140s, although she did grant the earldom of Salisbury to Patrick in 1147, indicating that she was not entirely inactive. On balance, however, the period 1141/2 is most likely for coins in the name of Matilda, all of which are in the style of BMC type I and light in weight.

Henry of Anjou was born in 1133 and his first visit to England was in 1142, when he was nine years of age. He made a further visit in 1147, supported by a small army, and returned again in 1149, by which time Matilda had left for good. It seems reasonable to dismiss the issue of coins in the name of Henry as being connected with his visits of 1142 and also 1147, for the reason that Matilda was still here, and bearing in mind his age. The year 1149 is a possibility but, from a historical point of view only, the balance is in favour of 1151. This last date presents problems, in that the majority of the pieces in the name of Henry of Anjou resemble BMC type I. The remainder have a facing bust which, at first inspection, appears to imitate type II but which are, in fact, probably copied from a coin of the fifth issue of William I. One must ask why a coin was chosen which had not been in general circulation for more than seventy years? It is possible that dies were produced on the Continent from a single specimen picked by pure chance. Or was it that type II, which was issued from eastern mints in England, did not circulate in the western part of the country? Whatever the answer, it remains a fact that there are thirty or so coins recorded today; some being good copies of Stephen’s first issue (either on both sides or at least on the obverse), whilst the remainder have a facing bust as do Stephen’s second issue.

However, one must not overlook the evidence of the coins themselves. The outstanding feature comes to light by comparing the mints. Matilda’s identifiable places are Bristol, Oxford, and Wareham, whilst Henry’s are Bristol, Gloucester, Hereford, and Malmesbury. Therefore the only mint which is clearly seen to have produced coins for both is Bristol and there a moneyer named ARFEN or ARFIN worked for Matilda and Henry. It is suggested that this moneyer was employed firstly for Matilda and afterwards for Henry for the reason that the coins in the name of Henry are the facing-bust type, which is assumed to be the later emission. Notwithstanding the preference historically for 1151 as the date for coins in the name of Henry, one cannot but postulate the earlier date of 1149 by noting that two separate areas were involved, for by this year Matilda had left England for good. If Henry’s coins were struck in 1149, perhaps the issue was organized by William, the new earl of Gloucester and it may be just coincidence that, for Henry’s profile type, three moneyers at least are known to

17 Ibid., p. 86.
18 But see below for a more detailed description of the profile coins of Henry of Anjou.
have been working at the Gloucester mint. However, the earlier date is not very likely but, in the absence of positive information, the possibility should be recorded.

As there is no positive evidence to support dating of the coins in the names of Matilda and Henry, the following dates are only conclusions based on the arguments put forward in this paper.

Matilda
- Coins in the style of Stephen’s first issue (Mack numbers 230 to 240)
- 1141/2 or possibly 1147

Henry of Anjou
- Coins imitating Stephen’s first issue entirely (Mack numbers 241 to 245)
- 1151 or possibly 1149
- Coins with obverse in the style of Stephen’s first issue but with reverse similar to Henry I’s last type (Mack numbers 247 to 253)
- 1151
- Coins with facing bust in style of William I’s fifth type (Mack numbers 255 to 261)
- 1152

It is suggested that these lightweight coins, all of which average about 15 to 16 gr., were put into circulation at a time when they resembled the type of regal issue most commonly, if not solely, in use. This would indicate that BMC type I was still circulating in 1150, and suggests that in the western part of England there might have been a shortage of coins, causing the later issues of the Angevin party to look only vaguely like Stephen’s types.

A considerable extension of the period of currency of BMC type I would fit in with the rarity of the other main types, and the fact that most hoards are limited to the first of the official issues. The revised dates of circulation now suggested are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BMC type</th>
<th>Western England</th>
<th>Eastern England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1135 to c. 1152</td>
<td>1135 to c. 1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Did not circulate?</td>
<td>c. 1150 to c. 1152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Did not circulate?</td>
<td>c. 1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>c. 1153 to c. 1158</td>
<td>c. 1153 to c. 1158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note that in the five hoards used for this paper, no coins were found from either Bristol or Gloucester mints with the obverse inscription STEIFNE. This could be taken to mean that the coins with this inscription were struck after 1146 in other areas, and that these mints at least were, by that time, not working at all for the king. If coins of Bristol and Gloucester mints with this obverse reading exist at all, they are very rare and the only specimen noted is by the moneyer GURDAN of Bristol and the final part of the legend is indistinct, so that it cannot be said with certainty that the reading is the latest variety. Although a number of coins of Stephen’s first issue from these mints were included in four of the hoards, it is worthy of note that the Nottingham hoard contained none from either place.

Mack suggests the year 1153 for the commencement of type VII and also puts forward the theory that types II and VI might have been concurrent, using as his argument a unique type II/VII transitional piece. Although the evidence produced by this particular coin should not be dismissed without due consideration, there remains the fact that all eight mints known to have struck coins of type VI are recorded for type II. So the suggestion that the two types were concurrent seems unlikely.

19 Ibid., p. 55; see also BNJ xxviii ‘Stephen Type VII’ by F. Elmore-Jones, for a detailed study of the type.
**Dating of the hoards**

In addition to looking at the coins of Matilda and Henry of Anjou for dating purposes, there are two other facts which are of some assistance in dating the hoards. Firstly, there is the content of the hoards which comprises coins from other reigns. In Watford, coins of Henry I and Stephen were represented in a ratio of 2:3; South Kyme had a ratio of about 1:30 for the same kings; Sheldon had a similar allocation; Nottingham contained coins of both Henry I and Stephen with a ratio of about 1:12, whilst Linton, although still containing some coins of Henry I, had a majority of Stephen’s second issue.

Secondly, some evidence may be afforded by the coins of the London mint by the moneyer Robert. This moneyer started work at the mint late in the issue of *BMC* type I. The name also appears frequently in type II at various mints, suggesting possibly that there may have been movement of moneyers between the mints during that issue.20 Robert of London is known for types I, II, and VII and his type I coins are to a large extent, but not entirely, of the last sub-type reading *Stiefne*. None of Robert’s coins were found at Watford. At South Kyme there were 3 out of a total of 40 London coins; Sheldon had none amongst 22 of that mint, whilst Nottingham had no less than 8 out of 10 London coins and of those 8, 5 or perhaps all of them read *Stiefne*. Linton had 2 coins of Robert, both with no title, as well as others with the same name, of *BMC* type II.

Taking into account all the points made, the conclusions reached as to the dates of deposit of the five hoards examined in detail are as follows:

### Types in hoard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoard and suggested date of deposit</th>
<th>Suggested dates of issue</th>
<th>Henry of Anjou types</th>
<th>Stephen type II or later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stiefne Rex</td>
<td>Stiefne Re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>[1135 to 1141]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1141]</td>
<td>1145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It follows that later dates can be suggested for some of the other hoards of the period, in cases where sufficient detail of the contents is known. These include the find at Dartford, which could be tentatively amended to c. 1149 and the find at Winterslow,21 which is unlikely to have been concealed before 1152.

21 See note 14.